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ABSTRACT

PRODUCTION OF THIRD SPACES FOR IMMIGRANT ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS: (RE)NEGOTIATING IDENTITY AND DISCOURSE IN THE SECONDARY CLASSROOM

FEBRUARY 2012

ANDREW W. HABANA HAFNER

B.A., HAMILTON COLLEGE

M.Ed., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Ed.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Margaret L. Gebhard, Ph.D.

This study explores theoretical and pedagogical implications of space, language, and power in renegotiating identity for immigrant English Language Learners (ELLs) in secondary schools in the United States. The primary research question explored in the study is: How does spoken and written language and discourse shape the production of third spaces for renegotiating immigrant student identity in the ELL writing classroom? I adopt an epistemological lens of space from a postmodern geographic perspective that contends that space is socially produced and is co-constituted by material, abstract and lived spaces. The theoretical framework draws on constructs of social space, space-time, and the chronotope propose reconsideration of third spaces for immigrant ELLs. The context of the study is an intermediate ELL writing classroom designed around immigrant students developing academic and critical literacy grounded in their lived spaces of immigration. The methodology employed combines ethnography of the classroom space with critical discourse analysis of critical spatial events that are analyzed
as moments of spatial production. Ethnographic narrative of the classroom space, governed by guiding concepts of critical literacy and shared behavioral norms, centers on the focal immigration unit in which student immigration narratives provide overarching chronotopes of immigrant student identities. Analysis of classroom spatial production highlights tensions in social space that are mediated by language, discourse and communication surrounding immigrant identities. Transcript analysis of critical spatial events traces intersecting space-times at global, local and micro-local scales of classroom discourse. Findings from ethnographic case study of one immigrant Latino male, who aspires to become a hip hop DJ, illustrate how hip hop discourses frame the chronotope of immigration and represent a shared third space between the teacher and focal student. This study contributes new ideas in theory and research methods by operationalizing third spaces for immigrant ELL student. Implications also follow for curriculum and instruction rooted in lived spaces of experience and for critical reflective practice for educators.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION
TOWARD PRODUCTION OF THIRD SPACES FOR IMMIGRANT ELLS

“I made the trip to America alone [which] was scary. It took me one month and fifteen days from El Castillo, Provincia Norte, El Salvador to Springtown, Virginia. I was 12 years old when I made my journey to the U.S.A.”

-Raul Moreno, Immigration Narrative composition

Raul was a ninth grade English language learner in my Composition class when he wrote his immigration narrative of Coming to America as an unaccompanied minor. He moved around to stay with different families in the two years before I met him, resulting in interruptions in his schooling, prolonged absences, and incomplete identification of his learning needs. During his freshman year at Cuttersville High School, these struggles continued as he negotiated a schedule of ELL, Special Education and mainstream classes. Raul dwelled on the social margins, often observed to be sitting alone in the cafeteria, sometimes skipping lunch entirely for the refuge of a quieter space in the library, computer lab or the empty ELL classroom. One day after releasing my class to go to second lunch, I found him sitting quietly on the floor in the dark side hallway across from our Room L2, hiding beneath his hoodie sweatshirt listening to his iPod. I asked him what he was doing sitting there and why he wasn’t in the first half of our class. With a characteristic blank expression, he admitted that he got confused about the schedule that day and went to first lunch by mistake. I invited him to hang out in the classroom and we spent this quiet time listening to music, while he worked on finishing his overdue draft about his “American Dream” of becoming a famous hip hop DJ.

Figure 1. Vignette 1: An Immigrant Student in Between School Spaces

This glimpse of one secondary English Language Learner introduces the complexities we face in envisioning an effective, engaging and socially just education for immigrant students. When I first met him as a 9th grader, it was undeniable that Raul’s journey to the United States was a formative experience in his adolescence and framed the institutional positions that shaped his school identities. These lived spaces of memory and meaning were an enduring backdrop to his unfolding immigrant story. I witnessed
over the school year his continued challenges inside and outside of school in making social and cultural adjustments as a language learner, as an immigrant, as an adolescent in America. This study aims to shed light on the tensions of immigrant ELL’s experiences in school spaces and how they navigate their multiple social identities in the instructional process.

**Statement of the Problem**

Raul would characteristically fit the label of ‘at-risk’ student from multiple institutional spaces. As sketched through the opening vignette, Raul’s navigation of the time and space dimensions of school is a complex challenge that is obscured by deficit-laden characterizations of him simply as an ‘at-risk’ student perceived simplistically to just skip class because he does not want to learn. While excessive absences and accumulated missed work was an on-going challenge for Raul and myself as his teacher, I frame this problem as the need to rethink and restructure how to effectively engage Raul and other immigrant students through multiple discourses and literacies that better respond to their immigrant experience. This perspective points to student-centered curriculum that engages immigrant ELL students in sharing, examining, reading and writing their experiences in meaningful ways, which may be in resistance to dominant discourses of schooling in America. If Raul is floating around these varied academic and social spaces of school, how do we design and produce spaces of learning that will better relocate his institutional position and engage him in his own learning in meaningful ways?
The time and space of Raul’s school experience were greatly structured by his
dual institutional designations as a Special Education (SpEd) student and an English
Language Learner (ELL). These two sticky institutional labels of SpEd and ELL, crafted
in conceptual spaces of educational research, assessment policy and program
development, get stuck in disproportionate numbers to culturally and linguistically
diverse students like Raul (Artiles, Rueda, Salazar, & Higareda, 2005; Harry & Klinger,
2006; Klinger & Artiles, 2003). These institutionalized labels can have significant
impact on tracking immigrant students’ along educational paths characterized by
unchallenging subject matter and low expectations for student achievement (Nieto &
Bode, 2008; Suarez-Orozco, Suarez-Orozco, & Todorova, 2008). As immigrant students
are tracked by low expectations, their learner identities are shaped by a sense that their
school experiences are on a trajectory of frustration and failure rather than success, which
can lead to students’ disengagement and resistance to school. These learner identities
such as a ‘good student’, ‘bad student’, ‘ELL student’, or ‘SpEd student’ heavily
influence students’ fulfillment of expectations of themselves and of others, which affects
academic performance and life trajectories.

These institutionalized labels take on discursive power in shaping students’ social
position in school and the spaces they inhabit in their daily lives in schools. These school
identities affect where they go to class, who they socialize with, who socializes with
them, what table they sit at in the cafeteria, who gets the benefit of the doubt and who
doesn’t. Furthermore, while these different labels of ELL and SpEd represent supportive
designs for Raul’s educational growth, they simultaneously shape his marginalized
position as a student and how he negotiates a learner identity in school. As a telling sign
of the cultural-linguistic barriers that marginalized Raul in between these institutionalized spaces, he did not even know what an Individualized Educational Program (IEP) was or if he had one, despite the fact that this SpEd document advocated for his educational rights and largely structured his daily life in school.

This is not merely a reflection of the marginalization of one student, but the broader concerns of educational equity and access for immigrant communities who frequently are not educationally prepared, informed or adequately supported to navigate institutional school spaces. Immigrant families face great cultural, linguistic and social class barriers that are reproduced in paths to and through education. Facing this difficult challenge of bringing immigrant students and their families to the center of the educational process must recognize how students are experiencing cultural and linguistic acculturation that takes on particular discursive forms in learning how to be “a student” and “do school” in an American social context (Gebhard, 1999; Harklau, 1994).

The numbers of immigrant students in the United States have grown rapidly in recent decades. According to the National Center on Immigration Integration Policy, in 2006-07, over 5.3 million English language learners (ELLs) were enrolled in public schools in K-12, representing 10.7% of the total enrollment. This represented nearly 8% growth in ELL enrolment nation-wide over the preceding decade from 1997-2007. The states with the highest ELL enrollment for 2007-08 were unsurprisingly in the west and southwestern states, led by Nevada (>30%) and California (24.3%), New Mexico (18.5%); states in the northwest United States varied between 5-10% or less. (NCELA, 2007).
As numbers of immigrant and ELL students increase gradually, there is greater attention and concern for their academic performance. In the state of Northeast (pseudonym) where this study takes place, 27% of high school ELL students, categorized as Limited English Proficient (LEP), scored at or above the “Proficient” category on the 2007 standardized math assessment. For the same exam, Hispanic students were the racial sub-group with the lowest percentage (42%) of the same statistic, as compared to 75.1% of white students and 82.2% of Asian students. On the 2007 high school English standardized exams, only 12.3% of LEP students scored at or above “Proficient”. Again, Hispanic students had the lowest sub-group rating, with 42.7% scoring at or above “Proficient”, as compared to 46.6% of black students. This profile of academic performance by ELLs and racial sub-groups in Northeast state is concerning when coupled with 2007 graduation rates for LEP students (54.5%), Hispanics (56.9%) and blacks (64.4%). In addition, ELL students had the highest drop-out rates at 9.5%, followed by Hispanic (7.9%) and black students (6.8%) respectively (USDOE, 2006-07).

This overview of performance and retention statistics for ELLs and racial sub-groups in Northeast reflect a familiar portrait of a pervasive achievement gap that needs to be addressed in public education. Bringing marginalized student groups, especially immigrant ELL students from low-income households, further to the center of the educational process is of paramount importance.

In reconsidering paradigms of second language learning that account for the broader sociocultural context of education, Gebhard (1999) asserts that “schools are structured, cultural spaces” that shape which particular language, discourses and social identities are allowable, and therefore, shape the “production and reproduction of social
orders.” Olsen (1997) traced how immigrant high school students are forced to negotiate their ‘place’ in the school environment and face the ‘Americanization project of schools’. Within school spaces, immigrants students are forced to negotiate and resist academic marginalization and separation; becoming English-speaking and dropping native languages; and “insistent pressures to find and take one’s place in the racial hierarchy of the United States” (Olsen, 1997, p. 240-241). Harklau (2000) documented how immigrant ELL students at secondary and post-secondary levels are represented stereotypically within institutional discourses by teachers, curriculum and educational programs. The representations and resultant positioning of students in school spaces contribute to shaping their identities as ‘immigrants’ and ‘students’. Harklau concluded that institutional and programmatic representations of immigrant language learners had motivational and material effects on students’ engagement in their learning experiences in the classroom.

Moreover, research on the language learning experiences of immigrant students reveals increasing complexities in understanding the differing characteristics and educational needs of immigrant students (Suarez-Orozco, 2008). In addition to the cultural-linguistic diversity of immigrant communities and the influence of varying historical conditions of migration, education is affected by contexts of prior schooling, native language illiteracies, and divergent experiences across immigrant generations (Harklau, 1994; Matsuda, Canagarajah, Harklau, Hyland, & Warschauer, 2003; Roberge, 2002). Such research continues exploring the nuances of educational challenges of immigrant students like Raul, who began schooling in their home countries during
elementary years, and migrated to America (under varying circumstances), often-times bringing only partial literacy in their native language.

Achievement gaps related to racial, cultural, linguistic and class difference must also be understood within the sociopolitical context of school spaces which are structured by dominant societal discourses that have marginalizing effects on immigrant students, and more so on immigrant students of color. School spaces and institutionalized roles of teachers and students have the potential to both perpetuate and resist discourses of power that are represented in educational policy, institutional structures, and formal curricula (Apple, 1995; Giroux, 1992a, 1992b; Popkewitz, 1997, 1998). These dynamics manifest challenges for immigrant students in English-only educational policies, curricula based on Eurocentric cultural perspectives, and pedagogical approaches that prioritize individual versus group identity (Nieto & Bode, 2008).

In the context of highly politicized national debates surrounding bilingual education over recent decades, shifts in language policy represent powerful ideological spaces of struggle that have material implications for teachers and immigrant ELL students and the conditions that shape the spaces of classroom interaction. In Northeast state, for example, the elimination of bilingual education in 2002 established a new conservative educational policy that further removed important cultural-linguistic resources from teachers and students. Moreover, such language policy mandated shifts pedagogical models toward sheltered-instructional approaches that forced ELL students to adapt quicker to mainstream classrooms and curriculum. As occurred in other states where bilingual education was eliminated, many teachers ideologically opposed found
themselves reprimanded for drawing on native language to support instruction, even when it such instructional scaffold was needed.

The opening snapshot of Raul’s disorientation in navigating school and seeking refuge in a side hallway provides a metaphor for the challenges he faced as an immigrant student in school spaces. This vignette also reflects the lived spaces in between culture, class and identity that shaped his school experiences, a similar experience to all immigrant students that are forced to locate themselves in the American social fabric. This study explores challenges and possibilities for how students and teachers can interrogate broader societal discourses and experiences of immigration to allow for the production of third spaces in the classroom that allow for renegotiations of immigrant study identities.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to develop new methods for analyzing how immigrant students are positioned discursively in institutionalized spaces of school and ways that discursive tensions of their lived experiences and immigrant identities can be renegotiated in classroom spaces. Understanding that the performance and shaping of identity occurs in and through socially produced space (Lefebvre, 1991; Soja, 1996), I focus on language use in oral and written texts as discursive moments of spatial production in the secondary ELL composition classroom (Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, & Shuart-Faris, 2005; Bloome & Clark, 2006; Leander, 2002). I analyze focal teacher-student interactions by drawing an attention to representations of time and space
(Fairclough, 2003) in written and spoken texts of the ELL classroom, which I characterize as *critical spatial events* constituted by moments of third space production.

Another purpose of this study examines the role of pedagogical designs for the classroom space focused on students’ lived experiences, emotional engagement with the world, and communicative processes guided by critical literacy (Freire, 1970). In this study, I analyze lived spaces of classroom discourse at the levels of group and individual interactions to explore how discursive representations of time and space can (re)negotiate immigrant students’ school identities by engaging them actively, critically and emotionally in school.

Toward these ends, I aim to extend the theoretical construct of *third space* (i.e. (Gutiérrez, K., Rhymes, & Larson, 1995) for the immigrant ELL classroom. This is in an effort to recognize the discursive resources of lived experience that immigrant ELL students bring to their learning. My aim is to move beyond essentialized characterizations of the “problem” of immigrant ELLs that is common in the research literature (Gutiérrez, Kris & Orellana, 2006). Following Solsken, Willet and Wilson-Keenan (2000), my intention is to “disrupt the prevalent dichotomy in research whereby classroom practices are described in terms of either celebration or critique in favor of a more complex view of the necessary interweaving of celebration and critique” (p. 204). In reconsidering third space for immigrant ELLs, my purpose is to look through the glass half full at the refracted visions of new learning and transformation for immigrant students like Raul and their teachers like me.
**Research Questions**

The primary research question explored in the study is: *How does spoken and written language and discourse shape the production of third spaces for renegotiating immigrant student identity in the ELL writing classroom?*

Secondary research questions in this analysis are:

- How are space and time represented in spoken and written discourse in the secondary ELL classroom?
- How do representations of space and time in spoken and written discourse shape chronotopes of immigration in the ELL classroom?
- How does engaging diverse spaces of immigrant student experiences mediate tensions of students’ multiple identities in social spaces of the classroom?

These research questions are probed through a lens of social space in analyzing how classroom discourse surrounding immigrants’ lived experiences can contribute to renegotiations of student identity in support of academic and critical literacy.

**Theoretical Framework**

Responding to a need for spatializing educational studies (Kostogriz, 2006; Leander & Sheehy, 2004), this study aims to make a theoretical move beyond space defined statically as context or setting, or used merely as a metaphorical concept surrounding social activity. The theoretical framework for this study expands on the construct of *third space* applied to educational research (Gutiérrez, Kris, 2008; Gutiérrez, Kris, Baquedano-Lopez, & Turner, 1997; Gutiérrez, K., Rhymes, & Larson, 1995) by applying a definition of space from a critical geographic perspective that considers space as social process (Lefebvre, 1974, 1991; Soja, 1989, 1996). I appropriate the notion that
space is produced through social process to operationalize third space as an analytical construct for understanding the ELL classroom with implications for promoting critical literacy (Freire, 1970, 1998; Freire & Macedo, 1987). Such as spatial perspective integrates in complimentary fashion to a situated and fluid perspective of negotiated meaning and identities as multiple and layered in different discourse communities. With an attention to language as a principal semiotic tool in the social production of school spaces, critical discourse analysis of oral and written texts can trace the discursive time-space contours of power and resistance in the classroom (Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, & Shuart-Faris, 2005; Bloome & Clark, 2006; Fairclough, 1992, 2003). From this perspective, discourse is understood broadly as social practice; which is shaped by and shapes situations, social structures, and institutions. It can both maintain and reinforce the status quo, or transform it.

In bringing together spatial perspectives to classroom discourse, this study contributes theoretically to Gutierrez’s (2005, 2008) recent reconsideration of a Grammar of Third Space by tracing how classroom space is produced and identity is renegotiated for immigrant ELLs through a shared classroom discourse of ‘social dreaming’ through communication and unity, which I conceptualize in the classroom space of Comm.Unity. In Chapter 3, I propose a redefinition of third spaces in fully outlining the theoretical framework for this study. In Chapter 5, I provide an ethnographic portrait of Comm.Unity as an organizing concept for the Writing 2 classroom that aimed toward critical and collective social consciousness, negotiated through discursive tensions related to students’ immigrant identities.
Significance of the Study

This third space study responds to the call of postmodern geographer Edward Soja (1989, 1996) for a “radical spatial praxis” which contends that spaces of everyday living are inherently sites of struggle in material, conceptual and lived ways. In this study, I follow educational researcher Kris Gutierrez (2008) in reconsidering third space to contribute new ways of thinking about “equity-oriented criteria for creating a more just and democratic educational system in an increasing complex, transnational, and hybrid world (p. 148).” A spatial perspective on better understanding the lived spaces of immigrant English Language Learners in U.S. classrooms is an important research agenda for addressing issues of oppression reproduced in schools.

Gutierrez and Orellana (2006) articulate the importance for more careful consideration of designs and methods in research on ELLs, citing the trap of normalizing deficit discourses of non-dominant students, while overlooking the important literacies and cultural discourses that provide resources for effective learning in schools spaces. The authors challenge researchers to raise their own critical consciousness in how research studies on ELLs adopt dominant frameworks that “unwittingly create or reinforce deficit views of these students and their communities (2006, p. 502).” This study responds to this challenge theoretically and methodologically in several ways.

In this study, I developed analysis around the salient themes of hip hop music and culture as discursive resources for academic and critical literacy development. Negative constructions of hip hop culture and discourse, which contribute to essentializations of non-dominant youth, run contrary to dominant discourses of American schooling. However, this study illustrates the discursive power of the chronotope of ‘hip hop
dreams’ as providing cultural resources for academic literacy development that reflect the focal students’ immigration narrative and future professional aspirations. ELLs have lived experiences of physical migration and cultural dislocation that are in continual negotiation within school spaces. In considering language learning as a process of literacy development, identity formation and socialization into a discourse community (Solsken, Willett, & Wilson-Keenan, 2000; Willet, 1995), this study takes specific consideration of how immigrant ELL students can identify with hip hop discourses (Ibrahim, 1999), and how teachers can draw on these unofficial spaces for developing academic literacy (Alexander-Smith, 2004; Dimitriadis, 2002b; Duncan-Andrade, 2004; Duncan-Andrade & Morrell, 2000; Kamberelis, 2001; Mahiri, 2004; Morrell & Duncan-Andrade, 2002a; Morrell & Duncan-Andrade, 2002b).

This study moves third space education research further by drawing on critical discourse analysis of language to trace classroom renegotiations of meaning and identity from diverse spatial and temporal locations (Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, & Shuart-Faris, 2005; Bloome & Clark, 2006; Fairclough, 2003; Fairclough & Wodak, 1997). Analysis of the chronotopes of classroom language use (oral and written) can account for classroom negotiations of identity in order to build academic investments and raise critical consciousness and student ability to ‘read and write the world’ (Freire, 1970, 1998; Macedo, 1996). “Space-time [ ] is produced across social, political, and conceptual dimensions of language” (Leander, 2001, p. 673). Through a critical linguistic analysis of how classroom third space is produced, this study contributes a deeper understanding of diverse space-times in classroom discourse that broadens potential meaning and encourages the renegotiation of power and identity for ELL students and teachers. In this
way the production of third spaces is mapped through critical analysis of space and time in classroom discourse.

The study is also significant in drawing new insights for how teachers and students produce third spaces in the classroom. From the conceptual spaces of designing teaching-learning experiences, analysis explores the significance of building academic learning opportunities that draw on cultural resources and lived experiences of students. Educators can produce the conditions for such third space in conceiving of curricular spaces and pedagogical processes that are then negotiated in the lived experiences of teaching and learning. Discursive tensions related to critical consciousness raising about students’ sociopolitical location as immigrants can be extremely productive in voicing student resistance to marginalized social positions.

On the other hand, mediating of tensions arising in face-to-face classroom interactions among students and teachers is also a crucial theme of data analysis that is addressed directly and reflexively. However, while both teacher and students attempt to transcend dominant school spaces, to reach out and pull in lived spaces of student experience into the classroom, these efforts are constrained by the institutionalized spaces of school that push us to ‘do school’ in material, abstract and lived ways.

A micro-ethnographic approach to classroom discourse analysis (Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, & Shuart-Faris, 2005; Bloome & Clark, 2006) draws on a de-centered and situated consideration of power shaping social work from multiple subjectivities of participants. Highlighting discursive tensions of ELL classrooms and transformative moments of third space, through an analysis of spoken and written texts, allows for a more complex understanding and pedagogical vision of how to design and facilitate
‘collective social dreaming’ (Gutierrez, 2008) that develops students’ critical literacy in reading the discursive workings of power in the world (Freire, 1970, 1998; Macedo, 1996).

This study addresses the contention that design and facilitation of third spaces in the ELL classroom, understood as a chronotopic social process (Bakhtin, 1986; Lefebvre, 1974, 1991), offer a deeper analysis of how language and discourse situate and relocate student identities within local and global scales in ways that can recognize marginality and recast non-school discourses as sites of hopeful transformation. The classroom needs to be reconsidered as a physical, conceptual and lived space where connections to multiple places and locations in time and space come into contact.

**Limitations of the Study**

This study has several limitations that must be outlined in framing this research process and findings. First, the focus of the study is largely confined to interactions in the focal ELL classroom and my teaching role in the ELL Department predominantly. As a teacher-researcher, my focused data collection of the broader school community was limited, although I had access to primary source materials and familiarity with the context. The focus of this study on the classroom space narrows my view of how the focal student negotiated his schooling experiences in the mainstream classroom and social environment. Observation of the focal student in mainstream classes, interviews with mainstream teachers, and teacher input on preliminary analysis are not part of the data set, although analysis of these school spaces is triangulated through other data sources.
Second, my interaction and data collection related to the focal student as a Special Education (SpEd) student is limited to interactions with his SpEd liaison regarding student support. Due to the working tensions between the SpEd and ELL departments surrounding the focal student I was not able to comfortably discuss the preliminary analyses of data to get feedback from the SpEd perspective. Therefore, this study’s data collection and analysis is situated in an ELL space, although implications of the focal students’ interaction in the broader school spaces are considered in data analysis as related to the ELL space. These issues related to data collection and tensions in working relationships, therefore, present limitations in terms of generalizing implications of this study for pedagogy beyond the focal ELL classroom.

Third, classroom there were several students within the ELL who were not participants in the study, which therefore presents limitations for understanding and analyzing discursive tensions in the classroom. This presents a limitation to the analysis and characterization of how third spaces are produced in the focal classroom because I cannot consider more centrally how these other important social actors are involved in the production of the social space. This has limitations, therefore, for my conjecture about the specific nature of spatial production in the focal classroom and how it contributes to both transformation and reproduction of institutional power and implications for renegotiating identity within a classroom community.

Finally, I find a significant limitation of the study in terms of my own subjectivity as the teacher-researcher, especially related to my theoretical and pedagogical goals of pursuing a transformative pedagogy in the classroom. This ideological orientation to address issues of power and identity directly and explicitly in classroom teaching as well
as in a research agenda entails the pitfalls of constructing our data, participants and analysis of interaction in ways that are favorable to our political agenda. In this case, the hopefulness of my own outlook on working with immigrant adolescents as a teacher is central to a pedagogical vision that also frames the research orientation behind this study. While I will strive to be critical of my own subject positioning throughout the process of this dissertation project, it is an on-going tension in analyzing data and drawing solid findings that will be practical and relevant for teaching and learning.

**Overview of Chapters**

Chapter 2 is the literature review framing this study, in which I map research discourses of ‘third space’ from theoretical perspectives of cultural geography, postcolonialism and post structural theory. This broad understanding of spatial thinking applied to education research is vital in order to better understand the education of non-dominant immigrant and second language learners in public schools.

Chapter 3 provides the theoretical framework for the study. I first introduce my redefinition of third spaces for immigrant ELLs. I proceed to draw on diverse theoretical constructs as the foundation for this analytical lens employed in this study.

Chapter 4 outlines the study design and analytical methods in order to operationalize my reconsideration of third space. I describe ethnographic and critical discourse analytic methods for examining how classroom discourses are intersected with meanings drawn in abstract, material and lived spaces. I also provide an outline of the research context, participants, data collection and analytical approach.
Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 provide analysis of classroom spatial production that maps chronotopes of immigration as mediated by language, discourse and communication in social space. Through both data analysis chapters, I trace the intersecting space-times through critical spatial events at global, local and micro-local scales of classroom discourse. In Chapter 5, I provide an ethnographic context for the study by describing the community, district, school and classroom contexts. I then focus on a classroom conflict and analyze and map diverse school and non-school chronotopes (e.g. immigration, employment, communication) that are interlaced in the production of space in the ELL classroom. In Chapter 6, analysis of teacher-student interactions with one focal student examines renegotiations of his immigrant identity within the chronotope of the “American Dream” he imagines for himself as a successful hip hop DJ. In Chapter 7, I provide a synthesis of the study’s findings and draw implications for theory and research, curriculum and instruction, and for reflective practice for educational practitioners broadly.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW
RETHINKING THIRD SPACES FOR NON-DOMINANT STUDENTS

“A revolution that does not produce a new space has not realized its full potential”

(Lefebvre, 1991)

Figure 2. (Re)Producing A Piece of Space (Space, Boston, MA)

Introduction

This literature review is a theoretical exploration of the lived spaces of schools for non-dominant immigrant students and their teachers. School spaces are more than the material and conceptual spaces that structure and direct education; school spaces are also produced through social interactions of lived spaces of experience. Social space is socially produced in the evolving process of interaction as people navigate the material and the abstract; social space is produced through daily experiences of lived space. This review contributes to the rethinking of the social spaces of school settings in a “third space” political project.
Following a theoretical perspective that space is produced socially through dynamic processes of human interaction, in this literature review, my goal is to further the spatial analysis of schools as a domain of social, political, cultural, and economic struggle as well as to engage in debates about issues of power at work in the daily lives of teachers and students. I focus on the construct of ‘third space’ as taken up in the research literature on historically marginalized students of color or ‘non-dominant’ students who are culturally and linguistically diverse students labeled as ‘English language learners’ (ELLs) in K-12 public school settings in the United States. As the spatial turn in education is apparent (Kostogriz, 2006; Soja, 2004; Vadeboncoeur, Hirst, & Kostogriz, 2006). I draw on educational literature from spatial thinkers in other non-US settings, principally western contexts of Canada, Europe, and Australia, who are interested in similar questions of equity and justice related to language and literacy of non-dominant students in their own situated contexts.

For the sake of consistency and clarity, I will use the term ‘non-dominant’ students to classify the focal population of my interest in this literature review and the future research projects it informs. The term ‘non-dominant’ implies, broadly, the unequal distribution of power in material, abstract, and lived spaces of education at the core of this political project. Oppressive spaces of schools require more just and equitable processes as well as new modes of social production of social space. I find theoretical and pedagogical possibilities in the construct of ‘third space’ as it is applied to language and literacy research to better advocate for students described alternately as ‘culturally and linguistically diverse’, ‘second language learners, ‘bilingual/bicultural’, ‘Limited English Proficient’, and ‘English language learners’. Among other euphemisms, ‘non-dominant’
indexes the spatialities of these students as relegated to oppressive positions in the social and institutional landscape of education (Apple, 1995; Giroux, 1992b; Nieto & Bode, 2008; Popkewitz, 1997, 1998). In general, the concept of *third spaces* and spatial theory has been increasingly explored in educational research along varied themes such as:

- *curriculum studies* (Callejo Pérez, Fain, & Slater, 2004; Edwards & Usher, 2003)
- *family literacies* (Campano & Carpenter, 2005; Pahl & Kelly, 2005)
- *out-of-school literacies* (Moje, 2004)
- *prison literacies* (Wilson, 2004; Wilson, Barton, Hamilton, & Iv anic, 2000)
- *educational theory* (Roy, 2005)
- *composition studies* (Crisco, 2004; English, 2003; Mau k, 2002)

Third space studies in education have drawn broadly from spatial epistemologies of cultural and Marxist geography (e.g. Castells, 1996; Harvey, 1989, 2006; Lefebvre, 1974, 1991, 2004; Massey, 1994; Soja, 1989, 1996). Third space research in educational has also been influenced by discourses of post-structural conceptions of knowledge and power as discursive (e.g. Foucault, 1980, 1986); postcolonial notions of ‘third space’ as hybrid cultural formations (e.g. Bhabha, 1993, 1996, 1997); post structural views on literary theory informing language and literacy research (e.g. Bakhtin, 1981, 1986).

**Organization**

The organization of the literature review reflects a genealogical approach to my research and analysis of ‘third space’ literature. Following Kamberelis & Dimitriadis
(2005) who explain a Foucauldian genealogical approach as complex and paradoxical, this review’s organization reflects a foregrounding of ‘discontinuity at least as much as continuity’ while also attending to ‘regularity in dispersion’ (p. 3). I comment on this genealogical approach as it is reflected through the multiple and co-constitutive planes of:

- my spatial analysis of the literature itself;
- my research methodology; and ultimately
- my understanding of the discourse community of spatial thinkers that I attempt to enter.

To this end, the review has the following organization. In Part I, I frame this review within post structural epistemology and clarify important concepts of ‘social space’, ‘space-time’ and ‘chronotope’, and ‘multiliteracies’ that I use as methodological and analytical tools in conducting library research.

Next, I embark on the principal analytic discussion of the literature from three principal epistemological perspectives on third space theory in education research that have emerged and intersected consistently in the literature: cultural geography, postcolonial theory, and education/pedagogy theory. I begin this analysis in Part II with foundational spatial theory from cultural geography with an engagement of the spatial trialectics of Henri Lefebvre which informed the work Edward Soja and David Harvey who have been considered as responsible for the resurgent spatial turn in English-speaking circles. David Harvey’s theoretical contributions are treated principally in this section and have lesser prominence in reviewed literature although I reserve further treatment of his work for future elaborations of this review.

In Part III, I enter third space theory in educational discourse with the research of Kris Gutiérrez and colleagues whose social constructionist perspectives on discourse and
culture formations, more broadly, have been prominent ‘third space’ studies rooted in Bakhtinian theory. Bakhtin is foundational in language and literacy research and his deliberations on *dialogism* and *heteroglossia* have been widely appropriated and will be explored in more detail throughout the review.

In Part IV, I introduce postcolonial and post structural discourses, interweaving the work of Homi Bhabha and Michel Foucault as they become nodes of ‘third space’ literature that interrogates power and non-dominant students. I draw implications from the analysis of ‘third space’ research for language and literacy education of non-dominant students.

In Part V, I review literature that brings spaces of a more global, transnational, and diasporic experience into the classroom context. I argue the literature better represents the lived spaces of non-dominant immigrant ELL students in public schools.

**Part I: Framing the Literature Review**

I define poststructuralism very broadly as a critique of modernist, Enlightenment conceptions of the singular ‘self’ that is positioned objectively within a universal social order that follows a doctrine of human reason defining ‘progress’. While poststructuralism is considered as originating in French intellectual thought of the 1960s and 1970s, I consider it within broader discourses of postmodern theory that launches a broad rejection against metanarratives that claim absolute truths or facts about the world. From a postmodern, poststructuralist perspective there is a plurality of reasons that stem from varied social experiences and systems of knowledge that structure human social interactions in societal contexts. A de-centered perspective on the social subject,
therefore, opens up the possibility for multiple perspectives in defining the social reality of personal experience within what are perceived as static ‘over-determined’ social structures under a structuralism perspective.

An important reconsideration of ‘texts’ is central to poststructuralist perspectives that are central to this literature review on third spaces in education and for language and literacy development in particular. An oral or written, for example, text is no longer considered to be a solitary container of meaning but an articulation of situated social process of the author’s construction of meaning. Moreover, the reader or receiver of the text will further interpret and renegotiate new meanings in his/her own perspective and understanding of meaning of this on-going social process which may be different than the intended meaning of the author. This perspective on individual subjectivity destabilizes meaning of texts as previously considered from structuralism perspectives, moving away from the notion of binary oppositions that frame conceptual discussion within an either/or dynamic of opposites. While critical theoretical traditions of structuralism also interrogated the power dynamics of social structures that are determining factors in one’s social position, a post structural perspective also questions the hierarchical theorizations of power and knowledge that are over-determined in explaining social position. A post structural perspective allows for varied interpretations of experience and, therefore reality, from multiple social positions in order to complexify understandings of power through resistance. A reconsideration of textual meanings as socially negotiated also broadens traditional perspectives on textual production from a socio-historical process that considers the dynamic social spaces of human interaction. This allows for a deeper semiotic understanding of how texts are produced and interpreted which have direct
implications for considering the spaces of textual production as fluid and social
processes.

Key Spatial Constructs

Social space

In this literature review, I define space as a socially produced and socially
mediated field of material, abstract, and discursive spaces. Space manifests the social
nature of our human experience which means that the processes of making sense of the
world or constructing meaning is situated in social practices that affect materiality and
ideology in turn. Spaces are produced and negotiated through social interactions in real-
and-imagined ways; social space is constructed through lived social practice. Framing
space as situated and socially constructed implies that it is not a fixed or static concept as
it is often conceived of as merely a background, context, or physical place. (Social) space
is dynamic and changing as we live it and create it; “all social relationships are
abstractions until they are concretized in space” (Soja, 2004). Social space defines space
as process; space is continually produced in a state of becoming as time unfolds and
realities become articulated.

Space-time

It is important to clarify the particular notion of space explored in the reviewed
literature since the concept of space is central to many diverse theoretical disciplines such
as geography, sociology, anthropology, mathematics, physics, astronomy, political
science, literature, and education. As a theoretical construct that has been transformed in
social and cultural theory, the materiality of space is also considered as abstraction as
well as processes of lived experience. This review approaches space as intertwined and
co-constitutive of time, or termed alternately space-time or time-space depending on the
epistemological discourses in which it is considered as an analytical field. This idea will
be discussed further although it is important to clarify at the outset that I consider space
and time to be implicated in each other.

**Chronotope**

The Bakhtinian concept of the *chronotope*, or literally time-space, is used relevant
to both the content and process of how this literature review was conducted and
discussed. Kamberelis & Dimitriadis (2005) use the chronotope as the organizing concept
for their meta-review in *Qualitative Inquiry: Approaches to Language and Literacy
Research*. They explain that the chronotope was a concept of Albert Einstein that Mikhail
Bakhtin appropriated and applied to the study of language and literature. Paraphrasing
Kamberelis and Dimitriadis, chronotopes are an articulated linking of time and space
with particular cultural events that produce “sedimentations of concrete, motivated social
situations or figured worlds.” Bakhtin commented on the fundamental importance of the
chronotope in making meaning:

> For us the following is important: whatever these meanings turn out to be, in
> order to enter our experiences (which is a social experience) they must take on
> the form of a sign that is audible and visible for us (a hieroglyph, a mathematical
> formula, a verbal or linguistic expression, a sketch, etc.) Without such temporal-
> spatial expression, even abstract thought is impossible. Consequently every entry
> into the sphere of meanings is accomplished only through the gates of the
> chronotope (Bakhtin, 1981).

The authors describe chronotopes of the genealogy of language and literacy
research to explain how theoretical conversations articulated and rearticulated new nodes
of meaning about qualitative research on language. Situating this literature review within the spatial turn draws from a chronotope of the revolutions of the turbulent 1960s associated with French Marxist radicals at the center of May 1968 labor and student uprisings in Paris. Following Kamberelis and Dimitriadis’ articulation of four chronotopes of qualitative inquiry, I am constructing my own theoretical meanings of the spatial turn in language and literacy research as aligned with their two chronotopes of ‘skepticism, conscientization and praxis’ - critical social theory and constructivist theory, and ‘power/knowledge and defamiliarization’ of the ‘posts-‘ (postmodernism, poststructuralism, postcolonialism). I will discuss the chronotope in more detail in the context of reviewing specific literature that will further illuminate my characterization of situating this literature review in New Literacy Studies.

**Multiliteracies**

At the core of New Literacy Studies is the idea of literacy as *multiple* rather than singular, therefore, I treat literacy in the context of *multiliteracies*. Multiliteracies are situated as social literacies which has direct implications for this literature review on social spaces of schools (Kress, 1997; Kress & Van Leeuwen, 2001; New London Group, 1996; Street, 1995). The New London Group’s (1996) post structural conceptualization of *multiliteracies* refers to “the increasing multiplicity and integration of significant modes of meaning-making, where the textual is also related to the visual, the audio, the spatial, the behavioral, and so on” (p. 64). This conception of multiliteracies also brings into greater focus the inherent dynamic of *multimodality* that refers to the increasingly varied and heterogeneous modes of production through which various literacies are
developed. This concept will also be further articulated through its treatment in reviewed literature. It is important here to clarify poststructuralism as an epistemological break from structuralism perspectives that gave primacy to time over space.

I bring this understanding of multiliteracies to my consideration of academic and critical literacies in the production of third spaces for immigrant ELL students in the writing classroom. In the conceptualization and design of learning and curriculum, multiple academic literacies become pertinent to the engaging students’ lived experiences and community knowledge that they bring to the oral and written communication. Multiple critical literacies capture the perspective of third spaces as sites of tension where multiple identities, located in diverse space-times, are in continual contact and intersection. In this study, multiple academic and critical literacies are intertwined in the social production of social space arising from conflict, convergence, and divergence of school and non-school discourses in the classroom.

**Part II: Cultural Geography & Trialectics of Spatiality**

An overarching theoretical lens of this study draws principally on cultural geography’s postmodern discourses around space that has been largely attributed to Henri Lefebvre and his foundational work, *The Production of Space*, first published in French in 1974 and later in English in 1991. Lefebvre’s core theoretical premise is a *trialectic* of social space as composed of *perceived* (material) spaces, *conceived* (abstract) spaces, and *the lived* space. As a philosophical consideration of space, Lefebvre’s trialectic has also been considered beyond epistemology and constituting a spatial ontology. These deliberations on Lefebvre’s contributions to the socio-spatial theorizing are testament to the latent potential of his ideas.
Edward Soja’s engagement of Lefebvre’s spatial trialectic is previewed in *Postmodern Geographies* (1989) and later developed more fully and directly in *Thirdspace* (1996). In *Thirdspace*, Soja takes Lefebvre’s trialectical thinking further in reasserting a spatial analysis in traditional social-historical paradigms that are characterized by a privileging of time engrained with Western theoretical traditions. Soja (1989, 1996) elucidates the epistemological genealogy behind Lefebvre’s postmodern, poststructuralist thinking that rejects the lure of binarisms at the roots of reductionist, modernist thinking. Soja builds from Lefebvre’s trialectical thinking in crafting the proposition of another trialectical heuristic for thinking more dialogically on *spatiality*, *sociality*, and *historicality* of human experience. This trialectic reiterates the socially situated nature and historically located production of meaning across discursive and material space-time. From this understanding of Lefebvre, he develops his conception of *thirdspace* that has become another important epistemological nexus for the development of spatial analysis in educational contexts. Another important spatial thinker is Marxist geographer David Harvey, whose seminal work *The Condition of Post modernity* (1989) coalesced discursively with Soja’s *Postmodern Geographies* into a spatial turn in the English-speaking academic circles of the 1990s to the present. In the sections below, I group my discussion of these three theorists according to what I see as parallel dynamics of each one’s spatial trialectic. By such grouping of these related ideas, I do not imply that they are synonymous but that they are genealogically engaged and, thereby, interdiscursively constitute a chronotope of spatiality as trialectic, an underpinning of ‘third space’ theory in its varied articulations.
**Perceived Space, Absolute Space, First Space**

Lefebvre describes the physical as the perceived space, or *first space* as Soja (1996) articulates, in which, “the spatial practice of society is revealed through the deciphering of its space. This materialized, social produced, empirical space [is] directly sensible and open, within limits, to accurate measurement and description.” (Lefebvre, 1974; as cited in Soja 1996, p. 66). This could refer to the physical built environment of a house, building, or street that are further delineated by our material practices within such space, for example, the constructed boundaries of a piece of property, identifying a particular neighborhood, or developing school attendance zones and a bussing district. First space is that of spatial practice.

In his own spatial thinking, David Harvey (1973) outlined a tripartite division that space can be understood as the *absolute*, *relative*, and *relational*. Paralleling the idea of *first space*, Harvey writes of absolute space: “This is the space of Newton and Descartes and it is usually represented as a pre-existing and immovable grid amenable to standardized measurement and open to calculation” (2006, p. 121). The absolute spaces, or first spaces, of educational contexts would include the place of schools: the buildings, the classrooms, hallways, and all the physicality of their activities. As the absolute space of ‘individuation … that applies to all discrete and bounded phenomenon including you and me as persons,’’ first spaces are the institutional spaces of teacher and student as physical units”, “deployed in spaces” of schools as Foucault might argue. The first spaces of educational institutions are situated within a physical geography of the campus and the surrounding community where schools are located. We can envision first spaces of increasingly widening administrative entities of towns, cities, states, countries, and
continents that index the geographic and political-economic mapping of most of our contemporary world. The first spaces present and construct boundaries and borders that are represented in the structures of the political, economic, social, and even virtual realities erected as walls of meanings around us.

**Conceived Space, Relative Space, Second Space**

The *second space* of Lefebvre’s trialectic is the *conceived space, or representations of space*, which is the “dominant space in any society (or mode of production)” (Lefebvre, 1974). This space represents a “storehouse of epistemological power” (Soja, 1996) because the conceived spaces greatly construct the ideas, policies, and beliefs that order society and our subjective positions within the social landscape. Here, *representations of space* are tied to the relations of production and, especially, to the order or design that they impose which is constituted through “control over knowledge, signs and codes.” Representations entail “the means of deciphering spatial practice” which we could describe, for example, as the development and pedagogy of official school curricula or the key concepts of a particular discipline. These representations, both in their content and in the perspectives they convey, are influential in the means of “production of spatial knowledge;” or how knowledge can be validated and perpetuated, or alternately contested and transformed. Language together with the literacies that are deployed in meaning construction (and enforcement) is at the essence of conceptual and theoretical terrains of second space. The conceived space is one of abstraction that tends “towards a system of verbal (and therefore intellectually worked out) signs,” referring to language, discourse, texts, and logos as the written and spoken
word (Soja, 1996). From poststructuralist perspective that views discursive meaning in a constant social process of re/construction, we envision a dynamic of textual *spaces of representation* influencing the production of spatial knowledge as knowledge is consumed, produced, and reproduced in and through text.

These second spaces intersect with Harvey’s (1973, 2006) idea of relative spaces within his parallel tripartite understanding of space. “Space is relative in the double sense: that there are multiple geometries from which to choose and that the spatial frame depends crucially upon what it is that is being relativized and by whom” (2006, p.122). The uniqueness of individuation and geographic location make space relative depending on your frame of reference which Harvey reminds us, borrowed from the thinking of Albert Einstein. The concept of spatio-temporality asserts that space and time do not exist independent of one another but in a constant symbiotic process of co-construction relative to the standpoint of the observer. For example, we can map the distance from a rural town A to the nearest city B in varying geographies related to transportation on a bus route, airplane, or riding a bike; or in the costs for transporting goods the same distance; or as a program guideline for a school bussing program of low-income students to a school across town. The relationship of A to B becomes relative in its process of definition and in its *spaces of representation* (Lefebvre, 1974).

The conceived spaces of mainstream educational policy and programming, concretized in language of varied texts, are confronted with dynamic lived experience that are incongruous with realities approximated or projected in static language. The overarching material importance of purposeful uses of language and literacies is incredibly important to a postmodern, post structural educational context where literacies
are multiple (New London Group, 1996); and organizational structures are fluid (Hargreaves, 1994); and the teaching-learning process is increasingly multimodal and mediated through virtual digital environments. Policy, governance, and enforcement of social orders are encoded in language and through language. Technology has allowed for the creation of virtual realities that can cause social, economic, cultural, and political affects in the material environment. For the purpose of exploring spatial thinking in education and around literacy development, it is useful to recall Harvey’s (2006) reminder about the difficulties that arise as we use language within these representational spaces to integrate understandings from different fields or disciplines “into some more unified endeavor”. In his argumentation, education is a prime example of a “more unified endeavor” for education encompasses the goals of integrating disciplinary knowledge within institutionalized processes that will recreate and necessarily transform that knowledge. The second spaces of the “conceived”, especially represented in and through education, are, therefore, greatly political in the ordained representations of lived experience that are institutionalized and reproduced as knowledge, fact, or reality.

