Identity Matters: Incorporating CLD Students' Identities into the Secondary Classroom

-----

Dissertation Defense

Presented to the Faculty of the Curry School of Education

University of Virginia

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Vonna L. Hemmler

August 2018

© Copyright by
Vonna L. Hemmler
All Rights Reserved
August 2018

Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education
Curry School of Education
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia

APPROVAL OF THE DISSERTATION

This dissertation, (Identity Matters: Incorporating CLD Students' Identities into the Secondary Classroom), has been approved by the Graduate Faculty of the Curry School of Education in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

____
Chair (Amanda K. Kibler)

____
Committee Member (Nancy Deutsch)

____
Committee Member (Peter Youngs)

____
Committee Member (Stephanie van Hover)

__________________________________Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LINKING DOCUMENT....…………………………………………………………………….6

Identity Incorporation in the CLD Secondary Classroom

Overview………………………………………………………………………......7

What Is Identity?..7

Common Theoretical Frames……………………………………………………...8

CLD Student Identity Incorporation: Three Studies……………………………….8

Why Is Identity Important in Learning?...11

Common Terms……………………………………………………………………..11

References…………………………………………………………………...…13

STUDY ONE …………………………………………………………………………………17

Identity Negotiation through Language in Heterogeneous Secondary Classrooms

Abstract………………………………………………………………………………..18

Introduction……………………………………………………………………………19

Rationale for Review………………………………………………………………….21

Theoretical Frameworks………………………………………………………………25

Review of Literature…………………………………………………………………..31

Discussion, Conclusions, and Implications……………………………………………...46

References……………………………………………………………………………….50

STUDY TWO …………………………………………………...…………………………...58

Using Scaffolding to Support CLD Students' Critical Multiple Perspective-Taking on History

Abstract…………………………………………………………………………………59

Introduction……………………………………………………………………………...60

Rationale for Study and Research Questions……………………………………………63

Perspective-taking and Culturally Responsive Teaching in Secondary Classrooms…….64

Theoretical Framing……………………………………………...………………68

Conceptual Framing……………………………………………………………...75

Methods…………………………………………………………………………..76

Findings………………………………………………………………………….84

Conclusion and Discussion………………………………………………………93

Implications and Suggestions for Future Research………………………………95

Tables………………………………..………………...……………………99

References………………………………………………………………………103

STUDY THREE……………..……………………..……………………………………...110

"You ARE Immigrant…but Not Like Us": A Discourse Analysis of Immigrant Students' Positioning of Undocumented Immigrants in a CLD Classroom

Abstract…………………………………………………………………………111

Introduction……………………………………………………………………..112

Relevant Literature……………………………………………………………...115

Conceptual Framing…………………………………………………………….118

Methods…………………………………………………………………………121

Findings………………………………………………………………………...130

Discussion and Conclusions……………………………………………………148

Tables…………………………………………………………………………...155

References………………………………………………………………………157

Appendices……………………………………………………………………..163

LINKING DOCUMENT

Identity Incorporation in the CLD Secondary Classroom

Vonna L. Hemmler

University of Virginia

Overview

The number of culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students in American public schools has increased in recent years and is only predicted to continue growing (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2017a, 2017b). This deserves attention because CLD students all too often experience inequitable classroom contexts that limit their access to curriculum as well as opportunities to have their identities validated in school spaces, both of which research contends is essential for adolescent students' academic and social development. The three studies presented here address the possibilities and tensions present in classroom spaces when instructional practices and curriculum are more or less responsive to the need to incorporate CLD students' varied identities in the classroom. They inform a new understanding of ways in which teachers can foster equitable, constructive, and inclusive classroom communities and in turn make general education curriculum more accessible to these students in the processes of their learning.

What Is Identity?

Each of these three studies operates with the understanding of identity as a social construction that is fluid, dynamic, and mediated by language (Brady, 2015; DaSilva Iddings & Katz, 2007; Ivanič, 2006; Lewis, Enciso, & Moje, 2007; Moje, Luke, Davies, & Street, 2009). In this way it is not fixed in the mind, but rather is constantly negotiated by people (self and others) via language use and other meaning-making resources according to the contexts in which one might find oneself (Andersson, Valero, & Meaney, 2015; Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Gee, 2000; Hyland, 2012; Tabouret-Keller, 1997). Such a conceptualization of identity is important when examining the incorporation of student identity in the classroom because of the highly social nature of learning (Vygotsky, 1978).

Common Theoretical Frames

Though the studies presented in this proposal each utilize their own frameworks to inform their unique examinations of the literature and data, there are common threads employed throughout each paper that come together to create the theoretical underpinnings of this body of work. The first two are briefly introduced above: sociocultural theory (Vygostky, 1978), which highlights the social and interactional nature of learning, and, in turn, an understanding of identity as something that is in flux and able to be repositioned because it is constantly (re)negotiated via language according to an individual's context/audience, or the Discourse in which that individual participates (Gee, 1989, 2011). Another pertains to the specific nature of CLD students as often (but not always) being students of color (Tatum, 2003) and thus employs Critical Race Theory (CRT; e.g., Delgado & Stefancic, 2001, 2012; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Taylor, 1998) to acknowledge the role that race plays in the often-marginalized treatment of individuals of color. Finally, and on a related note, Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, and Shuart-Faris's (2005) definition of *power* as "a structuration of interpersonal relations, events, institutions, and ideologies" (p. 162) is employed within CRT to acknowledge the need for these students' voices and experiences to be included in classroom and curricular interactions.

CLD Student Identity Incorporation: Three Studies

Study 1: Identity Negotiation through Language in Heterogeneous Secondary Classrooms

The first paper is a literature review of the empirically-documented ways in which students in English-speaking, general education (heterogeneous) secondary school classrooms negotiate their identities through language use. I frame the review in a discussion of why educators need to understand this topic when they have CLD adolescents whose languages and cultural experiences might be intentionally or unintentionally marginalized by their teachers and

peers in their classrooms and schools. Operating under the understanding of identity described above as something that is socially constructed via language use, I review existing empirical research that has documented how CLD students negotiated their identities via language in secondary classrooms for three purposes: to project their own identities, to accept or reject identities ascribed to them by others, and to engage in both of these actions simultaneously and dynamically. I also address what such language use within these three actions allows the students to accomplish. I end my review of this literature with a discussion of how the existing research might inform teachers' own instructional practices within the goal of incorporating CLD student identities in their classrooms.

Study 2: Using Scaffolding to Support CLD Students' Critical Multiple Perspective-Taking on History

The second paper describes one specific way in which teachers in a CLD high school history classroom enabled students to bring aspects of their identities into their learning via the examination of a general education history course designed to support CLD students in taking multiple, critical perspectives on the content. As alluded to above, curricular and instructional adjustments observed in this study provided teachers with ways to make sure that their CLD students were engaging with general education curriculum in meaningful ways. In this study I use intertwined theoretical lenses related to instructional scaffolding (Hammond & Gibbons, 2005), CRT (see above), and historical stance-taking (Barton & Levstik, 2004), as well as qualitative research methods (Marshall & Rossman, 2011) to explore the ways in which teachers exposed their CLD students to multiple, critical perspectives on history and how they actively guided students in their curricular interactions. A discussion addresses why this type of support is necessary and beneficial for CLD students in general education classrooms and implications

for teachers and suggestions for further research are also presented.

Study 3: "You ARE Immigrant…but Not Like Us": A Discourse Analysis of Immigrant Students' Positioning of Undocumented Immigrants in a CLD Classroom

The third study examines immigrant student discourse in a CLD classroom at a time when the larger topic of immigration is highly relevant and contested in the public sphere. In this study, I used elements of microethnographic discourse analysis to examine the "social construction of social identities" – specifically as they pertain to how immigrant students position undocumented immigrants – via the interpersonal interactions of four immigrant students in this classroom (Bloome et al., 2005, p. 157). The specific analytical tools I used within microethnography were *thematic coherence* and *contextualization cues,* which allowed me to identify how the participants created and made meaning of their positionings of undocumented immigrants in their conversations (Bloome et al., 2005). Additionally, I employed elements of critical discourse analysis (Gee, 2014; Rogers, 2014; van Dijk, 2001) to examine the power dynamics as they were reproduced by language behind how the participants talked about undocumented immigrants in their learning space. With the understanding that a student's status as an undocumented immigrant has a significant effect on his/her identity, particularly at the adolescent age (Danzak, 2011), a conceptualization of the relationship between language and power as it is defined above, and the knowledge that the teachers in this classroom consciously sought to create a community in which all students were welcomed and valued, this study looked at how four immigrant students (undocumented and documented students themselves) positioned undocumented immigrants within their discussions of the educational opportunities immigrants have in the US, the legitimacy of the reasons they have for coming here, and the roles they occupy in the larger society. Implications for these findings and areas

for further inquiry on this topic are also discussed.

Why Is Identity Important in Learning?

Several scholars have identified positive connections between active student identity incorporation as it is conceptualized above and the following outcomes, which can indirectly impact student learning: more active participation and academic engagement, more finely developed abilities in critical thinking, stronger and more significant teacher-student relationships, and increased self-confidence and academic effort (Barton & McCully, 2010; Cummins, 1996; Duff, 2002; Hong & Cheong, 2010; Ivanič, 2006; Sutherland, 2005; Zirkel, 2008). While these findings are of course informative, they also underscore the need for more information about the ways in which CLD students negotiate their identities with teachers and peers in classrooms that often are not designed with their needs in mind. Thus, the three studies presented in this manuscript-style dissertation begin to fill that gap, informing teachers and educators of ways in which CLD student identities can be welcomed into the general education classroom in an effort to enhance their learning experiences.

Common Terms

Because the studies presented here were conducted in a CLD classroom, I often use this term to reference the student population as a whole. However, it is important to remember that individuals differing in many significant demographic categories can compose a CLD student population, and thus, I must clarify how I use several terms throughout my manuscripts when discussing this population and its members. To begin, I use *heterogeneous* and *general education* synonymously when describing my study classroom because enrollment in general education classrooms in U.S. public schools, like the one under study here, is open to a variety of students from all backgrounds, including those representing the increased diversity that Enright

(2012) has called the “new mainstream” in American schools (p. 68). Similarly, I use the terms CLD, *marginalized*, and *people of color* in tandem – not to be mutually inclusive, but to convey that membership in one of these groups often can accompany membership in another. My use of CLD incorporates students who come from diverse (non-dominant) racial, ethnic, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds. As such, this often (but not always) means that they are students of color (Tatum, 2003) and/or students who come from immigrant backgrounds and may speak nondominant varieties of English or languages other than English in their homes and communities and thus become marginalized in their learning spaces (which often reflect the values of the dominant societal group). I acknowledge that students of all backgrounds can potentially be marginalized in the classroom for a variety of reasons; however, because my focus in these studies is on CLD students in general education classrooms, my use of the term throughout these manuscripts pertains only to this population of students and does not include White students who are considered to be proficient speakers of English.

References

Andersson, A., Valero, P., & Meaney, T. (2015). "I am [not always] a maths hater": Shifting students' identity narratives in context. *Educational Studies in Mathematics, 90*, 143-161. doi:10.1007/s10649-015-9617-z

Barton, K. C., & Levstik, L. S. (2004). *Teaching history for the common good*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Barton, K. C., & McCully, A. W. (2010). "You can form your own point of view": Internally persuasive discourse in Northern Ireland Students' encounters with history. *Teachers College Record, 112*(1), 142-181.

Bloome, D., Carter, S. P., Christian, B. M., Otto, S., & Shuart-Faris, N. (2005). *Discourse analysis and the study of classroom language and literacy events: A microethnographic perspective.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Brady, J. (2015). Dialect, power and politics: standard English and adolescent identities. *Literacy, 49*(3), 149-157. doi:10.1111/lit.12058

Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, *7*(4-5), 585-614. doi:10.1177/1461445605054407

Cummins, J. (1996). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society*. Ontario, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Danzak, R. (2011). Defining identities through multiliteracies: EL teens narrate their immigration experiences as graphic stories. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 55*(3), 187-196. doi:10.1002/JAAL.00024

DaSilva Iddings, A., & Katz, L. (2007). Integrating home and school identities of recent-immigrant Hispanic English language learners through classroom practices. *Journal of*

Language, Identity, and Education, *6*(4), 299-314. doi:10.1080/15348450701542306

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2012). *Critical race theory: An introduction (2nd ed.).* New York, NY: New York University Press.

Duff, P. (2002). The discursive co-construction of knowledge, identity, and difference: An ethnography of communication in the high school mainstream. *Applied Linguistics*, *23*(3), 289-322. doi:10.1093/applin/23.3.289

Gee, J.P. (1989). Literacy, discourse, and linguistics: Introduction. *The Journal of Education, 171*(1), 5-176. doi:10.1177/002205748917100101

Gee, J.P. (2000). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. *Review of Research in Education, 25*, 99-125. doi:10.2307/1167322

Gee, J. P. (2011). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method (3rd ed.)*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Gee, J.P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Hammond, J., & Gibbons, P. (2005). Putting scaffolding to work: The contribution of scaffolding in articulating ESL education. *Prospect, 20*(1), 6-30.

Hong, C., & Cheong, C. (2010). Literate identities among Korean students learning English in the USA. *English Teaching, 65*(4), 131-154.

Hyland, K. (2012). *Disciplinary identities: Individuality and community in academic discourse.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ivanič, R. (2006). Language, learning and identification. *Language, Culture and Identity in*

Applied Linguistics, 7-29.

Ladson-Billings, G. J., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record, 97*(1), 47-68.

Lewis, C., Enciso, P., & Moje, E. (2007). *Reframing sociocultural research on literacy: Identity, agency, and power.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (2011). *Designing qualitative research (5th ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Moje, E., Luke, A., Davies, B., & Street, B. (2009). Literacy and identity: Examining the metaphors in history and contemporary research. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *44*(4), 415-437. doi:10.1598/RRQ.44.4.7

National Center for Education Statistics. (2017a). English language learners in public schools. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cgf.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2017b). Racial/ethnic enrollment in public schools. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cge.asp

Rogers, R. (2014). Critical discourse analysis in literacy research. In P. Albers, T. Holbrook, & A. Flint (Eds.), *New methods of literacy research* (pp. 19-39). New York, NY: Routledge.

Sutherland, L. (2005). Black adolescent girls' use of literacy practices to negotiate boundaries of ascribed identity. *Journal of Literacy Research, 37*(3), 365-406. doi:10.1207/s15548430jlr3703_4

Tabouret-Keller, A. (1997). Language and identity. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Handbook of sociolinguistics* (pp. 315-326). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Tatum, B. D. (2003). "*Why are all the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?" and other conversations about race.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Taylor, E. (1998). A primer on critical race theory. *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 19*, 122-124. doi:10.2307/2998940

van Dijk, T. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. Hamilton (Eds.) *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-367). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Zirkel, S. (2008). The influence of multicultural educational practices on student outcomes and intergroup relations. *Teachers College Record*, *110*(6), 1147-1181.

STUDY ONE

Identity Negotiation through Language in Heterogeneous Secondary Classrooms

Vonna L. Hemmler

University of Virginia

Abstract

In this paper, I examine literature on the ways in which students in English-speaking, general education (heterogeneous) secondary school classrooms negotiate their identities through language use. I begin with an overview of why an understanding of this topic is necessary, particularly for adolescents who are marginalized in schools and whose skills and characteristics thus might not be outwardly valued by their teachers and peers. I then address the prevalent understanding of identity in this body of literature, which is that of a socially constructed entity mediated by language. I follow my explanation of this conceptual framework with a review of classroom-based empirical research on how marginalized students use language in secondary general education classrooms to negotiate their identities and what these uses of language allow them to accomplish. Finally, I discuss how the extant research might equip teachers to adopt practices that can enable marginalized students to negotiate their identities via language in their classrooms. I end with suggestions for future research. The highly specific nature of this paper synthesizes literature on this topic that has provided a detailed but incomplete picture of what we know about how identity negotiation is carried out by marginalized students in heterogeneous classrooms.

Introduction

In the current U.S. educational climate and its infatuation with high stakes testing, the administrative and political spotlight often falls predominantly on student achievement outcomes, such as test scores, that are taken to indicate academic growth. As a result, attention is often not paid to the processes occurring within and around the student that may affect such measurable progress. But ample scholarly research has in fact considered some of these processes and influences to varying extents, and one valuable case in point are studies of the ways in which students' negotiation of their identities in the classroom may relate to the measured outcomes taken to represent learning (e.g., Cummins, 1996; Duff, 2002; Hong & Cheong, 2010; Ivanič, 2006; Sutherland, 2005). Students' identity negotiation – or the ways in which they highlight and perform various aspects of themselves and/or contest labels placed on them by others within the processes of both identity construction and learning in the classroom – might appear on the surface to be tangential or secondary to more measurable academic outcomes. However, research has linked these processes and improved measurable content and language learning as it might arise from moderating factors, such as: greater self-confidence and academic effort, more developed critical thinking skills, stronger and more meaningful teacher-student relationships, more active participation, and deeper academic engagement (Cummins, 1996; Zirkel, 2008). As such, it is vital to understand the processes behind identity negotiation, particularly in heterogeneous or general education secondary classrooms,[1] where adolescents engage in academic learning while they simultaneously attempt to negotiate their own

[1] Throughout this paper, I use the terms *general education* and *heterogeneous* interchangeably. This is for two reasons: the realization that enrollment in general education classrooms in U.S. public schools is not confined to a subpopulation of students from any demographic but is instead open to a variety of students from all backgrounds, and the observation made by Enright (2012) that this diverse population has become the "new mainstream" in American schools (p. 68).

(potentially devalued) identities within the larger, dominant social structures present (Cummins, 1996; Ek, 2009).

This review presents the findings of research conducted on identity negotiation by students from racially, ethnically, culturally, or linguistically marginalized communities in secondary classrooms (generally understood as middle and high school, or grades six through 12) within English-medium schools in English-dominant societies.[2] Developmental research has shown that adolescence is an especially critical time for students to engage in these processes of identity development (Erikson 1968; Marcia, 1980). Additionally, educational research (e.g., Cummins, 1996; DaSilva Iddings & Katz, 2007; Sharples, 2017) has posited that students of this age who come from marginalized communities – which I am defining as those whose racial, ethnic, cultural, or linguistic characteristics and the identities that might accompany them are often not valued by the dominant societal forces undergirding the school system – may have an even harder time negotiating their identities within structures (like schools) that enforce dominant institutional value systems contradictory to those embodied by their diverse student population.

Though there are of course a variety of means through which students may negotiate their identities in a classroom environment, this paper examines one medium, language, as a tool through which students carry out this important work. As is illuminated below, this focus on language (both oral and written) stems from the understanding of identity presented in the literature as a sociocultural construct that is established during communication and mediated by

[2] I recognize that students of all backgrounds can potentially be marginalized in the classroom for various reasons. However, in this paper I focus only on students who are marginalized for the specific reasons outlined in this sentence. This focus stems both from Enright's (2012) argument that such students are now becoming the "new mainstream" in American classrooms, and from research the author reviews that established the negative effects of such marginalization on students' academic development (p. 68).

language use during interaction (see also Gérin-Lajoie, 2011). As Bailey (2000) and Paris (2011) have argued, language use allows individuals to consciously highlight certain aspects of their identities as they pertain to themselves and to others around them. Additionally, students can use language in the processes of learning to increase their cultural capital, or the knowledge and norms valued by certain sociocultural/socioeconomic groups (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977) – which would in turn necessitate a reassessment of the learner's sense of self, or his/her identities (McKinney & Norton, 2008). Thus, understanding the different ways that marginalized students in heterogeneous learning environments use language as a tool for negotiating their identities is essential if teachers, administrators, and policymakers want to understand how this identity negotiation can affect the academic development and outcomes of the multitude of individuals in this population. Furthermore, it is vital if educators are to bring about "genuine social change" in which significant and meaningful relationships are formed in the classroom between marginalized and non-marginalized students that can then carry over to society at large (Tatum, 2003, p. 95).

Rationale for Review

As briefly alluded to above, the growing racial, ethnic, linguistic, and cultural diversity present in U.S. public schools is well-documented. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) has predicted that by the year 2025, students of color (including but not limited to those of African, Asian, Latino/a, and Native American descent; Tatum, 2003) will outnumber White students in schools (2017). Similarly, multiethnic students currently comprise a significant portion of the student population in U.S. schools (Mohan, 2009). Additionally, English learners (ELs) constituted almost 10% of the American public-school population in the 2014-2015 school

year (NCES, 2017).[3] This increasing racial, ethnic, cultural, and linguistic diversity – which Enright (2012) calls the "new mainstream" in U.S. schools – is often not acknowledged or supported in many general education classrooms, in which instruction is catered towards students whose first language is English and who are seen by themselves or others as members of the dominant culture (p. 68; see also Carrasquillo & Rodriguez, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 2005). This mismatch between students and their learning environments could thus create a classroom context which is not fit to meet the needs of all of its students. This necessitates hard and important work on the part of the teacher to create an environment in which *all* students are able to feel a sense of belonging and negotiate their identities: in other words, to use language to present aspects of their identities or contest identities placed on them by others – even those which are not recognized or overtly valued in schools – within the context of classroom learning.