**Spaces of Representation, Relational Space, Thirdspace,**

It is from the third component of Lefebvre’s trialectic, *spaces of representation*, that Soja (1996) teases out a conception of thirdspace and with which Harvey (1973, 2006) engages with his idea of *relational space*. Lefebvre posits that these *spaces of representation* are distinct but encompass simultaneously the other two components of spatiality; his conceptual paradigm, thereby, overcoming the binary of *either/or* to assert a *both/and* model of possibility. This spatial dynamic is linked to the “clandestine or
underground side of social life” and indexes the “space that is directly lived, stretching across images and symbols that accompany it as the space of “inhabitants” and “users” (Soja, 1996). At the crux of Lefebvre’s trialectic is the social dynamics of *spatiality* – or *sociality* - transpiring through the lived spaces of experience. It is in these “othered” spaces of representation that Lefebvre conceives of the limitless possibilities – a radical openness according to bell hooks (1990) – as a space of transformation and/or as a space of social struggle. As Soja (1996) asserts:

*Lefebvre was the first to explicitly explore an alternative transdisciplinary conceptualization of ‘approximations’ of post-modern ‘spatial knowledge’ through a specifically spatial analysis: the (social) production of (social) spatiality (p. 57).*

Through a trialectical conception of spatiality, Soja further explains that Lefebvre’s theorizing was crucial in pushing the field of social/cultural geography, and the discipline more widely, toward more postmodern perspectives on spatial analysis. However, a better understanding of the foregrounding of Lefebvre’s spatial theory in Soja’s own construction of thirdspace comes with an appreciation of other contemporary geographers like David Harvey and social theorists like Foucault whose spatial writings were also highly influential in dialogue with Lefebvre. In his own tripartite conception of space, Harvey (2006) describes relational space through the contention that there is no such thing as space or time outside of the processes that define them. “Processes do not occur in space but define their own spatial frame. The concept of space is embedded in or internal to process. This very formulation implies that, as in the case of relative space, it is impossible to disentangle space from time.” From a spatio-temporal perspective, therefore, there are infinite threads of time-space that intersect in a given social moment.
“A wide variety of disparate influences swirling over space in the past, present and future concentrate and congeal at a certain point [ ] to define the nature of that point” (p. 123).

The sociality and historicality inherent in Harvey’s iteration of relative space constitute a shared orientation with the spatial thinking of Lefebvre and Soja, one that posits space as discursively producing and discursively produced.

In what Soja describes as thirding-as-othering, he moves beyond the heuristic binarism so prevalent in scholarship and, thus, represents the third/other as an “approximation” (building on previous approximations) that helps defend against the “totalizing closure” of all “permanent constructions” (Soja 1996, p. 60). Lefebvre articulates varied fields of human spatiality – the physical, mental and social fields – that must be conceptualized as simultaneously real-and-imagined, concrete-and-abstract, and material-and-metaphorical. Soja takes this thinking of thirding-as-othering to elaborate his conception of thirdspace which he parallels with bell hooks’ (1990) discussion of a “radical openness” that presents unlimited opportunities for transformation, both in theory and in practice. Third space opens up possibilities for a more radical political praxis by more deeply considering spaces of lived experience. It is the reassertion of the social dynamic, the lived experience of spatiality, that characterizes Soja’s Thirdspace (1996):

*Everything comes together in Thirdspace: subjectivity and objectivity, the abstract and the concrete, the real and the imagined, the knowable and unimaginable, the repetitive and the differential, structure and agency, mind and body, consciousness and unconsciousness, the discipline and the transdisciplinary, everyday life and unending history (p. 56-57).*

Understanding the fundamental nature of Thirdspace rooted in lived experience moves beyond the binarisms prevalent in modernist social theory and analysis. Thus,
third space theory uncovers more expansive realms of possibility for meaning making beyond merely the *conceived* and *perceived spaces* of Lefebvre’s trialectic. Lived experience is the space of representation for the ‘other’ alternative to meanings constructed from first and second spaces. The oscillation between the center and periphery of structural argumentations or the hybridity of the lived social realities, thirdspace theory operationalizes the reality of diverse spatialities at work simultaneously in every given moment. Harvey (1973) articulated the interrelationship of his own tripartite understanding of space concurrently with Lefebvre (1974), explaining in his own spatial terms that: “space is neither absolute, relative or relational in itself, but it can become one or all simultaneously depending on the circumstances. The problem of proper conceptualization of space is resolved through human practice with respect to it” (as cited in Harvey 2006, p. 125-126).

In summary, third space thinking holds great explanatory potential for a critical and self-reflexive political project that challenges discursive boundaries of educational research, refracting through the spatio-temporal lens that frames both the researcher and the researched, the self, and the ‘other’. The fertile potential for new understanding rests uneasily in this dynamic tension of these varied spatialities which are constantly engaged in a physical, conceptual and experiential interplay. Amidst this spatial trialectic, we glimpse possibilities for transformational moments of space-time that carry us beyond antagonistic thinking in binary oppositions, moving beyond toward new meanings of social justice. As Leander & Sheehy (2004, p. 2) reassert Soja’s (1996) contention:

*We must realize that both views from above [far] and from below [near] can be restrictive and revealing, deceptive and determinative, indulgent and insightful, necessary but wholly insufficient … To set them in antagonistic opposition only
constrains critical interpretation and severely limits the possibilities for strategic intervention and radical spatial praxis (p. 314)

The next section will turn this analysis from cultural geography to Bakhtinian post structural theories of language and literacy that bring our spatial praxis direct to the classroom chronotope of teaching and learning in schools.

**Part III: Third Space Theory in Education Research in Language & Literacy**

In this section, I will focus more specifically on educational contexts and studies that explore production of third spaces in schools and classrooms. These studies represent an important trend in research in education that draws upon and expands spatial thinking on ‘third space’. The increased transdisciplinary conversation between and among spatial theorists from various fields is promising especially as new possibilities for ‘insurgent spaces’ resist the oppressive institutionalized structures facing non-dominant students and cultural communities (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Roy, 2005).

**Foundations of Gutiérrez’s Third Space**

The work of Kris Gutiérrez in collaboration with various colleagues has been prominent in the integration of hybridity and third space theory into classroom research of culturally and linguistically diverse students (Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Turner, 1997; Gutierrez, Rhymes, & Larson, 1995; Gutiérrez, Kris, 1992, 2001; Gutiérrez, Kris & Asato, 2000; Gutiérrez, Kris, Asato, Santos, & Gotanda, 2002; Gutiérrez, Kris, Baquedano-Lopez, & Alvarez, 2001; Gutiérrez, Kris, Baquedano-Lopez, Alvarez, & Chiu, 1999; Gutiérrez, Kris & Orellana, 2006). As a starting point of origin in mapping
‘third space’ theory in language and literacy research, it is important to locate Gutiérrez’s treatment of space as principally discursive, drawing on the work of Bakhtin’s notions of social heteroglossia and dialogism, which she combines with other sociocultural theories of language and learning (Cole & Bruner, 1993; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & González, 1992). Bakhtin’s notion of dialogism describes the interrelations of language used in social interaction to the sociocultural contexts they reflect and inscribe. A dialogic classroom discourse makes room for multiple voices and perspectives to interact in a dynamic of social heteroglossia. The “heteroglot” nature of third space, however, does not constitute one that is free from conflict. On the contrary, Gutierrez, Rhymes & Larson (1995) posit that third spaces are born of these tensions between diverse in-school and out-of-school cultures that are mediated by teachers and students on a daily basis.

Interestingly, Gutiérrez and colleagues do not intersect their conceptions of spatial theory and ‘third space’ with cultural geographers such as Soja and Lefebvre. This is of interest to my attempts in this review to make those theoretical connections toward a more robust view of ‘third space’ theories represented in the work of Kevin Leander, Anita Wilson, Elizabeth Moje, and George Kamberelis who are reviewed later. Nonetheless, the work of Gutiérrez and various colleagues contributes to the spatial turn in literacy research and education from a discursive perspective on language and literacy and has been influential in educational research and pedagogy for non-dominant students as well as my own exploration of spatial theory.

In the well-known article, Script, counterscript, and underlife in the classroom: James Brown versus Board of Education, Gutiérrez Rhymes & Larson (1995) develop the idea of classroom script and counterscript that position the teacher and student by
institutionalized roles within the ‘official’ and ‘unofficial’ spaces of schools, which they draw from notions of centripetal and centrifugal forces (Bakhtin, 1981, 1986). Centripetal forces refer to the inertia or movement toward ‘the center’ (official), while centrifugal forces index forces that move away from the center (unofficial). In a school context this could be correlated, for example, to pressures toward standardization or the mainstream curriculum versus localized policies or classroom practices that deviate from such educational norms. The possibility for third spaces, however, lies in the dialogic social interactions in which heteroglossia of classroom discourse makes spaces for multiple voices and perspectives to interact within the intertwined centripetal and centrifugal forces of social space. The authors trace how teachers and students maintain subject positionings that keep them in separate physical, social, and discursive spaces in the classroom context.

In dynamic social spaces, however, (re)negotiations of these spatialized identities is possible and Gutiérrez Rhymes & Larson (1995) posit that third spaces are born of such tensions between diverse in-school and out-of-school cultures that are socially mediated by teachers and students. An unscripted space allows for a brief (re)negotiation of racial identity and meanings as the teachers’ script was opened by student questioning about historical categorizing of people of mixed white-black parenting. As an illustration of the instability of third spaces, the authors’ data analysis illustrates the teacher’s quick retreat from a socially negotiated and dialogic classroom space to a safer institutionalized teacher script that effectively shut down this dynamic learning opportunity. Gutiérrez Rhymes & Larson (1995) propose that a ‘responsive-collaborative’ script is a dialogic
script that is continually structured by tension between the self and other as one voice “refracts” another.

*It is precisely this tension – this relationship between script and counterscript or this juxtaposition of relative perspectives involving struggle among competing voices – that creates and maintains the third space (p. 467).*

Gutiérrez Rhymes & Larson (1995) assert that the productive tensions of classroom third spaces can be better encouraged and facilitated by ‘re-keying participation’ to more heteroglossic and symmetrical relationships between teachers and students. This entails a balancing of institutionalized power structures not only reified in teacher’s roles and responsibilities, but also in how students’ cultural and linguistic funds of knowledge (Moll, 1990; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & González, 1992) are incorporated in the negotiation academic meanings and identities within a permeable curriculum (Dyson, 1993a, 1993b, 1999). The instructional synergy between the content and process of classroom third spaces indicate, however, the need for a *re-spatialization* of classroom pedagogy in which teacher students can relinquish

*... the need for rigid and structured power relations as requisites for learning ...*  
*Redefining curriculum as social practice forces abandonment of monologic instruction and provides the social and cognitive rationale for including an constructing multiple forms of knowing (p. 469).*

The importance of reordering the social and institutional position of teachers and students is also the focus of a study of an after-school computer-mediated program with urban youth and local university student volunteers who engage students through cultural and technological literacies (Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Turner, 1997). The authors theorize a more ‘radical’ space in-between the official and unofficial school spaces as the
pedagogical orientation for building third spaces in educating culturally, and linguistically diverse students. They explain:

*It as a new theoretical and pedagogical space in which learning takes precedence over teaching, instruction is consciously local, contingent, situated, and strategic; and our current knowledge about language learning and language users informs the literacy curriculum (Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Turner, 1997, p. 372).*

As suggestions for putting this spatial theory into pedagogical practice, the authors comment on key features of teaching from the ‘radical middle’ toward third spaces: language, social organization of learning, curriculum, and pedagogy. Following Lisa Delpit’s (1988) argument about the importance of explicit teaching of school literacies for non-dominant students, the authors assert that this radical spatial pedagogy must involve explicit teaching of literacy strategies combined with constructivist approaches that will provide linguistic scaffolding (Vygotsky, 1978, 1986; Wertsch, 1985, 1998), Gutiérrez et al. (1997) explain that this shift from a focus on teaching to learning ‘requires literacy practices that turn the following into resources for literacy learning: a) the children’s and classroom language(s); (b) cultural knowledge; and (c) everyday practices of the classroom (p. 373). They analyze data from an after-school computer-mediated literacy program in which university undergraduate students interact with predominantly elementary students of color in Los Angeles public schools. Students and college participating in the program were shown to be (re)negotiating their knowledge’s and literacies as the ‘knower’ based on the situated, computer-mediated games and activities. The mediating role of language in (re)negotiating cultural knowledge and social positions of authority was highlighted as an “identity kit” (Gee,
of resources in achieving various personal and academic purposes of the socially-constructed and socially-mediated *third space*.

The third space research of Kris Gutierrez and colleagues has been instrumental in pushing a radical spatial praxis forward within discourses of education and pedagogy. The direct treatment of issues of immigrant and ELL students from diverse backgrounds and settings has been crucial in the context of anti-bilingual legislation in California that has further marginalized these populations over the past decade. While Gutierrez and colleagues continue their third space research in expanding a more detailed linguistic analysis and theory of the ‘grammar of third spaces’, the importance of this work is magnified in the context of other spatial analyses of schools, language, and literacy to which I will turn next.

**Spatializing Literacy Research in School & Non-School Contexts**

An important theoretical segue in my analysis was the book *Spatializing Literacy Research* edited by Leander and Sheehy (2004) which is an important volume providing diverse spatialized theories on literacy that networked directly while also extending my understanding of the ‘third space’ of Gutiérrez and colleagues. ‘Spatializing literacy research’ has broad implications within a poststructuralist view of literacy as multiple and multimodal following the *multiliteracies* of the New London Group (1996) and what has emerged as New Literacy studies. Situating the works within the spatial turn, *Spatializing Literacy Research* opens with a Preface by Edward Soja that outlines how the included works utilize spatial theory to (re)envision literacies and their situatedness. In the Introduction, Leander and Sheehy identify three overarching themes of space that
tie together the chapters of diverse work: hybridity, identity, and ‘complicating the real’. While I will review several of the book’s chapters in this review, the book is noteworthy in bringing together shared visions that “spatial insertions into literacy research and practice can be transformative, but not generically so. Rather, literacy spaces will be reworked and reinterpreted through the particularities of their production” (p. 12).

“Derogatory Terms” & Racialized Third Spaces in the Classroom

Kevin Leander is one of the researchers who has been doing considerable work in exploring spatial theory in researching educational contexts (Leander, 1999, 2001, 2002, 2003; Leander & Lovvorn, 2006; Leander & Rowe, 2006; Leander & Sheehy, 2004). In his piece entitled “Reading the spatial histories of positioning in a classroom literacy event” (2004), Kevin Leander references Gutiérrez, Rhymes, & Larson (1995) third space study as analyzing “the simultaneous and fractured social spaces with diverse practices and ideologies” that are at work in the classroom. However, Leander asserts a need for more literacy studies that analyze how classroom interactions “produce and are produced by historical and spatial processes” (p. 116). He turns to Soja’s trialectic of historicality, sociality, and spatiality to frame his study of social positioning and identity formation that is analyzed in transcribed micro-interactions of the classroom. He draws on the historicality of space-time to consider how students are positioned both within the frame of a given situated interaction but simultaneously through the relations among multiple social spaces and their histories. His analysis stems from an eleven-line transcript in which a high school class engages on a “Derogatory Terms Activity” that pulls from problematizes the text The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn for its racist language and
themes. The focal interaction is in the context of a brainstorming activity in which students thought of derogatory language used to “put down” others; students published on a large poster mural words like ‘nigger’, ‘honky’ and ‘cracker’ which became the textual impetus for further discussion about race, language, and cultural identity. Historical analysis of the focal interaction retraces the defensive stance taken by a white male student in reaction to a black female students comment on the word ‘honky’. His emotional commentary reflects the perspective that, in contrast, a white person cannot as freely use the word ‘nigger’ without being positioned as racist. The black student makes repeated unsuccessful attempts to clarify that she is merely commenting within the activity’s purpose to critically discuss the class’ brainstorm of derogatory terms published on the classroom wall. Leander also notes that the teachers themselves read aloud words like ‘trick ass bitch’ and ‘motha fucka’ as a pedagogical strategy in producing a social space within the activity that destabilized social spaces by reframing institutional school positions and social divisions operating in classrooms at a subaltern level.

Leander’s analysis of this classroom micro-interaction is traced historically through the development of Kempton Technical Academy as a part of a state-funded school-within-a-school with a core vocational curriculum targeted toward students tracked as ‘middle level students’. Leander’s historical analysis of KTA as part of the state Career Academy program traces how the institutional category of ‘middle level student’ was an unstable designation which incorporated broad parameters for students based on: standardized achievement scores between 25th to 75th percentile; academic records of ‘underachievement’; labeled as ‘at-risk’; ‘socioeconomically disadvantaged’; ‘educationally unmotivated’; having limited English proficiency (LEP) or ‘patterns of
irregular attendance’; or ‘serious personal problems such as pregnancy, dysfunctional families, or drug abuse.’ Leander traces the discursive positioning of students in KTA as the staff contested clear delineations of their focal population of ‘non-dominant students’, contending with institutionalized language from program funding proposals from its inception, while also debating concerns of the program becoming a ‘dumping ground’ for ‘low-level’ students.

Leander describes portraits of the two collaborating teachers in the focal interaction as engaged in critical pedagogies which put them in contrast and conflict with other veteran teachers they label “Academy Moms” who had many years experience in the school in which KTA was established and were part of the program’s inception. The focal teachers, Sid and Maureen, structure curriculum and pedagogy around engaging students through texts and classroom interactions surrounding media literacy, discussion of social issues, and representations of injustice which Leander puts in contrast to monologic scripts of patterns of Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE). Leander draws on Soja’s (1996) trialectic in his analysis and characterization of the Derogatory Terms Activity as constructing a liminal space, or the third space of Gutiérrez, Rhymes and Larson (1995).

Leander uses discourse analytic methods with the focal transcript triangulated with textual analysis of student visual texts representing KTA as a lived space and classroom mapping of racialized social and physical positions in the classroom community. Interview data with teachers and students as well as analysis of social interactions also bear significant concerns from white students about the changing social and racial space of KTA with a growing number of black students. Through the
trialectical prism of the social, historical, and spatial indicate, Leander’s study reflects a social production of KTA as a ‘shrinking space’ in the white imagination. Moreover, Leander concludes that ‘lived social spaces such as KTA or the space of pedagogy, produced by the Derogatory Terms Activity, are much more complex, vibrant and indeterminate than their readily perceived or discursively conceived realizations” (p. 138).

I will turn to considering examples of third space literature on family literacy programs that work across boundaries of home and school as part of the curricular goals for students and their families.

**Third Spaces of Family Literacies**

These ‘third space’ studies on family literacies not only illustrate further the importance of incorporating funds of knowledge (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & González, 1992), but signal new possibilities for more dynamic and situated educational designs for language and literacy development for non-dominant students and their families. From a triialectical perspective of the social-historical-spatial, this literature on family literacies problematize third spaces as dynamic and unstable, while illustrating their transformative potential as situated examples for better considering the physical, conceptual and lived spaces of education, precisely to forge new possibilities for transcending boundaries of dominance (Campano & Carpenter, 2005; Pahl & Kelly, 2005).

Pahl & Kelley’s (2005, p. 1) study of out-of-school literacies traces how home and school discourses mingle in the third spaces created through family literacy classes in which youth and family members interact around multimodal text production. The study
stems from formal evaluations of two family literacy programs in the United Kingdom that facilitated a ‘threshold space’ between home and school discourses in which multimodal texts were produced through physical and discursive travel between home and school. The authors draw on spatial research of Leander and Sheehy, Wilson and Bhabha, among others, in framing their case studies as examples of third spaces in which literacy practices are not situated precisely in either home or school, but in the negotiation and co-construction of learning between the two domains. They propose that the discursive and material movement of texts, artifacts and literacies between home and school contexts challenges the notion of literacies as situated in either domain, especially as parents are actively engaged to bring cultural funds of knowledge to the design of family literacy tasks. Drawing on Gunther Kress’ (1997) writing on multimodality, the authors also approach the children’s texts as holding traces of social identity and cultural practice as they drawn on out-of-school discourses. A point of critique of Paul and Kelley’s discussion is that the methods and analysis are not well-specified, although data collection included participant observation of classes and interviews (i.e. 60-70) across sites with learners, head teachers and program managers.

Programs had varied literacy tasks that included different material resources such as a ‘backpack’ of texts, tools and home artifacts that traveled with students; use of digital cameras by parent’s in documenting their children’s “Learning Journey” and providing an interpretation in a PowerPoint format; designing CD-ROMs about cultural experiences in their home country that were presented in the family class; storytelling using family and cultural artifacts and props in which parents were encouraged to explore performative aspects of delivering oral narratives such as gesture and facial expressions.
Pahl and Kelley highlighted the multilingual and multimodal nature of these family literacy programs as third space learning environments, where participants drew on home language in the process and product of text production. For example, based on a shared experience in the community, such as a museum trip, children and parents collaborated in multimodal representations of their experience that were produced in a process of discussion, play, performance, storytelling, sharing, reading, and writing.

They argue that the family literacy context provides important implications for how teachers can purposefully encourage third spaces in literacy development through curricular and pedagogical designs that allow for in-school and out-of-school discourses to interact in the process of text production. On the micro-level, the Pahl and Kelley highlight the effectiveness of incorporating multimodal perspectives on literacy in which material resources (i.e. home artifacts, cameras, computers, art supplies) can facilitate the physical and discursive mingling of home and school discourses. At the meso-level, their case studies highlight the importance of having a physical space within the educational institution as a location for third space practices and identities to be supported. On the macro-level, authors indicate that institutional partnerships are key in furthering opportunities for parents to build and extend their own learning beyond the context of the family literacy class to larger issues of self- and community advocacy (Pahl & Kelly, 2005).

The importance of considering the potential of family literacies as funds of knowledge, as well as the basis for curricular program design, is reiterated by the ethnographic teacher-research study of Campano & Carpenter (2005) who trace the literacy trajectory of one Filipino American migrant student. From a self-reflexive and
critical perspective of a classroom teacher, they offer a problematized account of third spaces of family literacies as crucial funds of knowledge for supporting academic literacy of migrant children, but that can often be ineffectually integrated within school spaces. The authors focus on the academic and social development of a Filipino American girl named Carmen whose school experiences are contextualized greatly by her family’s migrant narrative. The authors characterize interactions with Carmen around family literacies as happening in the ‘second class’ which they refer to as a third space that is located in the time-space of ‘the crack’ in the rigid school day. The ‘second class’ is an ‘alternate pedagogical space within which teachers and students dialogically construct learning through sharing and intermingling of personal experiences, cultural and linguistic funds of knowledge and their own worldviews, or spatial locations operating as interpretive frameworks. They characterize this ‘third space’ (Bhabha, 1994) as an ‘in-between’ space of cultural hybridity by infusing the first and second spaces (Soja, 1996) of school with resources from their own lived experiences as migrant communities. They assert that this third space context operates with a permeable curriculum (Dyson, 1993a, 1993b, 1999) that enables “learning experiences where students both recognize the epistemic value of their cultural background and gain access to educational capital” (p. 187).

Analyses of the focal student’s academic and personal development over several years take account trialectically of the social, historical and spatial dynamics affecting her schooling experiences. While perceived as a ‘reluctant learner’ in school who often appeared disengaged, Carmen’s played an instrumental role in her home life taking on many responsibilities for her father and grandparents in the absence of a mother. It was in
the ‘second class’ spaces where Carmen’s broader experiences in a migrant community brought her to a more spirited engagement with school literacies upon sharing her cultural history in the Philippines and “what it means to be a member of a diasporic community, separated from others by geography, yet connected by shared history, culture and tradition.” This cultural connection was strengthened by a personal meeting of the teacher with Carmen’s father in a community space of a neighborhood basketball game, which lead to generous invitations to visit their home, eat meals, hear about migrant life, political labor organizing against low wages and poor conditions. Carmen’s father’s passion for low-rider culture and his craftsmen skills of woodworking; he later employed carved a wooden case with a map of the Philippines on the cover to hold the biography project that Carmen did about him as a result of the movement of school and non-school literacies across institutional spaces.

The longer ethnographic study is one whose spatial dynamics illustrate Carmen’s social positioning of non-dominance that coalesced with other life experiences to adversely affect her school progress. Due to a redrawing of school zones, Carmen’s family and other migrant community families were forced to leave the school she had attended K-5 to spend Grade 6 away from her school and community networks. In the following years, Carmen lost her father to cancer, became solely responsible to care for ailing grandparents and missed a lot of school. She developed her feelings of frustration with low academic achievement, which also contributed in her retention twice, making her even more self-conscious of being an old seventh grader at 14 years old.

Campano & Carpenter reflect analytically on the ethnographic portrait of Carmen’s story of transient ‘third spaces’ that began with her engagement in the ‘second
class’ through her disaffected position in middle school. They highlight the idea of ‘second class’ programs in school spaces as a situated practice that can cultivate “multiple curricula to meet bureaucratic demands as well as the personal needs and capacities of our increasingly diverse student populations” (p. 193). They point to the importance of close personal relationships and an attention to community experiences, which in Carmen’s case was rooted in a spatial migrancy of her father’s work as a migrant agricultural worker and activist, as well as their diasporic identity as Filipinos with local cultural community and ties across the space-times of a homeland in the Philippines. Their analysis and reflection as teacher-researchers highlight the importance of a relational ‘third space’ that is transformative for both teachers and students as they engage each other’s worldviews while building school literacies from the linguistic and cultural resources, and other multiliteracies that shape their learning in lived spaces.

**Out-of-School Learning & the Bakhtinian Chronotope**

Some have used third space constructs to research the spatial hybridizations of in-school and out-of-school discourses in the context of school field trips (Larson, 2000; Leander, 2001; Nespor, 2000). As a physical departure from the first spaces of schools as geographic location, physical structure with concrete boundaries, a field trip is a literal escape from this panopticon (Foucault, 1977) of hall passes, bells and regimented schedules. These physical, discursive and social travels into the everyday community of life brings school-based learning into a new frame, although Nespor (2000) argues that public spaces available to children are becoming increasingly restrictive in that they are pre-define and pre-design their participation (e.g. kid play centers, gaming centers,
restaurant-game establishments; versus museums, parks and even malls). However this
does not necessarily imply that critically transformative opportunity for urban youth if
they are merely breaking away from school’s physical boundaries without any broader
that:

for field trips to serve these ends their destinations have to be something other
than space, which memorialize a history from which kids are excluded, or define
participation as the ability to purchase commodities and appreciate the aesthetic
elements of a setting (p. 39; as cited in (Larson, 2000).

Nespor’s sentiment of the importance of considering the spatial dynamics of
school field trips as related to the social and community position of non-dominant
students is echoed in Leander’s (2001) study of a field trip that intertwined space-times of
Civil Rights Era history with the social and discursive space of school-sponsored activity
Within the spatial trialectic of perceived, conceived and lived spaces (Lefebvre, 1974),
Leander draws on (Bakhtin, 1981, 1986) chronotope to identify and analyze the space-
times of a school field trip to illustrate the potential for dialogic negotiation of meaning in
such hybridized third spaces. Through different discursive space-times of an emotional
narrative of the past and a current space-time of institutional power dynamics, teacher
and student identities are repositioned beyond institutionalized power dynamics to allow
for a reconfiguration of identities and relationships of hybrid third space (Soja, 1996).
Using discourse analysis and student-adult interactions during the space-time of the
“Pilgrimage” to Memphis, Leander traces how the discursive context of a high school
field trip represents a fluid space-time in which lived spaces past, present and future
intersect (Lefebvre, 1974). Bridging interdiscursive contexts across space-time through a
‘chronotopic dialogism’ (Bakhtin, 1981, 1986), the field trip presented both opportunities and barriers for individuals to (re)negotiate their social positionings in reference to space-times of the Civil Rights.

In one focal interaction, a parent creates a hypothetical chronotopic narrative of a man’s emotional loss at his good friend Martin Luther King Jr.’s assassination, then interweaving this with the present chronotope of the imaginary loss of a best friend. In the emotionally charged appeal to students to ‘not take life for granted’, the parent invokes different multiple space-times that index variable discursive meanings drawn from the past, present and future narratives of friendship in students’ lives. The students became engaged and open up in sharing intercontextual links to personal hardships. The adult comments that, “This is our freedom bus going home right now” (Leander, 2001) which indexes the hybridized space times of the school field trip Pilgrammage and the 1961 Freedom Rides.

In a stark chronotopic shift and social identities, an accompanying teacher addresses the bus of students shortly following this interaction by recasting the discursive meaning of “taking things for granted” to remind them that they need to be concerned with their school identities and academic performance. “You need to think everyday is going to be your last. What would your grade be today if today you just dropped off the face of the earth.” This (re)negotiated social space of the field trip is completely recast in a present school space-time as the teacher invokes institutional positionings and power dynamics within this school-sponsored out-of-school experience. Once again they are back in the present and back in school. Leander’s analysis of these hybridized space-time contexts reiterates Nespor’s (2000) caution that mere transcendence of physical spaces
(first spaces) and even conceptual spaces (second spaces) of school contexts does not inherently mean that discursive third spaces of lived experience will be (re)negotiated in transformative ways.

Also exploring non-school literacy spaces, Moje’s (2004) piece illustrates that transcendent impact of literacies across diverse social boundaries of public spaces, popular culture and transnational hybridized identities. She draws on theoretical constructs of Gee’s (2000) identity categories, elaborating a fifth category of *spatial and temporal identities*, which she explains as versions of self that are enacted according to understanding of and relations in different spaces and time periods. The possibility of spatial and temporal identities are clearly abounding as we connect them with the implications of virtual literacies in a new era of globalized communication, and the multiple identities that are constructed through digitized intercultural exchange. Moje focuses her analysis of Latino adolescent literacies in various social and cultural spaces such as malls and movie theaters and how they develop literate identity through spatial texts such as t-shirts, music and writing. Moje drew on narrative and discourse analysis tools in finding that space was a central dynamic in the (re)production of literate identities. Her findings also tracked a resurgence and strengthening of the participant Latino youth’s cultural identities through virtual internet spaces – *relative and relational spaces* (Harvey, 1973, 1989, 2006) that constitute a *real-and-imagined* (Soja, 1996) dynamic that shapes thirdspaces of the youth’s own transnational cultural identity and citizenship, thereby resisting mainstream American discourses. She concludes her work with the important implication for education by reminding that youth will use various post structural texts (e.g. baseball hats, music, websites) to claim new spaces of identity:
Educators and schools should provide young people with opportunities to learn to navigate these spaces both strategically and tactically and to help them build a portfolio that will help them build portfolios that allow them to access other spaces (p. 37).

These images which are rampant in the media, entertainment and common perception (or ignorance) are influential within the space of schools; those physically located in these urban communities, as well as in wealthier suburban communities which are experiencing increased diversity as migration to new locations spreads diasporas. The implications of spatialized literacies and literate identities of Moje’s study is magnified through the study of Buendia et al (2004) that illustrates how racialized, linguicized and spatialized discourses of urban spaces are symbolically and geographically marked across schools as landscapes discursively formed through, by and into social spaces.

The implications of these studies of spatialized identities and formations of educational policy are further echoed in another study of (Moje, Ciechanowski, Kramer, Ellis, Carrillo, & Callazo, 2004) that draws on third space theory in content area literacy by examining how funds of knowledge can be drawn upon to build literacy and content knowledge in middle school science classrooms. In the theoretical section of this article, Moje, et al. highlight pedagogical perspectives on conceptions of third space (Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Turner, 1997; Gutierrez, Rhymes, & Larson, 1995; Gutiérrez, Kris, Baquedano-Lopez, Alvarez, & Chiu, 1999) who view third space as a bridge between school and community Discourses (Gee, 1990).

They authors also draw on the construct of funds of knowledge (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & González, 1992) by analyzing how students’ their knowledge of their parents’ employment in dry-cleaning establishments, factories, construction sites and auto plants,
to make connections with core science content in interview settings. Ironically, however, such opportunities were not maximized in classroom instruction surrounding important scientific concepts related, for example, to the water cycle, pollution and public health, which had direct and critical relevance to family’s lived experience. Another aspect of community knowledge from peer group interactions on the Internet illustrated how students had proficiency in how to utilize technology and web-based resources for social purposes, or dominant funds of knowledge. However, interviews with participating students revealed that they did not necessarily understand how to apply these navigational skills to access other funds of knowledge related to science content and formal academic curriculum. This reality reveals opportunities for teachers to build on student funds of knowledge in order to apply these skills toward developing content knowledge for academic purposes.

Another poignant example of Moje, Ciechanowski, Kramer, Ellis, Carrillo, & Callazo's (2004) study is the interview data regarding popular culture as funds of knowledge, particularly “music [which] provided a resource for conversation, for identity enactments, and for literacy practices” (p. 61) The authors point here to possibilities for using students detailed understanding of musical genres, for example, to make conceptual links to core academic ideas of categorization and classification.

Along these lines, in the next section I turn to a focused discussion of hip hop discourses and trends in hip hop research and education that is relevant to this study’s analysis and reconsideration of third space.
Spaces of Hip Hop Culture and Discourse

Specific mention of hip hop & space in this literature review is relevant to reconsidering third spaces in the classroom, and in supporting the academic and critical literacies of non-dominant students and immigrant ELLs in particular. It is instructive to briefly give an overview of hip hop’s historical origins as a sociological and cultural formation and the basic five elements of hip hop.

Hip hop’s origins are rooted in the South Bronx of New York City in the 1970s and 1980s as a cultural formation drawn from the experience of poor, marginalized communities of color, principally blacks and Puerto Ricans (or Nuyoricans, for those claiming New York). As Hoch (2008) summarizes:

*The end of the Civil Rights Movement in the late 1960s, the turmoil of the militarized political movements (Black Panthers, Brown Berets, Young Lords, etc.), urban blight and the advent of Reaganomics, the digital age, an exploding prison population, epidemics of crack, guns and AIDS—all of these forces converged to create a socioeconomic landscape unlike any other in history* (Hoch, 2008, p 350).

Tricia Rose (1994) description of hip hop’s origins reflect its creation and growth across the physical, conceptual, and lived spaces of the city, to carry on beyond:

*Out of a broader discursive climate in which the perspectives of younger Hispanic, Afro-Caribbeans and African-Americans had been provided little social space, hip hop developed as a cross-cultural communication network. Trains carried graffiti tags through the five boroughs; flyers posted in black and Hispanic neighborhoods brought teenagers from all over New York to parks and clubs in the Bronx and eventually to events throughout the metropolitan area. And characteristic, in the age of high-tech telecommunications, stories with cultural and narrative resonance continued to spread at rapid pace* (Rose, 1994, p 60).

The five elements of hip hop are generally understood as the four artistic forms of emceeing (MCing), deejaying (DJing), graffiti writing, break dancing (b-boying/b-
girling); and a fifth element of knowledge that has emerged with the cultural movement. Renowned hip hop journalist Jeff Chang characterizes the four elements from theoretical and epistemological lenses consistent with this study’s attention to space:

*Graffiti art was celebrated as a reaction to minimalism and conceptualism, an “outsider” art that correlated to postindustrial dislocation, confronted “drop dead” government with kids’ eye-creativity, and encapsulated all that was transgressive and progressive in the moment. B-boying’s radically democratic reclamation of public space and its aggressive athleticism reinvigorated modern dance. DJing brought the noise for postmodernists’ interest in rupture, repetition, and bricolage, and MCing seeming perfectly tailored for the poststructuralists’ obsession with textuality*” (Chang, 2006).

From these understandings of hip hop’s origins as cultural formation of the underclass, we can also trace hip hop’s evolution globally where youth appropriate and hybridize hip hop culture with local culture, language, and political purpose. A sense of the local space of the community, the neighborhood, ‘the hood’, shapes discursive identities. Alim, Awad, and Pennycook’s edited book *Global Linguistic Flows* (2009) draws on research from hip hop studies and sociolinguistics that focuses on the cultural influence of hip hop on youth identity, language, and discourse in places around the world, like Hong Kong, Tanzania, Nigeria, Brazil, and Canada.

Growing scholarship focused on hip hop and education informs my spatial understandings of the cultural importance of hip hop, locally and globally, and implications for transformative educational spaces. There is a growing body of research that evidences and advocates for the power of draws on hip hop as popular culture to build academic literacy and critical literacy in third space classroom settings (Dimitriadis, 1996, 2002a; Duncan-Andrade, 2004; Duncan-Andrade & Morrell, 2000, 2005; Morrell & Duncan-Andrade, 2002a; Morrell & Duncan-Andrade, 2002b). There is a body of
literature that focuses on hip hop in critical applied linguistics, literacy and language learning research (Alim, 2006; Dimitriadis, 1996, 2002a; Ibrahim, 1999; Kamberelis, 2001). A recent review of hip hop research by Irby and Hall (2011) discusses the dynamics of teacher and researcher perspectives in the treatment of hip hop in education. While I do not define this principally as a hip hop study nor my instructional style as hip hop-based education (Hill, 2009), this study contributes important implications for engaging hip hop discourses as a site of identity production and school third spaces for immigrant ELL students. Central to my analysis in Chapter 5 is how teacher and student negotiated tensions of engaging ‘unofficial discourses’ of hip hop within the ‘official discourses’ of school to promote the production of third space in ELL classrooms (Gutiérrez, Rhymes, & Larson, 1995).

**Spatial Practices of Hip Hop**

Hip hop discourses are often characterized with an anti-establishment ideology that is criminalized in public discourse. However, hip hop’s origins reflect histories of socioeconomic struggle, systemic violence and institutionalized racism for urban minorities as post-colonial subjects in America. Murray Forman’s (2002) spatial analysis of hip hop culture and discourses is particularly relevant to notions of how urban space and experiences of marginalization gave rise to discursive practices of hip hop as claims to identity, culture, and space. In his book *The ‘hood comes first: Race, space, and place in rap and hip-hop* (2002), Forman draws on cultural geographic notions of social space (Lefebvre, 1974, 1991) to frame a rigorous socio-historical and spatial analysis of hip hop culture and discourse. Forman’s analysis is particularly relevant to this study in that he
draws on spatial theories of Lefebvre, Soja, Harvey, and others in understanding the
development of hip hop culture and discourses.

Forman explains hip hop’s origins can be understood as a cultural resistance
movement in response to living in an urban decay that reflects the historical oppression
and societal marginalization of non-dominant communities. Space is central to hip hop’s
discourses of social, cultural, and political resistance to a dominant order that locates
communities of color in oppressed and marginalized spaces: housing projects,
unemployment lines, under-resourced schools, and prisons. Because spatial relationships
are organized along lines of subordination and domination, hip hop discourses are
intersected with ‘insurgent’ spaces (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987) that work to
deterritorialize lived spaces of non-dominant groups. The social spaces of Hip Hop
culture are involved in the political project of (re)claiming space “that makes existence,
no matter how bleak or brutal, something with stakes, something worth fighting for” (p.
17). From this perspective, Forman foregrounds the centrality of space in understanding
the discursive meanings and identities of hip hop:

In hip-hop, space is a dominant concern, occupying a central role in the
definition of value, meaning and practice. How the dynamics of space, place, race
and cultural differences are articulate among youths of the “hip hop
generation”… and how they are located within a range of social discourses
emerge as phenomena worthy of concentrated analysis (Forman, 2002, p 3).

Forman (2002) describes the hip hop’s discursive constructs of ‘the hood’, ‘the
ghetto’ and ‘the real’, for example, from a spatial perspective. The discursive
representations of an authenticity of lived urban experience are central to the discourse
and modes of expression of hip hop. Forman draws on Lefebvre’s notion of spatial
practices to explain that, “new vernaculars featuring spatially oriented metaphors,
expressions and narratives” are articulations of social space. As Forman (2002) argues: “Space and place figure prominently as organizing concepts delineating a vast range of imaginary or actual social practices that represented in narrative or lyric form and that display identifiable local, regional, and national aesthetic inflection” (p. 3).

Hip hop in my analysis represents another chronotope of our classroom space, an interspatiality of our lived experiences and our relationship as teacher and student. I hope to contribute to increasing explorations of how hip hop discourses can provide third space possibilities in education by contesting dominant perspectives on teaching and learning in school spaces. This study addresses recent calls for new research on hip hop pedagogies that are not driven by researchers that are cultural insiders, precisely, to better understand the transformative potential of hip hop in education when also engaged by teachers as cultural outsiders (Irby & Hall, 2011).

I recognize from the outset that it is problematic to label the hip hop community as a single discourse community because there are many different facets, styles, and politics within the hip hop community and many chronotopes of hip hop. However, for concerns of simplicity and focus, I make reference to hip hop discourses without distinguishing these complexities. For the analytical focus of this study, I frame hip hop discourses broadly to juxtapose school (official) and non-school discourses (unofficial) (Gutiérrez, K., Rhymes, & Larson, 1995), to propose a potentiality in integrating hip hop discourses into Raul’s lived school experience. This entails (re)negotiating learning and meaning we draw from curriculum and collaborations designed for the classroom (Alexander-Smith, 2004; Dimitriadis, 2002b; Duncan-Andrade, 2004; Duncan-Andrade & Morrell, 2000; Kamberelis, 2001; Morrell & Duncan-Andrade, 2002a; Morrell &
Part IV: Postcolonial Thirddspace, Discourse and Power

Postcolonial discourses have also expanded and contributed to constructions of third space as a space of liminality that characterizes the experience of non-dominant cultures in mediating the experience of being oppressively positioned in a postmodern context. I focus on Homi Bhabha’s notion of third space which provides an important perspective on power dynamics that are at play in considering how non-dominant students negotiate the mainstream institutional spaces of public schools and negotiation of culture. Bhabha’s third space is one of cultural tension that can become transformative as mediated through Bakhtinian notions of social dialogism and heteroglossia that break the binary antagonisms of self and ‘other’. Pappas, Varelas, Barry, & Rife (2002) describe a Bakhtinian notion of heteroglossia as “linguistic centrifugal forces and their products [that] continually translate the minute alterations and re-evaluations of everyday life into new meanings and tones.” Heteroglossia entails the idea that speech, language, and communication evolve through a historicity of language in use, wherein discursive interactions are necessarily intertwined with previous and pre-existing social contexts. Each utterance carries discursive meaning that is partially constituted and influenced by the previous utterances of others and prior conversations and contexts. From this sociohistorical perspective, nothing that is said, no usage of language can be truly original for we are recasting traces of already existing ideas, expression, intentions, and sentiment. Hybrid third spaces are, therefore, socially produced in heteroglossic (or heteroglot) social spaces which necessarily contain diverse and multiple linguistic meanings.
Bhabha’s notions of cultural hybridity in third spaces index the potentiality of alternative spaces of resistance to dominant discourses (Gee, 1990) - ways of thinking, believing, valuing, and acting – that are prevalent in schools. Bhabha describes how discursive conditions of thirdspace allow for the “same signs to be appropriated, translated and rehistoricized anew” (1994, p. 37). Lived experience of thirdspaces in school settings, for example, can work to re(map) the heteroglossic geographies of social space that are shaped and reshaped through on-going social interactions. Moje, Ciechanowski, Kramer, Ellis, Carrillo & Callazo (2004) comment on Bhabha’s work on hybridity as having direct implications for considering school curriculum and texts as colonizing and that students can experience a doubling of consciousness or dissonance between home discourses and school discourses. This dissonance, however, can also be a hybrid space of cultural production.

*Thirdspace, then, becomes a productive hybrid cultural space, rather than a fragmented angst-ridden psychological space, only if teachers and students incorporate divergent texts in the hope of generating new knowledge and Discourses (Moje, Ciechanowski, Kramer, Ellis, Carrillo & Callazo, 2004, p. 43).*

Teachers and students both embody and enact a socially constructed identity of education as they navigate and mediate the official and unofficial spaces of schooling. Teachers occupy institutionalized positions that are circumscribed in first spaces and second spaces of schools, Yet, they meet and converge with spatial realities of student sociocultural backgrounds and *funds of knowledge* that also occupy and influence official spaces of schools. These social realities of schools are thus framed as a site of production and/or reproduction that can become spaces of transformation as teachers and students negotiate their common purposes. Bhabha’s postcolonial third spaces as intertwined with
Bakhtinian notions of the social constructedness of language and literacy, therefore, present new horizons for considering the education of non-dominant students, particularly immigrant English language learners who are confronted with a trialectic of social, historic, and spatial challenges in navigating new locations and lived experiences.

I turn next to considering the post structural spatial theories of Michel Foucault whose work on the discursive formations of knowledge and power in space furthers this discussion of schools as contested spaces of oppression and resistance.

**Rethinking Foucauldian Spaces of Power in Prison Literacies**

Soja reviews and speculates on an important relationship between contemporary theorists Foucault and Lefebvre, explaining that Lefebvre critiqued Foucault’s apparent de-emphasis of spatiality in theorizing the hierarchies in his better known discussions of *Power/knowledge* (1980). Soja (1996, 2004) asserts that it was Foucault’s less known lecture “Of Other Spaces” originally delivered in 1967 that preceded Lefebvre’s *The Production of Space* (1974). Foucault recognized that space is not reducible merely to the contextual background conceived of as a static setting or place. Rather, he theorized the multiplicity of *heterotopias*, in contrast to singular utopias, that opened up the possibility of space-time contexts that are dynamic and situated.

The ethnographic work of Anita Wilson (2000, 2004) on prison literacies builds on Foucauldian ideas of institutionalized power and the physical and discursive control of *docile bodies distributed in space*. The logic of the *panopticon* (Foucault, 1979), a system and logic of surveillance that frames macro-institutional spaces, is contested in prison thirdsplaces where inmates manipulate discursive spaces for social purposes in ways that contradict the official nature of first and second spaces. Wilson gives us examples of how
literate identities are formed in accomplishing spatial transformations that resist the restrictive institutional spaces constraining self-definition (of non-criminal identities). Wilson also draws upon Homi Bhabha’s constructions of thridspace as sites of struggle which finds appropriate relevance in an institutionalized and militarized context where prisoner’s personal identities – literate and otherwise – are under constant surveillance.

After prolonged discussion, the prisoners and I concluded that the conflict between the imposition of institutionalized worlds and identities and their desire to retain a social and individualized lifestyle can only be resolved by the creation and maintenance of a third space (2004, p. 67).