The task of creating such an educational environment is undoubtedly a challenging one for a teacher, yet research in multiple fields has shown why the classroom is an especially important space for students to be able to engage in these processes of identity negotiation. Gee (1989, 2011) has supported this argument through his concept of *Big D Discourse* (2011, p. 34), or what he describes as an "identity kit" full of "instructions on how to act, talk, and often write, so as to take on a particular role that others will recognize" (1989, p. 7). Within his understanding of Discourse, Gee (2015) spoke of a person's *primary Discourse*, or initial/primary conceptions of identity as they are often connected to one's family, a *lifeworld Discourse* where common knowledge exists within a shared society, and *secondary*

[3] For this paper, *ELs* are students who were not born in the US, who speak a home language other than English and/or grew up in an environment in which a language other than English was dominant, and/or whose "difficulties in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language" may prohibit the student from meeting state academic standards, achieving in classrooms in which the language of instruction is English, or participating in society (U.S. Department of Education, 2016, p. 43).

Discourse(s), which are connected to public institutions and interest groups outside of the family. Gee (2015) argued in particular that secondary Discourses are ever-present in schools and, perhaps even more importantly, that a student's primary and secondary Discourses can interact or even complement each other in this space. Such interaction can occur, for instance, when school-based practices (secondary Discourses) are also present in a child's home life (primary Discourse) or when elements of a child's home life (primary Discourse) are welcomed into his/her school life (or their secondary Discourse environment). This alignment then results in that student coming to understand that his/her primary Discourse is compatible or directly linked with his/her secondary Discourses (Gee, 2015). A concrete example of such a link may be when use of bilingual students' non-English home languages are accepted or encouraged in their classroom at school (Cummins, 1996), or when the home and cultural experiences of a non-dominant racial/ethnic group are used as resources in, not hindrances to, students' learning (see Heath, 1982; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992).

However, not all students experience such levels of acceptance between their primary and secondary Discourse(s) in school. Ek (2009) argued that "institutions [like schools] can influence or shape the resources that people use to construct identities as well as the opportunities they are afforded to perform identities" (p. 407). This acknowledgement means that schools in effect can "value or ratify certain identities while negating others" (Ek, 2009, p. 406). Thus, unexamined school or teacher practices can indeed provide space for students to negotiate their identities when these identities are valued in the classroom, but they may also simultaneously (and perhaps unknowingly) ascribe certain identities to students that conflict with those students' own understandings of themselves, therefore marginalizing them in, or even ostracizing them from, their own classrooms. Gee (2015) pointed out that race is one particular

factor (among others) than can often prevent some students from experiencing an interaction of their Discourses at school, and this misalignment can undoubtedly lead to feelings of exclusion and in turn have an effect on how these students of color (attempt to) negotiate their identities in an environment where they may not have a legitimate place. Such an outcome is particularly problematic considering that this struggle can have consequences for students' social, personal, and academic learning and achievement (Ek, 2009; Zirkel, 2008).

Studies in the field of education like that of Ek (2009) are supported by prominent psychological research regarding the relationship between identity and adolescent development. These concerns are particularly relevant in secondary classrooms because identity work (including negotiation / performance / development / construction) is "distinctive, but not exclusive, to adolescence," an age that encompasses a period of intense transition between childhood and adulthood (Erikson 1968; Marcia, 1980, p. 159). Other work has also pointed out that this is an under-researched topic as it regards marginalized students in secondary schools in some contexts, such as the UK (e.g., Sharples, 2017). Therefore, if adolescence is an especially crucial developmental period for identity work, and, as described above, schools can potentially have a detrimental effect on this work, particularly for marginalized students, it is clearly in the best interest of the field of education to better understand secondary classrooms as sites for identity negotiation via language use among racially, ethnically, culturally, and linguistically marginalized adolescents.

The current literature review synthesizes extant research on this topic and asks the following questions: (a) How do marginalized students use language to engage in identity negotiation in the heterogeneous secondary classroom? and (b) What does this language use allow them to accomplish, both academically and socially, when negotiating their identities?

After synthesizing the results of studies addressing these questions, I end with a discussion of why an understanding of these processes is important for teachers and educational researchers. However, in order to situate empirical studies that address marginalized secondary students' identity negotiation in the classroom, I first address the most prevalent theoretical perspectives framing learning and identity as they are utilized in this body of research.

Theoretical Frameworks

Sociocultural Theory

One theoretical standpoint that is employed or alluded to abundantly throughout this literature is sociocultural theory, as originally put forward by Vygotsky (1978). A well-known lens through which education and learning can be viewed, sociocultural theory posits that human action is a social experience that directly impacts how one understands the world (Jaramillo, 1996; Moll, 1990). Perhaps more significantly for the purposes of this paper, sociocultural theory further supports that learning and cognition actually occur during and as a result of social interaction (Jaramillo, 1996; Moll, 1990). In opposition to cognitive or "transmissionist" understandings of learning, which examine what occurs in the mind during the learning process and how students process information they are told, respectively, sociocultural theory considers what occurs both outside of the mind and in a social context to mediate learning (Brenner, 1998, p. 123).

Scholars who work from the perspective of critical sociocultural theory draw upon these Vygotskian notions while also examining the power dynamics associated with such social and cultural influences on human interaction and learning. In other words, critical sociocultural theory contends that human action is a social practice that is "situated within communities invested with particular norms and values" and thus is strongly influenced by forces related to

and informed by a dominant culture (Lewis, Enciso, & Moje, 2007, p. 5). While critical sociocultural perspectives on learning can undoubtedly be valuable for myriad educational contexts, Orellana (2007) argued that they are particularly useful when considering how dominant views can be challenged in the classroom and "cultural mismatch" can be addressed for those students who, for various reasons, are not members of the dominant culture and therefore do not experience consistency between their home and school lives (p. 124; see also Chen, 2010; Gee, 2015). In fact, Orellana further advanced that some interactional spaces or communities are not as easily joined by some individuals as they are by others, and it is not a stretch to imagine the general education classroom as an example of such a space and marginalized students like those examined in this review as an example of such individuals.

Language Socialization

Another framework used in this literature to understand marginalized students' identity negotiation in the classroom is language socialization, which is primarily concerned with the co-construction of linguistic and cultural knowledge and understanding, such that as one is learning a language, he or she is also learning how to be a part of the culture in which the learning is occurring (Watson-Gegeo, 2004). As such, Ochs (2002) acknowledged that the "process of acquiring a language is part of a much larger process of becoming a person in society" (p. 106).[4] Though the study of language socialization is often focused on the incorporation of young children into their home culture(s), Schecter and Bayley (2004) noted that the process in fact can

[4] I have taken into consideration in my terminology the distinction made clear in ample scholarly work between *learning* a language through direct instruction and practice and *acquiring* it via (often subconscious) exposure and use. I have also considered Larsen-Freeman's (2015) advocacy to replace language *acquisition* with language *development*, a change which foregrounds the idea that language is an "ever developing resource" with "no common endpoint" for users (p. 1). Though an examination of students' language learning is outside the scope of this paper, it is important to acknowledge the difference between these three terms and to note that the way I have used in this paper is the same way in which the original authors used them in their works.

occur at any point in life where a person seeks to participate in a new community, including academic or classroom communities. The interactions that take place as part of socialization then create one's understanding of self, and it is this conception of identity in the literature to which I now turn.

Identity and Its Negotiation

The view of identity as a concept as it is presented in the literature reviewed here is distinct from its popular if not also traditional psychological meaning, which is that it is a fixed construct that originates and exists only within the mind, or "a stable structure located primarily in the individual psyche or in fixed social categories" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, p. 586). The echoes of transmissionist or cognitive views on education and learning discussed above, in which researchers are most interested in what happens in the mind as part of these complex processes, are evident here. And in this view, if identity exists only in the mind, then the role of language is solely to communicate a person's identity by transmitting it to others (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005).

Many researchers have problematized this definition of identity, however, by drawing from sociocultural theory (see above) to contend that it does not account for any of the "social ground" on which they posit identity is created or changed (e.g., Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, p. 587; Ricento, 2005). In emphasizing the social aspects of identity over the cognitive, several sociolinguists and discourse analysts have enlisted sociocultural theory to offer an alternative view to the understanding of identity described in the previous paragraph. This one foregrounds the discursive elements surrounding the manipulation of language that are seen as vital to creating one's identity. Identity to them is therefore a "social construct," rather than a psychological one, that is fluid, dynamic, and able to be actively altered instead of fixed in the mind (Brady, 2015; DaSilva Iddings & Katz, 2007; Ivanič, 2006; Moje, Luke, Davies, & Street,

2009, p. 417). In other words, scholars that advocate for this social understanding of identity contend that people use language to create and project identities for themselves and others rather than simply to represent what already exists in the mind (e.g., Lewis, Enciso, & Moje, 2007). As Mendoza-Denton (2002) contended in her own extensive work on language and identity, identity is "the active negotiation of an individual's relationship with larger social constructs, in so far as this negotiation is signaled through language" (p. 475; see also Gérin-Lajoie, 2011). In this understanding, identity is not fixed, but constantly negotiated, presented, and ascribed by people (self and others) according to the multitude of contexts in which they find themselves (Andersson, Valero, & Meaney, 2015; Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Gee, 2000; Hyland, 2012; Tabouret-Keller, 1997; see also Hecht, Warren, Jung, & Krieger, 2005). Lewis, Enciso, and Moje (2007) similarly argued that actors must "read the scene" and then decide how to enact or perform certain aspects of their identities (p. xvi; see also Guerra, 2007).

As such, what is conveyed in this definition is that identities are "situated in unfolding social contexts" and do not exist before being created through participation in given environments and discourses (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Chen, 2010, p. 164; Lewis, Enciso, & Moje, 2007). Several scholars have therefore described identity as a "discursive construct" or "intersubjective accomplishment" that develops via interactional processes through which individuals socially position themselves and others and are also able, via their language use, to accept or reject these positionings (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, p. 587; Kibler, 2017; Ricento, 2005). This new understanding makes way for the pluralization of the term *identity* and affords space in academic discourse for multiple identit*ies* to be recognized in individuals (and groups). Norton (1997) aptly described this relationship between identity and language for language learners in particular, who, each time they speak, are "constantly organizing and reorganizing who they are

and how they relate to the social world" – in other words, engaged in identity negotiation (p. 410).