Wilson analyzes how prisoners re(shape) their social identities by manipulating institutionalized spaces through discursive and linguistic maneuvering of personal expression and interpersonal communication. For example, official prison request forms become social texts in which prisoners and prison guards communicate humor (e.g. requests for machine guns, women and drugs) and personalized exchanges off-topic from the official textual functions. She also illustrates how common prison graffiti identifies inmates specifically by name, including their prison sentences, and identifies loved ones on the outside. Unlike graffiti’s usual anonymity of ‘tags’ or aliases which are written in exaggerated and often nearly indecipherable text, prison graffiti becomes a direct reclaiming of hybridized identities – from the inside and the outside – plainly displayed within institutionalized spaces for hope and resistance in dominated spaces. Wilson (2000) also notes how inmates use the available spaces of prison books to document and share their identities or pass messages in the inmate community. Prison third spaces of ‘in between’ literacies work in resistance to institutionalized goals of creating “docile bodies” (Foucault, 1972, 1977) is an acute example of how spatialities of identity
formation and literacy development cannot be controlled even in the most institutionally restrictive first and second spaces (Soja, 1996).

Wilson’s spatial analysis of prison literacies offers important correlations for considering the discursive associations between notions of ‘the city’, ‘at risk’, ‘minority youth’, and ‘urban schools’ that are under-resourced, under-credentialed, and allegedly under siege by all the bad influences of the streets. The literate identities that are afforded inner city youth within institutional school settings is frequently restrictive in forms of narrow curriculum, skills-based instruction, mainstream content unrepresentative of minority experiences, and a hyper-focus on test-preparation. This literature review asserts the precise need for teachers, students, administrators, and policy makers to engage in the borderland Discourse (Gee, 1990; Wilson, Barton, Hamilton, & Ivanic, 2000) of third spaces in between school and community. Pedagogical and discursive struggle in schools and classrooms can work creatively to manipulate and resist official spaces that trend toward an ‘institutionalization’ of pervasive deficit perspectives of minority youth, urban schools, and marginalized communities of color.

In moving this discussion from the institutionalized contexts of prison to the streets, the work of Buendía, Arez, Juarez, & Peercy (2004) is useful in exploring how the geographic markers of “East Side” and “West Side” represented a set of spatial codes that influenced the material and discursive production of knowledge within a US metropolitan school district undergoing a five-year reform plan. The authors provide a spatial analysis of how the social production of knowledge affected educational decision-making, drawing on Lefebvre’s concept of representations of space and Foucault’s notion of discourse as a theory of knowledge constructed through nodes of social
relations. The team of outside researchers/evaluators analyzed how the “technologies”, understood as assemblages of instruments, knowledge and people (e.g. media, policy documents, common understandings) – constructed the East Side and the West Side differentially through symbolic spatial markers indexing race, class, language, citizenship, etc. Discourse analysis of teacher interviews, for example, illustrated clear spatial markers for the describing the West Side like “the poor”, “the non-White”, “the non-English speaking,” “the uninterested,” and “at-risk” which referenced the pervasive portrayals of minority youth as gangsters, drug dealers or otherwise unproductive social beings. Furthermore, the track the discursive geographies of the “Central City” schools, an area of increasing diversity located in between East Side and West Side, where certain teachers and schools employed spatial markers of the West Side to characterize their student populations. Other Central City schools and teachers, however, avoided the localized referent of West Side as a spatial marker in describing students in exchange of the more widely used terms of ‘at risk’ or ‘inner city’, precisely to avoid association of their school as a ‘West Side’ school.

Buendía, Arez, Juarez, & Peercy’s (2004) study illustrates how these assemblages of discursive and spatial technologies, traced with symbolic markers embedded in language, were found to have great effect in determining the curriculum and knowledge that teachers and students engaged with in their respective school/city spaces.

Thus the knowledge of the East Side and the West Side, as well as the historical and spatial material relations already in place, continued to spatialize schools as places where choices of technologies (e.g. literacy programs, funding) were constrained to those that were “appropriate” for those spaces (p. 857).
The wider implications of spatialized knowledge and practice of this school reform effort show how pre-existing local knowledge and history provides a socially constructed landscape that determines implementation of programs and distribution of funding. Spatially constructed knowledge leads to the (re)production of spaces.

There are important theoretical parallels and implications between Wilson’s (2004) study of unofficial literacies in prisons and Buendía, Arez, Juarez, & Peercy’s (2004) analysis of how education is spatially and discursively (re)produced in essentialized urban settings filled with “at-risk” minority children. The connection of these two studies offers important theoretical tools for spatial analysis of school reform in US contexts by illustrating how spatialized knowledge shapes (social) space around urban communities of color in particular. As we consider the theoretical potential of bringing spatial analysis to urban and (sub)urban education reform, these studies map how society constructs with and through space a simultaneously discursive and material path of “at-risk” minority youth. Culturally and linguistically diverse ‘bodies’ are distributed in space from “West Side” streets, in and out of urban schools, through the discursive panopticon (Foucault, 1977, 1980) of deficit perspectives and ‘banking education’ models (Freire, 1970, 1998), marginalization in schools (Klinger & Artiles, 2003), and drop-out rates and criminalization that send minority youth into prisons in statistically significant numbers.

In the next section, I link the spatialized positioning of non-dominant communities illustrated in Buendía, Arez, Juarez, & Peercy’s, (2004) study to more globalized spaces that draw implications for immigration students.
Edwards and Usher (2004) point to the increasing use of spatial metaphors as textual traces of how globalizing processes and their effects are implicit in many current pedagogies drawing from critical, feminist, and postcolonial epistemologies. They argue that prominent spatial metaphors have entered educational discourse and theory such as border crossing (1992a), speaking from the margins (Spivak, 1993), borderlands (Anzaldúa, 1987), in-between spaces (Bhabha, 1994, 1996), and legitimate peripheral participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991) boundaries and peripheries (Wenger, 1998).

Edwards and Usher (2003) cite the increasing prevalence of such spatial metaphors and spatialized thinking as an important reflection of space-time compression in a postmodern world.

Kraidy (1999) describes the notion of the ‘glocalizaton’ to address how processes of globalization are always instantiated in the local context; in this way, locality is itself a hybrid space. For immigrant students, the locality of classroom space is certainly affected by a glocalization where discourses and identities are thrown together in a highly structured institutional context. Leander (2004) addresses this challenge relevant to creating third spaces of non-dominant students: “we need to understand how identities of students and teacher are always ‘glocalized,’ hybridized through dynamic geographies and temporalities seemingly distant from places called school.” This idea of addressing a ‘glocal’ dynamic is relevant as we considered the spatial identities and locations of non-dominant students in diasporic flows across space and time. Moreover, as we reconsider the education of non-dominant students with such spatial identities, we must rethink the space of public schools from a multidimensional perspective.
Global Spaces: Transnational Identities in Textual Third Spaces

In her article on the construction of border identities and transnational youth culture, Wan Shu Eva Lam (2004) analyzes how an immigrant Hong Kong Chinese adolescent negotiates his multiple social positionings through comic book literacies. Lam situates the study within the context of immigrant socialization into America’s stratified and inequitable social structure that becomes clearly materialized in how adolescents are positioned in the discursive and physical landscape of public schools (Olsen, 1997). Lam’s ethnographic study in a US high school context where she observed, interviewed, and participated in exploring how immigrant youth consumed, discussed, and interpreted comic books created in the U.S., Hong Kong and Japan.

Lam draws on a postcolonial third space (Bhabha, 1990) in analyzing a popular genre and discourse community of avid comic book readers regularly read, discuss, and trade comics, a daily literacy practice of the focal student, Willis. Lam’s analysis situates Willis’ comic book literacies in the context of his experiences as a native Chinese speaker who is marginalized by the ‘ABCs’ (American born Chinese); ridiculed for his accent by native English speakers; and tracked by the school system into less challenging classes despite his goals of preparing for college admissions.

Lam’s study approaches discourse as a socially situated repertoire of social practices that involve language, texts, multimodal representations, and performances of meaning that reflect and shape social structure (Fairclough, 1992, 2003; Gee, 1990, 1992). Her analysis of the focal student Willis’ textual practices in reading, interpreting, and critiquing comic books from different cultural settings draws implications for how
third spaces are negotiated by immigrant youth across boundaries of nationality, material borders, and localized subject positions. Willis’ interpretation of different comic book protagonists critiques the comic genre as culturally situated texts that are hybridized within globalized popular culture and capitalist modes of production in which texts are translated for distribution to different markets. Moreover, Lam’s analysis reveals that Willis’ discursive practices critique American comics as structured along the idealized oppositional forces of ‘good guys and bad guys’ that generally results in a clean emotional resolutions while Hong Kong comic books have other distinct groupings put in opposition that constitutes the central conflict. Lam’s analysis of Willis’ discourse around comics show a preference away from American classic hero comics like X-Men and Spiderman which he critiques as overly simplified and ‘self-glorified’. By contrast, Willis gravitates toward Japanese comics whose lead characters are more authentic and true to life in their modest appearance, personal qualities, and everyday human embarrassment of tripping on the sidewalk and falling down in public. In the conscious choice to affiliate himself with Japanese comics because of the discursive, textual, and aesthetic qualities, Willis creates a hybrid third space that locates him within a transnational hybrid community or third space as Lam proposes following Bhabha (1994) which intersect and hybridize cultural discourses form multiple geographic and social locations.

In the next section, I will extend Lam’s discussion of transnational identities as situated in processes of cultural globalization to other geographic and discursive locations of an Australian foreign language classroom. Hirst (2004) contends in her spatial analysis to represent contestations of local, national, and global chronotopes intersecting everyday public spaces of school.
Chronotopes of Global Spaces in the Foreign Language Classroom

Elizabeth Hirst’s (2004) of a “Languages Other Than English (LOTE)” classroom analyzes identity politics and discursive thirdspaces and counter spaces in an Australian elementary school. She composes a theoretical framework and methodology drawing from discourse analytics (Fairclough, 1992), Bakhtin’s (1981, 1986) ideas of dialogic heteroglossia and chronotopicity, and mediated action (Wertsch, 1998) within social contexts which she posits are best understood from the spatial trialectic of sociality, historicality, and spatiality (Lefebvre, 1974; Soja 1996). Hirst (2004) describes chronotopes as Bakhtin’s expression of the inseparability of time and space which function as the means by which time is materialized in space. Spatial and temporal realities intertwine and are represented textually as chronotopes serve to organize and manifest “significant narrative events” presented by the text (Hirst, 2004, p.43). Hirst identifies various chronotopes of the LOTE classroom from different spatio-temporal frames of nationalism, government policy, situated communicative roles, classroom pedagogy, and counter spaces. She situates the study within larger socioeconomic dynamics of changing politics, new socioeconomic orders, shifting global markets, and new geographically marginalized communities (Castells, 1996) whose impact is felt directly on schools and education.

She identifies how “spaces of economic rationality” and political-cultural identity of Australia as a regional neighbor in Asia has influenced the expansion of Asian language programs in schools which serve to minimize resistance and build cultural and linguistic familiarity among the future work force (Hirst, 2004; MacKerras, 1995). The
LOTE program is characterized by the “time/management” chronotope which Hirst indexes within prevailing economistic discourses that influence organization and management of schools. The LOTE program is structured by a defined number of contact hours needed for achieving linguistic competency. As supplementary curriculum, the LOTE class and teacher are also scheduled into the school day to facilitate corresponding efficiencies *non-contact time* for the classroom teacher.

The LOTE program and teacher, therefore, assumes a marginal position within the school community which Hirst situates within wider contexts of English-language, nationalist sentiments that bring racialized overtones to school settings, and, in this case, the foreign language curriculum. Furthermore, the ‘communicative chronotope’ of LOTE curriculum which emphasizes the creation of imaginary spaces and times within classroom instruction such as role playing authentic contexts of an Indonesia market. Communicative strategies can be seen as play, humor, and mimicry of dialogic interactions in the LOTE classroom which stands, in contrast, to the rigid institutional roles imposed by the LOTE teacher and reconstructs the LOTE chronotope with routinary spatial behaviors like standing and greeting the teacher upon his entry. Hirst indicates that the teacher’s cultural expectations for the LOTE space are influenced by different bodily and spatial behaviors common in Indonesian classrooms where hierarchical relationships are more clearly circumscribed in school spaces. Hirst’s analysis of the mainstream classroom teacher’s commentary in transitioning to and from the LOTE space further illustrates how the LOTE space is devalued and how the classroom teacher’s institutional authority as teacher is embodied in a way that the LOTE teacher’s is not.
Hirst (2004) draws on a postcolonial *thirddspace* and hybridization (Bhabha, 1990; Bakhtin, 1986) in analyzing how students negotiate counter spaces that resist the rigid hierarchical classroom roles established by the LOTE teacher. Hirst highlights the counter space *theatre time* in which an Aboriginal female student plays the role of *the clown and the rogue* (Bakhtin, 1981) by enacting a counterscript dialogue with others, communicating disrespect (e.g. ‘blood bastard’) to and about the teacher and making bodily claims on classroom space that mobilizes social resources precisely to undermine (and mock) the cross-cultural purposes of the LOTE space.

This spatialized framing of education within global networks, movements, and flows is crucial in theorizing about teachers and students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, located in situated socio-historical contexts through strong immigrant histories, transnational relations, and vibrant cultural identities that situate them globally across space-time.

To summarize this literature review, I mapped discourses of ‘third space’ from theoretical perspectives of cultural geography, postcolonialism and post structural theory in order to better understand the education of non-dominant immigrant and second language learners in public schools. Analysis of the reviewed literature illustrates the importance of considering how the multiliteracies and multiple identities of non-dominant youth are shaped by diverse space-times. In the next chapter, I will draw on the reviewed literature to articulate a theoretical framework that redefines third space to better understand immigrant ELL students and how identities are renegotiated in classroom discourse as lived space.
CHAPTER 3
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK
REDEFINING THIRD SPACE FOR IMMIGRANT ELL STUDENTS

In this chapter I draw on the literature review discussion to outline the theoretical framework for this study that underpins the reconsideration of the production of third spaces for immigrant ELLs. This framework grounds my analysis of how immigrant student identities are shaped by diverse space-times of the classroom, and my resultant understandings of transformative design of academic and critical literacy development.

The theoretical framework of this study redefines third spaces in the ELL classroom as:

1. fluid and undetermined spaces of negotiated meaning and identity mediated through social interaction;
2. shaped by student’s lived experience from diverse temporal (i.e. past, present, future) and spatial locations of scale (i.e. micro-local, local, global);
3. constituted by tensions among fields of power that can perpetuate and resist dominant institutional discourses in school spaces;
4. mediated principally through oral and written language, along with other semiotic systems and modalities for meaning making;
5. opportunities for building social relationships and community through developing critical literacy in response to lived spaces of marginalization.

This conception of third space for immigrant ELL students addresses the central proposition that their lived experience and social identity is located in multiple geographic spaces as lived in their home countries and through their physical migration. As immigrant students engage in negotiating meaning and identity in school spaces, their social interactions are mediated through diverse geographic and temporal locations of
their experience. For example, one of my Korean students did not understand the discursive meaning of a racist remark against Asians directed at him without the social understanding of himself as ‘Asian’ in America and discursive stereotypes of his ‘Asianness’ since his experience had been limited to a ‘Korean’ social space. My conception of third space accounts for how social process for immigrant students’ draws on specific geographic and temporal locations, and thereby, holds possible discursive meaning (or lack of meaning) that must be considered from beyond the immediate local social context.

**Conceptualizing Space as Social Process**

My re-conceptualization of third space in this study is grounded by Lefebvre’s (1974, 1991) foundational premise that space is produced as social process and through social process. This theoretical construction of space provides for this study’s critical exploration of how language and discourse in the classroom shape the meaning-making process and negotiation of identity within schools. The foundational premise of Lefebvre’s spatial theory is a *trialectical* view of space as composed of *perceived* (material) spaces, *conceived* (abstract) spaces, and *lived* spaces (1974, 1991). Lefebvre posits that the *lived spaces*, or *spaces of representation*, are distinct from, but encompass simultaneously, the other two components of spatiality – first spaces of the material realm and second spaces of the abstract realm. My understanding of Lefebvre’s theory is greatly informed by the work of post-modern geographer Edward Soja (1989, 1996), who built on Lefebvre’s spatial trialectic to articulate his notion of *Thirdspace* (1996) which has been an epistemological nexus for a reassertion of spatial theory in education.
research (Hirst, 2004; Hirst & Vadeboncoeur, 2006; Kostogriz, 2006; Leander, 2002; Leander & Sheehy, 2004; Vadeboncoeur, Hirst, & Kostogriz, 2006).

At the crux of Lefebvre’s trialectic is the social dynamic of spatiality – or sociality - transpiring through the lived spaces of experience. These are the third spaces of Soja that move beyond binary thinking of either/or paradigms toward a field of possibilities since lived space is simultaneously real-and-imagined, concrete-and-abstract, material-and-metaphorical. If space is produced through the social processes of interacting in the world, then “all social relationships are abstractions until they are concretized in space (Soja, 1996).” Lefebvre posits that spaces of representation are co-constitutive of material and abstract spaces; how we live space is shaped by its materiality and our conceptions of the material. Framing social space as dynamic, situated and socially constructed implies that space is not a fixed or static concept, as it is often framed in educational research as merely a background, context or physical container of experience. I propose to utilize Lefebvre’s spatial trialectic as a heuristic tool for exploring how third spaces are produced in the ELL classroom. Discursive tensions that arise in the classroom community surrounding race, class, ethnicity and gender, however, reflect critical questions of what ideas? whose stories? which knowledge? Those are at the ideological heart of curriculum design that promotes production of third spaces for immigrant ELLs. The significance of curriculum design that renegotiates power and identity by engaging students’ lived experiences of immigration is an implication of this study.
Social Space & Identity

Theorizing social space has important implications for considering social identities as fluid and in evolving process as people situate themselves in the world and renegotiate meaning from discursive locations of their lived experience, social relationships, and community and group identifications. If space manifests the social nature of our lived experience, then processes of constructing meaning and identity through education and literacy constitute situated social practices that shape and are shaped by the material and ideological nature of interactions (Barton, David & Hamilton, 2000; Barton, D., Hamilton, & Ivanic, 2000). Drawing from a critical perspective of language and discourse, my understanding of identity refers to the “social positions that people take up or are maneuvered into by the actions of others (Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, & Shuart-Faris, 2005, p xx).” In line with this definition of identity and social positioning is a Bakhtinian dialogical perspective that proposes that we develop a sense of self, a self-consciousness or personal identity, through our juxtaposition with the Other who we set apart from ourselves. The necessity of our relation to the world and social interactions for self-consciousness is predicated on human communication in and with the world. “To be means to communicate … To be means to be for another, and through the other for oneself … I cannot manage without another, I cannot become myself without another” (Bakhtin, 1984; as cited in Holloway & Kneale, 2000, p. 73-74).

From this situated perspective, the classroom can be re-conceptualized as a space where teachers and students experience the intersection of multilayered negotiations of identity and meanings in an evolving spatialized practice. They are in a continual negotiation with each other, with texts and academic tasks, with the curriculum and
mandated standards, with school policy and district bureaucracy, with diagnostic evaluation and high stakes assessments, and with state politics and federal policy. They are in negotiation with family expectations and transnational responsibilities, with supervisors in the workplace, with immigration lawyers, and with government immigration and enforcement agencies. These contextual layers intersect through micro-interactions in the classroom in a fluid dynamic as the classroom spaces are continually being renegotiated in the process of production.

**Applying a Grammar of Third Spaces**

Considering social space as social process provides opportunity for an important theoretical reconsideration of the prominent third space research of Kris Gutiérrez and colleagues on the education of culturally and linguistically diverse students (Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Turner, 1997; Gutierrez, Rhymes, & Larson, 1995; Gutiérrez, 1992, 2001, 2008; Gutiérrez, Kris & Asato, 2000; Gutiérrez, Kris, Baquedano-Lopez, & Alvarez, 2001; Gutiérrez, Kris, Baquedano-Lopez, Alvarez, & Chiu, 1999; Gutiérrez, Kris & Orellana, 2006). Gutiérrez’s treatment of third space draws on the concept of social dialogism which describes the interrelations of language used in social interaction to the sociocultural contexts they reflect and inscribe (Bakhtin, 1981, 1986). A dialogic classroom makes room for social heteroglossia, or multiple voices represented in language and texts. This perspective of the multiple discourses interacting dialogically provides new possibilities for renegotiating institutionalized spaces of schools in transformative ways.
This does not constitute a social dynamic that is free from conflict, however. On the contrary, Gutierrez, Rhymes & Larson (1995) posit that third spaces are born of discursive tensions between a classroom *script* and *counterscript* that position the teacher and students respectively within the ‘official’ and ‘unofficial’ spaces of schools. In this dissertation study, the focal student struggles with multiple institutionalized roles as an immigrant ELL and a Special Education (SpEd) student. Analysis of third spaces of the classroom *Comm.Unity* illustrate that drawing on his interests in hip hop in attempt to renegotiate identity within a permeable curriculum (Dyson, 1993a, 1993b) also entailed multiple discursive tensions among institutionalized spaces of ELL and SpEd, complexified by cultural-linguistic spaces of home and community membership.

Of particular relevance to this study is Gutierrez’s (2008) analysis of the transformative potential of the ‘collective third space’ accounts for mediation of social identity and negotiated meaning through a pedagogical framework that considers diverse time-spaces of experience. Immigrant students are encouraged to think of themselves as ‘historical actors’ to consider how their past experiences and future visions of ‘social dreaming’ are manifested discursively and textually in present pedagogical spaces of the classroom. This has parallels to the curricular design of the Writing 2 class in this study which focuses on student writing from lived experience and perspective on social issues. I aim to deepen this spatial analysis by employing Bakhtin’s time-space construct of the *chronotope* (see below) in analyzing classroom discourse to trace renegotiations of identity that contribute to the production of third spaces for ELLs (Hirst, 2004; Leander, 2001).
An important methodological move in third space research that I aim to push further in this study is Gutierrez’s (2008) beginnings of a ‘grammar of third space’. Textual analysis of classroom discourse practices illustrates “the affordances and constraints of the social organization of talk and interaction”. I draw on Gutierrez’s method of analysis of patterns in grammatical structures, use of linguistic devices such as metaphors, as well as lexical choices of words such as ‘hope’ that are analyzed to trace linguistic features of a discourse of ‘social dreaming’. In considering the implications of pedagogical design and process, these mediational tools “serve as the means for developing a historicizing literacy that links students’ historical and immediate past, the present, and the imagined future through collective social dreaming – a collective dream for a better world (Gutierrez, 2008, p.158).” Gutierrez’s (2008) analysis and conceptualization of a grammar of third spaces has important theoretical and pedagogical implications for this study in which I appropriate strategies of her critical linguistic analysis and aim to expand it through closer attention to a critical discourse analysis of chronotopes of third spaces for the ELL classroom.

**Analysis of the Chronotope in Third Spaces**

Educational researchers have integrated spatial perspectives from cultural geography with chronotopic analysis in researching hybridized third spaces in educational contexts (Hirst, 2004; Hirst & Vadeboncoeur, 2006; Leander, 2001, 2002, 2004). An important theoretical implication of Lefebvre’s (1974, 1991) process-oriented conception of space is that space is co-constitutive of time; time and space unfold dialogically as time-space, or alternately termed space-time. This concept is expressed by
Bakhtin (1981, 1986) in the chronotope – articulated linking of time and space with particular cultural events, that have enduring features that situate and shape the process of making meaning. Chronotopes produce “sedimentations of concrete, motivated social situations or figured worlds (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005) (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005).” While a chronotope is not a bounded field per se, there are distinguishable continuities in terms of the possible meanings and identities that are made available within the chronotope. “Without such temporal-spatial expression, even abstract thought is impossible. Consequently every entry into the sphere of meanings is accomplished only through the gates of the chronotope (Bakhtin, 1981, p 258).”

In this study, the chronotope of immigration is the predominant space-time that is analyzed as a means of tracing how teacher and students negotiate the situated meaning of their immigrant identities. The time-spaces of immigration varies for each student as it relates to different ‘figured worlds’ of their lived experiences of migration, social and cultural locations, and socioeconomic conditions of their coming to America. For example, students who migrated because of their parents’ professional identity and institutionalized positions as university professors negotiate meanings of immigration very differently than those students whose families migrated with economic motivations due to poverty and lack of opportunity in their home country. Therefore, each student negotiates meaning and identity within the chronotope of immigration differently, constructing meaning from diverse time-spaces, or chronotopes of experience. Assumptions about the dynamic and fluid social processes of spatial production in the classroom provides a complexity of perspective in analyzing how the community
engaged collectively in critical dialogue about these possible meanings across time and spaces of their experiences.

As an analytical tool, the chronotope has been utilized in classroom research studies focused on renegotiations of identity (Hirst & Vadeboncoeur, 2006; Leander, 2001, 2002), social positioning (Leander, 2004), collaborative learning (Brown & Renshaw, 2006) and literacy (Hirst, 2004). My analytical method in this study employs the construct of the chronotope similarly to trace how the focal student is simultaneously positioned within ELL and SpEd time-spaces in ways that create marginalizing tensions of his lived experience in school. As the teacher, I attempted to engage his passion for hip hop which is fulfilled through lived chronotopes of the hip hop community where he inhabits a social position of power as a DJ working in a club. With an attention to the lived third spaces of classroom interactions, I employ time-space constructs (i.e. *chronotope*, Bakhtin, 1986; *space-time*, Harvey, 1989, 1996) to analyze how students’ immigrant identities are renegotiated in transformative ways across past-present-future times and along local-global spaces represented in classroom discourse (Fairclough, 2003; Kostogriz, 2006; Leander, 2001). The chronotope of immigration, articulated in material, abstract and lived spaces of immigration, is a predominant line of analysis of how third spaces are produced for ELLs in the focal classroom. Figure 3 is the organizing graphic for the production of third spaces for immigrant ELLs that I aim to operationalize in this study.
Figure 3. Conceptual Model: Production of Third Spaces for Immigrant ELLs

In the next chapter, I outline the study design and my analytical methodology in order to operationalize my reconsideration of third space; mapped through an ethnographic and critical discourse analysis of how classroom discourses are intersected with meanings drawn from abstract, material and lived spaces.
CHAPTER 4
RESEARCH DESIGN & METHODOLOGY

This study is a classroom ethnography (Heath & Street, 2008) that focuses on interrelations of space, language, and identity for immigrant ELLs. To operationalize a method for mapping spatial production, I draw on critical discourse analysis (Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, & Shuart-Faris, 2005) to look at how diverse space-times are indexed in language and discourse in ways that allow for renegotiations of identity. In this chapter I will, first, overview methods of ethnography and critical discourse analysis. Second, I describe phases of data analysis, including detailed CDA steps for transcript analysis, which is a principal data source.

Part I: Overview of Methods

Ethnography complements a theoretical focus on production of space and third spaces by facilitating a sociohistorical understanding of social interactions. Ethnographic methods of “thick description” of observations situate data materially in the first spaces of the classroom and embodied interactions of social space. Abstract second spaces of pedagogical designs of curriculum and instruction are understood ethnographically in narrating a classroom culture over an extended period of time. Informed by a perspective of social space, this classroom ethnography provides a more deeply nuanced view of how the teacher and ELL students negotiate discursive tensions of their immigrant identities by engaging critically in collaborative reflection and writing about lived experiences.
Ethnography is rooted in anthropology’s traditions of trying to understand culture from the insider’s perspective and render it through methods of “thick description” (Geertz, 1973) of environments, people, interactions and practices. An ethnographer’s project is to immerse in the context of social communities in order to get a sense of how relationships, activity and living occur among people. From a traditional sense of culture as different ways of life from different peoples, ethnography has obvious value to understanding a multicultural social space of a classroom of immigrant ELL students. However applied to educational contexts, ethnographic study of schools, classrooms, institutions and community can aim to map how the nature of work, relationships and social norms produces social spaces of learning that are transformative. Heath and Street (2008) explain: “Institutions as well as organizations that carry no inherent ties to place of origin also develop core cultural patterns and meta-narratives about their ‘culture’.”

In this ethnography, I describe and analyze the culture of the Writing 2 classroom in pedagogical design and social negotiation to define, protect and nurture a sense of Comm.Unity. Described in the ethnographic portrait in Chapter 5, Comm.Unity was the conceptual second space I designed for the Writing 2 classroom space. In the writing process of narrating with descriptive details, the ethnographer is textualizing an interpretation of social discourse:

_The ethnographer ‘scribes’ social discourse; he writes it down. In so doing, he turns it from a passing event, which exists only in its own moment of occurrence, into an account, which exists in its inscriptions and can be reconsulted (Geertz, 1973, p 19)._
Following Geertz’s sentiment, this ethnography aims to ‘inscribe’ Comm.Unity as a classroom space governed by social discourses designed to produce third spaces in the ELL classroom.

Heath & Street (2008) explain ethnography for researching language and literacy in the classroom. In contrast to a static view of culture as “noun”, they take the perspective on “culture as verb” to denote that culture is a constant state of becoming and transformation. Drawing on research traditions of New Literacy Studies (New London Group, 1996), the authors articulate an axiom to guide the ethnographic researcher interested in deeper understanding of language and multimodal literacies. “Gradations of change in habits and beliefs correlate with shifts in structure and uses of language and multimodal literacies” (Heath & Street, 2008, p. 8). This perspective on social behavior as textualized through language and multiliteracies reflects this ethnographic study’s attention to space and time in classroom discourse and the production of social space.

A constant comparative perspective of ethnography (Heath & Street, 2008) reflects a recursive process of working from hunches in data analysis that develop in moving back and forth between data analysis and deepening understandings of relevant theoretical constructs. In this process, the ethnographer is always working in understanding overlapping contexts to understand what is familiar and move toward articulating the unfamiliar. I entered investigations with questions of the nature of third space, and worked back and forth from data analysis and theoretical understandings. “Ethnographers construct, test, and amplify theoretical perspectives through systematic observing, recording, and analyzing of human behavior in specifiable spaces and interactions (Heath & Street, 2008, p. 38).
It is instructive to reiterate that Lefebvrean notions of space are complex and cannot easily translate to simple delineations of data to bins of first, second and third spaces. All spaces are in dialogic processes of mutual influence and definition. In reflecting on the complexities of operationalizing this notion of space in classroom ethnography, Sheehy (2010) cautions that the ethnographer has to describe what is visible, and in doing so, reproduces further abstractions of lived space. “It is extremely easy to fall into the trap of reading a classroom space, that is, describing a classroom, and then assigning it particular codifications or meanings.” As such, I frame Lefebvre’s spatial trialectic as a heuristic in my approach to mapping third space, rather than analytical categories per se. To better address this caution, I draw on critical discourse analysis to aid in perceiving textual and discursive meanings across the data set in order to better define and intertwine notions of first, second and third spaces in the classroom.

I took a recursive approach of working through preliminary organization and analysis of data while concurrently deepening my theoretical understandings of space and spatial analysis as applied in education and literacy research. This recursive process resulted in the wedding of constructs of social space, third space and chronotope with critical discourse analytic methods to look at ‘micro-ethnographic’ events of classroom interactions (Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, & Shuart-Faris, 2005). These methodological relationships between ethnography and CDA and the integration of data collection tools and analytical methods are described in the subsequent section on data analysis steps.

A critical reflexivity is key for ethnographers to recognize the researcher’s own social subjectivities and tools for meaning making that influence the entire research
process. In an effort to understand “the other”, we are aided by better understanding “the self”. This can be understood from broad cultural terms, but also within the Bakhtinian notion of the Self being in dialogue with the Other, and the essential space of communication in between where meaning is negotiated. As the researcher considers gaining access to the research site, the ethnographer should be critically aware of how dynamics of race, class, gender, language and culture inherently shape and inform inquiry. This reflexivity in the research process is crucial in the data collection process, but also through analysis and the rendering of findings of the study.

Given the study’s theoretical perspective of third space as negotiated in social practice, recognizing how my multiple identities play an equally central role in the students’ negotiation of possible meanings and identities in the classroom. Heath & Street (2008) advise: “As you collect data, know the company you keep as ethnographer and get to know yourself as constant learner - every curious and open to what’s happening.” I recognize reflexively how my identities as both teacher and researcher directly influence the process of investigating the production of third spaces in the ELL classroom. In one clear example, the explicit incorporation of Paulo Freire’s (1970, 1998) concept of ‘read the words, read the world’, which was posted on the classroom wall, is a reflection of my own theoretical orientations developed as a doctoral student, my own learner identity behind this research study. In the research process, reflexive moments have allowed me to better understand how theoretical learning, and spatial thinking in particular, has also influenced my embodied practice as an educator. While these intersections of my own multiple identities are not the principal focus of this study, I have taken conscious note of how these have influenced data collection, analysis and theoretical underpinnings of the
study, and strive to bring a critical reflexivity to my data analysis and the implications I draw for the work of students, teachers and teacher educators.

As the teacher-researcher in this ethnography, melding the ideological and analytical tools of critical discourse analysis allowed a degree of distance in the details of linguistic and discursive constructions of meaning. Heath and Street (2008) describe the challenge of ethnography in getting inside culture: “Ethnography forces us to think consciously about ways to enter into the life of the individual, group, or institutional life of the ‘the other’”. In aims of reflexivity, CDA allowed my researcher lens to reenter the life of the teacher as “the other”.

Critical discourse analysis provides a micro-ethnographic analysis of social interactions through which we can map the production of lived third spaces of experience. I use CDA methods to explore linguistic and discursive features of classroom spoken and written texts (Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, & Shuart-Faris, 2005; Bloome & Clark, 2006; Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993; Fairclough, 1992, 2003; Fairclough & Wodak, 1997). CDA views discourse as situated social practice that involves the historical development of knowledge systems by people that inform the social structures and institutions of society and culture. Discourse is shaped by and shapes situations, social structures, and institutions, and therefore, can both maintain and reinforce the status quo or work to transform it. Discursive practices have ideological effects – they can produce and reproduce power relations – and CDA attempts to highlight these aspects of discourse (Bourdieu, Jaworski, & Coupland, 1999; Smitherman & Smitherman, 2000).
Later in this chapter, I outline the specific steps of my CDA method employed to interrogate discourses of immigration and how teachers and students can renegotiate identity from different space-times that constitute these discourses.

**Part II: Data Collection**

Data collection for this study occurred over the course of one school year when I taught high school ELL students from grades 9-11. The school followed a trimester schedule from September to June, with my classes covering two trimesters. During the first trimester (September – December) and second trimester (December – March) I taught Oral Communication 1 for beginning Level 1 ELL students. During the second and third trimester (March – June) I taught Writing 2, the focal course and context of this study. Writing 2 was a course designed on developing academic writing for intermediate Level 2 ELL students.

I spent an average of 3-5 hours a day over the school year in the focal context of the ELL classroom, ELL department and school, with the most concentrated time during the second trimester when both Oral Communication 1 and Writing 2 classes met. I taught during B and C blocks out of a 5-block school day (A-E), usually spending A block before classes as a planning period. While my scheduled teaching time at school varied over the year, I spent additional time consistent with normal teacher responsibilities for attending the department and faculty meetings, administrative meetings, and meeting with students and parents. I collected institutional data on the district context, school context, and ELL program and department over the course of the year. The classroom data set from the Writing 2 class was collected from December to
June. Varied data collection methods were utilized as described below.

*Ethnographic field notes* were generated in school before or after teaching responsibilities or upon leaving the school. I would also jot down teacher observation notes by hand in the flow of classroom events in an anecdotal record. While this is a common teaching practice, I was able to return later to these brief notes with a research lens and develop these observations into a larger field note. Observer comments were added in the process of writing out field notes with greater narration and detail. Comments were also added at different points in the research process as recursive analysis allowed for new observations in retrospect.

*Digital audio/video* was utilized to capture classroom interactions while I was teaching. I generally set up the video camera on a tripod in the back right corner of the room, which was furthest from the door and outside the double-rowed horseshoe configuration of the desks. The boom microphone allowed for audible recording of classroom interactions, although there were limitations on the width of camera angle due to available space in the classroom so in most (if not all) cases there were always a few students who could not be captured in frame. This presents limitations for getting the full visual picture of physical (first) space of classroom discourse. Nevertheless, the video recordings provide an essential data source for accurately capturing classroom interactions and analyzing classroom discourse. I video recorded approximately 40 hours of classroom interaction and student interviews. The classroom video became an invaluable ‘secondary source’ of observation of my own classroom practice, which allowed me to generate ethnographic field notes from a more etic perspective. Field notes were also written from viewing classroom video, which is described further in the
discussion of data reduction process and steps of analysis that follows.

*Digital photographs* of classroom spaces, instructional materials, artifacts, and student work were also collected. Digital photographs were taken during the course of instruction as well as at the end of the year when classroom materials were stored.

*Institutional documents* were collected over the course of the school year. These included school administrative and policy texts, and other relevant school communications in print and digital formats. Another important subset of institutional documents that are part of the data set is my own professional development plan and observations conducted by the ELL department head. Of particular relevance is the district-required third professional development goal related to ‘becoming a multicultural school district’, through which I articulated critical literacy goals that influenced the pedagogical design of our classroom’s material, conceptual and lived spaces.

*Curriculum and instructional materials* for the Writing 2 class are part of the overall data set as well and I have extensive sources as the classroom teacher-researcher. Instructional materials in the classroom include classroom displays, notes, chart paper, etc., of which I have both original materials and digital pictures. Lesson plans and instructional notes were available in multiple places (sometimes incomplete), but generally a description of lesson plans was recorded in a brief version in a plan book, while more detailed plans were written on the computer. These digital plans in particular were useful for data analysis through the qualitative analysis software HyperResearch, which was used for varied phases of data analysis.

*Student work and background information* was collected from the different stages of the writing process, which was an organizing structure the composition class (e.g. pre-
writing, drafts, edits, final drafts). Additional student work includes focused grammar exercises, which were also part of the core curriculum of the course.

*Background information* on the students includes student records, such as grades, second language testing, special needs evaluations and Individualized Educational Plans.

*Semi-structured interviews* were conducted during different stages of the data collection process related to the focal students’ academic progress and learning needs. These interviews were recorded when possible, but not always video or audiotaped, in which case field notes were taken following the conversation to record events. An important piece of the data set for the focal study entails the final curriculum unit on writing portfolio reflections and exit interviews at the end of the school year.

**Part III: Data Analysis**

Working from my theoretical framework, I employ the spatial triadeclic of first/material space, second/conceptual space, and third/lived space as a heuristic model for my overall approach to analysis of data (Lefebvre, 1974, 1991; Soja, 1989, 1996). Drawing on this tripartite perspective of space, I approached the data set with a broad semiotic perspective that considers how meaning is constructed through multiple modalities and through multiple literacies (New London Group, 1996).

I use *broad content analysis* to accomplish a reduction of the data set and identify overarching themes (Merriam, 1998). In this process, I used the notions of first, second and third spaces to look at curricular units across the school year. The spatial heuristic provided a means of setting apart curricular designs (second spaces) of academic units and classroom climate, to better analyze the lived (third) spaces of interaction and the
performance of curriculum. Analysis of lived spaces is facilitated through digital video documentation, which provides a means of textual analysis of dynamic social interactions in the material context (first spaces) of structured teacher-student relationships in classroom space.

My analysis focuses on language as the principal semiotic tool by which teacher and students negotiate meanings that reflect and inscribe discourses of power and resistance that (re)negotiate their identity in classroom spaces. The physical and conceptual spaces of the classroom are co-constitutive in the process of production of meaning mediated principally through language used in social interaction. I utilize critical discourse analysis to do detailed linguistic analysis of critical events with an attention to space. I outline the steps of CDA analysis applied to these focal interactions to trace how spatial features of language and discourse produce third spaces that allow students and teachers to renegotiate power and identity in the classroom. Analysis of spatial features of classroom discourse are mapped in terms of shifting chronotopes of teacher-student interaction that represent the repositioning of student subjectivities in the classroom space.

The unit of analysis of this study is the critical spatial event, defined as a series of social interactions in which oral and/or written language is used and represents negotiated tensions of discourses of race, class, gender, culture, and ethnicity. The critical spatial event is seen as constituting and constitutive of discursive moments of spatial production.

The tables below provide an overview of the design and analytical methods for this study. Table 1 is a data analysis chart that provides an overview of theoretical constructs, data sources and analytical methods to be used in this study. Table 2 is a chart
of phases of data analysis that provides more details on the recursive process of data analysis from broad content analysis, identification of focal interactions, and microanalysis through CDA.

Table 1. Data Analysis Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Research Question</th>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Unit of Analysis</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| How does spoken and written language and discourse shape the production of third spaces for renegotiating immigrant student identity in the ELL writing classroom? | • Social space as social process  
• Spatial trialectic of material, abstract and lived spaces  
• Third space  
• Time-space (chronotope) | Critical spatial events in focal curriculum unit  
• Unit: Immigration Narrative (Coming to America)  
• Comm.Unity Conflict (group space)  
• Hip hop hopes (focal student) | Ethnographic data triangulation  
• Unit 1: Comm.Unity  
• Unit 3: Describing Place  
• Unit 4: Writing Portfolios/Exit Interviews | • Curriculum materials  
• Instructional materials  
• Institutional documents  
• Professional development plan  
• Field notes  
• Classroom video  
• Interviews  
• Student texts | • Broad content analysis of discourses of immigration across data set  
• Identification of critical spatial events – focal interactions for detailed transcription  
• CDA analysis of discursive tensions & shifts of social identities in T/S interaction  
• Chronotopic analysis of space-times in T/S interaction |
Table 2. Phases of Data Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Broad content analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Content analysis with spatial lens across broad data set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organizing themes around chronotopes of immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Analysis of curriculum units and group interactions across year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify focal curriculum unit (Immigration Unit)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Critical Spatial Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Further organization and deeper analysis of data set of curriculum unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify critical spatial events at 1) group level 2) individual student level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Revisit ethnographic data set in coding process of sub themes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 3</th>
<th>Critical Discourse Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Critical discourse analysis of critical spatial events in focal unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Phases of CDA analysis (lexical, time referents, spatial scales, communication function, interactional units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chronotope mapping and shifting identities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 1: Broad Content Analysis of Ethnographic Data Set**

This study’s focus on the chronotope of immigration materialized initially through a broad analysis and reduction of the data set that was conducted through a recursive process of content analysis (Bogden & Biklen, 1992; Merriam, 1998). I conducted thematic content analysis of field notes, and reviewing video and audio documentation, student writing and other classroom artifacts, and then revisiting theoretical constructs in light of the data. I initially identified how the discourses of immigration, in particular, are made explicit in the curricular designs, or conceptual spaces, of the course (i.e. classroom Comm.Unity, New Year’s hopes composition, immigration narratives, race and ethnicity unit). This allowed me to focus more closely on how specific units and lessons represented experiences and issues of immigration, to what degree these discursive treatments of immigration were implicitly or explicitly manifest in classroom interactions, classroom texts and student writing.
Critical spatial events identified for analysis were selected from curriculum units across the school year. I define a curricular unit broadly as an organized instructional plan with specific pedagogical objectives. This definition of curriculum unit encompasses the standard conception of an instructional unit from a planned curriculum that articulates institutionally required educational frameworks. A curriculum unit also includes pedagogical designs for establishing a classroom community that aims to reflect, dialogue and write critically through ‘standard instructional units’ about students’ identity related to important social and cultural issues. For this study a broad definition of a curriculum unit allows for a deeper analysis of the production of third spaces in the focal ELL classroom where I as the teacher had explicit pedagogical goals to explore questions of race, class, gender and ethnicity for my immigrant ELL students. In this way, academic literacy (i.e. linguistic development) and critical literacy (i.e. critical consciousness, identity/self) were integrated pedagogical goals of curricular design, and therefore, provide important spatial perspective to analysis of critical events. I focus analysis on critical events from the focal immigration unit, *Coming to America*, triangulated with ethnographic data from critical events at different points along the academic year.

While immigration was a natural discursive theme for an ELL Composition course designed around student writing from their lived experience, content analysis of data pointed to how the chronotope of immigration was negotiated in different ways based on individual students’ unique experience and social subjectivities. From an overarching inquiry stance of how critical literacy (Freire, 1970, 1998) contributes to production of transformative classroom space, my content analysis revealed sub-themes surrounding the chronotope of immigration and inquiry questions that shaped later stages of analysis.
From the theoretical perspective that “issues of identity require attention to both situational positioning and to positioning at broader social and cultural levels in terms of race, gender, class, and ethnicity,” I followed these broad themes as a method of data reduction and sub-coding discourses of immigration (Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, & Shuart-Faris, 2005). An ethnographic case study of the focal student focuses on the immigration chronotope of the “American Dream” in more detail in Chapter 6. What is germane to the analytical methods outlined here is that a chronotopic understanding of third space takes into account that discursive tensions invited and navigated in the classroom space are considered from a wide range of subject positions and possible meanings at work in classroom discourse.

**Phase 2: Chronotopic Analysis of Discourses of Immigration**

My approach toward devising a chronotopic analysis builds on various approaches of spatial researchers cited previously; these include Leander (2001; Leander, 2002, 2004), Brown and Renshaw (2006), Hirst (2004), and Hirst and Vadeboncoeur (2006). As has been noted (Brown & Renshaw, 2006; Leander, 2001), there is no specific approach to chronotopic analysis that can be gleaned from Bakhtin’s complex notion of chronotopes, “which are not so much visibly present in activity as they are the ground for activity (Morson & Emerson, 1990, p 369).” A chronotopic analysis of critical events allows for an examination of how multiple space-times are hybridized, or laminated simultaneously within classroom discourse, as teacher and students negotiate third space tensions (Leander, 2001).
I appropriate Leander’s (2002) method of triangulating semiotic analysis across material, linguistic and discursive spaces of classroom interactions. This approach situates analysis of the immediate material context of face-to-face interaction within a broader historical analysis of the institutional policy spaces that frame social positions and linguistic choices made within the discursive space of interaction. I also draw on Leander’s (2001) approach to analysis and visual mapping of representations of space-times in discourse through an attention to lexico-grammatical features that construct intercontextual links between the temporal flow of interaction and different events in past, present and future space-times. I extend Leander’s method of analysis by mapping scales (micro-local, local, global) of classroom discourse in understanding (re)negotiations of immigrant student identity. More specific methodological details are outlined in Phase 3’s description of steps of CDA.

To reiterate, I define a critical spatial event as a series of social interactions in which oral and/or written language is used and represents negotiated tensions of discourses of race, class, gender, culture and ethnicity in the ELL classroom (Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, & Shuart-Faris, 2005). This definition of a critical spatial event is built on the notion that critical renegotiations of power and social identity between teacher and students are contributing to production of third spaces in the classroom. Teacher and student interactions in these events allow students to make connections between the current school chronotope and other non-school chronotopes that have significant meaning and provide scaffolding for literacy development, while also supporting immigrant youth identity. I do not consider an event to have a distinct temporal or spatial boundary; this perspective follows theoretically in line with the sense
of time and space being fluid. As such, a series of interactions between two people could index prior conversations that are drawn upon intertextually. In this sense, my conceptualization of a critical spatial event also draws on the chronotopic analysis of Brown and Renshaw (2006) who apply the chronotope to different pedagogical time-spaces of social interaction and collaboration within the classroom. In analyzing classroom interactions, therefore, I take a sociohistorical approach that considers past interactions as discursive grounding that situates meaning and provides available tools for linguistic and communicative choices in the classroom.

Chronotopic analysis was initiated during the initial Phase 1 of broad content analysis related to enduring themes of immigration tracked across the data set. In Phase 2 of chronotopic analysis, data reduction focused on identifying critical events with particular focus on triangulation between student writing and classroom face-to-face interactions. At this stage of my data analysis, I categorized the following themes of the chronotope of immigration and preliminary coding:

- lived space-times of student experiences of immigration and immigrant identity (e.g. life situation preceding their migration; their physical journey; life circumstance upon arrival)

- conceptual/discursive space-times of immigration as a sociohistorical discourse and ideological representation in American society (e.g. mythology of the “American Dream”; political rhetoric of anti-immigrant sentiment; current events of immigrant surveillance)

- pedagogical space-times of school and classroom interactions related to discourses of immigrant identity (e.g. negotiations of student identity in school environment; language and communication in social contexts; ELL classroom community across cultural-linguistic diversity; institutional positioning as an ELL and impact on immigrant learner identity

- personal goals/hopes for immigration related to family support, education, and future opportunity (e.g. need to provide financial support to family; goals for legal status to return home; petition of family members; reunite with child)
I paid attention to how chronotopes, as enduring dimensions of the process of making meaning, had particular dimensions of time and geographic space for immigrant ELLs considering their physical, conceptual and lived connections to other people, places and situated cultural experiences. My approach to chronotopic analysis within these themes is featured by two main lines of analysis. First, I drew a temporal line of analysis that traced indexing of past, present and future time-spaces of the chronotope. Second, I also drew what I am referring to as an analysis of scale of the chronotope. This becomes a foreground of a geographic notion of space-time that refers to how local-global relations are indexed in discourse and text. Chronotopic analysis of focal interactions, therefore, includes movement across these different time-spaces and scales in a dynamic of interdiscursivity, or linkages of different discourses within production of oral or written texts.

The specific coding utilized in these lines of analysis are described in more detail below in Phase 3 as part of CDA, which provides detailed linguistic method for tracing features of the chronotope represented in transcriptions of the focal interactions.

**Phase 3 - Critical Discourse Analysis of Critical Spatial Events**

My CDA approach to micro-ethnographic analysis of classroom interactions follows the approach of Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto and Shuart-Faris (2005) in conducting detailed transcript analysis. I also incorporate the critical analytical approach of Norman Fairclough (2003) in considering the scalar analysis of space-time
representations in texts which he develops from a tradition of systemic functional linguistics (Halliday, 1978).

A main feature of focal interactions, defined as critical spatial events, was discursive tension related to power, resistance and renegotiating identity that was apparent in the face-to-face communicative situation between teacher and students. Focal interactions are an identified event or a “bounded series of actions and reactions that people make in response to each other at the level of face-to-face interaction” (Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, & Shuart-Faris, 2005). As classroom events are considered from a situated perspective of social practice (Barton, & Hamilton, 1998; Street, 1995), I also apply the notion of event to the production of written texts which are produced through social interaction. Drawing on critical discourse analytic methods to explore classroom interactions leads to suggest reconsiderations of situated practice of third spaces. I am also interested in how people use available literacy practices to create and/or reproduce histories, social relations and social identities (Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, & Shuart-Faris, 2005). My approach to CDA of classroom events also considers the physical and behavioral aspects of communication through linguistic and non-linguistic means, such as contextualization cues and body language, which are complimentary to the notion of social space produced through interaction.

I analyzed the teacher-student interaction in a recursive fashion by identifying language features of spoken discourse and relevant contextual clues, while also paying attention to lexical, semantic and discursive markers of time and space. With this attention to time-space representations in discourse I began to trace the time-spaces, or chronotopes, that were woven together in the interaction (see Appendix for sample of
detailed analysis). Analysis of space-times referenced in discourse also analyzed the
temporal references of past, present and future, which are significant in the context of the
academic writing task and this illustration of the teacher-student mediation of space-time
in the classroom. “One can ask of any organization or institution [ ] how relations
between past, present and future are constructed and how they are ‘textured in texts, and
how they change as part of social change [ ]” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 152). Mapping of the
chronotopes of focal interactions across past, present and future space-times are presented
in the two data analysis chapters (Chapter 5 and 6). Indicated in these maps are the
corresponding re-positionings of student identity that are negotiated with the temporal
flow of the discursive interaction and production of classroom space.

**Steps of CDA**

Integrating a CDA approach to analysis of the chronotopes within the focal
interaction entailed different steps, which I followed in a recursive process in working
through the transcription. These following analytical steps are further outlined below:

1. detailed transcription of focal interactions;
2. preliminary linguistic analysis (lexical features);
3. temporal analysis of representations of past, present, and future time-spaces;
4. analysis of scale - links between local-global space-times;
5. communicative function of interaction;
6. identification of boundaries of interactional units;
7. identification and diagramming of shifts in chronotopes and identity
   within interaction.
1. **Detailed transcription of focal interaction**

Detailed transcription of the focal interaction was accomplished by viewing videotape to pay close attention to language use and other contextualization cues that were relevant to the communicative functions of interactions. A preliminary transcription was completed that focused on precision of documenting language use. Subsequent refinements of the transcription paid closer attention to paralinguistic features such as volume, tone, stress, pauses, and intonation, and were pertinent to the later steps of identifying boundaries in the interaction. Transcript conventions are included in the appendix.

2. **Preliminary linguistic analysis**

A principal feature of preliminary linguistic analysis paid attention to lexical choices and other grammatical features such as interrogatives and possessives. I coded for words that represent emotional referents and traced how the lexical chaining of emotional references (e.g. hope, joy, happiness, fulfillment, love) relate intertextually – interspatially – to other aspects of the overall data set. I hope to trace these more systematically represented across the data as a key aspect of producing third spaces in the classroom.

- affective relationships (e.g. love, hope, feel, joy, happiness, care)
- possessives related to emotional references (e.g. my dreams, my hopes)
- interrogatives – focus on teacher’s use of questioning to prompt student reflection (e.g. why? how?) on his own actions/agency related personal goals (and non-school identities)
3. Temporal analysis of representations of past, present, and future time-spaces

Temporal analysis entailed linguistic coding along a temporal line of analysis paid attention to some of the following features:

- verb tense related to student action/agency (e.g. past, present or future time-spaces)
- conditional verb forms (e.g. indicates action as an imaginary time-space;)
- imperatives (e.g. actions related to varying school/non-school discourses; ‘have to’, ‘got to’)

4. Analysis of scale - links between local-global space-times

In conducting analysis of scales in linkages between local-global space-times, I drew on some of the detailed linguistic analysis described above. I noted the correlation of scale of discursive representations in the chronotope, which situate meaning and student identity within broader understandings of society, culture and politics that shape lived experience. A scalar analysis of the chronotope draws on linguistic features to illuminate discursive features of the text germane to representations of scales of social life (Fairclough, 2003):

- lexical choices related to global (e.g. ‘the world’, ‘people’, ‘nobody’)
- spatial references to geographic location (‘came here’, ‘this country’, ‘home’)
- use of pronouns (e.g. ‘we’ as social class identity; ‘they’ as system, government, dominant society; ‘you’ as general reference connected to value statements ‘you should’)

5. Communicative function of interaction

Communicative functions of each turn at talk was analyzed in terms of the composite linguistic analyses describe above. In the context of the critical event, I considered what the underlying communicative function based on the linguistic choices made and the broader social and academic goals that contextualized the focal interaction.
Analysis of these communicative functions draws on an ethnographic understanding of the situated event and the relationship between the teacher and student that orient their discursive choices and conversational moves.

6. **Identification of boundaries of interactional units**

The analysis of these communicative functions as a series of interactions guided the definition of *boundaries and interactional units* based on the thematic coherence of the exchanges. Transcribed interactions were reorganized into interactional units, which are a series of conversationally tied utterances that are delineated by specific language features (i.e. lexical choice, verb tense), semantic meaning (e.g. content, purpose), non-verbal communication (e.g. body position, gestures) as well as contextualization clues (e.g. intonation, pauses, stress, speed, volume, etc.). Interactional units were analyzed in terms of the social moves and social identities that were being projected into the classroom space through discursive moves, and the strategic interactions through material, abstract and experiential fields of meaning making. In other words, boundaries are “part of the way that 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 (Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, & Shuart-Faris, 2005, p. 14).” In this way, we understand boundaries as socially constructed, and as such, can be viewed as discursive motions in the social production of social space in the classroom.
7. Mapping shifts in chronotopes and identity within interaction

Mapping chronotopes and identity shifts represented in the focal interaction followed from the exercise of identifying communicative functions and boundaries in interaction. Detailed linguistic analysis indexed temporal (time-space) and space-time scales represented in the text that allowed for a mapping of shifting chronotopes within teacher-student discourse. Each event was looked at more specifically in terms of interdiscursive links to the focal student’s (and teacher’s) social participation in other situated contexts or social communities. In essence, these links represent interspatialities of participants’ lived experience that is brought into the process of spatial production in the classroom through discursive interactions.

As represented in chronotope maps drawn from analysis in Chapters 5 and 6, shifts in chronotopes within the focal interactions represent discursive renegotiations of student identity and repositioning of students in diverse temporal and spatial locations. In the focal data, analysis of classroom discourse surrounding the student’s hopes to pursue his “American Dream” in a music career as a DJ are mapped across space-times of the current writing task, his immigration journey, social class oppression, hip hop dance party, teaching and DJing as profession. This mapping of shifting chronotopes and student identities within classroom discourse begins to illustrate findings toward the understanding from a spatio-temporal framework of how third spaces are produced for immigrant ELLs in the classroom.

This chapter outlined the research methodology for this study that blended ethnography and critical discourse analysis to investigate the production of third spaces in the classroom. In the next chapter, I move to operationalize these methods in narrating
the classroom space as a place where communication and unity, conceptualized as Comm.Unity, were designed as guiding principles for interaction and collaboration. CDA analysis of the critical spatial event during an immigration unit highlights discursive tensions and attempts to mediate conflict. Reframing classroom discourse around chronotopes of immigration and lived spaces of student experience allows for renegotiation of immigrant student identities.
CHAPTER 5
ETHNOGRAPHY OF THIRD SPACES IN THE ELL WRITING CLASSROOM

Examining immigrant student experiences in a college town like Cuttersville (pseudonym) where this study takes places contributes to understanding the growing complexities of educating immigrant ELL students in America. In coming to America, immigrants are historically relocated into marginalized spaces in society. The study’s context builds a broader understanding of immigrant student experiences beyond the historical settlement patterns in urban areas. Rather, the suburban context of Cuttersville frames the reality that addressing immigrant student, family, and community needs is a growing concern. Immigrant students and families experience an intersecting web of structural inequalities along lines of race, class, gender, culture, language, and other issues that can shape their experiences in any community setting be it urban, suburban or rural. This study’s attention to immigrant experiences, as understood from the local vantage point inside the ELL classroom, illustrates how the marginalization of immigrant communities in suburban even in well-resourced areas is a consistent problem. This is no different in Cuttersville.

Part I: Study Context - Tracing Tensions in Community Spaces

Community Context: A College Town Called Cuttersville

Cuttersville is a college town in the Northeast U.S. with a regular population of approximately 35,000 residents during the hot summer days when the parking lots are empty. However, every September, the town swells with an additional 30,000 college
students coming back to school, filling up the parking lots, sidewalks, coffee shops and bars.

Northeast State University (NSU), with approximately 27,000 undergraduate and graduate students, is located very close to the north of the main downtown area. It covers a wide area with multiple thirty-story high-rise dorm complexes, Division I athletic facilities, and academic buildings of mix-matched architectural styles spanning 150 years. The university, which is only mid-sized as far as universities go, is still big enough to have its own zip code and police force. Northeast University was established originally in the 1860’s as a public agricultural school. It evolved in the 1930’s into a state college, and a decade later in the 1940s, was reincorporated as Northeast University in its current structure as a public higher education institution.

The large state university in Cuttersville serves as an anchor for the local education economy and provides employment to the town and wider region. According to town demographic data from 2004, Northeast University is, by far, the largest employer with some 7,000 employees. Cuttersville is also home to two small private liberal arts colleges whose combined enrolment is less than 3,000 students. However, these two private colleges also account for an additional 1,200 jobs. This rivals the total employment of the local public schools and town services which account for some 1,400 jobs. After academic institutions, the next highest employment sector in Cuttersville is the health industry which is bolstered through elderly care services that serve a significant retirement community that has developed a reputation of Cuttersville as a desirable retirement location. According to 2000 U.S. Census data, 52% of employment in Cuttersville comes in education, health, and social services (U.S. Census, 2000).
Life cycles in Cuttersville move according to the four seasons and the academic calendar. In late August every year, when summer cools into the idyllic nostalgia of colorful fall foliage, there is an explosion of activity, people, and excitement that comes with a new school year. Cars and moving vans filled with students and parents transporting suitcases, microwaves, and mattresses into campus dorms, moderate- to low-income apartment complexes, and rental houses that undergraduate tenants landscape with ratty couches and plastic party cups. Apartment complexes often house low-income minority and immigrant families who are intermingled with the seasonal college student renters. During the fall homecoming weeks of Division I football at NSU, university stadiums fill with fans, boosters, and tailgaters whose erupting cheers can carry over the tree lines. On the south side of town, rivalries between small ivy colleges in the northeast bring a different brand of alumni and parental supporters who contribute to a multimillion dollar endowment and elitism hovering in the airs around Cuttersville.

The Cuttersville town common is abutted by the ivy walled buildings of American College (pseudonym), a top-ranking liberal arts college founded in the early 1800s. With its long history and multimillion-dollar endowment, American College is now one of the largest land owners in town. This is a local town political issue about generating income from these tax-exempt educational institutions that do not contribute to property tax, but utilize and benefit from public services such as public schools. The centrally located campus of American College is closely integrated around the town center which is a physical reflection of the school’s history in establishing the community and defining Cuttersville as a college town.
Ridgefield College is another smaller and younger college that was founded forty years ago in an experimental educational project to create an alternative higher education space. The Ridgefield educational philosophy is structured on a non-graded, student-driven learning curriculum that challenges traditional institutional models of defined majors and departments. Ridgefield College’s alternative educational space spawned local folklore of ultimate Frisbee being a legitimate major which is a socially constructed representation of a culture of academia and liberal values that has branded the place of Cuttersville and, to some degree, the broader area of surrounding towns. According to a recent 2008 Census, registered voters of Cuttersville identified as 49% Democratic and 43% independent, with only 6% Republican, and another nearly 2% for other parties (US Census, 2008). The town is located in a surrounding valley that is known to have a history of civil rights era politics and global political activism invoked locally.

Just ten miles away in neighboring towns, there are two other small private liberal arts women’s colleges that add to the educational credentials, economy, and culture of the surrounding area within a rough twenty-mile radius of Cuttersville. The ivory towers of the four small prestigious colleges and NSU constitute an academic stronghold that further bolsters various higher education institutions in the wider region stretching along the principal north-south interstate highway and river valley. This broader area includes two small post-industrial cities within thirty miles that have numerous small public and private colleges, technical schools and community colleges. These nearby urban areas also have larger minority, low-income and immigrant populations whose historical ties stretch out to affect demographic shifts in suburban Cuttersville.
Beyond Cuttersville, a nearby small city of Eastonville just nine miles away is home to an exclusive women’s college and is known for a LGBTQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer/questioning) community which is publicly vocal, well-known, and active. Beyond Eastonville, the culture and politics of the LGBTQ community are prevalent in Cuttersville and surrounding areas where people are engaged in the intellectual projects of identity politics and engaging power through public discourse in higher education.

The town culture and community is greatly influenced by the many cultural events, public speakers, academic conferences, political voices, and community activities that emanate from colleges and universities. Coming with the culture of academia are many accomplished and known writers, scientists, educators, and activists who are community members and parents of current or former students in the public schools. A common Sunday scene in the center of town captures an image of Cuttersville. On almost every Sunday morning in the center of Cuttersville, just up the sidewalk from the town hall, there is a regular peace vigil that is manned faithfully by some five to ten peace activists. It is mixed groups of men and women, mostly middle-aged and older, which stand behind a tattered canvas “peace” banner of rainbows and doves strung between two lamp posts. In all kinds of weather, they do their global civic duties to keep Cuttersville consciences conscious while chatting away the morning on fair-trade coffee and herbal chai. While waving to church-goers stopped at the red light, one of the peace brigade and an endeared male elementary school teacher steps from the curb along the busy row of five idling cars to pass out political leaflets with a smile and message that typifies the liberal ideological leanings around this town.
All sorts of people frequent the weekend farmers market set up in the public parking lot adjoining the town common to sell an array of locally-grown crops and products ranging from bak choy to bagels. “Buy local” bumper stickers promoting sustainable community agriculture mark the bumpers of mini-vans shuttling kids past the market on the way to Saturday morning soccer fields that are well-attended.

The town common is host to a wide array of publicly scheduled events ranging from the May town fair, sustainability fairs, arts and crafts fairs, and harvest festivals. There are also political events supporting free-Tibet movements, immigration rallies, and anti-war demonstrations. There is even an annual ‘Legalize It’ event supporting decriminalization of marijuana that fills the common with reggae rhythms and people of varied ages, colors, and stages of dreadlock (with a fair share of blond). Although more conservative local opinions usually surface by the following week, with a letter-to-the-editor by a concerned long-time resident who attests to and is appalled by the town’s condoning of the illegal aromas he inhaled (accidentally) as he passed by the event.

The commercial downtown of Cuttersville is dominated by eating establishments, coffee shops, and a small retail market of locally-owned businesses. There is a diversity of local ethnic food restaurants representing Mexican, Latin American and West African food, French and Italian cuisine, Spanish tapas, Chinese, Vietnamese and Thai restaurants, Asian fusion food, and the obligatory host of deli/bakery/coffee shops and pizza joints that are staples for college students and parents too tired to cook dinner. Many immigrants, both documented and undocumented, find employment as kitchen and bar staff of many of the local eateries. Many of them are newer Central American
immigrants, including several of the working ELL students enrolled at Northeast High School.

The rural setting of surrounding area around Cuttersville reflects a historically agricultural Northeast community that was settled by European immigrants in the 1700s and 1800s of mostly English, Polish, Irish, and French Canadian descent among others. Farming in the region consists of corn, tobacco, asparagus and dairy although numerous small-scale farms and an increasing number of organic farms, and farm cooperatives exist today. Several of the local farms employ seasonal laborers with a regular contingent from Jamaica and more recently, from Central America. These seasonal laborers are seen from the roadside, picking tobacco and tilling fields atop large industrial tractors. You can run into them buying supplies with their fistful of payday dollars that are then wired home at the Western Union counter located inside a local supermarket.

Nearby to Cuttersville are several small to mid-size post-industrial cities that once had a strong manufacturing and paper mill industries along the north-south Winding River. Jobs in these small cities that were once occupied by predominantly white employees with a smaller African American demographic but later brought more Latino migrants, mostly Puerto Ricans, north from New York City in the post WWII era. In the recent decade, Central Americans, Russian-speaking immigrants, and more recently, Somalian refugees have expanded the immigrant communities. The demographic shifts, however, put increasing strain on these small cities that have fallen into economic depression with several decades of deteriorating public services, safety, and health. This includes the struggling urban public schools that have a large minority student demographic and are chronically under-performing.
Despite being relatively well-funded, Cuttersville schools have dealt with challenges of educating immigrant students and serving newcomer families. Even when isolated or few families move into a district and require language support services, there is an array of needs for instruction, translation, bilingual materials, and other social service interventions that can often accompany teaching English language learners.

In the early 1980s, Southeast Asian refugees resettled through church sponsorships in these surrounding urban and suburban areas including in the town of Cuttersville. As settlement patterns tend with immigrant communities, family members and friends migrate to the same areas where they have the support system. The original resettled families become the foundation for many extended relatives and friends who are supported in their transition by multiple families sharing one house to save money. The front yard of one extended Cambodian family I know provides a good illustration with some seven to eight cars and trucks parked on the driveway and into the front lawn that was eventually paved to extend the driveway.

There are now second-generation English-speaking Vietnamese- and Cambodian-American students in the Cuttersville schools and some of their first generation parents are working in the school system. A Vietnamese man named Mr. Duy whom I met on the NSU campus was a high school principal back home before the war forced him to become a refugee. When he was resettled in the Cuttersville area he was forced to find work. He found twenty years of work in food services at NSU, where he supported his family and put all seven of his children through college taking advantage of employee tuition benefits. When I met him, he was finishing his master’s degree in education. Is this an “American Dream” fulfilled? Perhaps, over a lifetime, with intense sacrifice, hard
work, and determination, Mr. Duy won his uphill battle from the kitchens of NSU dining halls. This is another immigrant story in a place like Cuttersville.

**School/District Context: Questions of Excellence & Equity**

Cuttersville High School (CHS) reflects a well-educated, liberally-minded bent of the broader community. The school environment is one of high academic expectations and there is an influential tide of pressures that pushes students toward continuing on at prestigious colleges. A testament to this was the superintendents opening convocation to the district faculty and staff in which he took time and breaths to announce some thirty to forty names of different reputable colleges and universities where the previous graduates chose to enroll. Living in the atmosphere of academia provides pressure of all sorts. While college should be an option for all students, high college expectations and intense competition can be less than affirming for those students who are not college-bound, either by choice or circumstance. For lower income students, especially immigrants coming from poverty and interrupted schooling, college may not be an immediate priority beyond high school with the need to work and support family in the U.S. and in their home countries.

CHS is a regional high school of approximately 1,300 students from four surrounding towns in the area. The race/ethnicity demographics of the CHS student population for the 2006-07 school year outlined in Table 3 show small minority populations across racial groups, with the largest contingent being 10.4% Asian, followed by 8.8% Hispanic or Latino, and 7.7% African-American. The high Asian demographic reflects both the historical Southeast Asian immigrant communities as well as larger
numbers of Chinese and Chinese-American students, and more recently, Korean students.

Another interesting demographic of CHS is the 4.2% multi-race students, which is over
double the state average of 1.7%. This demographic reflects many students of mixed-
marrriages which is not only a noticeable part of the Cuttersville community but also
reflects liberal discourses around students accepting and embracing mixed-race identities.

A 68.5% White demographic reflects the Cuttersville community which is only slightly
lower than the state average of 71.5%. This demographic shapes the educational
discourse at CHS, driven by liberal, middle class values but with a social-consciousness
toward issues of equity and multiculturalism.

Table 3. School & District Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity (2006-07)</th>
<th>% of School</th>
<th>% of District</th>
<th>% of State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Populations (2006-07)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Language not English</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHS had only 2.2% Limited English Proficient students, which further reflects
how immigrant students are isolated as a group. Interestingly, 12.6% of students reported
that English was not their first language. In 2007, the secondary ELL program including
CHS and the feeder middle school had a total of 62 ELL students from Levels 1-3 with approximately one third having Spanish as a first language.

Cuttersville public school system had a strong commitment to providing a multicultural perspective in the schools. The district had stated policy and educational goals related to being a ‘multicultural school district’ which included organizational affiliations with multicultural education networks and corresponding professional development goals for all teachers regarding multicultural education, diversity, and equity. A discourse of multiculturalism that was pervasive in the schools was reflected in quality instruction, for the most part, that earned Cuttersville a reputation for its school system. Cuttersville has three decades of partnership with a nation-wide non-profit organization that sponsors low-income minority youth to live in a supervised group house and attend (and succeed) at CHS. There is wide-spread community support, annual fund-raisers, and a long-list of committed board members (and politics). Nonetheless, Cuttersville is also a place where one of the few long-time black business owners in the downtown had a brick thrown through his store window with racial slurs in tow. This is an incident that drew major community support for a long-time resident family that put their now-grown children through the public schools.

Despite Cuttersville’s prevalent discourse of multiculturalism (not always so critical) and social justice, inequities along race, culture, and language are evident, perhaps, more than some would recognize. Along with achievement gaps in academic performance and standardized testing, there was also the corresponding dynamic of disproportionate disciplinary action against minority students. The CHS administration, faculty, and students engage in these debates collectively with the involvement of the
wider community. There are parent-organized advocacy groups to dialogue with schools around issues of equity for minority students.

Overall, the quality of the schools is a strong motivation for white collar professionals and other working class families to move into the district. Well-funded special education programs and the commitment to educational equity for children with diverse learning needs is another aspect of Cuttersville’s reputation. With a community filled with educated and strong-minded parents, however, there are challenging (and unrealistic) expectations from parents on what a public school can reasonably offer. In fact, there are arguably more ideological agendas underpinning local politics than is recognized. Educated parents and community members are well-versed in research, analysis, and articulation of issues so much so that they can take up No Child Left Behind (NCLB) discourses of data-driven decisions and accountability to make arguments for more rigor and college preparation because Cuttersville’s performance is falling behind comparable school systems.

Achievement gap questions are the classic manifestation of social inequalities that characterize American public schools. Moreover, the fact that this issue was persistent in a well-resourced, liberally-minded district like Cuttersville is further testimony to the overarching structural dimensions of race, class, and culture that shape the social spaces of schools. Data on the mandated Northeast Performance Assessment (NPA) indicates an achievement gap in racial and language sub-groups in Cuttersville schools. On the 2007 Grade 10 Math exam (Table 4), white students outperformed all other racial sub-groups in the “Advanced” category with 63%. This high performance reflects test scores for 223 white students, or 79% of all students who took the Grade 10 exam. By comparison,
racial subgroups scored far fewer in the “Advanced” category with persistent achievement gaps for African Americans (19%), Hispanic (30%), and Asians (43%) (Table 4). Hispanic students had the most students in the lowest “Warning/Failure” category (15%) followed by Asians (10%). Fifty six percent of African-American students scored in “Needs Improvement” as compared to only 10% of white students. Low-income sub-group scores were more consistent with 27% scoring “Advanced” and only 7% scoring “Warning/Failure”. These statistics are better than 2007 state averages which were 21% Advanced and 19% Warning.

Table 4. Northeast Performance Assessment Results (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th># students included</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Warning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance on the Grade 10 English exam followed the same pattern. White students scored 39% Advanced, compared to 14% of Asians, 13% of African-American students, and 10% of Hispanic. Only African-American (6%) students and Asians (5%) scored in the Warning Failure category. However, in the “Needs Improvement” category, African American students had the highest percentage at 44% as compared to only 7% of white students. Asians and Hispanic students scored 36% and 35% respectively in the “Needs Improvement” category.
These standardized metrics in an era of accountability only intensify under pressures of an economic downturn at national and local levels, as was the case during the period surrounding the 2006-2007 school year. Budget cuts from the state of Northeast were threatening local public schools and there was widespread concern about lay-offs and restructuring of programs due to financial constraints. In Cuttersville, there were intense community debates around balancing priorities to maintain the same quality of education and diversity of curricular choices. As typical in most school budget situations, arts, enrichment programs, sports, and extracurricular activities become threatened. More conservative-minded contingents in the community, including elected town representatives and citizens armed with advanced degrees, invoke discourses of “equity” as they wage intense pressures to focus on academic excellence and increased instructional rigor. Aside from fundamental concerns about middle school students not being on track to take AP classes for college track preparation, arguments for academic rigor are asserted as best for all students especially minority students who face lowered expectations.

It is in a place like Cuttersville where well-educated community members and parental advocates are keen on the issues, know how to inform themselves, and are politically savvy in how they pursue their agendas in a ethically-sensitive environment. It is also in such a place, where parents get the students involved in voicing their opinions on educational debates, and even taking up signs on street corners (directly across from the peace activist brigade) regarding school funding and school committee elections. In years following this study, local school board politics and community mobilizing from an ‘accountability and excellence’ ideology pushed for school restructuring which
dismantled three long-standing culture-language programs Khmer-, Spanish-, and Korean-speaking students in three of the elementary schools.

The public discourse around gender, sexuality and sexual orientation was also present at Cuttersville High School, where many a classroom door, including the Writing 2 classroom, was stickered with the pink triangle of an LGBTQ safe zone. There is an established student-run, faculty-sponsored club focused on gender equity, days of silence, and solidarity, and even courses on gay/lesbian literature. There had been tension in previous years in the Cuttersville community surrounding a student club’s production of a play with varying themes of gendered identities and sexual politics.

As a 37-year old Filipino-American male, I was one of the few teachers of color at CHS that year. For other minority and white colleagues at the school, the paucity of diversity in the teaching staff was something of note. One African-American physical education teacher speculated that she avoided getting pink slipped at the end of the year under budget cut pressures partly because she was the only black teacher in the school along with two custodians. As I talked to colleagues of color and some white teachers about race politics in the Cuttersville schools, I heard more stories about teachers of color feeling isolated or scrutinized in ways that led some to leave. The issue of diversity among teaching staff in Cuttersville surfaced with ensuing debates about the achievement gap between minority students, which generally included little discussion about the implications for English language learners.

The ELL Department at CHS was small and amounted to three people sharing 2.3 full-time positions. The ELL teachers across the district were dedicated staff and I had occasion to work in different capacities with people at the elementary and secondary
levels as well as in the central office. At CHS, ELL Department Head Ms. Rainee and another veteran teacher Ms. Shakey, both experienced ELL teachers, were both tireless advocates of the ELL program and the students, families, and communities it represented. Ms. Rainee and other strong instructional leaders at the elementary level collaborated to advocate for the ELL programs district wide under threat of budget cuts, successfully preserving key tutoring funds that help support students in mainstream classes. In particular, Ms. Rainee’s advocacy for immigrant students in the schools reached out into people’s homes, local communities, and social services including supporting immigration issues as needed. She was well-known to all the students in the Writing 2 classroom and would very frequently show up in class to follow up on administrative and personal issues of students.

With this broad background on the community and school context of Cuttersville, I move in the next section to describing the Writing 2 classroom context of this study.

**Part II: Classroom Context - (Profiling) Immigrant Identities in Writing 2**

The curriculum map of Writing 2 was one that integrated traditional English grammar and composition skills with broad themes that invited students’ to reflect on their immigrant experience. The curricular units were thematically focused on students’ critical reflection of their experiences surrounding topics like race, ethnicity, gender, and immigration. There were also other units that focused on specific writing skills such as description of a place, writing paragraphs, or letter writing which presented opportunities in instruction. I infused more critical literacy across the units by adapting new content materials, texts, and multimedia and integrating them within the unit structures, or restructuring the units around new themes. For example, I focused on the issue of
homelessness for a unit on letter writing focused on the issue of homelessness which had become a recent issue when Cuttersville superintendent announced cutting funding for bussing homeless students due to budget cuts. Students worked toward writing persuasive letters to the superintendent to express their opinions on the controversy. Other curriculum units and student texts are described as part of analysis in later sections. Later in this chapter, I give a detailed description of the focal immigration unit as context for analysis of critical spatial events in classroom discourse. There is a partial curriculum map for Writing 2 included for reference in the Appendix.

The ELL Writing 2 classroom community in this study was a mixed age group of ELL students in Grades 9-11 (Table 5). All students were designated ELL 2, or Intermediate Level ELL students, on the district’s three-tiered language proficiency scale. Some of the profile of a level 2 student includes the following description:

Although somewhat proficient in conversational English, these students struggle with new vocabulary and listening comprehension. Their writing will still contain many grammatical errors, which could interfere with meaning.

The ELL Writing 2 class consisted of twelve students from various countries including El Salvador, Ecuador, Thailand, Korea, Cape Verde, Cameroon and Bangladesh. Students were at various stages and status in regards to immigration – with documents and without documents. There was also a diversity of socioeconomic, religious, and class backgrounds of students and their families, which correlated generally to the countries and conditions of their migration. Three Korean students were children of academic professionals who are affiliated with local higher education institutions. They had been living in the area for several years in anticipation of returning home when their parents’ academic appointments ended. One Korean student was living
without family in a sponsorship situation with a local church; a Cape Verdean student was also in a legal guardianship situation with a family relation.

Some half of the students, mostly Latino, had immigrant, working class backgrounds and had a mix of documented and undocumented immigration status. Many of the Latino students who migrated through underground means also experienced arrest and detention at the southwestern borders of the US before relocating to the area to be near extended family; some students are in legal proceedings regarding pending deportation and petitions for legal status. Some of the students were also working heavy part-time or full-time schedules, mostly in local food establishments.

At the start of the school year, there were two teen mothers, one Ecuadorian and one Cape Verdean. Two other Salvadoran students became pregnant during the course of the school year, and were showing bellies by the end of school. While a gender analysis is not central to this study, it is relevant to mention that content analysis of the broad data set reflected prevalent discourses around family, parenting, responsibility, and relationships. Understanding the broad range of discourses and identities engaged in the course of instruction does provide a broader spatial context in which to consider an ethnographic analysis of a Comm.Unity space. Intense conflicts that arose at other times during the school year around cultural discourses of gender, race, class, among others, underscore (to the point of undermining) the argument that third spaces are produced from engaging tensions in the lived spaces of the classroom.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th><strong>Name (pseudonym)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Gender</strong></th>
<th><strong>Country</strong></th>
<th><strong>Age</strong></th>
<th><strong>Grade</strong></th>
<th><strong>ELL Level</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comments:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Raul Moreno (RM)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>ELL 2</td>
<td>Special education; no passport, visa/residence in process;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hyo Jì (HJ)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>ELL 1</td>
<td>Living with nuclear family, Academic father on visiting professorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Esperanza Acuña (EA)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ELL 2</td>
<td>Became pregnant; working in local restaurant in kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Erica Velazquez (EV)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ELL EX2</td>
<td>Mainstreamed ELL 3 student; in-school tutor for Practical Learning Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hyo-Sonn Kim (HK)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>ELL2</td>
<td>Sponsored/Living at local Lutheran church; living without family under guardianship of pastor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Antonia Gonzalez (AG)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ELL2</td>
<td>Mother of 1.5 year old; working in fast food restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pang Thusaporn (PT)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ELL2</td>
<td>Living w/ sister; work in family restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Marta Jiménez (MJ)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ELL2</td>
<td>Became pregnant; working in fast food restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dong Shin Choi (DC)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>ELL2</td>
<td>Academic parents; returned home mid year in March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Alta Tavares (AT)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>ELL2</td>
<td>Mother of 1 year old; working; visa/green card process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mi-Cha Jeong (MJ)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>ELL2</td>
<td>Academic parents; returned home mid-year February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Clarisse Mbah (CM)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ELL2</td>
<td>Arrived to join resettled father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Zahir Khan (ZK)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ELL2</td>
<td>Living with older brother, recent college graduate; speculated mental health issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Writing 2 classroom space was one where discussions surrounding discourses of immigration and student immigrant identities were spurred by current political debates, news events, or social critiques of relevant themes in our writing. In line with our structured academic writing surrounding immigration, race, ethnicity and culture, broad analysis of the data set evidences classroom discussion making critical light of relevant current issues such as racial profiling, citizenship, borders, and travel restrictions. These issues were contentious current events and present experiences in many students’ lives. While understanding their own racial and ethnic identity was a specific focus on academic writing, discussions around these topics reflected the tensions that are inherent in learning to navigate the cultural-social spaces in daily life of immigrant students.

Over the course of the school year, there were several significant incidents that highlighted the post-911 fears around security and immigration that are so pervasive. Issues of school safety touched the climate at CHS with a required safety protocol being devised with local police and fire departments and training for all teachers. There were incidents that resulted in crisis lock-down procedures and deployment of code red protocols prepared by the classroom door. One of these was a mysterious white box left in a stairwell that had a bomb threat message which turned out to be a prank on a box of lost cupcakes intended as appreciation for teachers.

One example of particular relevance for many of the students of Writing 2 were the publicized immigration raids by U.S. government agents that were happening in nearby areas. Students were well-aware of the largely publicized New Bedford, CT raid by federal agents in 2007 that led to the over 360 illegal immigrants being taken into custody. A telling irony is that these illegal immigrants were working for a factory that
had millions of dollars in U.S. military contracts. The situation was highly criticized because of the families that were abruptly torn apart, with cases of small children and even nursing infants being left behind when their parents did not return home from work because they were relocated to a detention center in Texas.

Immigration raids on nearby restaurants where some Writing 2 students worked illegally also scared them from going to their fast food jobs during the immediate days following. I was surprised when the students reported that there had been immigration raids in fast food restaurants in the neighboring town where they worked commercial shopping mall areas. None of the Writing 2 students had been at work during the reported raids, but it caused great concern among students, especially those working and with children, and those who had been arrested during their border crossing.

One Salvadoran student Marta Jiménez did not return to her fast-food job the next day out of fear of being arrested as an illegal immigrant. Marta’s writing on ethnicity reflected how her strong cultural pride in being Salvadoran transformed in coming to America where she encountered a new racially “criminalized” profile as an illegal immigrant who traversed borders and experienced arrest and detention.

I wish some day in the U.S. people make me feel that I am American. I have been in the U.S. for 3 years. The ethnicity changes for me because I moved to lived in another country where a lot people look at me different because I am Latina. I feel sad when some people think that because I came from another country I am criminal. I know how’s feel because when I was coming to this country I got arrested by immigration and they treated me bad for example. (Marta Jiménez, My Ethnicity composition)

Esperanza Acuña, also a Salvadoran immigrant, described a fear of the police after crossing the U.S. Mexico border and traveling by car to Cuttersville.
Then I went to Arizona then I took a car for my father and I can go to Cuttersville. I sat and slept at the car and it was not comfortable my legs fall asleep. I felt that it was my adventures and the policemen were the monsters because they were so mean to us. We took 6 days for come here in Cuttersville. Finally I reunited with my mother. I took 1 month to reunite with my mother. (Esperanza Acuña, Immigration Narrative composition)

Around the time of the New Bedford immigration raids, the Writing 2 class accompanied another ELL Civics class on a field trip to the town hall that coincided with a local community rally about immigrant rights that was being organized in the wake of the raids. The size of the gathering was small and relatively low key as far as rallies go on such incendiary topics as immigration, but it hit home and sparked important in-class learning activities with news stories that built students’ academic and critical literacy. As part of this lesson we discussed and analyzed news stories about the New Bedford raids, especially the forced separation of children from parents, which drew out students’ attention to these questions that were personal to many Writing 2 students:

- Why Federal agents didn’t’ care about when Andrea Maldonado told them that her sister has children?
- What will happen with the children?
- What happens to the children if the parents are deported?
- Did the children die?
- Does the government care about the kids?

Our discussions in Writing 2 also entered to more school-specific contexts, such as one Korean student Hyo-Sonn Kim being teased and stereotyped by a black student as a “model-minority” who must be a good math student (Nieto and Bode, 2008). The student’s writing about this incident reflects great challenges of both confronting racial stereotypes of Asians while not reproducing stereotypes and prejudice against African-Americans. Racial chords were struck in Hyo-Sonn and other Korean students in Writing
2 when news broke of the 2007 rampage shooting by a Korean student at Virginia Tech who open fired indiscriminately in academic buildings and classrooms, killing 32 people and wounding 25 more. This was an international new story that sparked public discourse on gun violence, and mental health issues in school settings, and prompted a formal statement by South Korean government officials. Korean students shared that this tragedy caused great concern in the local Korean community, touching on a feeling of shame and worry about how other people would view them as well.

Another Asian student from Thailand, Pang Thusaporn, wrote about her experiences with racial stereotypes at Cuttersville High School in her compositions:

_I remembered when I first came to his High School. I was walking in the hallway and a student came up to me and yelled out “Yaww” because I am Asian. What is up with people? Don’t they know that not every Asian have to know Kung Fu. Sometime it is driving me crazy too when I hear that they are talking about me and my stereotype. But what can I do every people have different ideas (Pang Thusaporn, Stereotypes composition)._

Such school experiences she describes indicate a social environment where immigrant students and students of color, in general, are faced with stereotypes from broad spaces of media and social discourse. Despite the overall multicultural awareness at CHS and the Cuttersville community, these student experiences reflect persistent fear of discrimination faced by immigrant students in school.

There were many other classroom discussions that interrogated marginalizing experiences of these immigrant students. For example, there were other discussions about cross-cultural tensions and hatred between Salvadorans and Mexicans and whether that constituted racism. This is also an example of the complex politics of race and ethnicity in America that involves prejudice and tension among people form different countries in
Latin America. We discussed the experience of Cameroonian student Clarisse Mbah who received racial slurs shouted by a car full of boys as she walked along the road. In addition to overcoming language barriers as a French-speaker, Clarisse also navigated the racial repositioning of being seen as a black person in America. Clarisse’s devout Christian foundations and cultural gender norms also came into conflict with other female students specifically the young mothers during a discussion around teen sexuality and pregnancy. These incidents and tensions related directly to our discussions in the Writing 2 class about societal discourses around race, class, culture, language, and gender that were part of their school experiences as immigrant students in America.

Excerpts from student compositions about their immigration to America further illustrate how students used academic language learning to reflect on their immigrant identities in Writing 2. Antonia Gonzalez wrote about her transition from Ecuador to Northeast as one of cultural and linguistic isolation:

When I arrived here to Northeast, I didn’t know much people from my country or from different countries who can speak the same language. But when I came to high school I met with people from different countries and I felt more comfortable, because they speak the same language that me also they were from El Salvador. The people from that country are very nice and friendly (Antonia Gonzalez, Immigration Narrative composition).

Salvadoran student Esperanza Acuña described the difficulties in adjusting to an American school:

I did not know anything in English and it was hard for me to come to school, because I did not like or understand English. I used to hate school. I did not want to live here I wanted to leave this country and go back. I was so sad for 3 months. I took long time to learn English I had friends but still I wanted to go back to my country (Esperanze Acuña, Immigration Narrative composition).
These excerpts of student voices composed in their academic writing reflect the challenging social, cultural, and political spaces that intersect their lived experience. Furthermore, immigrant student texts reflect their experiences in marginalized school spaces where they face cultural and linguistic barriers, social discrimination, and racial stereotypes. Classroom spaces that engage immigrant students in recognizing and interrogating these oppressions were an important part of the classroom Comm.Unity and structured the content, process, and product of our collective work.

**Raul Moreno: Focal Student in the Writing 2 Classroom**

Raul Moreno was a 16-year-old, Grade 9 student from El Salvador who will be the focus of closer analysis in this chapter and in Chapter 6. Raul emigrated from El Salvador in a 3-month journey over land as an unaccompanied minor, leaving as a 12 year old and turning 13 years old along the way as her journeyed to America. He reflected in his writing on his life lessons from immigrant experiences in coming to the United States:

*What I am feeling in the USA, is that people can get a lot of opportunities working really hard to make it. But if you are just coming to have fun, it can make you pay the consequence, like getting in jail and being deported or even dying because there is a lot of violence in the best cities (Raul Moreno, Immigration Narrative composition)*

This excerpt from his narrative provides glimpses of Raul’s take on the “American Dream”. There is the hope of opportunity and meritocracy that rewards hard work but also the reality that social and cultural adjustments include many potential snares as people strive to get ahead. Raul faced his own struggles during the school year that
entailed conflicts with his school obligations, family expectations, and his investment in hip hop.

Further analysis of Raul’s compositions and participation in Writing 2 will describe a particularly complex profile of an immigrant ELL student with special needs that becomes marginalized within institutional spaces of CHS. Through closer ethnographic analysis of Raul’s case, I describe a chronotope of “mediating Raul” which surfaced in focal data where Raul’s “(mis)placed humor” during student sharing became a flash point. However, in looking more closely at challenges and opportunities in supporting Raul’s learning, I also argue in this study that critical interrogation of the chronotope of immigration tied to his investment in hip hop culture offer moments of production of third space that generate transformative opportunities for renegotiating student identities in the classroom.

In the next chapter, I paint a more complex portrait of Raul and renegotiations of his identity in the classroom space. However, a broad sketch is useful here for several reasons. In narrating the classroom Comm.Unity as part of my analysis of third space tensions, I hope to characterize Raul as just one member, among many, who contributed uniquely and dynamically from his lived experiences. Yet, it is also instructive for the analysis of the Comm.Unity conflict in this chapter to outline aspects of Raul’s school identities and role in spatial production in the classroom to be analyzed further.