Thus, the studies reviewed for this paper understand identity to be in constant flux, created discursively, and mediated both by particular environments and by how one uses language in those environments. Viewing identity as a social construct mediated by language therefore requires that language occupy a central role in any discussion about identity and allows for a greater understanding of the linguistic processes that students employ when interacting with their teachers, peers, and curriculum. Such an understanding of the relationship between language and identity is appropriate for a review of literature that addresses how students use language to engage aspects of their identities in a classroom context in which their primary Discourses may conflict rather than align with the secondary Discourses used by teachers and in schools.

Positioning

If identity is understood as a social construct that is shaped via language by self and others according to the context or Discourse in which one is participating, then it is the shaping aspect of this understanding to which I now turn. Many of the researchers cited in the review below employed positioning theory (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999; Moghaddam & Harré, 2010) to various degrees to frame the idea of using language to convey identity. Though positioning theory was initially developed within and applied to the discipline of gender studies, it is particularly pertinent for the current topic due to its examination of "how people use words (and discourse of all types) to locate themselves and others" (Moghaddam & Harré, 2010, p. 2). Bucholtz and Hall (2005) envisioned just this when they stated that "identity is the social positioning of self and other" (p. 586).

The way(s) one positions him/herself is greatly affected by environment and audience, while the way(s) others position an individual is also situated in particular contexts and can be similarly accepted or rejected by that person (Yoon, 2012). Several additional scholars on this topic who have utilized positioning theory to frame their research have similarly put forth this notion that individuals play an active role in their own identity negotiation while simultaneously accounting for their audiences and the way(s) in which such interactions may either align or disagree with these self-presentations (e.g., DaSilva Iddings & Katz, 2007; Moje, Luke, Davies, & Street, 2009; Yoon, 2012). This notion is akin to what Gee (2011, 2015) advanced in his description of how individuals must "recogni[ze] and be recognized" within a certain Discourse in order to be members of it (2011, p. 34). In other words, individuals must understand how to think/speak/act (i.e., position themselves) in accordance with a Discourse, but they also must be accepted (i.e., positioned) by other members of that Discourse in order to be truly considered a member. Chen (2010) also summarized this conceptualization of positioning by stating that such identity negotiations are "the continuous struggles between positioning and repositioning" of and by self and others (p. 165). In her chapter on participation in social worlds, Orellana (2007) similarly discussed choices made by individuals when their identities are not enacted by them but invoked by external actors or forces. As such, positioning theory contends that a person's identities can be constantly (re)manifested by self and by others according to context and via language.

I now turn to a review of the literature to examine how these conceptual frameworks were utilized within extant analyses of the ways in which marginalized students use language to negotiate their identities in the general education secondary classroom, and what this language use allows them to accomplish, both academically and socially, as a result of this identity

negotiation.

Review of Literature

I began my review by conducting a broad search for studies that examined students' use of language (oral and written) to negotiate their identities in a heterogeneous, secondary, English-speaking learning environment. I searched the PsycINFO, EBSCO, and Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts databases for peer-reviewed journal articles and books using multiple combinations of the following terms: *identity, identity negotiation, social identity theory, adolescents, ELLs, bilingual, multilingual, minority, non-white, African American, Black American, Blacks, Hispanics, Latin Americans, Latinos, Asians, Asian American, Native American, American Indian, Pacific Islander, language, language use, school, high school, high school students, secondary school, classroom, peer interaction, teacher interaction, teachers,* and *curriculum.* Results were returned of studies that examined this topic widely in educational contexts in the US and around the world. However, I restricted my search parameters to include only English-medium classrooms because of the unique history surrounding race and ethnicity in American public schools that is not present in other countries and that has often dictated that instruction in U.S. schools be conducted in English. In addition to this database search, I also consulted reference lists from publications returned from the database searches and the works of established scholars in this field to locate any other studies meeting the above criteria. This left 15 studies that satisfied my search criteria, and I describe each of these in the ensuing sections.

A common theme presented in the literature below is not only how the students in these studies used language to negotiate their identities, but equally as important, what such language use enabled them to accomplish in the classroom through this identity negotiation. In the case of this literature, the language used during identity negotiation allowed students to assert their own

agency by (a) actively claiming or projecting a chosen identity, (b) responding to an identity given to them by others (i.e., teachers, peers) in the classroom, and (c) engaging in both of these processes simultaneously. Thus, I have organized the sections below according to these three themes. (In all instances in which authors provided descriptions of particular teachers' practices regarding language use and their implications for students' identity negotiation in the classroom, I also include these details, though not every author in this review addressed this). I end with a discussion of my findings, which reinforce the need for teachers to create classroom environments where all students are able to use all of their linguistic resources in the classroom to engage in identity negotiation.

Language Use to Engage in Self-Positioning

Extant literature on the topic of student language use during identity negotiation has documented students from marginalized racial, ethnic, cultural, and linguistic communities using a wide variety of language types to assert or project aspects of their identities in different ways in the classroom. For instance, Martínez and Morales (2014) conducted an ethnography of communication at a middle school in East Los Angeles to examine the role of profanity in the bilingual word play of their Spanish/English bilingual participants. The authors determined that the students engaged in this language behavior despite being reprimanded by their teacher for it in order to display solidarity with similar peers and effectively construct aspects of their identities as informed by their bilingualism (Martínez & Morales, 2014). The choices behind the participants' use of language – both whether they used English or Spanish and *how* or *when* they used each language individually – allowed them simultaneously to display their socialization into the dominant English-language discourse and "construct individual identities as competent bilinguals" (Martínez & Morales, 2014, p. 343), though not as students who used language in the

way(s) deemed appropriate by their teachers. Such a finding shows how word play can in fact be seen as a linguistic resource in the classroom, particularly when it comes to identity negotiation, and also exemplifies how students can use language in transgressive or non-dominant ways when seeking to project an identity. Wiltse (2008) also found that students' self-positioning can be met with teacher resistance even when their language use is aimed at more academic ends. In her interview study with bilingual Canadian high school students, her participants reported using their bilingualism to help new students at their school who spoke that same language and to support their own future university studies (Wiltse, 2008). The teacher, however, described these students as "the in-between crowd" and saw their bilingualism as source of behavioral disruption, academic underachievement, and a signal that these students had not fully developed either language (Wiltse, 2008, p. 2). In this way, the students' own positioning in both Martínez and Morales (2014) and Wiltse (2008) contradicted that of their teachers, yet it also enabled them to position themselves as effective users of more than one language, both to establish relationships with similar peers and to negotiate various aspects of their own identities in the classroom.

Like Martínez and Morales (2014) and Wiltse (2008), Endo (2016) examined the ways in which 1.5-generation Japanese immigrants (defined as students who arrived to the U.S. before the age of 15) made sense of and asserted their non-dominant identities in a racially diverse high school in the Midwestern US. Endo observed her participants using *Japanglish*, or a mixture of Japanese and English, even though teachers reported not liking to hear non-English languages used and felt that English was "the expected language of communication and instruction" despite no official school policy stating so (p. 206). Endo thus found that the use of Japanglish by these students enabled them to express their non-dominant identities as Japanese immigrant youth and

preserve their cultural affiliations to Japan even though these were not seen as valued identities in the classroom space. The author further contended that by using language in this way despite the wishes of the teachers, her participants were able to challenge school norms that devalued these non-dominant identities and did not provide opportunities for the students to engage in "culturally affirming learning experiences" (Endo, 2016, p. 204). In other words, the students used language in this way to create meaning for themselves in their learning experiences and tie them to their own senses of identity even though they were not encouraged to do so by their teacher.

Finally, Brady (2015) found in his study of students in a secondary school in inner-city London that his participants, whose demographic characteristics were not fully provided but who attended a school with a large population of students from "minority ethnic groups," reported that they often used "non-standard English" (what the author equated with dialects and contrasted with "the authoritative language variety" of a so-called standard English) in the classroom because they felt it was the best way for them to "express their 'true' selves," particularly when creating a boundary between themselves as teenagers and the adults surrounding them who advocated for use of "standard" English (p. 149-150). In fact, one particular participant wrote on the survey that, "Non-standard English is one of the ways teenagers can express themselves and who they are" (Brady, 2015, p. 153). Interestingly, the author reported that his participants used language in this way despite the observation that their teachers often corrected the students' use of non-standard English via warnings and fines (Brady, 2015). In this example, the students used language in a transgressive way in the classroom in order to differentiate themselves from the adults around them.

In contrast to Martínez and Morales (2014), Wiltse (2008), Endo (2016), and Brady

(2015), in which the teachers discouraged the use of non-English languages or non-dominant versions of English, several scholars documented students using non-English languages or non-dominant versions of English in ways that were sanctioned and at times even encouraged by the teachers in their classrooms. For instance, Martínez (2013) observed a setting in which a teacher actively supported such language use by students to project their non-dominant cultural and transnational identities in the classroom. In his study of an English language arts classroom in an overwhelmingly Latino middle school in East Los Angeles, Martínez documented that his participants often used *Spanglish*, or what they defined as a mixture of Spanish and English, in the classroom; they stated they did so as a means of "cultural maintenance" and a way to preserve their cultural identity and ties to Mexico and Central America (p. 282). Student use of language in this way was explicitly encouraged by the teacher in this study, who drew on her own bilingual abilities in the classroom and thus modeled for students that such language use in that space was not only accepted, but valued (Martínez, 2013). As a result of the teacher's instructional choices, the students were able to incorporate their cultural identities through their own language use and carry out their cultural maintenance in officially sanctioned ways in classroom spaces. Similarly, in her case study at a middle school outside of Washington, D.C. in which she was interested in understanding what students' poetry revealed about themselves, Smith (2010) found that poetry afforded students with "safe places" in which they were able to "express and renegotiate selves" (p. 214; see also Wissman & Vasudevan, 2012, described further below). This is especially significant considering the assertion that "identity is *always* present in writing" (Williams, 2006, p. 710; italics original), despite the misperception that issues regarding one's identity are acceptable in personal writing but not in "objective, detached, and analytical" academic writing (p. 712; see also Kibler, 2017). The students in Smith's (2010)