The issue of Raul’s commentaries throughout the course of class instruction was something of particular attention for me because there were patterns of disruptive or interrupting on-going dialogue and/or comments that were inappropriate. He would often crack jokes or make quick commentaries although most often not signaling for a turn to
talk, he would interject directly or make quiet, audible, and unsolicited remarks. These remarks were directed at times to the teacher and other students but, often, into the shared space of discussion.

An example of Raul’s (mis)placed humor in classroom interactions came during a pair work exercise when he was working with Bangladeshi student Zahir Khan. The previous day during discussion about the relevance of geography and climate to the clothing characteristic of different places, Raul began making inappropriate comments with sexual innuendo that were derailing the productive focus of the task. I commented that people such as Eskimos living in an extremely cold climate would likely not wear bathing suits at the ocean. Raul then interjected several sexualized comments about girls wearing bikinis which became a series of distracting antics that were inappropriate and distracting enough to prompt me to sanction his participation. While misplaced and unconstructive in the context of the group discussion, Raul’s theme of bikinis and beaches resurfaced the next day during a peer interview activity with Zahir. The transcript of classroom interaction below illustrates a chronotope of “mediating Raul”, which in this instance related to his word play in pronouncing, “bitches and beaches” in a discussion about bikinis.
Based on his IEP and conversation with current and former teachers, I was cognizant of the possible influence of impulsivity related to Raul’s special needs, something that was a common observation. It was not until the last month of school that Raul’s IEP review and subsequent referral process resulted in an assessment schedule.
with a bilingual psychologist who related to me anecdotally that he had ‘severe ADHD’. This specific issue of Raul’s (mis)placed humor arose very specifically two months later during a unit on place when I did an informal assessment by facilitating a class reflection on describing our classroom Comm.Unity as a place. One of the student comments recorded on the semantic map I scribed was that ‘Raul is being cute’, but with the critical sentiment about the ‘timing of his jokes/humor’, which were also noted ideas of the text (Figure 5).

Field notes recount an interaction in which I mediated the revolving tensions of Raul’s (mis)placed humor by addressing involved students around not provoking further conflict with more antagonistic comments about Raul’s presence in the classroom space.

_I also commented to her that I wanted her also to be aware of what she herself did when it became turn for her to comment. I reminded her that she had very specifically called out Raul about his untimely use of humor when people are participating and sharing things in class, which is certainly an observed issue with the appropriateness of his classroom behavior (Field notes, April 9, 2007)._ 

---

**Student Descriptions of the “Comm.Unity”:**
- Music – rap; strong impression about non-verbal communication; Mr. Hafner is the best rapper; selfishness with putting own music
- Sharing different opinions – discussing opinions about homelessness;
- Talk a lot about our different cultures; different languages; different goals;
- Like family – lots of ELL classes together; talk to each other a lot; friends
- Humor – Raul is being cute; timing of jokes/humor
- Respect for teacher; More respect between people
- Classroom is set up like a rectangle
- Different goals for Comm.Unity
- People work together
- _Debate about right and wrong (good/bad)_

---

Figure 4. Student Descriptions of the Comm.Unity of Writing 2
There were times throughout the year where Raul, in particular, would get into conflicts with folks although he was generally not aggressive but more annoying and dismissive in attitude. Raul’s participation patterns, I would also argue, included many (or equal) examples of consistent, positive engagement with classroom activity and classmates. This recollection of the instructional dynamic with Raul’s classroom presence is triangulated through varied data sources including field notes and analysis of the video of classroom interaction. However, I would be remised in this analysis in not acknowledging my subjective observations as teacher-researcher which I denote reflexively in parentheses in the continuation of the same fieldnote:

(Though I don’t feel it is done with the malicious intent but rather better described as insensitive - I could be wrong and am giving Raul the benefit of the doubt on that one, as I don’t take him to be a person with a lot of negative energy to be dumped on others) (Field notes, April 9, 2007).

Spatial analysis also relevant to this point is my recollection being influenced by the materiality of how we were seated and the spaces I occupied (first space). The spatial dynamics of the classroom are relevant in that the horseshoe setting puts the class face to face in interaction and with a manageable class size. Most often, everyone could sit on the inside horseshoe which makes interactions more direct. I would pull chair into the center of the horseshoe and swivel from side to side with the dialogue. When seated in this position and facing forward, however, I would have Raul on my right side but beyond ninety degrees, leaving him sometimes in my peripheral vision. This means that when I was instructing or facilitating discussion from this central location, I could not always observe Raul’s engagement face to face with other students. This observation merely suggests that even when I was most centrally present in a facilitative mode,
ironically, I still did not observe all these antagonistic micro-interactions that could have been passing through the space simultaneously. This is in addition to the other opportunities for student interactions when I was moving to other classroom spaces without my attention directly on the class.

This spatial analysis is a good example that illustrates how the set up of the physical classroom space shapes discursive interactions between teacher and students as well as among students themselves. The horseshoe layout maximizes face to face dialogue which is desirable for a facilitative pedagogical approach that seeks to engage students in a dialogic process. One can clearly understand with this comparative example how a classroom setup of rows of desks is intended to orient communication only toward the teacher, thereby, allowing the teacher’s space at the front center of the class to be the panopticon of the classroom space (Foucault, 1977).

**Conceptualizing Comm.Unity: Third Spaces in the ELL Classroom**

Comm.Unity is a conceptual second space where academic literacy and critical literacy for immigrant ELLs could come together. In my mind, at least, it was a centripetal force and reminder to my own self to work to bring teacher and students together in a safe personal and community space. The hope of a critical pedagogy driving my instruction was reason enough to keep trying to build that spirit toward the end of the year. The guiding framework for our classroom experiences was presented at the beginning of the course and was posted in a large poster on the wall: “Comm.Unity: the place where Me, We & the World come together” (Figure 5). The other organizing concept that framed the type of learning community I was hoping to grow collectively
was represented in the equation: *Communication + Unity = Comm.Unity*. I developed the idea of Comm.Unity as I conceptualized how I wanted to teach both oral and written communication classes for the Writing 2 students in a way that would frame a critical and collaborative space.

![Figure 5. Comm.Unity Poster](image)

In this study, I am exploring a notion of Comm.Unity as a conceptual metaphor for a vision of classroom space, specifically, for third space in the ELL Composition classroom. The organizing philosophy of Comm.Unity guided my curriculum planning as well as facilitation of the teaching and learning process. Given the students’ diverse backgrounds and lived experiences, I envisioned the Writing 2 class to be a place where they could learn to use language for their own social and academic purposes. I recognize that my orientation toward critical literacy constitutes discourses that I imposed on the classroom space.
Ironically and appropriately in line with my conceptualization of third space, the ‘unofficial’ curriculum of critical literacy that was foregrounded may have been marginalizing for students in different ways. For those who were school-minded and focused on more traditional language learning tasks of grammar and punctuation, I could envision some students thinking in frustration, “Why are we talking about this stuff? Wasting time again from the lesson.” Alternately, when the group engaged in serious discussions of great personal significance, discussions might have worked to alienate some students in their attempts to embrace other personal experiences. For example, with the issue of teen pregnancy, students’ cultural norms of gender identities came into conflict in the classroom space.

In addition, a review of classroom video data shows a preponderance of teacher talk surrounding issues of social justice. Although directly related to student experience and academic writing, this teacher talk competes for instructional time. This issue is analyzed further in critical discourse analysis presented in subsequent sections. Therefore, in considering the meaning of Comm.Unity in this study, I continue to ask: “How do such abstract spaces shape the spatial practices of classroom context and lived space of the Writing 2 class specifically?”

An important framework for guiding the social and academic processes in Writing 2, and engaging with tensions in the classroom space were the Group Norms (Figure 6). The Group Norms were the textual product of a group process and community building exercise that established shared norms of behavior in the classroom at the beginning of the course. The Group Norms were adapted from a group collaboration protocol that I had learned and utilized in doing teacher training with adults which I began to apply in
my classroom teaching with kids. The goal for the exercise is to generate guiding principles for a shared collaborative space. This is meant and phrased not as rules but agreed upon values for the shared culture of the classroom community. In the exercise designed to establish a sense of shared membership, Group Norms are brainstormed through different groupings of individual, pairs, small group, and the whole group. At each stage, members share individual ideas with the task and goal of synthesizing all thoughts and sentiments in rewriting the norm statements. In the whole group discussion, each small group lists four to six Group Norms and eventually, all to be consolidated into one final collective list of Norms.

An important part of the original ‘Growing Norms’ protocol from which this was adapted is that norms are meant to be there as guiding frameworks for social process to serve the community’s needs. As such, these norms can and should be revisited and rearticulated by the group as is necessary. This aspect of revisiting the Group Norms in
response to a classroom conflict is the principal context for analysis of the critical spatial event analyzed later in this chapter.

A brief textual analysis of the language of the Group Norms is important in establishing a proposed sense of shared values of the Comm.Unity. This study, to some degree, is an exploration of whether these norms for the classroom space were taken up by the students. This exercise is insightful because the language and ideas in the norms reflect a group culture. Many of the Writing 2 students were not new and were not strangers to each other. To the contrary, the relationships of ELL students and their sense of Room L2 as the ELL classroom, home base, and safe space were relatively observable. This is important in framing the Group Norms and the emotional referents (love, respect, gentle) reflect, to some degree, these pre-existing relationships and many new friendships and relationships generated in this social space. The sentiment of collaboration and community is evident (help each other learn, work together, peacefully). The final norm surrounding the importance of and shared responsibility for communication directly reflects the formula of Comm.Unity (communication + unity) and clearly conveys that learning to communicate effectively and positively is an explicit goal of the ELL Writing 2 space.

In the next section, I turn to an analysis of the focal immigration unit and analysis of critical spatial events that pertain to norms of behavior in sharing and reflecting on very personal and, in some cases, painful student narratives. From the findings of critical discourse analysis of critical events presented later this chapter, I map a chronotope of communication and propose a chronotope of Group Norms as an enduring space of Comm.Unity that shaped production of third spaces.
Part III: The Immigration Unit: Coming to America

I inherited the Writing 2 curriculum from the ELL Department, which had developed the course over many years and iterations. Writing 2 was structured largely around technical skills of a more traditional English as a Second Language curriculum; the grammar lessons were taken from a skills-based ESL textbook. The Writing 2 curriculum took a partial thematic approach, with varying topics relevant to student experiences that became the topics for unit compositions. (see Appendix for partial Writing 2 curriculum map). The curricular units were thematically focused on students’ critical reflection of their experiences surrounding topics like race, ethnicity, gender, and immigration. There were also other less critically-themed units that focused on specific writing tasks, such as description of a place, or mechanical skills like writing paragraphs.

Table 7. Immigration Unit Overview (ELL Writing 2 Curriculum Map)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Methods of Assessment</th>
<th>Curriculum Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Information by Time /Journey to America</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>• Ready to Write 3: Organizing Info by Time</td>
<td>• Write paragraphs using time order.</td>
<td>• Symbols of correction. quiz</td>
<td>ELA Lit 8, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• New Kids in Town: Oral Histories of Immigrant Teens</td>
<td>• Write a personal narrative</td>
<td>• Grammar ex and test</td>
<td>ELA Comp. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Grammar 2: past time</td>
<td>• Identify and use narrative conventions (sequencing, suspense, details, dialogue).</td>
<td>• Ready to Write Ex.</td>
<td>ELL W.1, W.2, W.3, W.4, S.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify general and specific language</td>
<td>• Paragraphs</td>
<td>R1, R3, R4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Practice grammar exercises and take test</td>
<td>• Composition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Share writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I infused more critical literacy across the units by adapting new content materials, texts, and multimedia and integrating them within the unit structures, or restructuring the units around new themes. For a unit on letter writing, for example, students worked toward writing persuasive letters to the superintendent to express their opinions on the budget controversy of proposed funding cuts for bussing homeless students. The previously mentioned lesson on the immigration raids and rally was integrated into a lesson on comparison and contrast in which students reflected on their immigrant experiences with schooling in the U.S. in comparison to their home counties.

The Immigration Unit was one strong curriculum unit that structured the Writing 2 course. It was the third unit, but first extended curriculum unit of the course following introductions and establishing the group. For many reasons, this curricular unit focused on immigration represents the heart of the overall course curriculum that guided my instruction of the Writing 2 class. The overview of the immigration unit in the Writing 2 curriculum is provided in Table 7; a partial curriculum map for Writing 2 is included in the Appendix as representative of the overall curriculum.

**Connecting with Civil Rights History: “I have a dream (too)”**

The immigration unit began in January after the national holiday for Martin Luther King (MLK) Day. The timing was fortuitous and supremely appropriate to preface their own stories of coming to America with the heroic black civil rights leader who influenced the racial landscape of America in fighting for integration and equality. Honoring MLK with the students was not only introducing many of them to more details about the civil rights era and who he was, but also emphasizing the indebtedness of all
subsequent movements for social justice in America. The message was that the civil rights dream is an historical precedent to related immigrant dreams they have for themselves.

As an introduction and hook to the immigration unit, the class did brainstorming of background knowledge and questions prompted by a famous image of MLK on the Lincoln Memorial steps. We read a poem by Nikki Giovanni entitled *The Funeral of MLK, Jr.* and in particular the lines: “*but death is a slaves freedom, we seek the freedom of free men*” to identify more key vocabulary and discuss the historical legacy of slavery and the relevance to minority experiences in America today, including theirs. We watched a video of MLK’s “I have a dream” speech in class and for homework I asked them to identify ten key words in the speech text, and then use those words to free write connections between MLK’s dream and their own stories and hopes for immigrating to America. The students discussed the meaning and significance of this civil rights leader, his work and the meaning of the historical oppression of slavery and racism of contemporary politics. Some of the compiled key nouns in our group sharing from these exercises and texts were: *freedom, opportunity, slavery, oppression, death, jail, despair, dream, faith, creed, belief, God, brotherhood, nation, children, workers, non-violent, equality, all people, healing, heart, peace.*

This two-day lesson on MLK gave students important general history of racism in American society and made connections to their lived experiences as immigrants in America. Framing the immigration unit and where they are situated in the American landscape also pulled on threads of irony in our discussion and writing about the “American Dream”. This idea was something that we interrogated in the course of
reading, sharing and discussing their own stories which all entailed reflections on the challenges of Coming to America. The mythology of the American Dream was a recurring piece of reflection on student narratives that will be revisited further later in this analysis.

**Connecting with Immigrant Student Texts: Francia’s Story**

*Francia’s Story*, was the key reading text that anchored the Immigration Unit, and helped framed the irony of the “American Dream”. *Francia’s Story* showed a classic optimism for a better life in America that got deflated by harsh realities of social, political and economic marginalization upon arrival. The 9-page text is a personal narrative written by a 15 year-old immigrant girl from El Salvador who made a difficult journey to America. Francia’s story was an effective model both in that it was student authored and it drew out many common themes with the Writing 2 students’ experiences, particularly those from Latin America. Group discussion notes reflect some of students’ summary ideas from *Francia’s Story* (Figure 7).
Francia’s Story was one that was very similar to several of our students who made arduous and memorable journeys to America. Marta Jiménez wrote in her composition about the difficult separation and preparations “before” her journey to America:

*I said goodbye to my family and we cried a lot, I felt so sad because it is so hard to leave your country. I also felt sad when I was in the city of El Salvador because I felt alone. Then a guy told me that we would have to take the bus to go to Guatemala. There we would have to walk and run to Mexico. Moreover, the men told me that I would have to pretend that the guy who had come with us was my cousin or boyfriend so that the guards would think that I was from Mexico (Marta Jiménez, Immigration Narrative composition).*

The interspatial links between Francia’s Story and Marta’s composition are clear in their indexing of similar space-times of their immigration journeys. They both recount having to “pretend to be someone else” in order to fool people, most especially border authorities and other law enforcement. As Marta’s story reflected, she was a migrating Salvadoran

---

**Figure 7. Discussion Notes on Francia’s Story**

- Financial/economic reasons for migration
- Better life - jobs, making money
- Conflict & violence
- Long journey by plane, car, walking, boat
- Underground - illegal, hidden
- Borders – guards, police; with no papers, bribe/corruption; pretend to be someone else
- Extended family vs. nuclear family – she lived with grandmother; traveled with uncle and brother
- Differences in cultures – exposure to drugs, gangs, etc.
- Cultural community – food, parties, religion, music, language
that had to appear to be Mexican and traveling with family relations, rather than under the
guidance of a “coyote”, brokers and guides that smuggle illegal immigrants across
borders moving north to the U.S.

Marta’s writing about her journey to the U.S. also reflected her experiences of
arrest, detention and interrogation at the border.

_They put me in the van but I felt so sad because it was very hot, I had to sleep on
the floor, they did not give me any food and they make you tell the truth about like
where you come from, where are you going, why are you coming to this country,
where is your family, and who you traveled with_ (Marta Jiménez, Immigration
Narrative composition).

Esperanza Acuña’s immigration narrative also reflected these themes of an
arduous underground path on foot, bus, and car; and the fear of authorities that may catch
travelers along the way.

_So I decided to go to the U.S.A. It was so difficult for me. Then one day my mother
call me and she asked me that If I want to come here and I said yes. So my mother
paid to a man for his show my father and my mother the way for to go to the
U.S.A. So I went with my father to Guatemala and then I went to Mexico. In
Mexico the immigration took us and the men who my mother paid a lot of money,
he paid like $800 for we can still walking to the U.S.A. Then I had to took another
bus for go to frontier. Then I had to walk a lot I walked 3 days with not food or
water. It was so difficult for us to walk a lot without those things_ (Esperanza
Acuña, Immigration Narrative composition).

Her narrative also highlights the expensive costs, usually taking years of savings, to
prepare and finance the journey from El Salvador to the U.S. that ultimately reunited her
with her mother.

Raul Moreno’s immigration experience was similar to the Salvadoran and some
other students that connected with _Francia’s Story_. He wrote in his composition about
making an unaccompanied journey and having his 13th birthday along the way in
unrecalled places: _I left home on June first. My birthday is September 10 so I turned 13_
years old some where along the way, but I don’t remember where it was, I think it was in Salvación, Mexico.

This central text Francia’s Story was also a significant connection for immigrant students in interrogating the tensions between community and school discourses, and the challenges of living spaces in between school and non-school identities. Challenges of cultural and linguistic adjustments for immigrants are formidable. As previous excerpts from student texts illustrated, Francia’s Story reiterated student experiences of intense psychological and emotional isolation and adjustment faced in the transitions made by all the Writing 2 students.

During Immigration Unit, the physical space of Room L2 was print-rich with Writing 2 texts. Class notes, brainstorm, semantic maps, word webs, timelines, dialogue samples, and other instructional materials were covering the long back wall of bulletin boards. There was one mobile chalkboard whose backside I had also claimed with posters masking taped to the top.

Francia’s Story also provided language practice for nouns & pronouns, time sequence, and verb tense, for which we also did focused English grammar lessons and exercises. We engaged in textual analysis of the narrative while identifying different genre features of narratives such as descriptive language, using the 5 senses, simile/metaphor, use of dialogue in narrative. In collaborative jigsaw format, students discussed pieces of the story and generated ideas, which later provided vocabulary to draw on for their own writing. Students did writing skills work on organizing information by time and sequence, while practicing the present and past tense. Focused grammar lessons and grammar practice from various ESL resources were the language structures
that were incorporated into student writing along each unit theme.

![Student Brainstorm: Jigsaw Activity on Francia’s Story](image)

Figure 8. Student Brainstorm: Jigsaw Activity on *Francia’s Story*

For writing process techniques to structure narrative development, students principally used graphic organizers and scaffolding techniques of free writing, timelines, idea webs and paragraph templates. Feedback on multiple drafts was given by both peers with specific guidelines, as well as by the teacher, utilizing a code of editing marks that students had been getting more familiar with. The writing was broken up in ‘before, ‘during’ and ‘after’ stages of their narrative, which were scaffolded with pre-writing activities before drafting each section. Trips to the computer lab were scheduled at each stage to put the pieces of the narrative together in parallel with relevant analysis of the sample narrative of *Francia’s Story*.

The immigration unit ended up taking at least a week longer than originally scheduled three weeks. I might even be scared to say a month to final submission for some students. It was in fact the incredibly long time it took for everyone to read his or
her whole essay and to progress through a structured feedback process. However, these important narratives of students lived experiences, past, present and future were incredibly moving for the individual students, the group, and me as a teacher. This is perhaps why discussions around feedback to their stories, which were products of an involved writing process, resulted in very rich (and time-consuming) reflection on their life experiences in relation to immigration.

**Comm.Unity Café: Sharing & Caring on Student Narratives**

The Comm.Unity Café readings to culminate the Immigration Unit were a big curricular event that established a critical classroom space. The Comm.Unity Café was a space for students to read their immigration narratives of ‘Coming to America’ aloud to the group, and for the group to listen actively and provide feedback and support. The chronotope that was invoked was that of a café-style reading or open mic, which was perhaps a thin veil over a ‘formal’ oral presentation that ELL students practice in developing a formal academic discourse.

I had done the Comm.Unity Café readings in teaching a summer communication course for high school students with learning differences. We read poetry with lights dimmed over the Comm.Unity poster, a small mic and amp for projection, background beats behind their composition, and psychedelic Media Player ‘visualizations’ on the wall. The Writing 2 version was less dramatic, but performed nonetheless, with the Comm.Unity poster back dropping the center stage chair in front of the teacher’s desk, where a small lava lamp gurgled a little mood. The physical space of the Comm.Unity Café was simple but effective, especially in consideration of needing to share the
classroom space with other ELL teachers and quick transitions in between classes. The structure for the Comm.Unity Café readings was to put the teachers chair in the middle of the group. There was a big straw sun hat as a prop for fun, for a little humor to dilute students’ nervousness; but I ended up wearing it more than anyone else, like the class jester.

The classroom was organized in a horseshoe configuration of desks with an inside and outside rows facing the front of the classroom where the teacher’s desk was located. For the readings, the teacher’s chair was wheeled to the middle of the horseshoe in front of the teacher’s desk; this was my preferred location from where I generally conducted discussions if not writing on the board or the flip chart easel. It was nice to sit in the middle of the students on all sides, swiveling from side to side in relaxed fashion with my coffee, seemingly close to each student as needed. I could not only swivel on students, the chair rolled nicely, so with a gentle push of one foot, I could roll up in front of someone’s desk like room service. It was a personal posture for me, as it easily allowed me to stand up and approach students, especially those in the front row who were right directly in front of me.

This was particularly important for nudging anybody who was resting a little too easy slumped to the side or having their head straight on their desks. This was not uncommon for some students who worked heavy part-time schedules in the evenings and were tired in school. These work and family obligations on many students presented the principal barrier to their learning and performance, on top of the challenges of academic learning in a second language. Of course, other times student fatigue was just adolescent antics or the usual staying up late. For example on the second day of Comm.Unity Café,
Hyo Ji, a 16-year old conscientious Korean student who got consistent A’s, was looking unhappy and tired all class. After repeated inquiries and playful teasing, he later divulged he was up playing video games until way past midnight and got in trouble with his parents. He looked almost as sad as when he was in a panic because he lost his math textbook and could not concentrate in class, so we had to deploy the class to help search the room.

**Comm.Unity Café Feedback Guidelines**

The important interaction and collaboration structure that was central to the Comm.Unity Café readings was the feedback protocol designed to integrate active listening and critical, but supportive, response to student narratives. The feedback sheet was organized according to different numbered roles for assigned types of feedback to be given. Then for each reading, the class members would assume a different number and type of feedback to give. The goal was to deepen the language practice and engage positive discussion through guided responses to the writing. As a participation structure for the feedback discussions, we went around in order of feedback task with the student giving feedback to the author, making a comment and or asking a question. If the feedback were not clear I would help clarify or facilitate toward a question to ask of the author that would prompt more sharing. Given the intense and diverse experiences of immigration, articulated in a structured written composition, there were rich opportunities for each student to be the expert, share from their text, and teach the class about their country, their experiences, their journey. The six tasks outlined below provided the feedback template that framed class discussion:
Table 8. Comm.Unity Café – Feedback Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Role</th>
<th>Feedback Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 - Warm Feedback</td>
<td>Think of one positive comment about the reader’s narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 - One Question</td>
<td>Think of one question that you have for the reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 - Key Nouns</td>
<td>Identify two key nouns in the narrative. Relate these nouns back to the ‘dream’ of Martin Luther King Jr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 - Key Verbs</td>
<td>Identify two key verbs in the narrative in the past tense form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 - Narrative features</td>
<td>Listen to the narrative carefully paying attention to different features we have discussed and give an example (dialogue, descriptive/figurative language).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6 - Life Lessons (The World)</td>
<td>Think of one life lesson that this person’s personal narrative teaches us about the world.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the teacher, my engagement during the Comm.Unity Café readings was one of excitement and appreciation for the written compositions, not as perfectly polished and grammatically correct essays, but as identity texts for these students taking risks to share their stories. The sharing of personal and emotional writing involved risk-taking in sharing about their lives, and the feedback and dialogue served to build a critical literacy about their immigrant experiences. In fact, ‘brave’ was a key word (although not the assigned part of speech) identified in feedback to the one Cape Verdean student Alta Tavares’ tear-filled narration of separation from her one-year-old daughter. A classmate identified the key word of ‘brave’ to describe Alta’s intense love and care for her daughter, so much that she is separated from her now for the opportunity to finish school, get her green card, and return home to reunite with her.

Alta Tavares was the mother of a young daughter who she sent back to Cape Verde to live with family because she was concerned about being able to care for her and she was not in a good guardianship living situation. Her contributions to classroom discussion and in her writing were heavily focused on family, her responsibilities to her
daughter, and her sadness about being separated, while she attending school and worked part-time in a fast food restaurant. Alta wrote in her immigration narrative:

In 2003, I was in 9th grade in my school and I was finished and I cam to America. I left my mom pregnant and I don’t know my sister Angela. Life there was easy for me but now everything is hard for me because I have to work and go to school. It is hard for me sometimes. Everything changed when I had a baby and now it is more difficult with school, work and a baby but I will finish my school (Alta Tavares, Immigration Narrative composition).

When Alta began to cry during the reading of her immigration narrative, another of the teen mothers Antonia Gonzalez called to her in a soothing voice, “It’s okay Alta”, as a show of support.

Antonia could relate to Alta’s emotions since she also was a young mother who immigrated to the U.S. from Ecuador. She wrote about her arrival in her “Coming to America” composition, describing how she became pregnant and came to the U.S. with a bag, backpack and a belly:


These Comm.Unity readings were emotional and there were cases where students stopped reading passages of their narratives that made them uncomfortable to read aloud. Antonia stopped in the middle of her reading at the passages reflecting on the father of her son, and a recent disappointment with a new boyfriend she had hoped would care for her and her son. She told us that she did not want to read that part aloud, which was understandable. We stopped. We clapped. We gave feedback.
The different student ideas on life lessons generated form Feedback #6 “The World” are compiled below. These give an idea of the overall themes of discussion that were sparked by student’s written work, oral readings, and engagement of the group in reflecting on their immigrant experiences.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback #6 – “Life Lesson” (Compiled student ideas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Life is a journey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The world changes when you move to a new country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Even though at first you may not want to do things, they may turn out okay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Find your passion! (No substitute for the real thing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• When you live in unfamiliar places it help you realize who you are and what you value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Things that are unfamiliar are valuable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• People sacrifice to come to America seeking a better life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Family is very important and you look to them for support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• People can keep a big secret when it is very important, or you have to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• You need guidance along your journey in life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sometimes people come to feel more comfortable in their new country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leaving your country is very sad, but the hardship of the journey was worth it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Never too late to change about yourself and your life. You can love something new, new experience or place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Feeling different in a new country because of race and language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “A minority” - when you are not white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impressive and brave to love; be proud to care so much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hard to be away form family when they love you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The group was generally very respectful and engaged in listening to their immigration stories, which were also final compositions for a long and involved unit. While the discussions around each feedback item sparked interesting comments and insights, the emotional retelling of these student narratives generally had the audience attention. However, it was during the feedback session for Antonia Gonzalez that
Comm.Unity tensions between two Salvadoran students arose, Marta Jimenez and Raul Moreno, the focal student of Chapter 5. The particular conflict centered around a mounting tension from prior classes where non-verbal cues, laughter in particular, (mis)placed while someone else was speaking was mis/interpreted as ridicule or mocking, a sign of disrespect. I put the parenthesis around (mis) to signify that identifying an interlocutor’s intention with specific verbal or non-verbal participation is up for interpretation, and therefore, where the exercise of power is recognized.

As we consider the classroom context of adolescent interaction, the verbal and nonverbal communication taken up by teenagers is both provocative and strategically utilized. A classroom setting is so incredibly dynamic, despite the appearances of relative calm. Students are constantly interacting with each other and things outside the teacher-defined classroom space-time. They are carrying on dialogue, flirtations, antagonisms, doing other work, reading, texting, sometimes daydreaming or even possibly sleeping (for those working evening jobs, despite my best attempts to keep them all awake and engaged). In the conflict surrounding the focal interaction, the history of interactions between the two students preceding this episode reflects a tension of “mediating Raul” that continued throughout the year.

**Part IV: Critical Discourse Analysis of Classroom Tensions**

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) of the debrief discussion on the ‘Comm.Unity Conflict’ is insightful in reflecting ‘the worlds’ of immigrant students and how the space-times of their lived experiences intersect in the material, abstract, and lived spaces of the ELL classroom. Their English language learning experiences are daily and varied as well
as transect innumerate social spaces that influence the developing chronotopes of their immigrant experiences. The Writing 2 curriculum supported exploration of these subjectivities through writing which I would argue were shaped by scaffolding a ‘reading of the world’ that influenced textual production and critical literacy development.

There are several important points that frame my analysis of a classroom tension around (mis)placed humor and the debrief discussion of this Comm.Unity conflict. First, the critical spatial event I selected for analysis was purposeful in that it clearly illustrates the teacher (‘me’) exercising the power to control, shape, or facilitate dialogue in the classroom from an institutional position of authority over the classroom. While recognizing myself at the center of interaction presents methodological challenges, there is an explicit purpose in selecting focal interactions. It illustrates my role as teacher in facilitating production of social spaces that are critical and transformative which is precisely in line with tenets of Comm.Unity. The focal transcripts also provide textualization of pedagogical choices and spontaneous discussion aimed at revisiting Growing Norms of the classroom Comm.Unity. Motivations behind exercising power in performing a teacher role imply there is the obvious institutional responsibility of governing over the class as an orderly and purposeful space. However, there is also the hopeful power in reiterating notions of effective communication for building a respectful, loving, and sensitive learning community relevant to the students’ worlds. Considering multiple sites of power in the classroom, this focal transcript clearly illustrates that the discursive underground of student interactions is a powerful producer and shaper of classroom space.
Second, the debrief discussion of the conflict moves through different space-times of experience. The analysis traces the space-times of the current class, on-going present interactions, previous classes, micro-spaces of interaction, past employment situations, workplace space broadly, home cultural contexts, past immigration experiences, and others space-times not determined. A CDA analysis of focal interactions considers these workings of power and how their motivations can produce third spaces in which the space-time of the classroom is linked to other space-times of student experience and different chronotopes of their lives. This is to the point that ‘we’ are very diverse with different immigration narratives that position people in the classroom in different ways along broader societal discourses related to race, class, gender, culture, ethnicity, and language identities.

The third point of style and method is that, in this section of my CDA analysis, I will refer to the ‘the teacher’ in the third person as a performance of my researcher voice. In this teacher-researcher study, this shift in analytical voice is tactical in representing a critical discourse analysis of exchanges where I am directly involved. I comment on this further in discussing implications for research and practice in Chapter 7.

Comm.Unity Conflict: “I know how to speak English!”

The Comm.Unity Conflict analysis in this section stems from one class period during a student reading and debrief discussion in the Comm.Unity Café sessions. The critical event analyzed below is from a teacher-facilitated debrief of a conflict that arose between Raul and another student Marta Jimenez. The conflict that arose between Raul and Marta was during the feedback session of Antonia’s immigration narrative. During the feedback session, Raul was tasked as #6 Life Lessons. When I prompted him to share
his idea with the group, he spoke directly about his idea but his speech was not readily understood and the coherence of his idea not clear. This prompted a boisterous reaction from Marta as well as her Salvadoran friend Erica Velazquez who said, “What? I can’t understand what he is saying!” followed by laughter. This interjection interrupted the beginnings of my attempts to ask Raul to rephrase to clarify his point and I shifted my attention to the provocation to check it. Raul did not react suddenly. Rather, he shifted in his seat slightly and shook his head to the side in pause. I proceeded to ask Raul about rephrasing his point while I was ready to write on the chart paper on the chalkboard.

After about five seconds, Raul pronounced firmly, “I know how to speak English.”

At this point, I addressed them both to intervene in the exchange and to raise the most important fact that this was principally disrespectful to Antonia who was sharing her personal narrative. I redirected the dialogue to engage Raul in the task of recasting his feedback idea on Antonia’s composition. Raul articulated an insightful comment about her experience of leaving her home and everything familiar and how journeying to live in America constitutes a complete change in the spaces lived: “The whole world changes.”

This feedback on Antonia’s narrative ended after this exchange with approximately seven minutes left in the period which was not enough time to begin Raul’s reading of his narrative. Instead, I took the opportunity to have a Comm.Unity discussion about what had transpired during that session and revisit the Group Norms. This debrief discussion is the critical spatial event analyzed in the next section.
Debriefing the Comm.Unity Conflict (Part 1)

In this section, I give a detailed CDA analysis of the debrief discussion that traces shifts in time and space in classroom dialogue. This CDA analysis entailed detailed analysis of varied linguistic features of classroom discourse in order to identify and map chronotopes of student immigrant experiences. These chronotopes represent the lived spaces of immigration students bring into social spaces of the classroom which I argue are intersected by local and global spaces that shape discursive identity formation.

It is useful at the outset to clarify terminology for four different tools I use to represent analysis of classroom discourse in this critical event. (1) I use the term ‘transcript’ for transcription of classroom discourse that delineates turns-at-talk and provides conventions to represent interactional dynamics of pause, stress, overlapping, truncation, etc. (2) I use the term ‘transcript analysis’ to present the detailed CDA analysis as outlined in the methodology section using detailed linguistic analysis to identify representations of space-time scales and chronotopes that reflect negotiations of identity in discourse. (3) In this section, I will also provide in chart format a breakdown and description of twenty-five interactional units (IUs) that result from this analysis. (4) I present a chronotope map that outlines time-space shifts in classroom discourse that work to renegotiate student identities in classroom spaces. (See Appendix for a list of transcription conventions used.)

In the first part of this analysis, I comment on key interactional units in the first half of the debrief discussion (Debrief Part 1: IU1 to IU14) where discursive interactions indicate mediations of on-going conflict that frame renegotiations of identity accomplished in Part 2. For Debrief Part 1, I provide analysis at the level of the transcript
and interactional units as previously mentioned. This analysis of Part 1 sets up my discussion of a detailed CDA analysis of the second half of the debrief discussion (Debrief Part 2: IU15 to IU25). In this section, I again present the transcript of Debrief Part 2 and a chart of interactional units. Discussion of the more detailed transcript analysis reflects a numbering of utterances that are broken down within each interactional unit. Transcript analysis of Part 1 leads to mapping chronotopic shifts in discourse to illustrate specifically how student immigrant identities are renegotiated within classroom space.

**Critical Discourse Analysis of Debrief Discussion (Part 1)**

In Debrief Part 1, the teacher establishes a focus on revisiting the Group Norms of the classroom space. It is important to recognize at the outset, as is readily visible from the transcript, that the classroom debrief is largely dominated by the teacher. This is clear in the number and length of turns-at-talk (Ts) of the teacher (Ts1, 12, 14). While this can be interpreted as a clear exercise of power in controlling classroom discourse, this analysis recognizes the teacher’s principal intention to address the current Comm.Unity Conflict in reference to Group Norms within the limited time remaining in the class period. Moreover, there is an attempt by the teacher to address Group Norms as well as respectful social interactions in the context of the instructional goals of the Comm.Unity Café sessions and the personal nature of the Immigration Narratives central to this curricular unit.

As such, I aim to move beyond a perception of discursive power in the classroom that merely recognizes who dominates conversation but how power is exercised in
classroom discourse. In fact, it is clear in the debrief discussion that students exercise discursive power to perpetuate conflict in the classroom space by interjecting commentary (Ts3, 13, 17), using body language (T17), and other semiotic means (Ts25, 29). Debrief Part 1 is characterized by the overt tension of on-going conflict that continues despite the teacher’s intention to refocus discourse toward debrief and resolution. As previously asserted, this critical event illustrates the production of social space in the Comm.Unity is not governed by Group Norms merely because they are posted. It is precisely to the point of this analysis and explicit in the debrief discussion that these norms of behavior require investment by Comm.Unity members to give them power. The teacher exercises both institutional and discursive power to reassert everyone’s obligation to shared social space of the classroom.

The breakdown of interactional units (Table 11) of Debrief Part 1 illustrates points of tension and the crescendo of on-going conflict in classroom discourse. In the opening of the discussion (IU-1), the teacher both recognizes displeasure with the conflict but assumes it was ‘my responsibility’ for the collective disrespect of a fellow student during the Comm.Unity Café reading. The teacher takes responsibility in personal terms by framing a familiar relationship as an ‘older brother’ and recognizing colloquially that it was ‘not cool’ for him and others in the class. The teacher’s personal tone reflects the Group Norms reviewed in IUs3-5.
Table 10. Transcript: Comm.Unity Conflict - Debrief Part 1

**Transcript – Community Conflict: Debrief Discussion (Part 1)**

1. T: [IU1] This is what I am looking for, ok. *(Moving back from standing flip chart to stand in front of room, both hands outstretched to side, with palms facing up).* What happened earlier, ok, in the middle of interrupting the debrief of Antonia’s story, is not cool for me; as it obviously not for other people in the room. So these are things that have been going on in the room and maybe it is my fault, maybe I have not been paying attention, you know, in terms of being the older brother here in our Comm.Unity, right? This is something that’s my responsibility. [IU2] So, if we have time, we are going to move Raul’s story to Monday. [IU3] *(Moving back toward the flip chart)* Group Norms, who can read our Group Norms for us? Because if these are not working then we will have to revisit these and change them; that’s why they are there, *(Pang Thusaporn raises hand)* that activity we did when we began this class. Can you read them for us *(to PT)*?

2. PT: Yes. *(Reading aloud from chart)*. “Respect each other and love each other” =

3. EV: [IU4] = Love each other?

4. CK: Yes, *(to EV)*. And then “Work together”/

5. T: //You scared of love *(to EV)*

6. EV: = Huh?! No!

7. PT: [IU5] = Ok. “Work together to help each other learn how to live peacefully! Be friendly and be gentle with each other’s feelings. And understand each other in” [ ]=

8. T: “In a positive way.”

9. PT: Yea, “in a positive way”. And “good communications is” [ ]\/

10. T: \/(moving toward chart) “our responsibility.”

11. PT: Yes.

12. T: [IU6] Ok, so these Group Norms, and the confusion we had here with people disagreeing about how, you know *(moving to center of room and sitting in chair, in front of teacher’s desk, positioned in middle of horseshoe)*, there’s obviously some concerns, not just from one person, or about one person, but, what is the concern here that came up earlier? [ ] And how does that relate to what we agreed here? *(pointing to Group Norms chart)*, [IU7] Now these are the Norms that we all came up with and we all agreed to when we did that activity for our classroom community. And the reason that I did that activity instead of us having classroom rules is that the rules are the teacher’s rules and I say, “These are the rules,” and you guys have to live by the rules. But if you don’t believe in the rules, they don’t mean anything, right? They don’t mean anything to you. And that’s not the type of classroom community that we need to have, especially not as a writing community when we are going to be writing, and talking about personal stuff, like our personal narratives. Ok, so to me it’s not cool if people are feeling disrespected when someone is up there telling important stuff in their life, and other folks are not giving them the respect=

13. RM: [IU8] =fighting at each other.

(Continued on next page)
Table. 10. Transcript: Comm.Unity Conflict - Debrief Part 1 (Continued)

14. T: *(Shifting position to address Raul).* Hey, this is not a time to XXX, you know. This is something that you are involved in too Raul, so you have to be serious about it, right? *[IU9]* *(Redirecting attention to other students)* I don’t want there to be negative energy floating around this classroom because people don’t know how to listen. *(Marta is putting things away in her backpack sitting on her desk).* [IU10] So, what is the concern or issue that we need to revisit?

15. PT: Respect each other.

16. T: Ok, so part of respect is what? What is it? *[ ]* What did that- [IU11] Marta, what was part of that of being respectful of one another that you would like to remind us about?

17. MJ: I don’t know. *(Fixing things in her bag with focus on her bag).*

18. T: Well this is your chance. You can’t say, “I don’t know,” because this is the chance. This is the chance where you remind us *(gesturing with hands extended to her and then pulled in toward chest)*, for you what is it, what’s important *[ ]* here in class?

19. MJ: *[IU12]=NO, because I didn’t like it when he talks bad, /you know, because when he-/*

20. T: //when somebody, you don’t have to-//, in general. *(gesturing with hands in circular motion).*

21. MJ: =Ok, I don’t like it when somebody, you know, laughs at ME *(hands stretched out in front)*

22. T: Ok. *(glancing over quickly to right side of room)*

23. MJ: Because that person doesn’t want them to do it, when they do that to them.

24. T: //OK//

25. RM: [IU13] XXX (Spanish)

26. T: *(Turning attention to RM).* Raul, are you listening? You need to listen. *(Raising hand with palm facing in toward ear and gesturing gently back and forth to ear).*

27. EV: [IU14] Ah-ha. *(laughs distinctly)*

28. T: You need to listen *(as gaze turns to Erica sitting in corner who has engaged Raul with facial expression).* Erica, don’t/=

29. EV: =OH!

30. T: =No, no. Don’t engage the conversation please *(waving both hands back and forth to gesture between Raul and Erica).* Let’s focus on what people are- *(gesturing with one hand extended out and inward toward center of room).*

---

One student Erica reacts to the principle of “love each other” with a skeptical tone, to which the teacher retorts playfully by asking her if she is ‘afraid of love’ (IU-4).

It is important to comment here that the teacher’s jest in this brief interaction could also be considered the teacher’s own (mis)placed humor given the student’s defensive reaction and that this student was involved in the prior conflict and contributes to the on-
going conflict in the debrief discussion (IU14, 16). Recognizing that the teacher also uses humor regularly in classroom discourse lends again to a critical perspective on the students’ showing of humor in the critical event. Since the classroom social space is one where humor is allowable and is not contrary (and arguably even integral) to Group Norms, we understand that teacher and students contribute equally to the issue of (mis)placed humor in the classroom social space. This is central to the analysis of this critical event and the broader analysis of Raul’s classroom participation that follows in subsequent sections.

In IU6, the teacher reiterates the current conflict in reference to the Group Norms in aims of bringing discussion to a global space of communication rather than the localized conflict between Raul and Marta and the tensions of classroom space are a shared concern. The teacher characterizes the conflict as ‘confusion’ and ‘disagreement’ surrounding interactions as well as the ‘concerns’ are shared by ‘people’ and ‘not just one person’ (T12). There is an important time-space shift (IU7) to the past discussion at the beginning of the school year when Group Norms were established collaboratively.
### Table 11. Debrief Part I: Interactional Units 1-14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debrief Discussion Part 1 – Interactional Units (IU-1 to IU-14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teacher unhappy with recent conflict during Antonia’s narrative and states personal responsibility for relationships in classroom space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher makes change in presentation schedule and signals shift in discussion to debriefing conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher establishes reviewing Group Norms as focus of Comm.Unity discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student Erica reacts to ‘love’, teacher responds with (misplaced) humor &amp; student Erica reacts in defense of emotional self (maturity).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student Pang volunteer reads Group Norms aloud with teacher scaffold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teacher establishes shared problem of recent conflict in reference to agreed Norms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Shift to past Group Norm discussion and design of shared obligations to social space of writing community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Student Raul interjects (or comments on) conflict &amp; teacher reminds of group obligation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teacher re-emphasizes to group the importance of listening in social space (&amp; not creating ‘negative energy’ of disrespect in communication).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Shift to space-time of group debrief discussion (task) re: global space of respect as social norm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Teachers observes student Marta upset &amp; solicits input, student resists sharing, &amp; Teacher reminds Marta of her obligation/chance to (re)shape space through Group Norms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Student attempts personal reference in conflict &amp; teacher redirects her to comment generally (not personally) re global issue of communication, Student Marta establishes complaint about laughter (&amp; mutual respect/13).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Raul interjects side comment, in reaction, Teacher continues dialogue w/ speaker but attention shifts to mediating side interactions (conflict).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Student Erica engages conflict; during Teacher reminders to Raul of listening to current discussion, &amp; Teacher redirect of Erica to student Marta’s comments (obligation to space).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teacher invokes the chronotope of the Group Norms by recalling their textual production as more than just a classroom activity but a pedagogical choice to facilitate the co-construction of shared values, thereby, a shared obligation to the social space of the classroom. The teacher juxtaposes this intention with an alternate classroom space governed by traditional delineation of institutional power where the teacher dictates and enforces ‘the teacher’s rules’ that students are expected to follow even if they ‘don’t mean anything to you’. The teacher rejects this directly (‘that’s not the type of classroom
community that we need to have’) and reiterates the importance of Group Norms to a ‘writing community’ and the context of the present immigration unit and Comm.Unity Café readings ‘when we are writing and talking about personal stuff like our personal narratives’. The teacher names the issue of respect in depersonalized terms (e.g. ‘people, someone, folks’) that does not make reference to the current conflict between Raul and Marta. The teacher discourse here reiterates a vision of social space that has meaning in Group Norms built on personal, caring, and emotional relationships in the classroom Comm.Unity.