study encountered teachers who encouraged them to express themselves using different writing styles according to what came easily to them – by, for instance, allowing them to draw on their knowledge of hip hop culture and language and their experiences living in the "'hood" (p. 210) – and complimented them on their diverse language use in their poetry. In this way, the students could use language freely in ways that allowed non-academic aspects of their identities to "coexist within the culture of the academy" (Smith, 2010, p. 215). Such processes were made possible in Smith (2010) as a result of the teacher's design of learning activities, and another study in which teachers encouraged students in their use of a variety of writing styles is Carbone and Orellana (2010). These authors noticed in their examination of bilingual sixth graders at a Los Angeles middle school that one of their participants projected her immigrant identity via language use – namely, her pronoun and vocabulary usage and structural/organizational choices in her essays – that would typically be seen as non-academic (see Williams, 2006). In one assignment, the participant wrote two essays, one to the government/president, and one to her mother, on the topic of immigrant rights. In the former, she identified herself explicitly as "a young daughter of an immigrant" (which she would presumably not have to state in the letter to her mother) while also writing in both essays statements like "we're all humans and we all deserve to be treated with respect" and "we're not aliens, we're just humans" (Carbone & Orellana, 2010, p. 304). However, in the first letter to the government/president, the participant attempted to use the "expected conventions of a persuasive essay," including "rhetorical distance" while she instead incorporated her own voice more into the second letter (Carbone & Orellana, 2010, p. 304). As with Smith (2010), the teachers in Carbone and Orellana's (2010) study allowed the students to choose their own writing topic and audience(s) while also encouraging them to use their "audible voice" to negotiate and present their own identities, even

in their more traditional academic pieces (p. 296). Thus, the teachers in these three studies created learning environments in which diverse language use was not a barrier, but rather an asset that students could use actively to position themselves and negotiate their identities.

These seven studies illuminate not only the types of language that students have been observed to use (both with and without teacher encouragement or approval) when projecting aspects of their identities, but also what this language use has enabled them to accomplish in terms of asserting their identities in the classroom. As seen in Martínez and Morales (2014), Wiltse (2008), Endo (2016), and Brady (2015), when students employed home languages or non-dominant varieties of English in unsanctioned ways in the classroom, they were able to negotiate peer solidarity, present their cultural, ethnic, linguistic, or immigrant identities, and preserve their cultural affiliations; however, they were not able to draw upon these identities to further their academic learning and their language use was seen as "transgressive" in the classroom (Martínez & Morales, 2014, p. 342). Though these students were thus able to use language as a means to a positive end in terms of identity negotiation and assertion, they had to do so while working against forces (like teachers) who were sending the message that this linguistic aspect of their identities was not welcome in the classroom. On the other hand, when non-dominant languages and diverse varieties and styles of English were actively welcomed into the classrooms by teachers (Carbone & Orellana, 2010; Martínez, 2013; Smith, 2010), students were able to project their non-dominant identities while also engaging in a process of cultural and linguistic maintenance through the curriculum, which allowed for a coexistence of academic and non-academic identities in a space which is often thought to complicate or even prohibit such an important relationship for marginalized students. However, transgressive and approved uses of language are not only a medium through which students from marginalized populations can

conduct the vital work of proactively asserting their identities in the classroom: they can also engage in these uses of language to respond to others' positioning of their identities.

Language Use to Respond to Positioning by Others

As delineated in the previous section, individuals can use language to assert aspects of their identities in the classroom, but they can also use language to respond to identity ascriptions placed on them by a plethora of outside sources. This section describes instances in which students were observed to use language to this end, how they did so, and what they achieved through these responses to others' positioning of them.

Of the studies reviewed in this section, the majority saw participants using or alluding to their proficiency in a non-English language to contest an identity placed on them by external forces. For instance, Bailey (2000) conducted a discourse analysis of his participant, an immigrant from the Dominican Republic attending high school in the U.S. who is "phenotypically indistinguishable from African Americans," in order to understand how this participant used language to negotiate his own ethnic and racial identities while resisting conforming to certain identities placed on him by others (p. 555). Focusing on one class period in particular during which students were socializing in class with little teacher supervision, Bailey found that his participant's use of the Spanish language with peers confounded the process of peers assigning him a "totalizing" identity based on his racial attributes (p. 570). In other words, people had trouble identifying this participant in strict societal terms because his race and ethnicity did not align (in the context of this study); his use of the Spanish language as an African American man complicated others' identity ascriptions on him and enabled him to resist a restricting categorization placed on him by others. Bailey therefore asserted the power of language not only in overcoming static, pre-existing boundaries and identity categories, but also

in creating newer, more flexible categories, as his participant did.

Hong and Cheong (2010) similarly documented how a case-study student used language in her writing to contest an identity placed on her by an outside force in the classroom. Though this study did not observe the participant using a non-English language, it did discuss the significance for the participant of speaking a home language other than English. The authors found that Sue-Jee, a Korean high school student in New York, used her biliterate identity in her writing to re-negotiate her own positioning in her classroom, particularly as it pertained to how her teachers viewed her (Hong & Cheong, 2010). Because Sue-Jee had attended school in the US previously, she assumed that her teachers had certain expectations for her writing in terms of content and organization, and she was concerned that she could not meet them because she believed that she did not have the linguistic skills in English to do so (Hong & Cheong, 2010). Sue-Jee expressed all of these concerns to her teachers by writing about them in English, despite her admission in an interview that that "English never comes out naturally like Korean for me" (Hong & Cheong, 2010, p. 146). She wrote about censoring her own ideas when she felt they would contradict what teachers wanted to see in her writing:

> I feel like I am judged by my writing. Because I am so stressed by the feelings of judgment, I do all my best to write proper writings that fit into the right context and use correct grammar, and writings that that I think contain the right answer. Because of this, I often don't write my own thoughts but write to meet certain expectations required. (Hong & Cheong, 2010, p. 145)

Thus, Sue-Jee experienced a tension among her own language background, her perceptions of how others would position her identity as a writer, and her self-perceived abilities with written English, which she actively navigated in her writings. In doing so, however, she

may have missed opportunities to develop her identities through exploring her own thoughts in her writing.

As Sue-Jee used English in Hong and Cheong (2010) to contest external identities placed on her, so, too, did Neta, a young Bosnian woman in Miller's (1999) work. However, while Hong and Cheong (2010) examined Sue-Jee's perceptions of her own use of English in her writing, Miller (1999) focused on how her participant's use of English in general changed others' perceptions of her at school. In her study examining relationships between immigrant students' language acquisition and the development of their social identities in Australian high school settings, Miller concluded that language acquisition and identity work were integrated for her participant. She illustrated this finding by describing how one of her participant's positionings by others changed as a result of her use of English in class; she was identified by her peers simply as a "'student' like any other, not as a Bosnian student or an 'ESL kid'" only after they had recognized her as a "legitimate user" use of the English language, which gave her a "social identity in the mainstream" that she did not have previously when spending all of her time in an English as a second language (ESL) setting (Miller, 1999, p. 163). In effect, Miller concluded that her participant used her newly-acquired language to cross linguistic boundaries and influence the social identities projected onto her by her classmates.

The three studies just presented discussed students confronting identities placed on them by external forces primarily in their classrooms (i.e., peers and teachers) but with little direct teacher involvement in guiding students in how they might use language to do so. One study which documented teachers' encouragement of students using language in the process of contesting ascribed identities was Skerrett (2012). This author found in her case study of Angelica, a Latina student in a ninth-grade reading classroom in a diverse high school in the

Southwest US, that she initially saw herself as a “reluctant reader” due to an institutionalized identity placed on her via her low scores on standardized reading assessments (Skerrett, 2012, p. 68). However, once Angelica tired of consistently being placed in reading classes, she decided to work to improve her reading skills and effectively reposition herself as a good reader (Skerrett, 2012). Angelica’s teacher aided her in this process by emphasizing in her classroom that “one’s reading identity could change from moment to moment” (Skerrett, 2012, p. 70) and enabling her to reflect in her writing not only on how she came to be viewed as a “struggling reader” in the first place, but also how she could contest that label (p. 67). For instance, Angelica’s teacher provided writing prompts that asked her students to identify how their life histories and experiences shaped them into the type of reader they currently are (Skerrett, 2012). Thus, the teacher “construct[ed] a literacy environment that enabled students to claim strong academic identities” (Skerrett, 2012, p. 71). In effect, in this class, Angelica and her classmates “realized that they could claim and maintain strong identities as readers while critically exploring the factors that supported or threatened this identity,” and this inquiry was made possible by the types of writing assignments that the teacher gave students in class (Skerrett, 2012, p. 73). This participant in Skerrett’s study thus was documented to use language in this way at the teacher’s encouragement to contest identities that were placed on them by external forces.

All four of the studies in this section thus convey how students used language in the classroom to contest identities placed on them by outside forces – whether teachers, peers, or societal structures – in the midst of their identity negotiations. While in some cases (Bailey, 2000), use of a home language challenged peers’ racio-linguistic assumptions or configured an elevated status for students’ home languages and ethnic identities in an environment in which they were devalued, in others, the use of English expertise allowed students to challenge how

their teachers viewed them (Hong & Cheong, 2010), to cross linguistic boundaries and gain acceptance from peers as legitimate speakers of English (Miller, 1999), and, with the help of the teacher, transform an academic identity despite what systemic school forces were projecting (Skerrett, 2012). Therefore, these studies show multiple ways in which language can be used as a tool to carry out identity negotiation in the classroom – in this case, to contest identity ascriptions placed on them by others.

Language Use to Dynamically Position Oneself

Though the previous sections presented two types of identity negotiation in the classroom – assertion of one's identity and response to an identity ascribed by others – in an isolated fashion as they have been documented in the literature on this topic, this organizational structure does not mean to imply that students can only do one or the other of these two actions via their language use in the classroom. In other words, the aforementioned studies were separated above according to whether the participants used language to project or respond to positionings of themselves, and this is because this distinction was made clear in the findings. But, as might be expected, language use in identity negotiation is much more dynamic, and the authors of the studies described in this section made this interrelationship clear, documenting students simultaneously asserting aspects of their identities while also navigating identities placed on them by others. One such researcher was Ek (2009), who documented how students can use (features of) non-English languages to dynamically negotiate their identities with their peers. In trying to determine what identities her participant, Amalia, was being socialized into in her home, school, and church contexts in California, Ek found that Amalia purposely used her home language of Spanish – specifically Guatemalan Spanish – with peers in her English-speaking school in which Mexican Spanish was the valued version of Spanish in order to resist American-

and Mexican-influenced forces of socialization. Ek documented how Amalia consciously remained “faithful to the Central American lexicon” by using elements of it instead of the Mexican one, when, for example, referring to a straw in Spanish with friends (p. 413). Amalia pushed back against her school’s preference for Mexican Spanish by using Guatemalan Spanish in order to maintain her own sense of Guatemalan identity while also resisting forces of Mexicanization being projected onto her (Ek, 2009; see Rosa, 2015 for further discussion on maintaining one’s “ethnic specificity” (p. 32) in similar situations).

Just as Ek (2009) documented Amalia using a version of Spanish that was not valued at her school in order to maintain her sense of cultural and linguistic identity in this environment, O’Connor (2017) observed his participants using a non-English language in a way that signified similar markings of an identity in a space in which it could potentially be challenged. O’Connor conducted a linguistic ethnography of a class in a primarily Mexican American high school in Arizona and found that several features of his participants’ speech (like pronunciation and grammar) simultaneously projected aspects of their cultural and linguistic identities while also negotiating those ascribed to them by their learning environment. For instance, O’Connor observed one participant, Alex, applying the phonology of Chicano English to English words when he did not pronounce the ending of the word “what’s” in a particular utterance (p. 132). Alex did so even though he was aware of the “perceptions of nonstandardness” that accompanied this pronunciation, largely due to his understanding of how such pronunciation would mark him as Mexican in an environment in which local dialogue surrounding Mexican immigration in Arizona could potentially make such a categorization problematic for him (O’Connor, 2017, p. 133). In this way, Ek’s (2009) and O’Connor’s (2017) studies showed how students (and others in the classroom) used their non-English home languages to dynamically negotiate cultural and

linguistic aspects of their identities, even in particularly tense educational environments where such language use may have very negative practical consequences.

As Ek (2009) and O'Connor (2017) documented students' dynamic identity negotiation in the classroom, so, too, did Sutherland (2005) and Wissman and Vasudevan (2012). However, while the participants in the former studies used (features of) non-English to dynamically negotiate their identities in environments in which such language use was not valued, the participants in the latter two studies used English to engage with texts in culturally relevant ways in the process of dynamic identity negotiation in ways that were encouraged by their teachers. Sutherland (2005) found in her study of an all-girls honors English class at a majority African American high school that the African American female participants both responded to stereotypical identity projections and reflected on their own negotiations of identity while reading *The Bluest Eye*, a novel by Toni Morrison (1994) about an African American girl navigating issues of racism while growing up in the years after the Great Depression. Research has argued that textual engagement fosters identity formation, particularly for adolescents (see Glenn, 2012), and Sutherland (2005) found evidence for this claim in her study, in which the teacher explicitly encouraged this type of engagement with *The Bluest Eye* by asking students to think about themselves, their families, and turning points in their lives in relation to the text. Sutherland concluded that the students used the class reading material and the tools of inquiry presented to them by the teacher to better understand their own life experiences and, therefore, their own identities in the process. Examining *The Bluest Eye* and writing about it in this way enabled the students to reject certain markers of "being Black" (Sutherland, 2005, p. 385) – for instance, the notions that they were expected to be "loud and smart-mouthed," "poor," and "sexually promiscuous" (Sutherland 2005, p. 366-367) – while also discussing ways in which

they did not fit these categorizations – by, for example, choosing to refrain from using profanity in their speech (Sutherland, 2005). Wissman and Vasudevan (2012) came to similar conclusions as Sutherland (2005) in their study of mainly African American girls in a large urban school district. The authors documented that their participants used autobiographical poetry to perform their own identities while reflecting on "stock stories" they received about expected norms for African American girls in certain categories (Wissman & Vasudevan, 2012, p. 170). For instance, one participant, Jasmyn, used her poetry to "flip the script" (Jasmyn's words) of young women of color from "'fresh', materialistic, and a 'booty shaking smut'" to self-determined (Wissman & Vasudevan, 2012, p. 162). Likewise, several other participants used their poems to acknowledge stereotypes of young African American women as "too loud," "too grown," "uneducated," and "likely to become a teen mom" and to contest these categorizations by labeling themselves instead as passionate, responsible, in the process of receiving an education, and a "*M*agnificant-*O*utreaching-*M*arvel" (Wissman & Vasudevan, 2012, p. 170). While the role of the teacher in this classroom was not directly identified in Wissman and Vasudevan's (2012) study, the fact that the students were given significant opportunities to present their poems orally to the class implies that the teacher at least indirectly acknowledge the ways outlined here in which they were using language.

The studies reviewed in this section showed how students have been observed to negotiate their identity dynamically – both asserting it on their own and responding to identities placed on them by others – in the classroom. In Ek (2009) and O'Connor (2017), the participants used diverse varieties and styles of non-English in devalued ways to understand and project their own cultural and racial identities while rejecting (permanently or temporarily) those placed on them by outside forces and structures. In Sutherland (2005) and Wissman and

Vasudevan (2012), the participants used English to engage with teacher-provided culturally relevant texts in ways that allowed the students to understand their life experiences while simultaneously reflecting on how those experiences influenced their identities. Thus, these four studies displayed students negotiating their identities dynamically in the classroom, carrying out these processes through language varieties and forms not typically associated with dominant school or classroom Discourses.

Discussion, Conclusions, and Implications

Identity negotiation has been discussed in the literature as central to adolescent development and influential on academic outcomes at this age. As the above review has shown, identity negotiation has been observed to occur via language use in the heterogeneous, secondary, English-medium classroom in a variety of ways and to multiple ends. Several researchers (Bailey, 2000; Brady, 2015; Ek, 2009; Endo, 2016; Martínez & Morales, 2014; O'Connor, 2017; Wiltse, 2008) have documented students using their home languages or non-dominant versions of English to negotiate their immigrant identities; preserve cultural affiliations and maintain ties with peers; challenge racial, cultural, and linguistic assumptions of outsiders; and effectively distance themselves from others, despite the fact that their language use in this way was, with the exception of Bailey (2000), unapproved in classroom spaces. Although students' use of their home languages and non-dominant English varieties to negotiate identities was in these cases unsanctioned by the teacher, there were other instances (Carbone & Orellana, 2010; Martínez, 2013; Smith, 2010) in which such language use was welcomed via teachers' approval of various writing styles and modeling of their own bilingualism and resulted in the co-existence of students' academic and non-academic identities in the classroom.

Additionally, other researchers (Hong & Cheong, 2010; Miller, 1999; Skerrett, 2012;

Sutherland, 2005; Wissman & Vasudevan, 2012) have observed marginalized students challenge how others (teachers and peers) viewed them; gain acceptance as legitimate language users; and claim academic, cultural, and racial identities by way of engaging with culturally relevant texts, despite what was being projected on them by structural or societal forces – all by virtue of using English in ways that, in Skerrett (2012) and Sutherland (2005), were encouraged by the teachers in the classroom through their emphasis on the fluidity of identity as a concept and the explicit connection of identity to one's reading and writing, respectively. The above review therefore shows not only the different ways in which students have been observed to use language in the classroom to negotiate their identities and the ways in which teachers may influence these processes, but it also highlights what exactly this language use allowed the students to do in terms of asserting their own identities or dynamically navigating ones that have been ascribed to them by their peers, teachers, or larger societal forces prevalent in the current school system.

The studies presented here convey that language use is a significant means through which students can engage in the processes of identity negotiation, which have been theorized to affect adolescent development and academic outcomes. Despite this body of knowledge, however, there is still much more to learn about how racially, ethnically, culturally, and linguistically marginalized students go about this process in a general education classroom. One way that researchers can fill this gap in knowledge is to inquire as to how teachers understand student identity negotiation and its relationship to students' adolescent development and academic outcomes – or whether they are aware that this relationship exists in the first place (see also Yoon, 2007). Another is to consider students' and teachers' perceptions of the use of non-English languages or non-dominant varieties of English in the classroom and how these perceptions influence or co-occur with actual teacher practices. A nuanced understanding of

such perceptions might enable teachers to critically examine how their practices truly enable their students to engage in identity negotiation while using all of their linguistic and experiential resources. A third is to gauge teachers' recognition of opportunities for this identity negotiation in the curriculum – and to examine the effectiveness of strategies teachers attempt to use to incorporate these processes when they are not readily drawn on or apparent in course materials. A fourth is to consider the classroom space that is being examined. Although the environment for the current review was the general education classroom, not all of these classrooms look or function the same way; how does the demographic makeup of a classroom relate to the types of language use and negotiation processes that students are able to access?

As stated above, because general education classroom environments are rarely designed to meet the needs of marginalized students, both teachers and students in these populations have to allow for and engage in diverse language practices to ensure that these processes of identity negotiation that enable students to present or reposition themselves in the context of learning are occurring for this population. One way teachers can ease this task for students is by creating learning environments in which a wide array of student language practices is not only accepted and encouraged, but are also actively drawn on as resources for learning (see Heath, 1982). Doing so would go a long way towards enabling students not only to present understandings of their own identities in the social and academic contexts of the classroom (Duff, 2002; Yoon, 2012), but also to counter any identities placed on them by outside forces that they do not approve (see Carbone & Orellana, 2010) and to "challenge the historical pattern of subordination that has characterized relations in the broader society" and manifested itself in schools (Cummins, 1996, p. 3). Gaining a better understanding of the processes behind marginalized students' identity negotiation via language use in the classroom and the teaching methods that

facilitate them has the potential to positively impact personal development and academic outcomes for these students.

References

Andersson, A., Valero, P., & Meaney, T. (2015). “I am [not always] a maths hater”: Shifting students’ identity narratives in context. *Educational Studies in Mathematics, 90*, 143-161. doi:10.1007/s10649-015-9617-z

Bailey, B. (2000). Language and negotiation of ethnic/racial identity among Dominican Americans. *Language in Society*, *29*(4), 555-582. doi:10.1017/S0047404500004036

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society, and culture.* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Brady, J. (2015). Dialect, power and politics: standard English and adolescent identities. *Literacy, 49*(3), 149-157. doi:10.1111/lit.12058

Brenner, M. E. (1998). Development of mathematical communication in problem solving groups by language minority students. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *22*(2-4), 149-174. doi:10.1080/15235882.1998.10162720

Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, *7*(4-5), 585-614. doi:10.1177/1461445605054407

Carbone, P. M., & Orellana, M. F. (2010). Developing academic identities: Persuasive writing as a tool to strengthen emergent academic identities. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *44*(3), 292-316.