It is at this juncture (IU8) that the on-going conflict resurfaces with Raul interjecting into the group space a comment about “fighting each other”. This is an apparent self-defense coming from his linguistic identity of a non-English speaker, as an immigrant being ridiculed for speaking unclearly.(i.e. ‘I know how to speak English”). The teacher mediates Raul’s provocation while maintaining the current chronotope of Group Norms through a series of consecutive comments that follow a local-to-global trajectory. The immediate response to Raul is addressed at a micro-local space of the self. The teacher shifts space-time reference to local spaces of classroom interaction in the next comment about the importance of listening and ‘negative energy floating around’ (IU9). The teacher responds directly to the micro-local space of Raul (‘you are involved too’), not to implicate him in conflict, but rather as a reminder of the mutuality of his obligation to the global space of Group Norms. The third reference (IU10) shifts discourse back to the debrief discussion at hand and querying the group from a global discursive space of shared behavioral norms governing relationships (i.e. respect).
The teacher pushes the tensions of debriefing the issues behind conflict by redirecting an open question toward Marta specifically to solicit her input [IU11]. The teacher’s aim here is to obligate the student to the group, that is, to solicit, engage, and encourage participation in addressing conflict. In this way, the global space of normative behavior is intersected explicitly with the micro-local space of the individual students’ experience (with conflict) and preferences. The student’s body language and actions of packing her bag in preparation to leave class communicate the on-going conflict. The student is located in the present space-time of conflict still unfolding. As such, her behavior translates into a lack of investment in engaging the group discussion in a global space of norms of mutual respect. The teacher engages her directly by obligating her to share her concerns by addressing the Group Norms: “You can’t say ‘I don’t know’ because this is the chance … where you remind us, for you, what is important [ ] here in class?”

The on-going conflict resurges in IUs12-14 as students interject antagonistic comments into the debrief discussion that causes the teacher to successively shift focus to check student discourse to maintain the global space-time of Group Norms. In the IU12, there is again a discursive mediation by the teacher redirecting student comments (T19) away from the personalized micro-local space of individual behaviors within the local space of on-going conflict. These discursive moves reflect the teacher’s goals to maintain debrief discussion in a global space of Group Norms (T20) despite students’ continued efforts to perpetuate conflict. Marta follows the teacher plea to speak ‘in general’ about ‘somebody’, and promptly rephrases; “Ok, I don’t like it when somebody, you know, laughs at ME.” Although the rephrasing is thinly veiled within the global
discursive space, a general reference allows the conflict to be depersonalized in the discourse of Group Norms.

The teacher’s attention in IU12 is drawn to Raul who then in IU13 makes an inaudible comment (T23) in Spanish that overlaps with Marta explaining how “that person” also doesn’t like to get laughed at (T25). The teacher abruptly redirects attention to Raul reprimand, “You need to listen.” (T28). This prompts a mocking reaction by Erica (“Ah-ha”) in IU14 which is clearly antagonizing to Raul, as if to say: ‘That’s what you get!’”. At this point the teacher redirects attention immediately to Erica to check her antagonizing reaction that perpetuates conflict (“Erica don’t=) and Erica again reacts defensively (T29) to the teacher’s direct response to her. The teacher then moves again quickly from the micro-local space of these targeting comments of on-going conflict to the local space of the group debrief, attempting to refocus on Marta’s comments about (mis)placed laughter in classroom communication (T30).

**Key Points of Analysis of Comm.Unity Spaces**

It is important to briefly reiterate some key points about these interactions and how they set up analysis of Debrief Part 2. Detailed CDA analysis of Part 1 illustrates several important points. As interactions in Debrief Part 1 clearly illustrate, there is on-going conflict that is transpiring even as it interweaves itself in the teacher’s attempts to debrief the conflict that transpired earlier in the class. Despite the teacher’s apparent attempt to facilitate a group debrief by revisiting Group Norms and a reaffirmation of more global understandings of respectful interactions, students are continually engaged in conflict in ways that directly contradict the teacher’s efforts and intentions. Highlighting
the contradictions between precepts of Comm.Unity as an emotionally caring space and one riddled with conflict aims to underscore notions of third space as built on navigating discursive tensions in ways that renegotiate immigrant student identities.

On that note, we observe our focal student Raul as being, in many ways, held in a discursive positioning as an antagonist or ‘problem student’ even though he is largely occupying a defensive position in these critical events that are the focus of analysis. Although Raul does not make many active moves in this excerpt of classroom discourse, his brief interjections are strategic to draw reactions from both teacher and students. To problematize his role in the Comm.Unity, the conflict during Antonia’s reading was one where he was clearly ridiculed, causing a previous defense of his linguistic identity as an immigrant student who “know(s) how to speak English.” This put him in a defensive stance through this interaction, although clearly poised for conflict. These provocations in the classroom involving Raul, both as instigator and target, are an overarching chronotope of the Comm.Unity space and the Writing 2 class throughout the school year. As such, the chronotope of “mediating Raul” both reflects and shapes the analysis and findings of the study given that these teacher perceptions frame and filter the researcher lens.

In terms of the teacher’s discursive maneuverings seen in Debrief Part 1, there are several instances where the teacher’s spatial references move the inertia of conversation back to a globalized space of Group Norms and away from the micro-local and local dynamics of the on-going conflict. There are several points where the teacher makes consecutive spatial references that moves conversation from a micro-local space, to a local space, on a trajectory of ‘retreat’ to a global space of Group Norms as the focus of
the current debrief discussion. I contend that these spatial movements in teacher
discourse help facilitate connections between immigrant students’ identity at the micro-
level to larger global spaces that highlight chronotopes of their immigrant experiences. In
the critical events here surrounding the Comm.Unity Conflict and the Debrief Discussion,
issues of communication become the global spaces of experience that connect student
interactions in the classroom to their broader life experiences. These discursive moves to
the global spaces of communication and immigrant experiences are further traced in CDA
analysis of Debrief Part 2 in the next section. CDA analysis of this critical event
facilitates the mapping of shifting chronotopes that trace how student immigrant
identities are renegotiated in transformative ways in classroom space.

Debrief Discussion (Part 2) – Mapping Shifting Identities

Critical discourse analysis of Debrief Part 2 leads to mapping shifts in chronotope
and space-time scales in classroom discourse that I contend indicate shifts in student
identity for immigrant ELL students. The chronotope map (Figure 9) drawn from this
analysis is discussed in greater detail following discussion of transcript analysis, however
it is instructive at the outset to highlight key points to frame the direction of my analysis.
The mapping of Debrief Part 2 shows a movement through shifting chronotopes that
represent student identities as: immigrants (and emigrants), ELLs, students in school,
workers and employees, caring group members, among others. Situated in a local context
of the classroom, there are also shifting chronotopes I characterize as the chronotope of
(mis)communication which is an integral discursive thread of classroom interaction in
this ELL Writing 2 course. While this may be a simple observation on the one hand,
CDA analysis traces how teacher-student interactions surrounding Group Norms addresses communication and miscommunication at multiple space-time scales. These scales I define as the:

- **micro-local** space of the self,
- **local** space of the classroom as a discursive space of multiple and simultaneous social interactions, and at
- **global** spaces of communication abstractly (at a meta level) that reframes engagement of students in multiple space times of their lives, past, present and future.

These chronotopes of immigration and school are mapped along the interactional units of Debrief Part 2 which illustrate how the simultaneous intermingling of diverse times and spaces (interspatialities) shape school discourse. Mapping these chronotopes in the production of classroom space carries implications for (re)negotiating the available school identities of immigrant ELL students in ways that speak back to their lived spaces (Lefebvre, 1974, 1991) of marginalization and oppression.

Transcript of Debrief Part 2 is presented below in Table 12 and analysis covers IU15-24, which are outlined in Table 13. Debrief Part 2 is characterized by more emotional referents in teacher discourse and moves toward connecting the micro-local spaces of individual experience to more global spaces of immigrant experiences. These chronotopes of immigration are connected to classroom space through the on-going debrief of classroom conflict and meta-level awareness about the dynamics of communication that affect immigrant ELL students of the Comm.Unity.
Table 12. Transcript: Comm.Unity Conflict - Debrief Discussion (Part 2)

Transcript – Community Conflict: Debrief Discussion (Part 2)

30. T: [IU-15] So, so people, laughter. Laughter is something that can be misunderstood. Ok, 
and there’s a time when, you know, two people-/
31. EV: [IU-16] //Not really. Because wouldn’t you know when someone is laughing at you? I
mean you could notice those things obviously.
32. T: [IU-17] Well, maybe there is a time and place to show laughter. There’s times when
we could think that something’s funny, but we don’t have to show it, we don’t want to
share it to the Comm.Unity. Precisely because it may not be appropriate, right?
(Attention and gesture directed toward EV)
33. EV: Right.
34. T: Right? [IU-18] When someone is reading, maybe they are feeling like, “Why are they
laughing at the way I am speaking?” Or maybe someone is concerned here- For
everybody it is difficult to come up here and pretend, and to read in English, and then
you are reading your stories. So I think that we need to be sensitive to a lot of things
that people might feel nervous about, right?
35. RM: [IU-19] XXX I’m not nervous.
36. T: Huh? Well Raul you may not feel nervous but obviously other people, particularly that
are sitting here sharing. This is not specifically about you Raul, it’s about all of us. It’s
about all of us. I don’t want to make this personal because that doesn’t, that doesn’t
solve the problem. [IU-20] It’s just a reminder that these are things about
communication, about oral communication, right? Body language, all those things.
[IU-21] Like when people are sitting in my class like this (leans over forward,
slumping to side, and putting chin in his hand as if to sleep;
37. Ss: (quiet laughter from a few students),
38. T: … or like this (shifting position in seat
to put head on forearm as if sleeping on the desk), it may mean that they are just tired,
because they have been working all night. I could be like (making a frowning
expression, gesturing with hand outstretched, “Phsst! What’s up with you? Man, you
need to wake up in my class?” It may not be personal against me, but I may take it
personally, right? [IU-22] So we need to be aware of the signals that we send, //right?
(gesturing to Erica with eyebrows raised as if to seek agreement)
39. EV: //Sorry. (low voice)
40. T: … and being sensitive to one another. And it means
controlling ourselves, (CK raises hand and puts it down promptly) [IU-23] just like PF
had to hold a secret for three months (turning in chair toward PF). It means being
sensitive to other people, just like the supervisor at McDonalds’ needs to realize that
you don’t need to raise your voice at people to get them to understand what they need
to do better.
41. AG: Yeah.
42. T: [IU-24] Ok, so we all need to be sensitive to that. And that is something that is
different between communicating on the page, reading and writing, but oral
communication is a lot more dynamic. So, I want you in class to think about how you
are respecting one another as we are communicating (gesturing to Pang who is raising
hand).

(Continued on next page)
Table 12. Transcript: Comm.Unity Conflict - Debrief Discussion (Part 2) (Continued)

| 43. PT: [IU-25] Sometimes it is tough for me because I don’t like wait, they laugh at me, and sometimes they talk (Bell rings to signal end of period) and I don’t understand, and they just laugh, and I don’t understand. (Some students get up to move) | 44. T: It’s a hard thing to get; (getting up from chair) but, let’s take this as a reminder to one another. (Moving toward student desks) [ ] Good job you guys. |

Continuing from the analysis of Part 1 above, Part 2 of the Debrief Discussion is delineated by the proposed boundary signaled in IU15, in which the teacher reclaims the present space-time of the debrief discussion despite inertia of on-going conflict. Analysis illustrates that this discursive trajectory of maintaining the global space of communication reiterates Group Norms as it relates to classroom space and immigrant experiences broadly. In IU15, the teacher moves to re-establish the core issue of dispute: “Laughter is something that can be misunderstood”. The teacher is met in IU16 with a direct challenge of “Not really” interjected by another student Erica who continues a current of tension established through Part 1. Erica’s retort takes the notion of understanding laughter as the very literal notion of observing the material nature of laughter as something one can verifiably see, “obviously”, as she contends with apparent sarcasm.

The teacher responds in IU17 with the global parameters of “time and place” in communication, to assert that laughter is something that can be shown strategically and appropriately based on the social context. Here the teacher frames the notion that responsibility lies with the micro-local space of the self to make discursive choices regarding laughter and the meanings potentially misinterpreted based on social context. The teacher reasserts the hypothetical situation of (mis)placed laughter, reminding students that “we don’t have to show it”, which frames these discursive moves as one of
choice by each individual. The connection between discursive choice and obligation to norms of “appropriate” behavior in the local space of Writing 2 is made explicitly: “we don’t want to share it to the Comm.Unity” (T32).

Table 13. Interactional Units - Debrief Part 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debrief Discussion Part 2 - Interactional Units (IU-14 to IU-25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 Teacher reclaims present space-time of debrief discussion &amp; establishes issue of laughter as key (mis)communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Student Erica interjects &amp; contradicts/challenges teacher, stating that laughter is clearly observed in a communicative situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Teacher re-shift to social/group space, and importance of ‘time and place’ in negotiating meaning &amp; (mis)understanding of laughter, student Erica acknowledges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Teacher references shared feeling of insecurity with laughter during reading aloud on multiple levels: role play setting of Comm.Unity Cafe, L2 experience, personal narratives; need for sensitivity to nervousness on many levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Student Raul interjects to assert self as not nervous/insecure; T. responds that others may feel nervous; then redirects away from micro-local of Raul as issue, to shared concern and group obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Reframes in global issue of oral communication and body language in interpersonal space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Shift to role play of (mis)communication with classroom interactions; performing student with humor; recognizes self/teacher also equally responsible for (mis)interpretation of personal offense, recognizing students as workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Teacher reemphasizes self-awareness in communication, sensitivity, and self-control; quick request for acknowledgement by Erica who apologizes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Teacher links to immigration experiences as retold through student readings in Comm.Unity Café; global space of home country &amp; challenges of emigration; present experience after arrival as immigrant in work place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Connection to differences between oral and written communication, &amp; reminders of respect in social interactions of classroom Comm.Unity,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Student Pang shares experience with (mis)understanding laughter of non-ELL/mainstream peers, period ends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of the first person plural ‘we’ in these consecutive statements stresses that each group member is equally present and powerful in shaping social space of the classroom. Moreover, the phrasing of a shared obligation (‘have to’) that is willfully accepted (‘want to’) speaks to the spirit with which Group Norms aim to shape social
spaces of learning in the ELL classroom. The teacher assertion that laughter ‘may not be appropriate’ also frames how discursive meanings are negotiated in social space of the classroom. In this case, the notion of an appropriate ‘time and place’ implies that the proposal of humor may be misplaced in social interactions. However, on the one hand, the ‘appropriateness’ of humor also implies that even though humor may be proposed, it may not be understood or shared by others, regardless of the ‘time and place-ness’ of such (mis)placed humor. In Ts32-34 the teacher seeks acknowledgement of understanding with student Erica who acquiesces by simply repeating “right” with a hushed and agreeable tone.

In IU18 the teacher reframes the issue in the local space-time of the Comm.Unity Café and the shared challenges of reading personal narratives aloud to the class (Table 14). Here the teacher speaks globally of a shared nervousness and possible feelings students have when they are in the vulnerable position of having their turn to share in the Comm.Unity Café readings (L70). The teacher addresses numerous possible sensitivities that students may experience in this culminating activity of publicly sharing immigration narratives. In doing so, the teacher recasts students from multiple subject positions, from varied co-mingled spaces of identity that drawn on diverse space-times. The teacher reasserts that (mis)placed laughter may be misperceived through the insecurities of an immigrant ELL who is self-conscious and thinks quietly, “Why are they laughing at the way I am speaking.” (L71). The teacher reminds the whole group of the shared experience of doing oral presentations in front of peers and giving an academic performance of their own lives: “for everybody, it is difficult to come up here and pretend” (L73). While the Comm.Unity classroom space strives for a safe and sensitive
space, the notion of students ‘pretending’ (L73) adds even more pressure in the sense of students being forced on stage in role playing the Comm.Unity Café (even if staged merely with a midnight poster and a lava lamp). Being on center stage is challenging enough for many students, and for many people in general; and that much more so in doing public speaking in English as a second language (L74).

Perhaps it is an obvious point, but there is significance in how the physical space of the horseshoe of desks arranged in Room L2 puts the person sitting “up here” in the middle of attention, from right, left and center. It is interesting to reconsider the discursive power of sitting “up here” (L73) in the teacher’s chair as experienced differently by teacher and student. As the teacher, I feel that the material spaces of this arrangement and its location allowed for a facilitation style that was more relaxed and personal. I was able to roll over and put my hand on the arm of the person with their tired head down on the desk from working the previous night, a situation I role played in IU21, perhaps with (mis)placed humor. It is, however, naïve to presume that the student feels somehow empowered by assuming this spatial and discursive location at the center of the group. A notion of bestowing a discursive power in being the center of attention is false when students realistically feel a power imposed on them with the ‘assignment’ of this central location. For the student sitting “up here”, the power of this central space becomes inverted when they experience all eyes and ears on their academic performance of their immigration narratives. The teacher recognizes this challenge for anyone to read their own life out loud to the world (L75), and several students showed emotion (some tearful) when retelling difficult experiences through their immigration narratives.
The teacher’s plea for sensitivity is disrupted, however, when the focal student Raul (IU19) illustrates the power on the periphery by effectively claiming he does not need others’ sensitivity. Raul’s statement, “I’m not nervous” (L77) serves to position him outside the shared Comm.Unity space shaped by emotional and social sensitivity. This subtle interjection, uttered with an assertive ‘I’m not’ that fell into a muffled ‘nervous’, exercises power over the social space by undermining the Group Norms that the teacher struggles to re-establish. The discursive move presents a direct challenge to the Group Norms that the teacher aims to re-establish in the debrief discussion. Raul’s statement denies a sharing of common vulnerabilities with his fellow Comm.Unity members as immigrants, ELLs, students learning public speaking skills, adolescents sharing personal stories and struggles. This was a characteristic defensive move by the focal student, to be oppositional in ways that reasserted a public persona of self-confidence. This discursive move (L77) illustrates one thread of his school narrative as a nexus of tension, both in instigating conflict and how he reacted in defense.
Table 14. Transcript Analysis - Debrief Part 2 (IU18)

IU18 – Teacher references shared feeling of insecurity with laughter during reading aloud on multiple levels: role play setting of Comm.Unity Cafe, L2 experience, personal narratives; need for sensitivity to nervousness on many levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Discourse</th>
<th>Chronotope (Time-Space)</th>
<th>Space-time (spatio-temporal scale)</th>
<th>Social Identity</th>
<th>Communicative Function</th>
<th>Language &amp; discourse features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70. T: When someone is reading, maybe they are feeling like,</td>
<td>Classroom space</td>
<td>present/local space-time of Comm.Unity café</td>
<td>role playing - mis/reader of (mis)placed laughter</td>
<td>generalizes common immigrant experience of linguistic marginalization</td>
<td>‘feeling’ – emotional interpretation of discursive meanings in social space; ‘like’ – interpretation, not confirmed, but based in perception, rather than intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. “Why are they laughing at the way I am speaking?”</td>
<td>Classroom space</td>
<td>present/local space-time of Comm.Unity café</td>
<td>facilitator of space</td>
<td>role playing student self-consciousness, insecurity in social space</td>
<td>role playing student reader, in local social space of Comm.Unity Café readings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Or maybe someone is concerned here-</td>
<td>immigrant experience ( &amp; accent L2 learner)</td>
<td>micro-local of indiv. reaction</td>
<td>facilitator of space</td>
<td>recognizes emotion (anxiety) w/ comm</td>
<td>transition to another example of student concern with public performance, class presentation, personal narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. For everybody it is difficult to come up here and pretend,</td>
<td>immigrant experience ( &amp; accent L2 learner)</td>
<td>present/local space-time of Comm.Unity Café</td>
<td>facilitator of space</td>
<td>recognizes emotion (anxiety) w/ comm</td>
<td>‘for everybody it is difficult’ – common sensitivity to the public language identity of ELL &amp; personal story</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on next page)
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74. and to read in English,</td>
<td>• immigrant experience (&amp; accent L2 learner)</td>
<td>• present/local space-time of Comm.Unity café</td>
<td>• facilitator of space</td>
<td>• recognize challenge of L2 speaker in school, social space</td>
<td>• second language challenges; self-concept?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. and then you are reading your stories.</td>
<td>• immigrant experience (&amp; accent L2 learner)</td>
<td>• present/local space-time of Comm.Unity café</td>
<td>• facilitator of space</td>
<td>• indexes L2 performance &amp; readings</td>
<td>• Personal stories; self-concept? Self-conscious; emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. So I think that we need to be sensitive to a lot of things that people might feel nervous about, right?</td>
<td>• immigrant experience (&amp; accent L2 learner)</td>
<td>• (mis)comm.</td>
<td>• Future space-time of strengthened Group Norms</td>
<td>• recognizes many possible emotional concerns in current Comm.Unity Café setting</td>
<td>• ‘be sensitive’ – Group Norms ‘be gentle’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Transcript Analysis - Debrief Part 2 (IU18) (Continued)
The teacher’s response to Raul (L78) aims to disarm his challenge by recognizing his claim, while reminding him that other group members feel nervous, particularly the student sitting in the middle sharing her narrative. The teacher makes a distinct shift to disengage from Raul’s challenge and depersonalize the on-going conflict of Part 1 (IU8 & IU13) away from Raul; “This is not specifically about you Raul.” (L79). The teacher’s comment identifies a ‘micro-local’ space of the individual (‘you’) in production of a ‘local’ classroom space. This reply works to disarm Raul’s defensive interjection (L77) and claims of emotional confidence; and importantly, reposition him as not the center of tension, which was a chronotope of the Comm.Unity space. In L80 the teacher reiterates the issue of a shared involvement in the classroom conflict (“It’s about all of us.”), which recasts Raul as merely another member responsible to Group Norms in a shared local space. “I don’t want to make this personal,” the teacher explains (L81) in moving to reframe discussion toward the “problem” of (mis)communication that is key to maintaining the shared local space of the classroom (IU20).

The teacher makes a shift in IU20 to a global space of communication, discussing abstractly in terms of how signs and interpretations of meaning can be misunderstood, often when emotion is deeply involved. In this way, the teacher seeks to reassert a shared attention to the process of spatial production in the classroom. Embodied meanings (mis)conveyed through “body language and all those things” (L83) are central to interactions in social space. In this critical spatial event, the teacher asserts to students the importance of being sensitive and “aware of the signals that we send,” lest they be misperceived. It is a plea for more emotion in handling the emotions of others as they are performed and embodied in student behavior. The teacher quickly moves in L84 to a
classroom example through effectively role playing a simple situation in which student behavior is misunderstood from the perspective of institutional authority with ownership over classroom space (“Like when people are sitting in my class like this”).

In IU21, the teacher shifts to a local space of the classroom by role playing (“like when people”) an example of a student sitting slumped in the chair as if sleeping or tired. The teacher’s antics of performing with accentuated body language and a twinge of humor drew a few quiet snickers from students (L84-86). In L87, the teacher constructs a hypothetical space-time of the classroom within the present debrief to highlight that the teacher may also misinterpret student behavior as disrespectful or resistant to school norms. The teacher offers a self-critique in speculating that there are other legitimate meanings behind student behavior (“it may mean”) that may escape the teacher situated within the hierarchy of school spaces. With an animated parody (L88), the teacher role plays how a reactionary misinterpretation of student behavior can lead to power struggles over respect and control of institutional spaces and delineated social norms of behavior between teachers and students. The teacher role plays a strong offense to student behavior cast with a colloquial, rough tenor of the sidewalk, (“Phsst! What’s up with you?”) and reasserts sole ownership of the classroom space and enforces the norms of allowable behavior (“Man, you need to wake up in my class!”). The teacher’s ‘alter ego’ (and other side) performed in this hypothetical space-time serves as a self-critique of the institutional power wielded by the teacher.

This shift to an alternate space-time of the classroom in which tension is vibrating around the teacher’s own interactions and (mis)communications resituates the teacher as just another group member with equal vulnerabilities in maintaining positive
relationships in social space. The teacher recognizes strong emotion in the micro-local spaces of the self which is channeled through personal (mis)perception and (mis)interpretation in communication in the classroom. There is recognition of the illocutionary effects (L89: “It may not be personal against me,) and the perlocutionary effects (L90; “but I may take it personally, right?”) of micro-interactions in the classroom. In reframing the teacher as equally susceptible to (mis)communication and tension in the classroom, this hypothetical classroom space provides a reinterpretation of a responsible adolescent carrying job and personal responsibilities, which should be supported not judged.

This example interaction of a student acting overly tired was something that occurred occasionally, with different students and for different apparent reasons or needs; (not always a real need for rest, but perhaps just a common adolescent behavior of appearing disinterested). Shifting into this hypothetical space-time of potential conflict, however, reflects another chronotope of immigration and the lived spaces for immigrant students having work and family responsibilities that affected school participation. For myself as the teacher, this tension of Comm.Unity involved recognizing and mediating challenges of student behaviors, prompted by personal circumstances of financial hardship and family obligations to their own children and family in America and in their home countries. For many in the class, and the focal students in this interaction, I would argue that a ‘student’ identity was not the predominant discourse shaping the ‘micro-local’ spaces that governed their presence and performance in the class. This is not to imply that they did not care about school, but more simply, that they had other obligations that compete with school among their priorities. This need to work reflects a
lived reality for those students whose immigration narratives, before, during and after coming to America, are shaped by low socioeconomic status and financial hardship. The immigration narratives of these students were shaped by the chronotope of “the American dream” of a better life and opportunity. CDA analysis of another critical event presented in later sections maps the chronotope of the American Dream and the focal students ‘hip hop hopes’ that intersect in his immigration narrative.

The shift in space-time in IU23 reflects a discursive intersecting of the global and local spaces of immigration and communication. The teacher recognizes the real challenges faced by students, pulling together multiple space-times of immigrant experiences in the past, recent past, and present. Chronotopes of immigration are also intertwined in the lived spaces of the immigration unit as academic content, process and product. It is in the intersecting space-times of the Debrief Discussion where this analysis traces available opportunities for students and teachers to renegotiate identities for immigrant youth in school spaces. CDA analysis of the Debrief Discussion frames a shift of classroom discourse in IU23 that pulls together the micro-local student immigration narratives and global spaces of what people experience in emigration from their home country and immigration to an adopted one.

**Mapping Chronotopes of Comm.Unity**

In the chronotope map of Debrief Part II (Figure 9), classroom discourse is situated principally in the present time of the Immigration Unit as the on-going curricular unit. In IU23 the teacher links past, present and future in a consecutive reference that stretches geographically from the home country, to employment in America, to school
spaces of the classroom. In IU18, the teacher’s future-oriented comment emphasizes Group Norms through emotional engagement and sensitivity toward diverse immigrant experiences shared in the classroom. Again in IU23, the teacher reemphasizes Group Norms in the future through the abstract space of communication as a social process that requires sensitivity to produce safe and supportive third spaces.

In L97, the teacher connects the challenges of self-control (L95) in communication through the example of one student Clarisse Mbah’s immigration narrative and Comm.Unity Café session in which she described how she “had to hold a secret for three months” about her departure for concerns of personal safety. She related how she and her family needed to be secretive about their departure out of fear of being targeted for the money that they saved and collected to make the journey and resettle in a new country. During the debrief of her narrative, she spoke about how this overriding concern for safety meant that only immediate family were aware of her plan to emigrate with her brother and father. She was not even allowed to tell her closest friends that she would be leaving for America with no guarantee of coming home. One day, she just left everything behind. Framed within this imposed silence, this student’s emigration from home is another illustration of intense emotional connections and disruptions through socio-spatial relationships that shape the chronotope of immigration and third spaces of the ELL classroom.

Again the imperative of “being sensitive to other people” (L98) in social space is related to abstract space of communication as a social process negotiating messages and making meaning. In L99, the space-time shift connects the immigrant experience of preparing to come to America with the challenging reality of life in America after arrival.
and the working world where several of the students spent long hours every week. The teacher relates sensitivity in communication with the recent debrief discussion of Antonia’s narrative in which students share the challenge and frustrations in dealing with the “the supervisor at McDonald’s”. Basic interpersonal communication and power dynamics of the workplace are complicated further through a second language and culture, and in most likelihood, the youth and immaturity of adolescence in learning how to be an employee. The students recounted how supervisors would speak harshly in giving instructions, react critically to your performance, and not establish a supportive environment where an employee was allowed to learn from mistakes, but rather one where mistakes would be dealt with punitively. These communication challenges experienced in a low-paid, low-level position made the lived spaces of employment painful for these immigrant students, a social and economic marginalization all too common for low-income immigrants that disproportionately fill service jobs. These challenges of hard work, marginal treatment, and cross-cultural challenges come with the chronotopes of immigration. It is an unromantic characterization of ‘the American Dream’, but Raul’s insight on Antonia’s narrative captured an essence in plain and simple terms: “She came to USA to make some money.”

This chronotope of employment in school discourse produces third spaces where immigrant identities as workers and responsible family members intersect with institutional identities of ELL student. Space-time links in IU21 linked potential misunderstanding in classroom communication due to the teacher misperceiving student body language from being fatigued from work and family obligations (“working all night”). The teacher’s interspatial references to Antonia’s narrative and the feedback
session discussion about workplace communication reaffirm this unromantic reality of immigration, recognize students as workers, and validate the challenges that work responsibilities impose on school. This connection between the debrief discussion’s emphasis on communication facilitates a direct interspatial linking of classroom space and work space, where a sensitive and supportive perspective should guide social interactions and spatial production.

In IU24, the teacher shifts back to the global space of communication to remind students of shared obligations to norms of behavior, and that “oral communication is a lot more dynamic” than written communication (L102). A metacognitive perspective on developing their own functional and critical literacies that are intermingling in spaces of the Comm.Unity Café session, student narratives, the Immigration Unit, lived spaces of immigration, and classroom space. There is a future-oriented shift once again in IU24 in aims of refortifying the love and care of the Group Norms hanging on the wall by “respecting one another as we are communicating” (L103).

The teacher’s quick intertextual references to other students’ narrative, and the recent space-time of the Comm.Unity Café reading, link micro-local, local and global spaces of student experience within the Immigration Unit. Moreover, the teacher’s reference links the global notion of communication, as a chronotope of immigrant experiences – past, present and future – to the process of spatial production in the classroom. The space-time links accomplished are connections between learning to communicate and multiple student identities: as Comm.Unity member, as ELL student, as employee, as responsible family member, as emigrant, as immigrant (Figure 9).
Figure 9: Chronotope Map: Debrief Part II
Summary of Analysis

CDA analysis in this chapter traces how different space-times related to the chronotope of immigration are represented in ways that renegotiate student identities in school spaces. Utilizing CDA methods to trace and map representations of space-times in classroom dialogue provides direct insight into the production of space in the classroom. The focal interactions of this transaction represent key moments in the debrief discussion that ensued following the student reading and feedback. Focusing on this particular piece of data is purposeful in this study for several reasons.

First, in articulating a notion of third space for immigrant ELLs, I purposefully analyze data that is engaged with conflict in the classroom. From a perspective of social production of social space, we must examine the intense, emotional dynamic of face-to-face interactions to get a sense of spatial production at the micro-level. I propose that understanding underlying tensions and enacted conflict in the social space of the classroom must be from our intellectual, emotional, and spiritual selves. The affective and emotional notion that ‘we teach who we are’ (Palmer, 1998) puts our whole and complicated selves at the center of social interactions in the classroom. For immigrant ELL students and their teachers, this entails identities that are located in diverse languages, cultures, and places brought into conflict in school settings. Shifting chronotopes of immigration uncover interspatialities linking the chronotopes of conflict and communication in the classroom (Debrief Part 2) to space-times of emigrating from the home country and employment struggles in the American workplace (Debrief Part 1). Analysis traced the teacher’s discursive retreat to global lived spaces of communication
and community in mediating conflict through reemphasis of shared norms of respectful
and caring interactions.

Second, despite the critical literacy goals underpinning Comm.Unity in the
Writing 2 classroom, I recognize that spaces of oppressions are also (re)produced through
workings of discursive power both within and across institutional boundaries of school.
The focal interaction is from a class marked by an undercurrent of tension that mounted
and broke into conflict during a Comm.Unity Café reading. These interpersonal conflicts
were in disrespect to a fellow classmate who was telling her immigration story and
despite the teacher’s attempts to mediate both verbal and non-verbal communication. In
the focal interaction of the debrief discussion, the teacher frames in relation to collective
responsibility to classroom space and challenges of communication in real-world settings.
I exercise power in my obligation of students to Group Norms of behavior with the goal
of obligating themselves to the Others that share the classroom space, a shared otherness.
However, despite my attempts to reassert and re(facilitate) a common commitment to the
shared space via Group Norms of behavior, the undercurrent of conflict continues in
disrupting the very discussion about behavioral norms that aim to address conflict. In
focusing on a classroom interaction where student conflict interferes with an important
group sharing process which the teacher cannot effectively maintain, I am to underscore
the very notion of third space or Comm.Unity as one born of engagement with tensions.

Third, this interaction illustrates a meta-chronotope of the Writing 2 classroom
showing ‘mediating Raul’ as a learner and contributing member of the Comm.Unity.
While the data selected for analysis directly involves Raul as a participant in the on-going
conflict, his participation is one of multiple foci of analysis as intermingling of tensions
from multiple space-times and chronotopes exists. Rather, it is the how the debrief
discussion interrelates school and non-school spaces, local and global spaces, personal
and shared spaces, in aims of depersonalizing conflict (away from Raul as a flash point)
and reiterating collective commitment to norms of behavior rooted in love, respect, and
friendship through effective communication. As the teacher redirects at one point, “It’s
not just about you, it is about all of us.” As it is with many individuals sharing classroom
space, there are simultaneous processes of spatial production occurring both
independently and co-dependently. Clearly, the teacher’s institutional position of
authority can not control the myriad space-times intersecting in the production of
classroom space which is ultimately a situated process for each individual. This focal
interaction highlights Raul as just one contributing member in the Comm.Unity and as a
student whose chronotopes of classroom conflict are not marked merely by his instigating
behavior but also cases of him being targeted (i.e. ‘I know how to speak English).

In summary, analysis of classroom interactions presented in this chapter reflect
tensions of facilitating an effective and critical classroom learning space that invites
diverse immigrant experiences. The classroom portrait describes conceptual spaces of
student-centered curriculum, group norms based on emotional engagement, participatory
academic tasks, and idealized notions of Comm.Unity. However, analysis of the critical
event of group conflict illustrates tensions in lived spaces reflected in and through
classroom discourse.

In the next chapter, I focus more closely on the ethnographic case of Raul in
analyzing and mapping space-times of an immigration chronotope of ‘hip hop hopes’ for
the future.
CHAPTER 6
(RE)NEGOTIATING IMMIGRANT IDENTITIES IN SCHOOL SPACES
(RE)WRITING RAUL

After school on Monday I ran into Raul waiting at the bus stop in front of the church uptown. He was sitting patiently listening to his iPod which he carries with him all the time. Music is an apparent constant for Raul. I said, “What up?” to him and he paused, looking at me, not really recognizing me immediately, probably because I had on my own iPod and hat and sunglasses. When he realized it was his teacher, he smiled while also turning his head away with a smile, seemingly embarrassed to be caught outside of school at only 1:30, during E period at school. I asked him where he was going and he said he was headed home because he had guided study hall last period. When I asked if he had permission to leave school, he shrugged his shoulders and smiled not giving an answer. He asked where I was going and I said home also. We got on the same South Cuttersville bus that came along promptly. As we were sitting on the bus, I was reminding him that the trimester is ending and we have to get the rest of his unfinished work done. He looked at me as he usually does with a somewhat unresponsive expression that tells me maybe he is not following exactly what I am saying. I asked if he got caught up with Ms. Rainee’s class and he said yes. I asked how he did that and then recalled him doing it during internal suspension for excessive absences. I quipped, “Internal suspension, right?!” He smiled big and responded, “Yea!” (Field notes, February 27, 2007).

The analysis in this chapter focuses more deeply on the case of Raul, a 15-year old immigrant male from El Salvador, who navigates institutionalized roles and spaces as a bilingual, special education student. Analysis in the previous chapter illustrated Raul’s active presence in classroom conflict, as antagonist and/or antagonized. This glimpse of the Comm.Unity chronotope of mediating Raul was consistent for other students and myself as facilitator of the shared social space. However, as I frame his potential roles of antagonist and antagonized, Raul was also a constructive and positive Comm.Unity
member who engaged in group dynamics, has positive relationships, and contributes to learning objectives. In the previous chapter, the critical events of the Comm.Unity Conflict and debrief discussion were sparked by Raul’s participation in the Feedback #6 role, in which he shared the positive insight about Antonia coming to America “to make money” in support of her infant son. His association of an immigrant “American Dream” of economic prosperity was something he recognized in common with other student experiences during the Comm.Unity Café sessions.

The chronotope of “the American Dream”, textualized in his discourse of hip hop hopes, is central to this chapter’s analysis of the critical spatial event. Critical discourse analysis of classroom interactions illustrates the significance of engaging his strong investments in hip hop music as a musical genre, nexus of community membership, and field of hope for his future aspirations as a hip hop DJ. Chronotopic analysis of classroom dialogue during the writing of his immigration narrative show how the interaction of mixed local and global chronotopes make connections between his musical investments in hip hop and the broader societal inequity of unjust government, racism, and class. These discursive connections between his world, the world, and the classroom world illustrate potentially how third space is produced and identity renegotiated from a spatio-temporal lens on classroom interactions. However, to appreciate learning opportunities and production of third spaces in engaging hip hop discourses in school spaces, it is crucial to describe Raul’s case in the context of the marginalizing spaces he negotiated in school.

The following sections of this chapter are broken down into three major parts. In Part I, I will provide an ethnographic portrait of the focal student and the multiple
institutional spaces that framed his school identities in Special Education and English Language Learner programs. The analysis of this chapter aims to challenge institutionalized discourses of Raul as an ‘at-risk’ student due to his struggling academic performance, inconsistent attendance, family background, and non-school identities. To speak back to deficit perspectives of minority youth often characterized by race, class, culture, and language (Nieto & Bode, 2008), I characterize Raul’s institutional identities as SpEd and ELL as backdrop to foregrounding an analysis of his identification with hip hop culture, music, and discourses.

In the Part II of the chapter, I describe my own and Raul’s connections to hip hop as a chronotope of our classroom space that I contend was relevant to his school experience and (re)negotiation of his student identities. I provide brief historical and theoretical context of hip hop discourses in the growing research literature on hip hop and education that is instructive for a broader ethnographic portrait of Raul’s role in production of third spaces in the classroom.

In the Part III of this chapter, I turn again to critical discourse analysis of one critical spatial event in which teacher-student interactions surrounding hip hop hopes illustrate the transformative potential of engaging students’ lived spaces. As this student’s immigrant hopes evolved with his musical interests, I map shifting chronotopes of this critical event to illustrate potential for renegotiating student identity for immigrant ELLs in school spaces.
Part I: Institutionalized Student Identities

Last Day of School Conversations

The last day of school of the school year for students was a make up day for final exams. Raul was the only student I saw that day. He was in to make up his final grammar test for my class which he had missed. As he struggled through the test, not recalling the past progressive tense and other linguistic follies, I went about cleaning up bulletin boards while I tried not to help him too much on the test. When he was about two thirds of the way done with the test, we were pleasantly interrupted by Ms. Rainee, the ELL Department Head, who stopped by to follow up with Raul about various housekeeping items, as she usually did in looking out for all the students. She checked in on how his classes ended up, and in particular how he did on his Algebra class. He shared with a wince and an innocent smile that he got a 45. She asked if he was going to go to summer school so he cold get credit and move on to the next course in the fall.

We discussed his need for better organizational skills, in class and with his homework, so he could keep current and not fall behind in his work. We discussed whether he was getting enough help with his study skills and organizational challenges which was to be coming from his SpEd support during a directed study class. We reiterated to him that he must practice reading and writing which were essential skills to graduate high school. He was told that he would have to repeat ELL Level II curriculum next year because he had not sufficiently progressed in his linguistic development and academic performance. Ms. Rainee discussed the evaluations being done (finally, only at the year’s end) by the bilingual psychologist to help determine if he needs further support as documented in his Individualized Educational Program (IEP).
“Do I have one of those? I heard that’s what people get when they tried to graduate high school,” he said.

“No, that’s a GED,” we said.

Marginalization in School Spaces & Tensions at Home

It is very significant that Raul was not familiar with his IEP. During that last day conversation, he expressed an interest in wanting to stay in school and graduate from high school. He shared that he did not want to end up though at the Learning Academy which was the satellite campus for students needing alternative instructional models and learning support. (I found out eventually that he did end up getting moved there the next year). He also recognized his need for more structure in meeting his academic responsibilities at school and at home. His comments are consistent with exchanges that happen in the formalized IEP meetings or are likely when students are before multiple adults and feeling certain pressure to fulfill expectations – they answer appropriately.

However, in a private conversation following our discussion with the other ELL teacher, he shared with me that he did not even know what an IEP was. He even asked the question if everyone had an IEP, clearly showing gross ignorance as to the central role this document plays in his schooling and how it is the principal framework intended to guide his instructional day including the materiality of scheduled classes, classrooms, and classmates that shape how he lives school spaces. In that last day conversation, I asked him about whether he understood about his IEP and its purpose. He paused and then asked me with a calm and quizzical look, “How long do I have that?” When I responded that he has had one since middle school, he blew a dismissive exhale from his pursed lips (“phssst!”) while cocking his head back with surprised expression, I make the
reasonable inference in this analysis that Raul experienced a realization (at least momentarily) that his experience in school had been mediated by this educational plan and a tag he had been carrying for several years without real consciousness of his location in school spaces.

It is not an uncommon occurrence for students and parents, especially low-income minorities, to be left at the margins of their own IEP process and its implications for their own social and learning experience in school spaces (Klinger & Artiles, 2003). These issues of marginalization are even more acute for immigrant families who are navigating the challenges of interfacing with the official spaces of school where their own cultural and linguistic backgrounds are not effectively accommodated. This also proved to be the case with Raul’s mother, the principal contact with the school in the IEP process, whose oral English communication was at a very beginning stage. A translator and a school bilingual outreach worker were assisting her with communication throughout the IEP process and other student support services received by the family. Despite such supports provided to the family, it was apparent that the student and family were not confident in navigating these school spaces. Another cross cultural dynamic that immigrant families must navigate is the difference in parent-school relationships and their role in self-advocacy which is also impeded by basic communication. Their role in the IEP review meeting was relatively passive. They were asked to speak a few times but responses were limited although the majority of the time was devoted to teachers reporting about progress and challenges with Raul’s academic work. There was a lot of suggestion about what Raul needed to do but no conversation structured around how we, as educators, surrounding him could better help him do things differently or better include him in the
decision process. Admittedly, I make a judgment here that there are alternate ways to structure relationships between immigrant families and students especially in such a complex case where multiple learning needs are intertwined.

In our final day conversation, I spoke with Raul about the need for him to be aware of his own IEP so that he could better advocate on his own behalf and on behalf of his parents. He shared that this dissonance between home and school discourses added to additional tensions in their parent-child relationship as well. Instead of the IEP as a tool for advocacy with the school surrounding academic needs in school, the family’s marginalization in the process was translated into further tension at home. As Raul commented in response to my comment about advocacy: “Me está echando la culpa a mi! (She is putting the blame on me!).”

Raul is a complex case study that prompted concerted efforts at the building level to re-evaluate his learning needs and explore other possible challenges impeding more consistent progress in middle school since his arrival in the United States. He was an intermediate ELL student who was fifteen years old and in the 9th Grade at the time of the study. He emigrated from El Salvador in a 3-month journey over land as an unaccompanied child that turned 13 years old along the way. He arrived in the Cuttersville Regional Middle School for grade 7 when his initial referrals for Special Education began. He then relocated to Virginia where his father was living but he reportedly had extended periods of truancy for several months at a time. This school year was largely considered a loss of a year and represents a significant disruption in his schooling upon arriving in the U.S.
I entered into a long-standing conversation about his academic performance and engagement in school which was not improving despite concerted efforts by building support teams and district outreach services. The sociocultural context of his immigrant experience and family context also factored into the building assessment team’s discussion of his learning needs and concerns regarding observed isolation and possible depression. He was observed regularly eating alone in the cafeteria and there were several times, as described in the opening vignette, when I would find him in a side hallway across from the ELL home base classroom L2 which led to the ELL department office.

There were many confounding factors in assessing Raul’s academic performance in light of his pre-existing IEP and still unidentified learning differences. Some of the details of his identified ‘non-specific disability in writing’ included:

- generating written language in longer assignments;
- comprehension of longer reading assignments;
- retaining and recalling instructions;
- recalling information in testing situations;
- short-term memory problems

Raul’s IEP underwent a formal review during the course of the school year as it was overdue for revisiting and revision, but the re-evaluation process only managed to schedule assessments with a bilingual psychologist at the very end of the year. After conducting preliminary meetings and assessment with him in Spanish, the psychologist commented only anecdotally and prior to any documentation, that Raul had ‘severe’ attention deficit problems (i.e. ADHD). I never saw any such written assessment prior to the end of the year. These undiagnosed needs presented underlying questions for how to
best support Raul’s learning in Writing 2. These questions are also threaded indeterminately in this analysis of Raul’s experience and identities in school spaces.