Carrasquillo, A., & Rodríguez, V. (2002). *Language minority students in the mainstream classroom*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Chen, X. (2010). Identity construction and negotiation within and across school communities: The case of one English-as-a-new-language (ENL) Student. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, *9*(3), 163-179. doi:10.1080/15348458.2010.486274

Cummins, J. (1996). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society*. Ontario, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.

DaSilva Iddings, A., & Katz, L. (2007). Integrating home and school identities of recent-immigrant Hispanic English language learners through classroom practices. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, *6*(4), 299-314. doi:10.1080/15348450701542306

Duff, P. (2002). The discursive co-construction of knowledge, identity, and difference: An ethnography of communication in the high school mainstream. *Applied Linguistics*, *23*(3), 289-322. doi:10.1093/applin/23.3.289

Ek, L. (2009). “It’s different lives”: A Guatemalan American adolescent’s construction of ethnic and gender identities across educational contexts. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 40*(4), 405-420. doi: 10.1111/j.1548-1492.2009.01061.x

Endo, R. (2016). Counternarrating racialized expectations at school: The diverse enactments of “non-dominant” identities among 1.5-generation Japanese immigrant youth. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *15*(4), 201-215. doi:10.1080/15348458.2016.1193440

Enright, K. A. (2012). Making it matter: Relevant instruction for new mainstream students. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, *48*(2), 67-71. doi:10.1080/00228958.2012.680368

Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis.* New York, NY: Norton.

Gee, J.P. (1989). Literacy, discourse, and linguistics: Introduction. *The Journal of Education, 171*(1), 5-176. doi:10.1177/002205748917100101

Gee, J.P. (2000). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. *Review of Research in Education, 25*, 99-125. doi:10.2307/1167322

Gee, J. P. (2011). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method (3rd ed.)*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2015). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideologies in discourses (5th ed.)*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Gérin-Lajoie, D. (2011). *Youth, language, and identity: Portraits of students from English-speaking high schools in the Montreal area.* Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc.

Glenn, L. N. (2012). Playing for real: Texts and the performance of identity. In D. Alvermann & K. Hinchman (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing the literacies in adolescents' lives: Bridging the everyday/academic divide (3rd ed.)* (pp. 3-28). New York, NY: Routledge.

Guerra, J. (2007). Out of the valley: Transcultural repositioning as a rhetorical practice in ethnographic research and other aspects of everyday life. In C. Lewis, P. Enciso, & E. Moje (Eds.), *Reframing sociocultural research on literacy: Identity, agency, and power* (pp. 137-162). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Harré, R., & van Langenhove, L. (Eds.). (1999). *Positioning theory: Moral contexts of international action*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Heath, S. B. (1982). Questioning at home and at school: A comparative study. In G. Spindler (Ed.), *Doing the ethnography of schooling: Educational anthropology in action* (pp. 102-131). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Hecht, M., Warren, J., Jung, E., & Krieger, J. (2005). A communication theory of identity: Development, theoretical perspective, and future directions. In W. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 257-278). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Hong, C., & Cheong, C. (2010). Literate identities among Korean students learning English in the USA. *English Teaching, 65*(4), 131-154.

Hyland, K. (2012). *Disciplinary identities: Individuality and community in academic discourse.*

Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ivanič, R. (2006). Language, learning and identification. *Language, Culture and Identity in Applied Linguistics*, 7-29.

Jaramillo, J. A. (1996). Vygotsky's sociocultural theory and contributions to the development of constructivist curricula. *Education*, *117*(1), 133-140.

Kibler, A. (2017). The making of a "Mexican feminist": A minoritized bilingual's development of disciplinary identities through writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 38*, 26-41. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2017.10.011

Ladson-Billings, G. J. (2005). Is the team all right? Diversity and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *56*(3), 229-234. doi:10.1177/0022487105275917

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2015). Saying what we mean: Making a case for 'language acquisition' to become 'language development'. *Language Teaching, 48*(4), 491. doi:10.1017/S0261444814000019

Lewis, C., Enciso, P., & Moje, E. (2007). *Reframing sociocultural research on literacy: Identity, agency, and power.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Marcia, J. (1980). Identity in adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (pp. 159-187). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Martínez, R. A. (2013). Reading the world in Spanglish: Hybrid language practices and ideological contestation in a sixth-grade English language arts classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, *24*(3), 276-288. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2013.03.007

Martínez, R., & Morales, P. (2014). ¿Puras Groserías?: Rethinking the role of profanity and graphic humor in Latin@ students' bilingual wordplay. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *45*(4), 337-354. doi:10.1111/aeq.l2074

McKinney, C., & Norton, B. (2008). Identity in language and literacy education. In B. Spolsky and F. Hult (Eds.), *The handbook of educational linguistics*. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons.

Mendoza-Denton, N. (2002). Language and identity. In J. K. Chambers, P. Trudgill, & N. Schilling-Estes (Eds.), *The handbook of language variation and change.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Miller, J. (1999). Becoming audible: Social identity and second language use. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, *20*(2), 149-165. doi:10.1080/07256868.1999.9963477

Moghaddam, F., & Harré, R. (2010). Words, conflicts and political processes. In F. Moghaddam and R. Harré (Eds.), *Words of conflict, words of war: How the language we use in political processes sparks fighting* (pp. 1-28). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Mohan, E. (2009). Putting multiethnic students on the radar: A case for greater consideration of our multiethnic students. In S. Steinberg (Ed.), *Diversity and multiculturalism: A reader* (pp. 131-141). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Moje, E., Luke, A., Davies, B., & Street, B. (2009). Literacy and identity: Examining the metaphors in history and contemporary research. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *44*(4), 415-437. doi:10.1598/RRQ.44.4.7

Moll, L. C. (1990). *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 31*(2), 132-141. doi:10.1080/00405849209543534

Morrison, T. (1994). *The bluest eye*. New York, NY: Plume/Penguin.

National Center for Education Statistics: English language learners. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=96.

Norton, B. (1997). Language, identity, and the ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, *31*(3), 409-429. doi:10.2307/3587831

O'Connor, B. H. (2017). Language out of place: Transgressive semiotics and the lived experience of race in borderlands education. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *16*(3), 127-141. doi:10.1080/15348458.2017.1283991

Ochs, E. (2002). Becoming a speaker of culture. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization: Ecological perspectives* (pp. 99-120). New York, NY: Continuum.

Orellana, M. (2007). Moving words and worlds: Reflections from "the Middle". In C. Lewis, P. Enciso, & E. Moje (Eds.), *Reframing sociocultural research on literacy: Identity, agency, and power* (pp. 123-136). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Paris, D. (2011). *Language across difference: Ethnicity, communication, and youth identities in changing urban schools.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ricento, T. (2005). Considerations of identity in L2 learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 895-910). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Rosa, J. (2015). Nuevo Chicago? Language, diaspora, and Latina/o panethnic formations. In R. M. Reiter & L. M. Rojo (Eds.), *A sociolinguistics of diaspora: Latino practices, identities, and ideologies* (pp. 31-47). New York, NY: Routledge.

Schecter, S., & Bayley, R. (2004). Language socialization in theory and practice. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 17*(5), 605-625.

doi:10.1080/0951839042000253621

Sharples, R. (2017). Local practice, translocal people: Conflicting identities in the multilingual classroom. *Language & Education, 31*(2), 169-183. doi:10.1080/09500782.2017.1295980

Skerrett, A. (2012). "We hatched in this class": repositioning of identity in and beyond a reading classroom. *The High School Journal*, *95*(3), 62-75. doi:10.1353/hsj.2012.0008

Smith, A. M. (2010). Poetry performances and academic identity negotiations in the literacy experiences of seventh grade language arts students. *Reading Improvement*, *47*(4), 202-219.

Sutherland, L. (2005). Black adolescent girls' use of literacy practices to negotiate boundaries of ascribed identity. *Journal of Literacy Research, 37*(3), 365-406. doi:10.1207/s15548430jlr3703_4

Tabouret-Keller, A. (1997). Language and identity. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Handbook of sociolinguistics* (pp. 315-326). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Tatum, B. D. (2003). "*Why are all the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?" and other conversations about race.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

US Department of Education. (2016). Non-Regulatory Guidance: English Learners and Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/essatitleiiiguidenglishlearners92016.pdf

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Watson-Gegeo, K. (2004). Mind, language, and epistemology: Toward a language socialization

paradigm for SLA. *Modern Language Journal, 88*(3), 331-350. doi:10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.00233.x

Williams, B. T. (2006). Pay attention to the man behind the curtain: The importance of identity in academic writing. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *49*(8), 710-715. doi:10.1598/JAAL.49.8.7

Wiltse, L. (2008). "The in-between crowd": Contrasting representations of minority language students. *Language and Literacy*, *10*(2). doi:10.20360/G2D59B

Wissman, K., & Vasudevan, L. (2012). Re-writing the stock stories of urban adolescents: Autobiography as a social and performative practice at the intersections of identities. In D. Alvermann & K. Hinchman (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing the literacies in adolescents' lives: Bridging the everyday/academic divide (3rd ed.)* (pp. 160-180). New York, NY: Routledge.

Yoon, B. (2007). Classroom teachers' understanding of the needs of English-language learners and the influence on the students' identities. *The New Educator*, *3*(3), 221-240. doi:10.1080/15476880701484055

Yoon, B. (2012). Junsuk and Junhyuck: Adolescent immigrants' educational journey to success and identity negotiation. *American Educational Research Journal*, *49*(5), 971-1002. doi:10.3102/0002831212443694

Zirkel, S. (2008). The influence of multicultural educational practices on student outcomes and intergroup relations. *Teachers College Record*, *110*(6), 1147-1181.

STUDY TWO

Using Scaffolding to Support CLD Students' Critical Multiple Perspective-Taking on History

Vonna L. Hemmler

University of Virginia

Abstract

American public-school classrooms are becoming increasingly culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD), yet the curriculum and instructional practices designed for these classrooms most often do not cater to the needs of this population of students. One way to incorporate CLD students more centrally into the learning processes of their classrooms, particularly in history classrooms where curriculum often depicts only the achievements and contributions of the dominant societal group (which typically does not include CLD students), is to prepare these students to approach this curriculum critically and view historical events and figures from multiple perspectives. This study examines how two teachers of CLD high school students do just that. Using overlapping theoretical lenses related to instructional scaffolding, Critical Race Theory, and historical stance-taking, I explore the interrelationships between teachers' exposing students to these perspectives in the first place and then actively guiding their interactions with this curriculum. A discussion addresses why this type of support is necessary for CLD students in general education classrooms and how it makes their curricular interactions meaningful. Implications for teachers and suggestions for further research are also presented.