**Academic Progress & Repeating ELL Level II**

Focusing on Raul’s negotiation of identity in academic literacies is especially important in the context of his marginal progress over the school year. Based on diverse assessment tools and data from classroom performance, we discussed, as a matter of procedure in the ELL department, all students in order to determine eligibility for them to proceed to the subsequent ELL level which impacted enrolment in corresponding ELL courses, appropriate mainstream courses, and scheduling considerations for elective availability. Raul’s classroom performance in ELL courses and his mainstream classes by the end of the school year showed him in danger of getting mostly D’s and F’s in all his classes. He was awaiting his math final exam grade which, according to school/district policy, he needed at a minimum score to bring his failing course grade above a minimum in order for him to be eligible to take the math summer school class to raise his average and become eligible to move to Calculus.

Based on Raul’s academic performance and his marginal progress on state language assessments, the ELL department decided to have him remain at Level II and to not advance him to Level III, which meant a repeat of the Writing 2 class I taught. Despite this administrative decision, the ELL team also felt that Raul’s lack of progress was not due to lack of either cognitive/academic or linguistic ability. Rather, it was the result of other confounding factors related to ineffective learning habits and insufficient strategic support plans in place around him across the ELL and Special Education
departments. While this discussion was certainly situated within the ELL department’s perspective and discourse around students, there is significant data that indicates a serious dissonance and lack of coordination among the various educational professionals and service providers working with Raul and his family. There are broad implications for educational policy and programming drawn from this case study of Raul as an ‘at-risk’, bilingual, Special Education student (Klinger & Artiles, 2003). This is especially relevant considering his experience within a relatively well-resourced community reputed for its progressive, multicultural agenda in the public schools. These broader implications of this case study for curriculum and instruction as well as policy and research will be discussed further in the last chapter.

**Dis/Organizational Challenges**

Organizational challenges were one principal concern with Raul’s academic progress, and therefore, with his own participation in the community of the Writing 2 classroom. In the context of a writing process curriculum, it is significant that Raul often could not complete final compositions to similar expectations as his classmates. This was not because of an inability to offer significant insights into content or respond appropriately to others’ writing. Rather, Raul often did not have the drafting work completed or available when he arrived in class, thereby, making it difficult to give and receive feedback with structured peer editing tasks. He repeatedly misplaced or lost his binder, journals, and cumulative writing portfolio which made it difficult to consider the progress of his work without the textual record and evidence of his work. Homework logs and assignment charts were created and provided for all students to utilize in
documenting assigned tasks. This was especially important for Raul due to his identified short-term memory problems although he was not able to take advantage of this system. His backpack was in a constant state of disarray and the papers stored inside a binder were stuffed in as a stack of dog-eared sheets, not properly inserted in the three rings. Raul consistently had some left-behind clothing, XL t-shirts and sweatshirts, discarded on the heater in the classroom. I attempted to help him organize his paper mess on several occasions which meant helping him make piles of papers based on subject in order to discern what he may and may not have saved. However, this task was rather time-consuming and was difficult to address as regularly as needed. We discussed among the ELL teachers in particular that some of these necessary organizational tasks should be addressed in his academic study skills class; and there were on-going concerns about disjuncture between the ELL support and recommendations and the SpEd team’s interventions.

Recognizing some of these basic attending skills of being a conscientious student is an important starting point for understanding Raul’s performance and participation in the writing class. While I expected all students to be responsible for maintaining accurate and effective organizational systems, I had to consistently reconsider Raul’s performance in light of this issue and negotiate my expectations because he had serious difficulties with the basic work of being a student. These challenges were central to negotiating his learner identity, perceptions of teachers, and how he navigated his institutional role as a student in school spaces.

There was a continuing discussion in the ELL department about the effectiveness of the SpEd support model he received which gave focused attention on mainstream
content courses during his Academic Support class. Despite on-going budget issues that were threatening funds for bilingual tutors, ELL Department Head Ms. Rainee advocated staunchly for keeping important bilingual tutor positions which allowed Raul and other ELL students to receive native language support during Academic Support and in mainstream classes. Ironically, SpEd staff managing the Academic Support time commented with seeming frustration (or resentment) that Raul and the bilingual tutor would sit together and speak Spanish the whole time. This reflects a two-fold marginalization of Raul in SpEd spaces as being perceived as a linguistic Other which provided an unspoken justification for staff not to directly engage and support his learning tasks.

These illustrations of his membership and marginalization in these varied school spaces – mainstream, ELL, and SpEd – were a constant point of discussion and negotiation that directly impacted his academic identity as a student. While my ELL colleagues and I also shared responsibility in supporting Raul’s progress, there was on-going dissatisfaction in the ELL department with the SpEd department’s leadership in mediating Raul’s organizational and learning needs. In various interactions, the SpEd staff directly implied that he was not fulfilling his own organizational responsibilities and was not showing any investment in wanting to improve his academic performance. Interactions documented in field notes triangulate this tension of student expectations and student needs that grew over the year.

In the next section, I discuss how hip hop discourses were spaces of relationship and engagement with Raul that provided both challenges and opportunities within school spaces. Hip hop discourses provided a terrain for production of third spaces for Raul and
me to relate personally in school spaces and, in the process, offered opportunities to renegotiate his school identity.

**Part II: Negotiating Hip Hop Discourses in School Spaces**

An ethnographic appreciation of how Raul and I related through hip hop is a chronotopic backdrop to CDA analysis of the critical event presented in Part III of this chapter. As a starting point, it is relevant then to briefly describe my own identity in relation to hip hop culture along with Raul’s engagement with the hip hop community.

I am a long-time fan of hip hop culture but I do not per se consider myself an insider to this discourse or cultural community. I am an appreciative patron of the arts of hip hop. Also, I am allied to the positive forces of hip hop but I am not one who contributes to cultural production directly. By contrast, Raul was actively invested in the hip hop community, constantly plugged into the music, working and learning to DJ, wearing hip hop styles, producing social space imbued with hip hop discourses, and his hip hop hopes in writing about the future. Taken as a cultural difference between us, our interactions surrounding hip hop were shaped by abstract spaces rather than a shared identity; but our lived experiences intersected around hip hop in ways that allowed for renegotiations of identity in school spaces.

**Teaching Self: Appreciating/Appropriating Hip Hop Discourses**

It is relevant here to attempt to articulate my appropriation of hip hop aesthetics & discourses and its importance for my relationship with the focal student. I do so with intention to neither glorify nor trivialize hip hop in this narrative and analysis. Rather, in
line with the theoretical and methodological goals of this study, I explore how
close connections with hip hop discourses frame the chronotope of immigration and represent a
shared connection – a third space – between myself and one struggling ELL student.

Hip hop does not represent the community context or worldview that framed my
socialization. I grew up in a suburban, university town in the northeast United States
when hip hop was emerging in the 1970’s and 1980’s in the South Bronx of New York
City. I was a witness and fan to the growing arts and urban aesthetic that reached friends
around me, but hip hop did not define my coming of age. Like millions of other youth
back then following hip hop culture emerging on the East Coast and traveling to the West
Coast, I memorized the lyrics of Sugar Hill Gang’s *Rapper’s Delight*, the track that made
history as a commercial watershed for hip hop. I still listen to my deteriorating cassette
tapes of old school hip hop music from junior high and high school that play in low
fidelity on my first dilapidated boom box. I was never a performer of any hip hop arts
although I managed a decent back spin, practiced graffiti lettering on my notebooks,
mimicked beat box riffs, and could memorize my favorite jams. Yet, these were doings
of a cultural outsider.

My first teaching job in a public middle school of Washington, D.C. was my
urban immersion and introduction to education in “the hood”. It was the time when hip
hop became an urban aesthetic I appropriated around my work and living and one that
energized my experience. It was another experience of working with Central American
immigrant youth and observing their struggles and adaptation to American school and
community settings that were mostly African-American and dominated by hip hop
discourses among adolescents. Something about hip hop also echoed spaces and struggles
around me at that time – school spaces, community spaces, and personal spaces. Hip hop rhythms traveled with me during years living overseas, where, still in the urban grittiness of commutes and night shadows, I plugged into the urban pace of hip hop rhythms to keep me moving confidently down unknown sidewalks late at night. In the years following that I spent abroad, I also witnessed the global arrival of hip hop to influence youth and popular culture in places far away.

In the years preceding the school year of this study, I had been teaching, training and researching in urban school districts. I worked on research projects with university faculty, fellow doctoral students, and public school teachers that explored how teachers can incorporate hip hop genres in literacy instruction for urban youth. Teaching and researching in these settings resulted in studies and professional presentations centered on analyzing how hip hop discourses in school curriculum and instruction can produce third spaces for non-dominant students. I applied these interests in developing a summer communication course drawing from hip hop culture for students with special needs and learning disabilities, most of whom were middle class white kids, not the low-income minorities associated with hip hop. Coming off the second summer of teaching this communication course, I took the position as an ELL teacher at Cuttersville High School to teach communication and writing courses. I brought with me these personal and professional experiences surrounding hip hop and school learning which provided seeds for the abstract spaces of Comm.Unity that are at the heart of this classroom ethnography.

In this study I presume that deficit perspectives associated with Hip Hop are intertwined with deficit perspectives of non-dominant youth and in particular, of urban, low-income, communities of color (Nieto & Bode, 2008). As such, I am allied to efforts
aimed at political activism, consciousness raising, youth education, and transformative community visions through hip hop. While I would not claim to be on the front lines of these efforts, I offer my respect to those pushing this political work and positive social transformation. As pervasively as hip hop discourse has been appropriated by corporate media and consumerism, there are organic, community-oriented efforts that draw on the resistance roots and artistic elements as vehicles for community organizing, youth advocacy, and positive social change.

**Hip Hop Discourses in the Comm.Unity**

While I am wary of essentializing the influence of hip hop music on adolescent behavior and identity, it is important to tie up Raul’s personal experiences with these relevant themes that are portrayed and reflected in hip hop culture. While Hip hop discourses do not reflect a mainstream educational discourse, this does not imply any correlation between identifying with hip hop and not identifying with school. There is also no correlation between being academically unsuccessful as a result of such identification with hip hop. To the contrary, literature reviewed in Chapter 2 illustrates an increasing scholarship, advocacy and practice around recognizing hip hop as an important vehicle for academic and critical literacy development.

Forman’s (2002) characterization of spatialized discourses of hip hop and a sense of scale is illustrated in Raul’s identification with the Spanish mixed-dialect *reggaeton*, which is the musical genre coming out of transnational Latino communities of the continental U.S., Puerto Rico and other Caribbean and Central American communities (Rivera, Marshall, & Hernandez, 2009). Raul showed investment in hip hop culture
broadly, but the spatialized identity and discursive formations of reggaeton inscribed space with greater meaning for Raul as it touched on his cultural, linguistic and racialized identities in immigrant America.

We connected surrounding shared musical interests and we actively discussed and shared music, exchanging CDs and listening to music on each other’s iPods. Music is an on-going point of convergence for our teacher-student relationship, while simultaneously a point of struggle over the consistent attachment to his iPod and headphones; this seemed consistent in all his classes based on feedback from other teachers.

*Today in the computer lab we were working hard on the final drafts of our letters about the issue of busing homeless kids. Raul was working in the corner spot near the window. He was working fairly well, maintaining his concentration although as usual being distracted by his need for music. He said his iPod broke and so he was streaming music from a site. It is always a constant battle with him over the music, but that is his passion. (Field notes, April 4, 2007)*

As the above excerpt illustrates, the utilization of music in the classroom was a constant source of both productive and disruptive tension. On the one hand, music provided a reified funnel for more productive participation in academic tasks; it often helped keep him on task and was one of his study habits. That is another thing that he and I share, for I am always one to have music playing when reading and writing. However, the welcoming presence of music and allowing students at appropriate times to use music to help them focus on individual work also became problematic. Unlike some other teachers, I did not make the decision to restrict Raul from his music in the classroom context because I felt there was more potential for productive engagement than it posed challenges; although there certainly may have been times where a priority for academics should have overshadowed consideration of his personal identity and need for music as a
tool for keeping on task. Despite these on-going challenges, I tried to make connections between content and hip hop culture and the discourse communities it represents as a way of encouraging him to write around themes of personal interest, many being represented by and through hip hop culture.

“Un hombre tiene que ser real”: Keeping it Real in the Comm.Unity

Personal conversations with Raul surrounding music and life experiences over the year allowed me a sense of his flirtations since his arrival in the U.S. with an overarching discourse of hip hop, what could be nominalized as “street life”. Hip hop discourses portray and convey an urban experience of “the hood” that is marked by male-dominated themes that spawn strong critiques that hip hop is inherently misogynistic and violent. While engaging in a critical discussion of hip hop discourses is not central to this study, it is relevant to describe how these aspects of hip hop discourses are recurrent in Raul’s classroom participation and academic writing. As he wrote on a graffiti mural assignment we did for a unit on gender: “un hombre tiene que ser real”, which translates directly as “a man needs to be real”. This reflects discursively the notion of “keepin’ it real” which references in hip hop discourse the idea of authenticity and realism to the lived experiences that hip hop represents (Forman, 2002).

Broad content analysis of the data set shows themes of Raul’s participation and writing that is consistent with a discourse of “keeping it real” in terms of representing street life and performing a code of respect in interactions surrounding conflict. An example was Raul’s interest for an optional media assignment in investigating stories about the brutal transnational El Salvadoran gang MS13 that has received national media
attention in the U.S. He recounted to me that he was aware of their presence during his
time in Virginia where he lived after recently arriving in America. Many of the El
Salvadoran students described community settings back home where violence and
intimidation by different groups, government and civilian, was common. A major
contributing motivation for migrating to the U.S. was to flee the instability and violence
of post-conflict El Salvador that is one of the legacies of a decade-long civil war that saw
diplomatic end with 1992 peace accords.

The social commentary in Raul’s writing reflects a transnational awareness of the
marginalization and exploitation of poor communities in America and El Salvador, “my
two hoods” as he depicted on a poster presentation comparing his home and adopted
countries. For another unit on homelessness, youth, and education, he wrote in his
composition that homeless youth “are going to pay for what the parents are doing like be
in the streets … they can be killed and [nobody] will know because of gangs or drugs.”
Drug use was another theme in his classroom discourse of street life with his occasional
gestures or jokes about smoking weed and getting high. Perhaps, more than a reflection
of his habits, these remarks were likely intended more toward getting a reaction from
others which was a feature of Raul’s presence. On occasion, his cousin and classmate did
react to these drug references with innuendo as if there was truth to this behavior.

Raul was a very large, broad bodied young man with wide shoulders and a strong
physique. He played football at the beginning of the fall but had to quit because of low
grades which disappointed him. Despite his formidable size, he still had some remnants
of a youthful chubbiness. He could easily be taken as much older than his sixteen teenage
years. He could realistically pass as older and gain access and exposure to adult social
spaces and their male-dominant discourses. According to fellow teachers who knew his story since his arrival in middle school, Raul was reportedly taken by some uncles to social gatherings where there was drinking and he was supposedly even taken to an adult strip club.

Like most adolescent heterosexual males, Raul was interested in girls (and women). This was evident in his playfulness and occasional flirtatiousness with female classmates and his efforts to be the joker to gain their attention. He would also make inappropriate gendered comments or behavior that were misplaced in the social space and discourse of classroom interactions. This was a component of analysis of the Comm.Unity Conflict episode and Debrief Discussion in the previous chapter. An example was just before the female student began reading her immigration narrative while she was sitting in the center chair on stage, Raul pulled out a small digital camera and attempted to take her picture, explaining with a mischievous smile, “It is for my cousin,” as if to imply he was going to get them connected. Echoing principal critiques of hip hop discourses as male-dominated and exploitative, Raul’s gendered interactions such as this were another recurring source of tension in the social space of the classroom, often in a communicative chronotope of (mis)placed humor as discussed in the previous chapter.

**Acting Hard: Negotiating Codes of Respect**

Another aspect of Raul’s male-oriented discourse was an invoking of a *street life* discourse in the classroom space by “acting hard”, or taking on a self-confident disposition of being tough. While I would not describe Raul as outwardly aggressive, I
am sure his behavior could be intimidating for other Comm.Unity members because of differing cultural norms of behavior and his occasional discursive performances of being obnoxious or acting hard. In one very telling exchange during a unit on race and ethnicity, we were discussing a homework exercise in which students had to think about using language strategically in a social interaction when faced with racial prejudice or discrimination.

One Korean student named Hyun related a recent personal experience in a Math class when a white student stereotyped him along the “model minority myth”, saying that “all Asians are good at math” and that is why he didn’t like Asians. (According to Hyun, apparently the other student wasn’t doing so well in the class.) In reaction to this scenario, I invited the other students to brainstorm how they might respond in this situation. Raul was the first to interject that he would fight the person in defense of “my people”, which could be interpreted as Salvadorans specifically or Latinos generally. When I pressed him further to think of his choices and the consequences of fighting, his defensive reaction was only a sarcastic retort, “What I am going to do? Tell the teacher? If I did that, I would be, like, stupid!”

Raul was invoking a “code of respect” that was outside an institutional behavioral code governing school spaces. He rejects the option of deferring to the teacher’s institutional authority and power to mediate this racial conflict, dismissing the thought of turning to the teacher for support which would only reflect poorly on himself (as soft). Within the classroom Comm.Unity, however, I took opportunity to engage him directly within the academic content and task of practicing the use of language for such strategic social situations of dealing with racism. I challenged him to think about his choices,
recognize that they have consequences, and that an aggressive response is not necessarily going to be the best thing for “your people.” After a few exchanges, I disengaged from him directly to avoid shaping group discussion too much based on his reactionary comment. I turned the question to other students to react to Raul’s comment by sharing alternate responses and strategic uses of language. This presented the opportunity for Raul and others to think more critically about negotiating a “code of respect” and facing racial discrimination they experience as immigrants in school, community and workplace settings.

**Tensions of Multiple Identities in School Spaces**

The home and school tensions surrounding Raul’s DJing and other nightlife activities came to a head during an IEP meeting in January. The outreach worker related that this was a source of tension with his mother who was having difficulty monitoring Raul’s social activity. She worked long, evening hours, and sometimes on weekends, which compounded parenting challenges of being available to guide Raul’s time out of school. She related that he was resistant and did not comply with her wishes against activities and social settings that might expose him to drinking alcohol and other social pressures. When his mother shared her concerns to all in the meeting; she also reassured everyone in the room “*que es una buena persona*” (that he is a good person). There was a tense exchange that followed when a bilingual tutor who worked closely with Raul also shared directly about him DJing in a club being problematic while making critical comments about his lack of engagement and performance in school. However, it was clear to him that coming home at 5:00 a.m. on a Monday morning was not cool,
especially when he came in late and tired to school only after the ELL department head called the house to check in on his late arrival during first period. Unfortunately, the team leader did not make any attempts to ask Raul about his interest in music and DJing as an important and relevant endeavor.

Immediately following the meeting I discussed the issue with him directly and in the privacy of the side hallway near the ELL department space where he often would hide out when he got confused about his class schedule or did not want to go to the cafeteria. I explained that I understood how important the experience was because of his passion for hip hop music and that it was also a great opportunity to learn the skills of DJing working with his uncle. He recounted that, after the club closed, he was brought along by his uncle to eat with some girls whom he described as ‘crazy’, suggesting his excited reaction to their dancing style and other social behavior. We discussed directly that even though he loved DJing this was not something he could continue because there is no way he can be ready for school being out so late on Sundays. This was especially an issue of disrespecting the wishes of his mother. At the end of our conversation following the IEP meeting, Raul admitted to me that he knew it was problematic and he would eventually have to stop DJing at the Pacific Club which he did. I would guess that the all staff involved was relieved to have Raul removed from this night club scene and with fewer distractions to interfere with school obligations. While I was also concerned for him, I was disappointed for him, knowing how hip hop excited and engaged him with himself and the world.
A Low Note with the Law: Community Service (Learning)

During the spring, Raul got arrested for shoplifting CDs at a local electronics/media store. He was given a probation officer and was sentenced to community service at a site that was yet to be identified. Out of concern that this was putting Raul further “at-risk” in and out of school, the ELL staff discussed and recommended to the SpEd team the possibility of arranging community service in the school which would keep him engaged at school and would create opportunity for additional academic support. From the ELL department perspective, there was a lack of response on this recommendation and little advocacy in support of Raul and his mother in finding a site for his court-mandated community service. He eventually did his community service with a local astronomy association setting up telescopes on Saturday mornings for public viewing in the downtown area. I ran into him one sunny day in town and he said that it was working out, that the old man supervising him was nice, and he liked being outside and seeing people.

On different occasions during this community service period, Raul did confide in me about the tensions he felt in wanting to have material things. Material wealth is another clear theme of hip hop discourses, portrayed in lyrics and videos that glorify a luxurious lifestyle that comes from “making it”. Ever-growing hip hop fashion industries and increasingly influential commercial media increasingly fuel the “bling bling” themes of material wealth. He shared with me in confidence about experiences of impulse and premeditation upon entering a store. Yet, he divulged this to explain that while he had these thoughts that he could just steal it, “but then I couldn’t do it! I couldn’t do it!” he said with a wide-eyed, surprised expression at overcoming the struggle of conscience.
I qualify my narration of Raul’s legal incident for fear of further reproducing deficit perspectives of an ‘at risk’ immigrant, ELL student, or of hip hop as a negative influence. Although materialism is a vein of hip hop discourses, I do not claim Raul’s shoplifting incident was the result of his investment or identification in hip hop or a manifestation of him “keeping it real”. It is a common impulse for adolescents to want things, and the temptation to steal is also arguably rather common for adolescents of all backgrounds. However, in Raul’s story, it reinforces a vulnerability related to his socioeconomic reality and class experience in the chronotopes of his immigration narrative.

In the next section, I analyze a critical event and map shifting chronotopes of immigration represented in teacher-student discourse. The chronotope of Raul’s hip hop hopes represents his immigrant “American Dream” and his pursuit of a better life through a life in music. Critical discourse analysis illustrates how shifts in chronotopes facilitate a (re)negotiation of identity for Raul as an immigrant youth and a student in school spaces.
LIFE BEFORE In El Salvador

My last school was something that I am never going to forget, because there were many things that I liked about it. The name of the Salvadorian school was Escuela Superior.

I did many things that were wrong but I just loved it, because that was the time that I was alone just with my grandmother. My parents were in the United States, making money for my sister and me, and my sister was studying in el Instituto Nacional de La Tecnología.

She lived in our house (Moreno’s HOUSE) and I lived with my grandmother. I lived in two places my grandmother’s and my house. In front of our houses lived my best friends Joshua and Gabriel.

When my mom decided to bring me to the U.S I was so happy because my dream was becoming real but, at the same time I was feeling so sad because I was leaving my country maybe forever. my beautiful country; where I might never return.

THE JOURNEY

I made the trip to America alone which was scary. It took me one month and fifteen days, from La Castilla, Provincia Norte, E.S. to Springtown, VA. I was 12 years old when I made my journey to the U.S.A. I left my home on March thirty first. My birthday is June 15 so I turned 13 years old some where along the way, but I don’t
remember where I it was, I think it was in Puebla Mexico. When I was in El Salvador and I passed across the border from Guatemala to Mexico, they made me throw away every thing like my two jeans and my 3 t-shirts so all I had left was my one t-shirt and a pair of jean. I crossed the border of Guatemala to Mexico with chairs in my back so the border watchers thought that I went to buy those chairs in Guatemala so they thought that I was form Mexico. But my other partners had to walk 8-10 hours to cross that border, so I feel so lucky about what happened that I just walked 15 minutes and the others walked 8-10 hours just to cross the border.

**LIFE in AMERICA**

I have many hopes for my new life here in America. One of the reasons is that I should get my license to drive legally, so I could buy my car and achieve my dream, be a famous reggaeton Dj of all the world because music is of the few things that I like. Reggaeton a kind of music that is made from basic beats of hip hop, reggae, dancehall and all the Latin rhythms like bachata, merenge, salsa and cumbias. I will get so much money with this kind of music that makes a lot of money because it is one of most selling discs in the entire world. Also I like a lot of rapping and I wish I could be a rapper to defend all my Latin people. But when I am playing at the club it’s really good that people are moving to the song of my beats and it feels really good that I could be famous some day and get a mansion with many kids and a wife. What I am feeling in the USA, is that people can get a lot of opportunities working really hard to make it. But if you are just coming to have fun, it can make you pay the consequence, like getting in the jail and being deported or even dying because there is a lot of violence in the best cities. Being in peace all depends on who you are and what you are doing. If are you doing something good, then good is going to happen to you. That’s what my experiences have taught me.
Part III: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Hip Hop Hopes

In this section I focus analysis on Raul’s immigration narrative (Figures 11 & 12) and a critical event of teacher-student interaction during the writing process. I will first describe teacher and student challenges in Raul’s writing process for this immigration narrative. This is important for illustration, consideration and critique of this analysis of Raul’s classroom experience, renegotiation of student identity and the production of school space. Second, I characterize the chronotope of hip hop hopes that is threaded through Raul’s writing. Third, CDA analysis of the critical event follows in detail to explore a focused teacher-student interaction that scaffolded Raul’s academic and critical literacy in communicating his immigration identity.

“The Journey” of the Immigration Narrative

Raul’s composition from the immigration unit met similar organizational challenges of lost pre-writing and a string of absences that set him back in his writing process. The writing was broken up in ‘before, ‘during’ and ‘after’ stages of their narrative, with trips to the computer lab scheduled in to put the pieces of the narrative together. This was done in parallel with the reading of the sample narrative of an immigrant teen story subdivided in ‘before’, ‘during’ and ‘after’ segments. However, as the unit progressed, Raul fell behind in the drafting stages, I was concerned that he would not be able to complete the composition. Due to disorganization of the papers, he was not able to submit all required writing process steps that supported the composing of the final draft.
In the “during” portion of writing about his journey to America, he lost his paragraph writing template somewhere in the disarray of papers in his backpack. This pre-writing exercise was a cooperative activity that generated notes and sequenced ideas for composition organized in a graphic organizer. This was terribly inconvenient and unfortunate when his notes from pre-writing exercises such as this were not available to him when we arrived at scheduled time in the computer lab. This was the case for writing the ‘during’ portion of his narrative and teacher and student are together faced with this challenge of effectively having to start over right in the computer lab. We did another pre-writing brainstorm on paper given Raul needed such scaffolding activities to activate prior knowledge, generate language, and outline a sequence of ideas for composition. As I asked him some basic questions about his experiences traveling to America, he shared more amazing details of his experience and I guided him in recording them in his paragraph template. In brainstorming discussions, he was encouraged to develop relevant ideas that he may not initially feel confident about or recognize as rich ideas for his academic composition or perhaps not see as relevant to his school task. These personal conversations were important for helping Raul bring his experiences out and onto the page.

He recollected proudly in conversation and in composition the amazing details of his experience of *Coming to America*. He opened this second part with a short but powerful topic sentence, followed by the simple details of his age and his recollection of the exact number of days of “The Journey”. “*I made the trip to America alone [which] was scary. It took me one month and fifteen days from El Castillo, Provincia Norte, El Salvador to Springtown, Virginia. I was 12 years old when I made my journey to the*
U.S.A.” While unfortunately not uncommon for the poor and often illegal immigrants, these simple facts alone highlight the lived spaces of physical and geographic migration that students can bring to the classroom.

He recounted in pre-writing discussion and incorporated in his composition his amazing story of crossing the Guatemalan-Mexican border. The handlers assisting him instructed him that he should carry chairs on his back to give the impression he was just returning from market rather than illegally crossing the border. Another powerful detail that resulted from that brainstorming conversation was how he was forced to discard all his belongings which he retold as “my two jeans and my 3 t-shirts so all I had left was my one t-shirt and a pair of jeans.” These details that strengthen his narrative were teased out in personal conversation as the scaffolding for Raul to write down his pre-writing ideas. This type of scaffolding is effective for all learners, important for second language learners, but even more crucial given Raul’s his “non-specific disability in writing”.

One instructional decision I made in this writing process was to allow him to rework his previous unfinished New Years Hopes essay. In this unfinished work, he talked about his dreams of becoming a hip hop DJ so we negotiated how he could continue developing these ideas and incorporate it as the ‘After’ part of his immigration story. When he recounted to me on different occasions about his real world experiences DJing in a hip hop club, it was quite clear that being part of these social and cultural spaces was not just exciting, but also fulfilling and validating because he got to DJ. He wrote about “doing his dream job”: “I was DJing on December 31st, new years; I was at the Pacific Club seeing all the people dancing. I felt so good.” He beamed with smiles and a pride restrained in his stoic stature with his head gently nodding when sharing with
me what it is like to see people “grooving to my music.” He claims an artistic identity that comes with creating something with one’s skills and musical sensibilities, something that makes one feel good. These hip hop hopes were the heart of his immigration narrative.

He reinvested himself in that draft and was able to expand his ideas considerably. He incorporated more descriptive supporting details in defining reggaeton’s musical genealogy “from basic beats of hip hop, reggae, dancehall and all the Latino rhythms like bachata, merengue, salsa and cumbias.” Aside from the material wealth of musical success, he claimed his cultural pride to become a famous rapper to “defend all my Latin people”. In his last paragraph, he connects his ideas of his musical dreams to the larger immigrant ideologies of Coming to America. While he echoes clichés of achieving the American dream through hard work, Raul is also aware that “if you are just coming to have fun, it can make you pay the consequences, like getting in jail and being deported or even dying because there is a lot of violence in the best cities.” Raul concluded his immigration narrative with a bit of philosophy about: “Being in peace all depends on who you are and what you are doing.”

Leaving Home Behind: “I ain’t gonna get another chance to come here”

Debrief discussion during Raul’s Community Café reading came with some interesting feedback and exchange despite Raul’s rather reserved presence on stage. The transcript below (Table 15) follows interactions and discussion during Feedback #1, handled by Hyo Ji, and Feedback #2 by Antonia. These exchanges underscore important
understandings of Raul’s immigration experience and developing identities. In the first place, Hyo Ji recognized the clear theme of music and Raul’s dreams of being a DJ.

Table 15. Transcript: Feedback Session on Raul’s Immigration Narrative

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transcript: “I ain’t gonna get another chance to come here”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. T:</td>
<td>So, feedback, number 1. Warm feedback on a cold day. (<em>BA is swiveling the chair gently</em>). One thing that you liked about his reading?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. HJ</td>
<td>He wants to be a DJ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. T:</td>
<td>He wants to be a DJ? So why, why do you like that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. HJ:</td>
<td>Because it is his dream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. T:</td>
<td>So, you liked that he talked about his dream as one of the opportunities [ ] for his life here in America. (<em>Raul swiveling in the chair to face K on his right side</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. HJ</td>
<td>Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. T:</td>
<td>Do you think that is an easy dream to accomplish? (<em>to K</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. HJ:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. T:</td>
<td>No? It will take a lot of work, right? (<em>Addressing K</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. RM:</td>
<td>Yep. (<em>breaking into a wide grin and readjusting his position in the chair</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. T:</td>
<td>Ok. Good. Number 2? (<em>looking toward AG</em>) Number 2, you have one question. Something you want to know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. EV:</td>
<td>Can I go to the bathroom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. T:</td>
<td>To what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. EV:</td>
<td>Bathroom. (<em>Teacher nods. Student gets up and exits quietly</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. AG:</td>
<td>When he says that he will never go back to his country. Why did he say that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. RM:</td>
<td>I don’t know (<em>mumbled quietly in the direction of AG</em>). Because I am illegal. So- (<em>his face breaks quickly into a grin, his eyebrows gesture up, and he rolls the chair forward and re-shifts his position</em>, //I don’t know// (<em>voice tapering off</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. T:</td>
<td>//Why you will never// go back to El Salvador, because you are illegal here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. RM:</td>
<td>Yeea. (<em>looking down at his paper</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. AG:</td>
<td>So?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. T:</td>
<td>Would that prevent you from going?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. RM</td>
<td>Because I ain’t gonna get another chance to come here. And I //don’t have-//</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. T:</td>
<td>//So, since you// are here illegally, you might not get to come back?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. RM:</td>
<td>Naaa. (<em>shaking his head slightly, with a straight expression</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. RM:</td>
<td>And also, I don’t need it, so- (<em>shakes head, shrugs shoulders</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. T:</td>
<td>You don’t need what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. RM:</td>
<td>To go back to my country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. T:</td>
<td>So, you are feeling like the opportunities you have //now are// the ones you want to, [] to keep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. RM:</td>
<td>(<em>nodding his head, pursing his lips</em>) //Yea// (<em>quietly</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. RM:</td>
<td>I don’t want to go back (<em>looking down</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. T:</td>
<td>I mean, that’s fine. That may change, right?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moreover, there was a quick, but definitive affirmation by Raul in Line 10 that the path to achieving his dream will entail hard work. It was reinforced later in the debrief commenting that Raul’s passion for music was something that we all shared. Secondly, Raul’s response to Antonia’s questions about not returning home to El Salvador illustrates a further complexity of the immigrant experience. Raul was rather decided that he did not want to go back to his country, repeating the statement several times in the exchange for emphasis. It was the fear of his “illegal” status being a vulnerable position, so much so that he was more concerned with maintaining his life in America over the opportunity to return home.

This perspective of seeing himself rooted in the space-time of America rather than in his home country is an important reality that he had apparently realized. As he wrote in his immigration narrative of how he knew when he left that it was possibly for good:

*When my mom decided to bring me to the U.S. I was so happy because my dream was becoming real but, at the same time I was feeling so sad because I was leaving my country maybe forever, my beautiful country; where I might never return (Raul Moreno, Immigration Narrative composition).*

In the next section, I analyze a critical spatial event and map shifting chronotopes of immigration represented in teacher-student discourse. The chronotope of Raul’s hip hop hopes represents his immigrant “American Dream” and his pursuit of a better life through a life in music. Critical discourse analysis illustrates how shifts in chronotopes facilitate a (re)negotiation of identity for Raul as an immigrant youth and a student in school spaces.
Hip Hop Hopes: Analysis of a Critical Spatial Event

This analysis of a critical spatial event with Raul was identified and transcribed in the interaction entitled “Hip Hop Hopes” (Table 16). Analysis of both space-time scales and temporalities provided clues to later identifying the discursive boundaries of interactional units. I conducted a line-by-line analysis of transcript interactions with an attention to the communicative functions of each interlocutor to identify the particular discursive meanings being negotiated and their implications for social identities being animated in classroom space (Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, & Shuart-Faris, 2005). I revisited in a recursive fashion each of these different spatial analyses across the transcript, revising and deepening analysis in order to identify discursive boundaries and interactional units (Table 17; Table 20 Appendix B).
**Table 16. Transcript: Hip Hop Hopes**

*Transcript: Hip Hop Hopes*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>T: So what are you working on?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>RM: My essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>T: So you are on the computer right now? So, you need help with anything? You got an idea about the pieces?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>RM: I am working on my music, my rapping, my hopes <em>(point to different writing on the computer screen)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>T: There you go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>RM: I am working on my music, my rapping, my hopes <em>(point to different writing on the computer screen)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>T: There you go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>T: Why? You got a reason. This is about you figuring it out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>T: Why? What do you love about reggaeton?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>RM: Huh? <em>(Staring at the floor)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>T: Why do you love, why do you love music? Why do you love hip hop and reggaeton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>RM: I don’t know, the beats, hip hop and …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>T: What does it tell you about the world?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>RM: It tells you many things happening in the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>T: Like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>RM: Like, the government is always cheating about us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>RM: That people are from minus class, little class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>T: Lower class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>RM: Yea, lower class. They just think that we are like nothing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>BA: That’s just what I think … <em>(breaking into a smile, changing tone)</em> and also I like the dance, how vareo <em>(lit. shaking; undetermined)</em> is it… Yeah. <em>(sweeping his head to the side)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>T: So how does that relate to you and coming to America?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>T: You came to America, you had a difficult journey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>T: You found reggaeton, you found music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>RM: No, well that was already here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>T: But you found it. It was something that you found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>RM: I think about that kind of music in my future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>RM: That is something that is important to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>T: How do you think you can make it part of your future?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>T: What do you think you will have to do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>T: Because people always talk about coming to America, there’s lots of opportunities, but nobody is going to show up at your doorstep with a record contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>T: What have you been doing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>RM: I have been trying to mix music;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>RM: so my cousin can put it on in his dancing parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>T: So start DJing parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>RM: Start DJing, yea,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>T: And you have a connection, you know somebody that owns a club, so you get to go and DJ a little bit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>T: What is the feeling that you are get when you are out there?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
Table 16. Transcript: Hip Hop Hopes (Continued)

| 39. RM:   | People are dancing, it’s so cool. When people can come together to your music. That feels really good. music. That feels really good. |
| 40. T:    | How does that make you feel? |
| 41. RM:   | Really good |
| 42. RM    | People enjoy the music, my music |
| 43. T:    | You got everybody up there moving and jumping and having a good time. |
| 44. RM:   | Yea |
| 45. T:    | Yea, so that’s something that makes you fulfilled |
| 46. T:    | So that’s something about you making that as part of your profession, |
| 47. T:    | hopefully we have jobs that we love to do also, |
| 48. RM:   | Yea |
| 49. T:    | It makes working … right. |
| 50. T:    | You don’t want to have a teacher that hates teaching. |
| 51. RM:   | Nooo! |
| 52. T:    | because they won’t be a very good teacher. |
| 53. T:    | So you know, anyway … |
| 54. T:    | So that’s something right there. It makes people, when people are dancing – |
| 55. T:    | Put that in there! |
| 56. RM:   | *(Raul turns back to computer, puts hands to keyboard to type)* |
| 57. T:    | That’s why I asked you. I didn’t ask you because … –right? *(T pats him gently on the shoulder; slight laughter)* |
| 58. T:    | *(Continues talking to Ss who is facing the computer)* We were talking about your life in America and your hopes for your music. |
| 59. T:    | What did you just explain to me. |
| 60. T:    | You love it when people are dancing. How does it make you feel, right? That’s hopeful, what you just told me. When you make people move and dance. That gives you hope, joy, happiness. *(Teacher walks away from student, and student remains seated at computer and typing)* |

I also utilize a related spatial concept of *space-time scales* (Harvey, 1996, 2006) that were indexed in the interaction to identify the discursive representations of local and global space-times. As analysis reflects in the chronotope map (Figure 13), there is a movement of discursive interaction from local space-times of the present school task and students’ personal experience to the global scale of the immigration chronotope and experiences of marginalization and oppression. The blending of the local and the global become hybridized in third space where discursive meanings are woven into student experience at a ‘glocal’ space (Kraidy, 1999) of the hip hop community and his DJ identity which serves to resituate student identity within the focal writing task. “We need
to understand how the identities of students and teachers are always ‘glocalized,’ hybridized though dynamic geographies and temporalities seemingly distance from a place called school” (Leander, 2001, p 642)

Table 17. Interactional Units: Hip Hop Hopes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interactional Units: Hip Hop Hopes (IUs1-12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. INTERACTIONAL UNIT 1 – Student on-task, teacher moves to scaffold student writing; Student establishes hip hop discourse and interspatial links to future hope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. INTERACTIONAL UNIT 2 – Teacher takes up hip hop discourse and scaffolds student reflection on investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. INTERACTIONAL UNIT 3 – Teacher shifts inquiry to discursive level of hip hop as textual representation of the world; Student signals marginalized as ‘low class’ and social critique in global chronotope of systemic injustice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. INTERACTIONAL UNIT 4 – Student discursively reverts and situates himself on the margins, underscoring his perspective based in lived experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. INTERACTIONAL UNIT 5 – Teacher redirects to immigration narrative, proposes/acknowledged an interspatiality of immigration &amp; American dream; scaffolding academic task at hand;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. INTERACTIONAL UNIT 6 – Student restates interspatiality of hip hop and his future goals; teacher prompts his reflection on agency in fulfilling mythologized American dream and present activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. INTERACTIONAL UNIT 7: Teacher prompts student to think about present activities; recognizes student membership in hip hop discourse community; invites student lived experience into school discourse, task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. INTERACTIONAL UNIT 8 – Teacher prompts student reflection on lived space of DJing a dance party (i.e. emotional experience, personal fulfillment); repositions student within chronotope of dance party as powerful, influential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. INTERACTIONAL UNIT 9 – Teacher recharacterizes the dance party chronotope as ‘fulfillment’ for a DJ, and constituting a professional aspiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. INTERACTIONAL UNIT 10: Shifts to global time-space of having enjoyable work (i.e. labor of love)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. INTERACTIONAL UNIT 11 – Teacher uses hypothetical parallel to teaching as a ‘labor of love’ to validate students’ passion, fulfillment as DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. INTERACTIONAL UNIT 12 – Shift back to teacher scaffolding writing task with explicit summary of ideas and instruction to include in text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Scaffolding Critical Literacy (IUs2-4)**

Detailed transcript analysis (Table 18) appended at the end of the chapter illustrates how the teacher and student negotiate this relationship in immigrant discourses of his hip hop dreams and the American dream (IUs2-4). The teacher prompts the student to explicitly reflect on the discursive meanings he draws from hip hop. When probed for the reason why he ‘loves’ hip hop, the student is not able to immediately articulate a reason (Table 18: L2, 7). Raul’s inability to immediately explain his preferences could reflect a very common difficulty most people experience when asked to comment on something that is so familiar to them that they have never thought of or had to reflect on their own emotions, thoughts, or beliefs. The teacher-student scaffolding in this stage in the writing also aims to bridge the distance between hip hop discourses (unofficial) with the present context of school and academic tasks (official) as the writing assignment.

The teacher scaffolded persistently in drawing out an explanation of an emotional (“love”) attachment to hip hop culture (L1, 3, 4, 6). The teacher pushes Raul toward articulating his own interests in hip hop by stating that he has a reason which can be inferred as a valid and justified reason to identify with hip hop and reggaeton (L3). Here the teacher’s discourse connects his academic purpose with the personal purpose of his own self-awareness and sense of self in relationship to hip hop culture. “This is about you figuring it out.” The teacher’s scaffolding in (L3) is significant in that it connects micro-local spaces of self and identity with the lived spaces of experience and participation in social communities. One’s sense of membership and identity shapes our role in the process of spatial production. The attempts of the teacher to scaffold the connection of
personal, emotional spaces with an official (and conceptual) space of academic writing help facilitate production of transformative third spaces in teacher-student discourse.

Upon follow up questioning, Raul mentions ‘the beats’ (L7), which is the craft of the DJ and the domain of the DJ’s artistic and discursive power. It is a reference to the material aesthetics of sound and pulsing rhythms that drive production of space on the dance floor. This is the work of the DJ to produce a sonic space that spurs movement carried in rhythm. In line 15, he segues back to his idea and reiterates this reason he loves DJing because it makes him feel great that people can “come together to my music”. He establishes the emotional connections of living spaces of community in and through hip hop, and this being one source of fulfillment that fuels “social dreaming” (Gutiérrez, 2008) with hope for the future.

In IU3, the teacher changes his line of inquiry by asking directly about how hip hop discourses are representative of a critical literacy that helps Raul ‘read the world’. Invoking a raising of critical consciousness, the teacher asks directly about hip hop as social critique: “What does it tell you about the world?” (L8). The space-time shift in teacher discourse (L7, 8) provides interesting and varying interpretations of how space-times are introduced and retracted and what meanings and identities are possible in teacher-student discourse. From one perspective, the teacher’s discursive shift in Line 8 failed to pick up on the student’s connection to the “beats” and rhythms of hip hop which he finally shared in Line 7 and returns to in Line 15. However, an alternative interpretation is that the discursive move by the teacher further opens a dialogic space for the student voice of resistance to a space-time of governmentality (Foucault, 1980), which is a national and global space-time.
The student responds with a social critique about inequitable class politics and a social position as “low class” (L12-14) that is oppressed by a government that “is always cheating about us” (L11). Here the community of ‘us’ could refer to low-income communities in general, a global ‘poor’, or more specifically to the Salvadoran or Latino immigrant community with which he identifies with. This indictment of government is somewhat implicit in his own lived experiences of marginalization and hardship both in his home country and as an immigrant in the U.S. Raul’s personal narrative of unaccompanied migration and illegal border crossings reflects common circumstances of the marginalized poor as the non-dominant segments of society that are positioned inequitably in public spaces. During the course of the school year, he, like many of the students, was engaged in legal procedures related to immigration status. In Raul’s legal proceedings to get his immigration status legalized in America, he was simultaneously involved in applying to get a Salvadoran passport as well. Interestingly, in the case of Raul, there were key points in the school year in which he reached excessive absences due to legal appointments and his and his family’s confusion on providing proper notification to the school.

Fairclough (2003) explains that space-time are socially constructed and represented in texts as well as constitute a linking of different scales of social life (Harvey, 1996). In this example, Raul animates a discourse of marginality in a space-time of inequitable class politics in which the government does not equally represent the interests of all its citizens equally. His immigrant identity and lived spaces (Lefebvre, 1991; Soja, 1996) of a physical migration over land are rooted in material spaces of poverty. He makes an indictment of government from his subject position as ‘low class’
stating plainly that ‘they think that we are like nothing’ (L14). His choice of pronoun ‘they’ represents the presumption of relationships among people, that ‘they’ the government is run by people although his discourse of oppressor and oppressed fits an ‘us-and-them’ paradigm quite plainly. In the subsequent line, he qualifies his position, or repositions himself in the classroom chronotope, stating that this is ‘just what I think’. His tapering voice and body language reflect a message that he is not in his place to critique the system especially not from within the official spaces of the school and classroom. The chronotope of inequitable government is a recurrent theme in the data set that I hope to explore more deeply as related to discourses of immigration and students’ negotiation of their immigrant identity.

(Re)negotiating the DJ and the Teacher: Profession and Passion

The subsequent interactional units of the transcript show a shift in chronotopes that reflect a discursive movement across time and space. This also affirms the student’s musical dreams and positions him and the teacher on equal ground being passionate about their work. These chronotopic shifts and renegotiations of student identity are represented in mapping of space-time shifts (Figures 12). Through the remaining interactional units, we trace a shifting of chronotopes that allows space for diverse student identities to be incorporated in classroom work. In IUs5-6, it prompts a time-space shift from the students’ hip hop hopes of the future to the chronotope of immigration which is the focus of the composition. As the teacher relates the chronotope of the students’ personal immigration and his discovery of hip hop, the student shifts the time-space stating that hip hop music is important to his future. IU7 shows a time-space
shift to the present as the teacher prompts the student to reflect on what he can do to work toward this future goal which sets up an invitation to talk about his present activities as a DJ (IU8). With several time/tense shifts, the teacher critique’s the immigration myth of the American Dream building discursively on the students’ previous reflection on hip hop as critical literacy by nominalizing America as a ‘nobody’ that is not going to ‘show up at your doorstep’.

The chronotopic shift of IU8 takes the exchange into the time-space of a hip hop club and Raul’s current activities as a DJ mixing music. These exchanges within the club chronotope are significant as the teacher prompts the student to reflect on the emotional sensation - the lived spaces - of making people ‘come together’ and ‘move to my music’. This repositions the students as hip hop DJ; as an important and central community member in hip hop; and, as the one who produces the musical space of the hip hop dance party. Ironically, the students’ sense of importance within the club time-space reflects a principal third space tension of the study; the students’ strong investment in hip hop, and; the teachers encouragement and attempts to build academic literacy from those lived spaces. Yet, an eventual hip hop-home-school conflict re-positions both teacher and student within dominant institutional spaces that discourage the DJ.

IUs9-11 are also significant in repositioning the student as having valid professional aspirations as a DJ, affirming that making music and making people move is personal fulfilling which is of great importance in choosing a profession that is a ‘labor of love’. The teacher makes chronotopic parallel to students not wanting a teaching that doesn’t like teaching to which he answers ‘No!’ This shift to the chronotope of fulfillment of teachers – and, therefore, myself as his teacher – can also be interpreted as
a statement about the current interaction as fulfilling and that my relationship with him is fulfilling. In making this chronotopic parallel of the DJ and the teacher as having equally fulfilling ‘labors of love’, it puts the DJ and the teacher on equal professional ground and in discursive space within the classroom space. Nevertheless, in interactional unit 12, the teacher quickly shifts back to the present academic task and the time-space of the writing assignment. As it appears that the student has lost the focus on the conversation as scaffolding for his writing assignment, the teacher proceeds to review the key ideas that were discussed, underscoring in particular the emotional reflections of the student on his sense of fulfillment and hope in making people dance and move: “That gives you hope, joy, happiness.”
Figure 13. Chronotope Map: Hip Hop Hopes
Discussion: Engaging and Accommodating Raul in the Writing Process

The description above of Raul’s writing process is characteristic of what we struggled with all year long. His persistent disorganization was partially reflective of an uncoordinated support plan and other likely issues still undiagnosed. Our collective inability to get him organized, despite many efforts from numerous people, illustrated how he was caught in the in-between spaces of SpEd and ELL program. Since his papers were persistently in disarray, he could not draw on his brainstormed ideas from pre-writing exercises to develop a coherent composition essay from his notes. His memory issues, coupled with a disorganized backpack, made it logical to consider how to accommodate his writing process and engage him in producing spaces of meaning and identity in telling his story. It is a story of Hip Hop Hopes.

These details of Raul’s writing process and the text of his immigration narrative illustrate tensions between accommodation and engagement in mediating his classroom presence. Engaging and accommodating Raul’s identity as a student, located in marginalized spaces of SpEd and ELL, entailed inviting and accommodating his active and constructive participation in classroom discourse while mediating characteristic issues of impulsivity, (mis)placed humor, and social conflict. This was central to the analysis of the Comm.Unity Conflict and Debrief Discussion laid out in Chapter 5.

The chronotope of ‘mediating Raul’ was a pedagogical challenge. Raul’s behavior overall was highlighted by many constructive and supportive interactions with the teacher and others. However, any resistant or disengaged behaviors that Raul was prone to and irritated by academic frustrations were communicated in and through social spaces that contributed to tensions in the Comm.Unity. As analysis in Chapter 5 illustrates,
mediating Raul was a process of both holding him accountable to Group Norms while also facilitating the Debrief Discussion away from focusing on the micro-local space of him as the nexus of conflict. Classroom discourse retreated to the global in order to highlight the overarching chronotope of communication as it relates to the varying chronotopes of immigration and students’ multiple situated identities as students, family members, parents, and employees.

In terms of Raul’s immigrant and community identities, this analysis illustrates the opportunities in engaging him through hip hop discourses and accommodating his self-expression in ‘writing the worlds’ he has seen and envisions. Raul’s personal immigration narrative reflects an adolescent that has endured an arduous journey to arrive in school in America. These lived experiences index space-times of oppression in the chronotope of immigration, producing micro-local spaces of self that are confronted with abstract (second) spaces of SpEd and ELL as institutional locations and spatialized identities. These marginalized locations in the school landscape transform the materiality of school through spatial practices of education which, for Raul, included difficulty in following confusing, rotating schedules that caused him to plan on the wrong lunch. These first spaces relegate Raul to skipping lunch to hide in the side hallways. There were many of these days when I invited Raul to hang out in the classroom to relax and catch up on life, on music, on homework. The critical spatial event of ‘Hip Hop Hopes’ analyzed represents one of those days.

In the this chapter, I provided a closer ethnographic portrait of Raul as a case study within the shared group space of Comm.Unity and his role in the production of third space in the classroom. I described his multiple school and non-school identities,
often colliding with tensions in social space and being renegotiated in the classroom. I also articulated our relationship in and through hip hop discourses in the classroom. In part three of the chapter, CDA analysis illustrates how teacher-student discourse repositions Raul in relation to learning tasks, thereby, renegotiating a positive relationship between his immigrant identity and his marginalizing institutional identities (i.e. ELL, SpEd). It is in the juxtaposition of these different mediations of Raul that I aim to illustrate how classroom discourse can index diverse space-times that reach lived spaces of an immigrant student’s experience. The dissonance between these contending spaces of Self, as derivative of social interactions with Others, represent third space tensions that can (re)negotiate immigrant student identities in the classroom.

In the next chapter I will provide an overall summary of the study, draw conclusions, and outline implications for theory, research, and practice in education of non-dominant students.
Table 18. Transcript Analysis: Hip Hop Hopes (IUs2-4)

**INTERACTIONAL UNIT 2** – Teacher takes up hip hop discourse and scaffolds student reflection on investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken discourse</th>
<th>Chronotope (TIme-space)</th>
<th>Space-time (spatio-temporal scale)</th>
<th>Social Identity</th>
<th>Communicative Function</th>
<th>Language Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. T: So when you are talking about your hope related to your music, how does the music make you feel? Why do you love hip hop? Why do you love reggaeton?</td>
<td>• Hip hop dreams’ • Hip hop community • Latino/hip hop community</td>
<td>• Self/Emotional Present/Self &amp; Present/community of hip hop Commercial music &amp; hip hop Global/diasporic - Latin American space-time of hybrid musical genre; Global space-time - hip hop’s prominence as youth discourse of resistance</td>
<td>• Teacher support for student; Teacher as knowledgeable of hip hop as international music T as aware of RAUL passion</td>
<td>• Teacher affirms student’s idea and question prompts brainstorming ideas for composition task • Recognizes social identity &amp; group membership w/ marginalized discourse community • Invites hip hop as legitimate within dominant school discourse</td>
<td>• T interrogative [Why?] - reasons for emotional investment/reaction to musical passion; investment in future hopes through musical • T - verb – ‘love’, emotion • ‘hip hop and reggaeton’ - indexes both (1) unique American musical discourse community of hip hop; (2) Caribbean/Latin American hybrid genre – reggaeton (musical/linguistic/cultural) • teachers awareness of students’ ‘music’ – prior knowledge and interaction surrounding hip hop as common discourse community, although at different levels/degrees and chronotopes (i.e. generational; style preference; old school vs. new school) of membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. BA: I don’t know. I just love it.</td>
<td>• Hip hop community</td>
<td>• Self/Emotional Present/Self: Present participation in hip hop community • <em>Hip hop DJ</em> • Passionate member of hip hop discourse community</td>
<td>• Restates his passion for hip hop, Conveying uncertainty, or unknowing about value of discourse community? (within school space?)</td>
<td>• S – Inability to answer ‘Why?’ – ‘I don’t know’ – inability to readily articulate emotion/feeling about passion • just’ - reiterates emotional action of verb ‘love’; as if the emotion is not explicable [inability to explain Why?] • verb/lexical choice – love; emotional process; lived experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. T: Why? You got a reason. This is about you figuring it out.</td>
<td>• School/T-S interaction • Hip hop community</td>
<td>• Self/Emotional Present/Self • Alternative possible meanings: -Present/Self school task –</td>
<td>• Teacher supporting/pushing student to complete academic task Mentoring/support to BA</td>
<td>• Teacher pushing student to articulate his ideas for academic task [OR alternately] Mentor/support to BA to validate his passion;</td>
<td>• ‘well’ - (rising intonation – as if to indicate a rhetorical question; implying obligation to self • T telling S/tone – authority, pressure, encouragement for reflection to take action, self-fulfillment (praxis)Imperative verb form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on next page)
Table 18. Transcript Analysis: Hip Hop Hopes (IU2-4) (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Hip Hop</th>
<th>Teacher Support</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. T: Why? What do you love about reggaeton?</td>
<td>Hip hop dreams</td>
<td>Self/Emotional Present/self</td>
<td>Student as hip hop DJ</td>
<td>Teacher support for student</td>
<td>Interrogative – shift line of inquiry to What? Lower level of analysis (i.e. Bloom’s Taxonomy); Possible reflection of special needs/ADHD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latin American space-time; Hybrid musical popular genres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Global space-time - hip hop’s prominence as youth discourse of resistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reiterating students passion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Affirms reggaeton as hybrid hip hop Latino/Spanglish genre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interrogative – shift line of inquiry to What? Lower level of analysis (i.e. Bloom’s Taxonomy); Possible reflection of special needs/ADHD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Huh? (Staring at the floor)</td>
<td>School/T-S interaction</td>
<td>Present/Self – student identity</td>
<td>Student falling ‘off task’; losing attention</td>
<td>Student utterance reflects challenges with maintaining attention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Why do you love, why do you love music? Why do you love hip hop and reggaeton</td>
<td>Hip hop dreams</td>
<td>Self/Emotional Present/self</td>
<td>Hip hop DJ</td>
<td>Teacher reiterates question to push student in scaffolding ideas/thoughts/emotions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hip hop DJ</td>
<td>Teacher reiterates question to push student in scaffolding ideas/thoughts/emotions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I don’t know, the beats, hip hop and</td>
<td>Hip hop dreams</td>
<td>Self/Emotional – Present/Community</td>
<td>Hip hop DJ</td>
<td>Student establishes an opinion about why he loves hip hop on a material level of musical aesthetic</td>
<td>S – Inability to answer ‘Why?’ – ‘I don’t know’ – inability to readily articulate emotion/feeling about passion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Global reference to hip hop as discourse – ‘beats, rhymes &amp; life’ (TCQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘beats’ – rhythmic qualities of music; DJ activity/discourse of mixing beats; previews later commentary/chronotope about discursive power of getting people dancing/moving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** TCQ – Textual Context Question
### INTERACTIONAL UNIT 3 – Teacher shifts inquiry to discursive level of hip hop as textual representation of the world; Student signals marginalized as ‘low class’ and social critique in global chronotope of systemic injustice

#### Transcript 18. Transcript Analysis: Hip Hop Hopes (IUs2–4) (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. What does it tell you about the world?</th>
<th>Hip hop dreams</th>
<th>Self/Emotional – Present/Community – hip hop &amp; politics of oppressed</th>
<th>Global space-time – Spatial scales – world; national/gov; community/class</th>
<th>Teacher reframing hip hop as genre of social commentary</th>
<th>'tell you about the world’ – indexes music as a discursive representation of lived experience</th>
<th>'reading the world’ – element of critical literacy; classroom Comm. Unity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA: It tells you many things happening in the world.</td>
<td>Social injustice &amp; oppression of non-dominant communities</td>
<td>Social injustice – Present/Community – hip hop &amp; politics of oppressed</td>
<td>Global space-time – Spatial scales – world; national/gov; community/class</td>
<td>Social critic, philosopher, Expert/knower</td>
<td>Establishes his opinion about why he loves hip hop, on discursive level</td>
<td>S – direct response related to [what?]; conscious of reasons, previously unable to describe [why?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. T: Like?</td>
<td>Social injustice &amp; oppression of non-dominant communities</td>
<td>Social injustice – Present/Community – hip hop &amp; politics of oppressed</td>
<td>Global space-time – Spatial scales – world; national/gov; community/class</td>
<td>Social critic, philosopher, Expert/knower</td>
<td>Pushes student to articulate specifically visions of the world through hip hop discourse</td>
<td>Focus on symbolic/discursive genre feature – representations of ‘the world’; significant that first immediate genre feature is related to discursive representations of sociopolitical context of class politics; Ability to answer ‘Why?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Like, the government is always cheating</td>
<td>Inequitable system/government</td>
<td>Global space-time of government; Social critic of government</td>
<td>Student conveys knowledge of discursive theme of hip hop</td>
<td>the government’ – source of injustice in the world located in 'global space-time’;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on next page)
| 12. That people are from minus class, little class. | Inequitable system/government | Global space-time of lower class position – marginalized social location | Social critic | BA places himself with an oppressed community, marginalized socially and politically due to class and socioeconomics; poor people of color | Adverb – ‘always’; [abstract notion of state of injustice – reality, truth] | ‘Us’ – ‘non-dominant’ communities; immigrants in America; Salvadoran/Central American context | ‘Us’ – Latinos [in reference to genre of reggaeton; hybrid of hip hop – lots of Latinos, PR in NYC, but reggaeton is a diasporic hybrid; Spanish language code switching mix] |
| 13. T: Lower class | Inequitable system/government | Global space-time of lower class position – marginalized social location | student as social critique | Recognizes BA’s social position; affirms his class analysis | Lexical choice/noun – ‘class’; understanding of concept of ‘class politics’; social hierarchy; socioeconomic stratification; sociopolitical/cultural power | Lexical choices/adjective [searching for semantics] – (1) ‘minus class’ mathematical semantics of subtracting value; (2) ‘little class’ – small amount, relative size/power; diminutive, paternalistic; |
| 14. BA: Yea, lower class. They just think that we are like nothing. | Inequitable system/government | Global space-time of divides between rich & poor [class ideology] | Student as social critic | BA response associates oppression with personal experience, community experience; | S – reasserts semantically focus on social class; | ‘just’ – adverb – qualify ‘basic’ essence of meaning/statement | ‘They’ ~ ‘government’ - [Us & them construction of the government as ‘other’ ~ [enemy?]; govt. becomes singular noun/concept of structures & |
| | Chronotope of feeling cheated by ‘the system’ | Local/Personal lived space – identification with ‘we’ as part of lower class | Member of oppressed class | Equates | ‘they just think that we’ – govt is recast as a collective/pluralized notion of people/actors, enacting govt; ideologies in process, defining social position, power structure |

Table 18. Transcript Analysis: Hip Hop Hopes (IUs2-4) (Continued)
reggaeton) as racial
group? (vs. African Am exp related to hip hop)

• ‘We are like nothing’ – ontological value
on in relation to
 perception of ‘state of being’

INTERACTIONAL UNIT 4 – Student discursively reverts and situates himself on the margins, underscoring his perspective based in lived experience

| 15. That’s just what I think … and also I like the dance, how XXXX (Spanish). (breaking into a smile, changing tone). Yeah. (sweeping his head to the side) | • Present/Self - Personal lived spaces experience; Present – return to T/S dialogue; mark statement of differing opinion to mainstream [resistance] | • Social critic • Member of oppressed class • Conveying uncertainty, or unknowing about value of discourse community? (within school space?) • Qualifies his statement as if to not appear so resistant - critical of government | • ‘just’ – qualifier of a remote, marginalized social position; thoughts, opinions, lived experiences that are qualified as not as valid or founded; • ‘what I think’ - Statement of resistance to social injustice of class position |
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSIONS & IMPLICATIONS

This study examines how teachers and students negotiate power and meaning through the multiple spaces of the classroom – abstract, concrete and lived. I examine how classroom spaces are shaped by institutional discourses of schools as a highly structured and linear space (Fain, 2004). I analyze the central role of language, discourse and texts in producing spaces of representation and resistance to the marginalization of immigrant ELL students that are at play in classroom space. This study examines immigrant student identity along analytical lines of space, language, and power. In focusing on third spaces for immigrant ELLs in school spaces, I have explored how immigrant students bring diverse space-times of lived experience to social interactions and academic tasks in school. I have also analyzed how teachers and students renegotiate immigrant identities in classroom discourse through an engagement of these discursive tensions reflective of experiences of marginalization and oppression.

As a prelude to framing the implications of this study’s findings, it is instructive to revisit the central research questions and my redefinition of third space for immigrant ELLs as proposed in this study. This study investigates how students and teachers can interrogate broader societal discourses and experiences of immigration to allow for the production of third spaces in school. Since my treatment of third spaces operates from the centrality of language in spatial production, I examine the following question: How does spoken and written language and discourse shape the production of third spaces for renegotiating immigrant student identity in the ELL writing classroom?
In this final chapter, I will revisit how data analysis addressed this principal research question and move toward describing the implications of these findings. First, I drawing implications for theory in the definition of third space for immigrant ELLs. Second, I describe implications for curriculum and instruction that directly engages students lived experiences of marginalization and oppression as immigrant ELLs. In moving toward operationalizing this definition of third space, I assert the importance of communication, shared norms, and engaging students multiple identities in developing academic and critical literacy for ELLs in secondary classrooms. Third, I move toward implications for reflexivity in classroom practice and research, and highlight the power of critical discourse analysis. Finally, the outro of this study is a reminder of the importance of identity and sense of self at the heart, mind and spirit of critical, caring teaching. This is the hopeful vision of education that aims to connect to the same heart of meaningful learning and critical consciousness for immigrant ELL students.

**Part I: Implications for Theory - Redefining Third Spaces**

This study contributes an important methodological move in classroom research by extending Gutiérrez’s (2008) ‘grammar of third space’ through bringing together cultural geographic conceptions of ‘space’ with critical discourse analytic methods. I will revisit the central notions of social space from cultural geography that I bring to re-envisioning third space. I have envisioned this task through a theoretical lens of space as social process (Lefebvre, 1974, 1991). A fundamental theoretical move in this direction is a re-conceptualization of space as not a void or backdrop to activity or processes, but as a fluid and constant process of becoming through social interactions. This postmodern,
geographic perspective draws a Marxist theoretical perspective on the *spatial production of social space*. This is social space produced from intertwining of space and time (Harvey, 2006) and co-constitutive threads of material, abstract and lived social spaces. Viewing space as social process from a trialectical perspective (Lefebvre, 1974, 1991; Soja, 1989, 1996) on the social space that is produced in and through schools entails a more global political project of rethinking the education of non-dominant students.

In addressing the research questions with this theoretical perspective, I propose a (re)definition of third spaces for immigrant ELL students in the classroom. Transformative third spaces for immigrant ELLs are understood as lived social spaces produced through social interaction that allows opportunities for renegotiations of power and identity in the classroom. More specifically, findings of this study contribute to articulating third spaces as: (1) fluid spaces of negotiated meaning and identity; (2) shaped by lived spaces from diverse temporal and spatial locations; (3) produced through tensions that perpetuate and resist dominant discourses; (4) mediated principally through oral and written language; and, (5) provide opportunities for developing critical and academic literacy in schools.

Drawing on this redefinition of third space, this study aims to draw new implications for classroom practice by using a lens of social space in analyzing how classroom discourse surrounding immigrants’ lived experiences can contribute to academic and critical literacy. Central to this study is the development and renegotiation of student identity in the classroom, which happens from diverse space-times. Findings of data analysis in Chapters 5 illustrate how shifting chronotopes of classroom discourse made intertextual and interspatial links between identities shaped by student and non-
student identities. Moreover, the overarching conceptual design of a collaborative and supportive classroom space, negotiated and mediated through an attention to building relationships across difference, shaped classroom discourse in ways that engaged students’ immigrant experiences and non-school identities. Findings of analysis map production of third spaces through engaging with tensions along lines of race, class, gender, language and culture, and in relation to student multiple identities as students, immigrants, parents, family members, employees, and others. In Chapter 6, findings of analysis of multiple space-times in teacher-student discourse illustrate how diverse lived spaces of the focal students’ identification with hip hop culture are intersected with their understandings of their immigrant identity.

A reconceptualization of space-time contexts shaping the production of third spaces draws implications for reconsidering the classroom as a material, conceptual, and lived space where connections to multiple places and locations in time and space come into contact and intermingle, creating new spaces for individual and collective transformation. In broadening our understanding of how diverse spaces and times are present and shape the production of classroom spaces, we gain new spatial perspectives for better supporting immigrant ELL students in America’s classrooms.

**Part II: Implications for Classroom Curriculum & Practice**

Educators can design and shape contexts for such third space in conceiving of curricular spaces and pedagogical processes that invite student immigrant identities and experiences to be at the center, rather than the margins. This relates to the ideological power of abstract second spaces (Lefebvre, 1974; Soja, 1996) of curriculum design and pedagogy. The broad curriculum of Writing 2 had a critical literacy orientation that
allowed for students to write about their own lives in ways that engaged them in reflecting on their experiences and social identities along lines of race, class, gender, language, culture, citizenship and immigration status. In a post-9/11 era of rising anti-immigrant sentiment in the United States, curriculum and instruction for ELL students must recognize and help immigrant youth make sense of the sociocultural and political contexts that shape their lives. Engaging discourses of immigration in the context of students’ multiple identities provides great opportunity to develop structured and critical dialogue around sociopolitical issues. Facilitation of these discursive tensions at local and global space-times, and at personal and emotional levels, is supported by interactional protocols to guide communication and collaboration in classroom spaces (e.g. Comm.Unity, Group Norms, Comm.Unity Café, feedback). Findings of this study as analyzed through student texts and classroom discourse illustrate that students can engage in academic literacy development built around a critical interrogation of their immigrant experiences.

Academic and critical literacy development that occurred in the Writing 2 class can be strengthened through allowing students deeper investigation of self-designed topics. Longer curricular units, such as the time devoted to the Immigration Unit, supported by a critical investigation-reflection model would allow for students to research and write about topics of personal importance within the broad Writing 2 curricular themes. This would be a literacy-based curriculum focused on student-designed and student-negotiated meaning from a critical literacy perspective. For example, Raul’s passion and participation in hip hop culture could be recognized and developed to look more deeply into its meanings, cultural history, and its contributions.
Critical investigation and reflection could also entail critique of commercialization and corporate culture, as well as discourses of race, gender, and violence that shape public perception. Of particular interest might be the resurgence of hip hop social movements around the world. These movements are grassroots cultural arts that represent marginalized communities and youth voices which are at the roots of hip hop. A curriculum that allows for deeper investigation of student experience is liberating for these students as they can (re)negotiate immigrant identities and the world they see, as it can only be for a Bakhtinian Self.

**Operationalizing Third Space: Group Norms & the Communicative Chronotope**

Chapter 5’s analysis of the Comm.Unity Conflict paints a portrait of group space and the inherent discursive tensions that provide a glimpse into the production of third spaces for immigrant ELLs. Efforts to engage and mediate discursive tensions related to critical consciousness-raising of students’ sociopolitical locations as immigrants can be extremely productive in allowing third spaces for voicing student resistance to marginalized social positions. However, findings of analysis also point to the challenges of mediating tensions arising in face-to-face classroom interactions among students and teachers as their social identities are invited to intermingle in the instructional process.

The significance of engaging in an analysis of social conflict in the ELL classroom is central to the proposition of Comm.Unity as a discursive location for production of third spaces. Analysis of diverse spatial and temporal locations, micro-local to global in nature, illustrates how immigrant student identities in the classroom are shaped by experience. In many ways, the overarching abstract space of Comm.Unity as a
'place where Me, We and the World come together’ directly reflects this nexus of conflict. This organizing philosophy that framed teaching and learning in the classroom directly invites third space tensions of engaging students about their lived spaces as immigrants. These tensions of third space are precisely to the theoretical and pedagogical point of understanding how immigrant student identities can be (re)negotiated in the classroom. It is from conflict that new spaces emerge with possibilities for new ways to read the world and new ways to write the self.

I propose a chronotope of Comm.Unity as a counterpace to the institutionalized spaces of school, and highly structured classroom roles and identities that leave immigrant students in the margins. The Group Norms protocol was an important pedagogical tool in shaping social practices from the abstraction of Comm.Unity. This group process activity and norm building structure is itself yet another abstract design (second space) of the classroom, as are any listing of rules, guidelines, and policies that structure social spaces of schools. However, the ideological value of a Group Norms protocol, as an academic activity to practice and prescribe classroom relationships, is that they are shared and negotiable understandings for the production of safe and caring social space. They are growing norms in that they are in process, evolving with on-going interactions and relationships; and as such, they are intended to be a guiding framework that can be revisited, renegotiated, and rearticulated as is needed by the group. The language of Group Norms in the Writing 2 classroom included “love, respect, feelings, live, peacefully, help, together.” Transcript analysis traces these emotional referents through classroom discourse in mediating conflict, understanding immigrant struggles, and projecting hopeful futures. These are lexicon of a grammar of thirddspace (Gutiérrez,
2008), and these designs for classroom community provide a beginning framework for conceptual understandings of a communication of third space. As such, I assert that the use of organizing principles for shaping the ELL classroom space is vital within a pedagogical vision for a critical and transformative instructional experience for immigrant ELL students.

The importance of having both a commitment to respectful and productive classroom discourse requires an explicit instruction and attention to communication processes. Protocols for structured norms of collaboration and communication, in both oral and written forms, provide important scaffolding for academic learning. A diversity of instructional strategies, visual aids, collaboration structures, and group process discussions is evident in the Writing 2 curriculum. In the interest of building academic literacy around critical literacy development of ELL students, however, an attention to language and communication in the social space is an imperative. Moreover, the curriculum structures and the teacher’s designs for classroom practices, are bolstered within an overarching *chronotope of communication* as a tool for navigating, understanding, and reacting to the experiences through oral and written discourse.

Implications of this study point to the implementation of Group Norms protocols such as a communicative infrastructure for Comm.Unity as well as a useful framework for building relationships and producing third spaces in the ELL classroom. People need help learning how to communicate with each other in their native language, let alone in a second or third language. I have utilized Group Norms protocols in varied instructional settings and professional communities; as such, I have learned and adopted these process structures from the experience of a learner and trainee. Such communicative structures
will provide a way to agree on at least negotiating how to be together, without the institutional predominance of rules. In proposing to partially operationalize third space designs through Group Norms, an overarching *chronotope of communication* becomes a tool for navigating tensions of race, class, gender, culture, and language both inside the classroom and in their daily lives. In this way, the curricular designs bridge academic literacy and critical literacies of communication.

This is important when considering students in the Writing 2 classroom, many of whom, I would argue, did not consider school as the principal priority (and identity) in the face of parental, family, work, and even legal obligations stemming from their undocumented status. However, the fact that they were persisting and working hard to graduate high school is a testament to the importance of their education in their lives even if there were many encroaching realities on their school obligations. In contrast, Raul’s non-school identities and identification with Hip hop culture and discourses present another example of opportunities to engage immigrant students’ experiences in school spaces. I argue that it is an educational imperative for developing curriculum, pedagogy, and a shared teaching philosophy that engages ELL immigrant students, academically and critically, around their lives and the chronotope of immigration. With news only increasing in the present day of the trials, tribulations, and deportations of immigrants in America, we are remiss in not fully considering the educational significance of engaging the chronotope of immigration for ELL students in school spaces.

**Renegotiating Student Identities in Social Space: A Hip Hop Hope**

An important part of this mediation of student identity is analyzed in relation to the focal student Raul and how social production of social space contributed to his sense
of Self in classroom spaces. While his role in spatial production of the classroom was characterized by academic and social tensions, space-time analysis in Chapter 5 of teacher-student discourse mapped an ideological retreat to global spaces that depersonalized conflict. Relocating Raul within shared challenges of second language learning and communication served to relocate him as an equal member of Comm.Unity, in both participation and obligation to social process and the production of classroom space.

As has been analyzed in this study, Raul lived in spaces of school from marginalized social, cultural, and institutional locations. Moreover, his complex learning needs and continuous academic struggles were sources of frustration in effectively and appropriately engaging him in individual and collaborative academic tasks. Raul’s classroom participation was threaded by tensions with social interaction although I do not characterize or consider the communicative outcomes of his participation as overly antagonistic, disruptive or unproductive. There are additional factors at play in regards to his own learning needs, sociocultural background, and current struggles of dislocation in his current life.

Given this overall sense of his institutional locations in school, fostering a sense of belonging and community for and around a student like Raul is vital especially when considering him as “at risk” and disengaged in school. An important part of the chronotope of mediating Raul was that of engaging his participation and ideas while accommodating his communicative intentions, discursive style, and academic learning needs. Implications of this study’s findings indicate that the development of Raul’s student identity was supported positively within a shared Comm.Unity space; shaped
through a discourse of care and respect; and conceptualized and mediated through Group Norms. Such a classroom space both guided Raul’s participation and mediated Raul’s presence as well as provided for the production of a social space in which his “at-risk” student identities were renegotiated in embracing the DJ’s Hip Hop Hopes.

Raul’s inner DJ was engaged through hip hop as a third space discourse for teacher and student to connect from school and non-school spaces. It is the chronotope of Hip hop Hopes that is analyzed and mapped in Chapter 5 of this study; the story of an immigrant boy who traveled alone to America, and dreamed of becoming a famous DJ “to represent all my Latin people”. Moreover, in this study, I have described my own position as an outsider, guest, and fan in the hip hop community which I esteem with respect the power of the hip hop elements. The production of third spaces in the Writing 2 classroom was shaped by these interspatialities of hip hop constituted with discursive threads that reinforced the development of a positive teacher-students relationship.

I believe in the power of the fifth element of knowledge – paraphrased as a brand of critical consciousness (Freire, 1970) – as promoted by hip hop godfathers like Afrikaa Bambaataa and early day pioneers like KRS-ONE. The positive vein of hip hop discourse continues despite the commodification and political demonization of an urban cultural form that was born from the ghetto’s material, abstract, and lived spaces of oppression and marginalization in America. A realistic proposition can be made for the predominance of hip hop aesthetics in popular culture (music, television, fashion, advertising, sports) that has grown over the last forty years and has now reached a global scale. And while the popular cultural elements of hip hop are still pervasive exports in a globalized world, there are the historical resistance roots of the South Bronx popping up
all over the world. There are examples of hip hop youth movements and outreach programs amidst the ruddier streets of places like Cambodia, Brazil, Senegal, and Palestine; each one renegotiating and reshaping the critical consciousness born from hip hop culture. Youth are finding the voice and hopefulness in the beats, rhymes, moves, and mosaics of hip hop culture as a means to speak back to their marginalized social positions. Community-generated spaces shaped by and around hip hop are proposed in contrast to the global capitalist machinery that has obscured hip hop’s community roots and positive vision. Witnessing its emergence in the global context of the developing world, we should be reassured of the transcendent heart of hip hop as lived spaces of self and community expression, cultural identity, and social resistance against oppression. This study contributes to new ways of considering and analyzing hip hop culture and discourses in the classroom. Irby & Hall (2011) review research literature and point toward new directions for this growing body of scholarship that establishes the cultural and theoretical significance of this global phenomenon.

More expansive, penetrative, methodologically diverse studies are required that (a) capture how personal (e.g., race/ethnicity, class, gender, sexuality, cultural disposition) and professional (teaching experience, educational background, grade level, subject area, etc.) identities shape the ways hip-hop pedagogies are implemented and to what ends and (b) better understand the relationships between teachers’ respective identities, pedagogies, and student outcomes (Irby & Hall, 2011, p. 234).

While I do not frame this study as hip hop research or research on hip hop, findings effectively propose hip hop in example as an identity space for one immigrant student that carries great power for academic and critical literacy development. Furthermore, I analyze how hip hop discourses intersect with the student’s evolving identity as an immigrant in America. As Irby & Hall (2011) suggest, there is a need for
new research that engages hip hop from the outside, I propose this study as one that is situated somewhere on the borderlands between inside and outside the Hip Hop community. I frame hip hop as one strand of spatial production in the Comm.Unity that carries discursive challenges and productive tensions for renegotiating student identity and developing academic and critical literacy in the classroom.

Part III: Implications for Praxis: Our Teacher and Researcher Selves

I conclude with reflections on the Self and implications of this study for considering micro-local spaces of identity development of teachers and researchers as well as teacher-researchers in the ELL classroom. I draw implications for engaging with the personal and critical practices of critical consciousness in education research and practice. I close with hopefulness for the production of third spaces where immigrant ELLs and their teachers can renegotiate identities and foster meaningful and emotional relationships in schools. The critical praxis that characterizes Gutierrez’s third space research is at the root of its enduring theoretical and pedagogical value for diverse and critical thinking. It is evidenced in the extensive body of literature that it has influenced, including this study. Toward rethinking the direction of third spaces in theory and research on immigrant ELLs and non-dominant students, Gutierrez (2008) challenges us to raise our own critical and political consciousness in how we study and represent non-dominant students in discourse broadly.

In answering her challenge, findings of this study reflect identity as an engagement of the Bakhtinian Self with the world (Bakhtin, 1981, 1986), a learning Self that is rooted in diverse space-times. Along with a perspective on the social production of
space, I must examine the teaching Self (Palmer, 1996) as it intertwines chronotopically in classroom spaces. As such, I claim that this study is framed within the intellectual, emotional, and spiritual Selves of this teacher-researcher, and they leave textual traces to be perceived and ascribed meaning in these pages. Palmer (1996) outlines that good teaching rests in the connections – interspatialities – between ourselves, Others and the world:

*Good teachers possess a capacity for connectedness. They are able to weave a complex web of connections among themselves, their subjects, and their students so that students can learn to weave a world for themselves … The connections made by good teachers are held not in their methods but in their hearts – meaning heart in its ancient sense, as the place where intellect and emotion and spirit and will converge in the human self (p. 11).*

This perspective informs this study’s findings and draws implications for the need for critical reflexivity in conducting research and understanding the education of immigrant ELL students. This study serves to recognize and animate the subjectivity inherent in any representation of reality by proposing that multiple identities of teachers and students should be positively engaged in classroom spaces. Any attempt to analyze and describe the classroom space in text is only partial as implicated in this analysis. Moreover, I clearly recognize my teacher-researcher self is situated from my unique location in time and space.

In aims of transcending the bounds of my unique spatial location, I found value in analytical tools of critical discourse analysis (CDA) in providing some distance from my own central presence in classroom interactions being examined. Methodologically, the research process can be exasperating, as one gets tired of knowing the teacher was me; and I am first to critique this research as self-indulgent. Despite analytical biases that
result from this inescapable emic-etic paradox, the power of CDA in teacher research bolsters a commitment to professional development. There were *ethnographic moments* that entered my thinking and reflection throughout the analytical process:

*These are epiphanies-moments of intuition or realization experienced during fieldwork or pre-fieldwork, that provide insight and a point of entry into the research that could not be arrived at simply though the exercise of logic* (O’Connor, 2004, p. 3).

I would characterize the critical spatial events as such ethnographic moments that showed glimpses of meanings that evolved in moving recursively through and around the data set. Significantly, the recursive process moved across space-times of the classroom, back and forth in time, to provide different lenses on social practices of the classroom. These were third space moments that were both causes and cures for social conflict. They were also vibrant opportunities to mediate tensions in ways that engage multiple identities in the classroom.

**Reflective Practice & Critical Analysis of Language and Discourse**

The methodological mix of ethnography and critical discourse analysis for researching classroom spaces leads to important implications of engaging in this kind of reflective instructional practice. As an attempt toward research as third space praxis, an auto-ethnographic (Denzin, 2003) perspective on classroom practices speaks to the importance of teacher critical inquiry into their own teaching selves and how these selves inform and shape classroom spaces. Findings of this study map how these multiple selves and identities within classroom spaces also engage and shape non-school identities for immigrant ELLs and their teachers.
Moreover, a critical attention to language and discourse in the education of immigrant ELLs is crucial for teachers to be able to recognize and analyze how classroom space can reproduce inequity. An important, and methodologically difficult, challenge that follows from this study is the value of employing critical discourse analytic methods to reflecting on one’s teaching practices. It is hard to achieve a degree of analytical distance when examining how your institutional role as teacher can reproduce and resist dominant discourses in school settings. In this study, I purposefully engage in social tension and conflict as a means of sketching a classroom topography that is built around situated identities and engaging with difference. Teachers in their own reflective practice can benefit from a greater attention to language and discourse as a means to better understand how third spaces possibilities are produced and dissolve in the classroom.

In gratitude for a critical and hopeful graduate school education, I point to the critical educational and research practices of the ACCELA Alliance (http://www.umass.edu/accela/) as an example of how critical teacher education can support teachers of immigrant, ELL, and non-dominant students in developing both academic and critical literacy in the classroom. As teacher, researcher, and teacher educator, I have been shaped by the philosophy of the ACCELA Alliance and its philosophy on improving teaching practice that draws on critical linguistics analysis to better understanding the education of culturally and linguistically diverse students. This teacher-researcher study of third spaces in the ELL classroom follows in the tradition of ACCELA’s educational practice and research (Gebhard, Habana Hafner, & Wright, 2004; Gebhard, Harman, & Seger, 2007; Gebhard, & Willet, 2008; Harman, 2007).
In the ACCELA program, teachers are trained and supported in using critical discourse analytic methods to observe, reflect, critique and improve their practice. While the methodological demands of detailed attention to language and discourse can require time, there are many productive opportunities to analyze focal interactions in the classroom with specific inquiry questions to guide teacher learning. Moreover, in a peer-coaching model for teacher development, there are the supports and protocols for teachers to engage in reflection and dialogue with others that can make these reflective practices powerful and transformative in improving classroom practice. The power of CDA methods in teacher learning is also framed in community. If the production of space is a social process, and teaching and learning are also understood as a social process, then an understanding of self in driving reflective practice as educators is at the heart of building positive and transformative classroom communities. As Palmer (1996) describes:

“Community cannot take root in a divided life. Long before community assumes external shape and form, it must be present as seed in the undivided self: only as we are in communion with ourselves can we find community with others” (p. 90).

We Teach (and Learn) Who We Are

There is an intentional hopefulness in this study by design, which I take from my own “social dreaming” (Gutierrez, 2008), a bias to hope that I am contributing to the production of transformative spaces, more than I am closing them off. This study’s analysis of production of classroom social space illustrates opportunities for renegotiating student immigrant identities in relationship to their academic and social positions. As the classroom teacher, I project my own hope into the material, abstract and lived spaces of
the classroom. As a political being, I recognize and engage with the tensions inherent in a classroom of immigrant ELL students.

What follows from this study are the opportunities to produce critical social spaces in the classroom in which immigrant students can interrogate their lived experiences and develop a critical literacy to better understand and navigate ‘the world’, while also developing academic literacy and English language competence. A lens of spatial production and an attention to diverse space-times represented in discourse provide insights into how diverse immigrant student identities can be engaged supportively and renegotiated within the highly structured spaces of school. In recognizing teachers and students as equally social beings that contribute to classroom space and the development of academic and critical literacy, I reassert the notion that “we teach (and learn) who we are” (Palmer, 1996). These multiple selves are intertwined in the classroom, folding in and spiraling out from multiple space-times.

From macro to the micro levels of analysis of a classroom interaction, there are at work a myriad factors transpiring, or crystallizing in the moment of each pedagogical interaction as an analytical horizon. From a spatio-temporal perspective, there are transformative opportunities for teaching and learning that are perpetually converging and disintegrating as interspatial meanings collide, merge, and fracture into spatial meanings. Opportunities to tug effectively at one of the infinite threads of space-time intersecting in third spaces of the classroom become the synapse of pedagogical pulses firing between teacher and student as well as the social production of new spaces of learning and identity. For immigrant ELL students and their teachers alike, it is my hope
that who we are is open for (re)negotiation in classroom third spaces of Comm.Unity (communication + unity = Comm.Unity).
## APPENDIX A

### TRANSCRIPT CONVENTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript Conventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>please</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>//overlap//</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cough)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[   ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[     ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inco-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX B

**TRANSCRIPT: HIP HOP HOPES**

**TRANSCRIPT:** “Hip hop Hopes” (Divided by Interactional Units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERACTIONAL UNIT 1 – Student on-task, teacher moves to scaffold student writing; Student establishes hip hop discourse and interspatial links to future hope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. T: So what are you working on?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. BA: My essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. T: So you are on the computer right now? So, you need help with anything? You got an idea about the pieces?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. BA: I am working on my music, my rapping, my hopes <em>(point to different writing on the computer screen)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There you go.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERACTIONAL UNIT 2 – Teacher takes up hip hop discourse and scaffolds student reflection on investments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. T: So when you are talking about your hope related to your music, how does the music make you feel? Why do you love hip hop? Why do you love reggaeton?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. BA: I don’t know. I just love it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. T: Why? You got a reason. This is about you figuring it out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. T: Why? What do you love about reggaeton?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Huh? <em>(Staring at the floor)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Why do you love, why do you love music? Why do you love hip hop and reggaeton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I don’t know, the beats, hip hop and …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERACTIONAL UNIT 3 – Teacher shifts inquiry to discursive level of hip hop as textual representation of the world; Student signals marginalized as ‘low class’ and social critique in global chronotope of systemic injustice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. What does it tell you about the world?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. BA: It tells you many things happening in the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. T: Like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Like, the government is always cheating about us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. That people are from minus class, little class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. T: Lower class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. BA: Yea, lower class. They just think that we are like nothing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERACTIONAL UNIT 4 – Student discursively reverts and situates himself on the margins, underscoring his perspective based in lived experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. That’s just what I think … and also I like the dance, how XXXX <em>(Spanish).</em> <em>(breaking into a smile, changing tone).</em> Yeah. <em>(sweeping his head to the side)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERACTIONAL UNIT 5 – Teacher redirects to immigration narrative, proposes/acknowledged an interspatiality of immigration &amp; American dream; scaffolding academic task at hand;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. T: So how does that relate to you and coming to America?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. You came to America, you had a difficult journey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. You found reggaeton, you found music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. BA: No, well that was already here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. T: But you found it. It was something that you found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. BA: I think about that kind of music in my future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TRANSCRIPT: “Hip hop Hopes” (Divided by Interactional Units)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interactional Unit</th>
<th>Dialogue Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>That is something that is important to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERACTIONAL UNIT 7</strong> – Student restates interspatiality of hip hop and his future goals; teacher prompts his reflection on agency in fulfilling mythologized American dream and present activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>T: How do you think you can make it part of your future?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>What do you think you will have to do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Because people always talk about coming to America, there’s lots of opportunities, but nobody is going to show up at your doorstep with a record contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERACTIONAL UNIT 8</strong> – Teacher prompts student to think about present activities; recognizes student membership in hip hop discourse community; invites student lived experience into school discourse, task.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>What have you been doing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>BA: I have been trying to mix music;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>so my cousin can put it on in his dancing parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>T: So start DJing parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Start DJing, yea,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>T: And you have a connection, you know somebody that owns a club, so you get to go and DJ a little bit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERACTIONAL UNIT 9</strong> – Teacher prompts student reflection on lived space of DJing a dance party (i.e. emotional experience, personal fulfillment); repositions student within chronotope of dance party as powerful, influential.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>What is the feeling that you are get when you are out there?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>BA: People are dancing, it’s so cool. When people can come together to your music. That feels really good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>T: How does that make you feel?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Really good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>People enjoy the music, my music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>T: You got everybody up there moving and jumping and having a good time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>BA: Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERACTIONAL UNIT 10</strong> – Teacher recharacterizes the dance party chronotope as ‘fulfillment’ for a DJ, and constituting a professional aspiration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>T: Yea, so that’s something that makes you fulfilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>So that’s something about you making that as part of your profession,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERACTIONAL UNIT 11</strong> – Shifts to global time-space of having enjoyable work (i.e. labor of love).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>hopefully we have jobs that we love to do also,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>BA: Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>T: It makes working … right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERACTIONAL UNIT 11</strong> – Teacher uses hypothetical parallel to teaching as a ‘labor of love’ to validate students’ passion, fulfillment as DJ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>You don’t want to have a teacher that hates teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>BA: Nooo!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>T: because they won’t be a very good teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>So you know, anyway …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERACTIONAL UNIT 12 – Shift back to teacher scaffolding writing task with explicit summary of ideas and instruction to include in text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. So that’s something right there. It makes people, when people are dancing –</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Put that in there!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. [BA turns back to computer, puts hands to keyboard to type]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. T: That’s why I asked you. I didn’t ask you because … –right? [T slaps him on the shoulder; slight laughter]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. [Continues talking to Ss who is facing the computer] We were talking about your life in America and your hopes for your music.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. T: What did you just explain to me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. You love it when people are dancing. How does it make you feel, right? That’s hopeful, what you just told me. When you make people move and dance. That gives you hope, joy, happiness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. (Teacher walks away from student, and student remains seated at computer and typing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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