Introduction

The increase in students of culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) backgrounds in American public schools is well-documented (e.g., Mohan, 2009; National Center for Education Statistics, 2017a, 2017b; Tichnor-Wagner, Parkhouse, Glazier, & Cain, 2016; U.S. Census Bureau, 2009) and has been growing to such an extent that it is no longer a surprising development to report.[5] Teachers in these classrooms do not need official statistics to confirm these changes, but what *is* noteworthy to consider is the extent to which this growth is expected to continue; in this vein, Enright (2012) has argued that this diversified population has become the "new mainstream" in U.S. schools (p. 68). This change warrants attention for several reasons. First, research has observed that the teachers in these classrooms are often very different racially, culturally, and/or socioeconomically from their students, which can in turn mean that they are not prepared to meet their students' academic, personal, and/or socioemotional needs (Assaf, Garza, & Battle, 2010; Irizarry, 2007; Kelley, Siwatu, Tost, & Martínez, 2015; Ladson-Billings, 2005; Scott & Scott, 2015; Waddell, 2011). In addition to this mismatch between student and teacher is one between student and curriculum, a fixed and standards-driven "object" that is often "explicit, proscribed, and given" to teachers by external forces like adminstrators, designers, and policymakers. In current educational practice, K-12 curricula still tend to take monocultural and monolinguistic perspectives on students and on the valuation and dispersion of information (Banks, 2013; Carrasquillo & Rodriguez, 2002; Enright, 2012; Joseph, 2011, p. 3). New and established teachers alike are often not trained in culturally

[5] Throughout this paper, I use this term to describe students from diverse racial, ethnic, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds who are students of color (Tatum, 2003) and/or who speak languages other than English or nondominant varieties of English in their homes and communities. For the purposes of this paper, it does not include White students who are considered to be proficient speakers of standardized American English.

responsive pedagogical practices, [6] which means that students of CLD backgrounds often find themselves marginalized[7] in general education classrooms, [8] with teachers and curriculum that do not meet their needs or allow them to draw on their unique experiences and resources in the processes of learning (Almarza, 2001; Gay 2000, 2004, 2010). It is logical that as a result of this marginalization, these students likely face additional social, cultural, linguistic, and cognitive demands in school (Hammond & Gibbons, 2005). This is an issue of increasing significance for the prospect of American K-12 schooling given the fact that English learners (ELs) comprised almost 10% of the American public school population in the 2013-2014 school year (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017a)[9] and the prediction that by the year 2025, students of color (including but not limited to those of African, Asian, Latino/a, and Native American descent; Tatum, 2003)[10] will outnumber White students in U.S. schools (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017b; U.S. Census Bureau, 2009). What is projected to occur, then, is an

[6] Gay (2010) defined culturally responsive teaching as that which uses the experiences, background/cultural knowledge, and frames of reference of CLD students in affirming ways to make their curricular encounters and classroom learning experiences meaningful and effective.
[7] I acknowledge that students of all backgrounds can be marginalized in the classroom for a multitude of reasons. However, in this paper I focus only on students who are marginalized as a result of their CLD backgrounds. This focus stems both from Enright's (2012) argument about the "new mainstream" in American classrooms, and from the context of my study classroom, in which students were indexed and chosen for participation in the class mainly according to their membership in one or more CLD category (p. 68). As such, for this paper, CLD students are considered to be students who are marginalized due to their racial, ethnic, cultural, and/or linguistic background(s).
[8] I use this term to indicate a content-area classroom in a U.S. public school in which enrollment is not confined to a subpopulation of students from any demographic group but is instead open to a variety of students from all backgrounds.
[9] Demographic terminology used throughout this paper is consistent with what is used on the study school's website. Because the website does not provide a definition for *EL*, I use federal guidelines to define ELs as students who were not born in the US, who speak a home language other than English and/or grew up in an environment in which a language other than English was dominant, and/or whose "difficulties in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language" may prohibit the student from meeting state academic standards, achieving in classrooms in which the language of instruction is English, or participating in society (U.S. Department of Education, 2016, p. 43). Despite the deficit orientation of this definition, I have employed it for this paper since the school in my study must abide by its tenets in the ways that it provides services to ELs.
[10] Tatum's (2003) use of Latino/a is synonymous in this paper with my use of Hispanic.

increase in CLD classrooms that are not prepared to meet the needs of their students.

Several scholars have suggested remedies to this situation. One includes recruiting teachers from demographic groups similar to CLD students and/or training teachers via teacher education programs and professional development to be adequately prepared, regardless of their backgrounds, to work with such students (Fuller, 1992; Ladson-Billings, 1999, 2005; Waddell, 2011). Another entails teachers approaching K-12 curriculum critically, in a way that would address power dynamics in education and challenge "traditional modes of knowledge production" (Marshall & Rossman, 2011, p. 21) by highlighting multiple, critical perspectives on content – namely, the experiences of racially, ethnically, culturally, and linguistically marginalized groups – rather than continuing to center it around "concepts, paradigms, and events that primarily reflect the experiences of mainstream Americans" (Banks, 2013, p. 181; see also Ladson-Billings, 1992). While a debate of what teacher education programs should provide future teachers is not the focus of this paper, the use of curricular materials and instructional practices in culturally responsive ways to reflect the perspectives of a CLD group of students in general education classrooms is central to the current study. Traditional history curriculum in particular often highlights the experiences and stories of a dominant societal group while downplaying or ignoring the historical accomplishments of marginalized groups; as a result, this study uses qualitative research methods (Marshall & Rossman, 2011) to examine the ways in which a high school history teacher, Mr. Stringfellow,[11] and his co-teacher Mr. Jordan supported their CLD students in their encounters with American history,[12] and how this support enabled these students to engage in critical, multiple perspective-taking on the content.

[11] All names of people and places in this paper are pseudonyms.
[12] In the school district in which this study took place, a co-teacher in a general education classroom provides special education services for students with disabilities or language services for students designated as ELs.

Rationale for Study and Research Questions

Because the curricular redesign referenced above would essentially involve an overhaul of K-12 education as it currently exists – and because no singular curriculum could ever have complete relevance to the wide range of students often found in a CLD classroom – a likely more realistic and timely way to effectively meet the needs of CLD students is to augment the existing curriculum with information that more accurately reflects their varied histories and interests and to provide them with the kinds of support they would need to interact critically with a curriculum that was not created for them. Such an addition would allow students to approach this curriculum in ways that enable them to bring their backgrounds and identities into their learning processes, and research has shown that identity incorporation in this way is positively associated with greater self-confidence and academic effort, more developed critical thinking skills, stronger and more meaningful teacher-student relationships, more active participation, and deeper academic engagement (Barton & McCully, 2010; Cummins, 1996; Duff, 2002; Hong & Cheong, 2010; Ivanič, 2006; Sutherland, 2005; Zirkel, 2008). Moreover, identity incorporation may be particularly important in history classrooms, where the curriculum often only depicts the achievements and influence of the dominant societal group, of which CLD students are often not a part. Supports that could facilitate teachers' goals in this regard include use of planned curricular materials provided by the teacher, or *designed-in scaffolds*, and instructional practices implemented by the teacher in the moment of teaching, or *contingent scaffolds* (Hammond & Gibbons, 2005). Both of these types of scaffolding, according to Hammond and Gibbons (2005), combine to constitute "true" scaffolding (p. 20) and are necessary for students' success in their curricular encounters. Therefore, it is vital to identify what exactly designed-in and contingent scaffolding might look like when enacted in a CLD history classroom, to examine how the two

types interact with each other to help make students' critical encounters with curriculum meaningful, and to understand why it is important for students to receive this kind of support in the first place. As such, the research questions for this study are:

1. How did two teachers in a CLD general education high school classroom support their students in taking multiple, critical perspectives on American history?
    a. What perspectives on historical content did the teachers present to students and what perspective-taking actions did the teachers ask students to take in assigned tasks, as informed by Hammond and Gibbons's (2005) designed-in scaffolding and Barton and Levstik's (2004) stances on history education?
    b. What instructional/interactional supports did the teachers provide students via contingent scaffolding (Hammond & Gibbons, 2005) to guide them in the moment in their multiple perspective-taking, as framed by Barton and Levstik's (2004) four stances on history education?
2. How did these two types of scaffolding interact, as informed by Hammond and Gibbons's (2005) notion of "true" scaffolding (p. 20) and Barton and Levstik's (2004) stances on history education, to make this support valuable for students?

To frame my exploration of these questions, I next present what is already known empirically in the literature about how teachers in secondary general education classrooms have implemented culturally responsive pedagogical practices that allow students to engage critically with the content they are learning.

Perspective-Taking and Culturally Responsive Teaching in Secondary Classrooms

If one purpose of history education from a teacher's standpoint is to reduce students' acceptance of "narrow or partisan perspectives on the past" and to expand their historical

understanding to encompass both previously-held and newly developing beliefs (Barton & McCully, 2005, p. 85; Barton & McCully, 2010) – and if teachers want to help CLD students access a history curriculum that is not created for them – then one way for teachers to do this is to expose students to multiple perspectives on the same historical events and issues. There is currently no empirical research that documents practices teachers have used to get their students to engage in multiple perspective-taking on history within the specific setting of a secondary history classroom, which makes the current study a welcome addition to the literature. Nonetheless, researchers have made several interesting – and sometimes conflicting – discoveries regarding students' reactions to being exposed to more than one perspective on history. Some students relished the history they learned in school as "an objective account of the past" that was in opposition to the "community bias" on historical events that they received in their homes (Barton & McCully, 2010, p. 165-166; Barton & McCully, 2012). Others, notably CLD students, identified school history classes as the most prominent and believable source from which they got their historical information and did not problematize the tendency of the curriculum to present only one perspective, which was most often that of the White man (An, 2009; see also Epstein, 1998, 2000). Still others, again notably CLD students, explicitly identified the history taught in their schools as strictly monocultural, Eurocentric, largely reflective of the dominant (in this case, White) population, and significant only as "facts to memorize for school tests" (Almarza, 2001; An, 2009, p. 770; Dimitriadis, 2000; Epstein, 1998).

This description of how students, particularly those of color, have viewed their history education reveals the complexities behind their opinions and the way in which issues of race in particular seem to inform their beliefs, at least at some level (see also Flynn, 2012). As such, several researchers have used the mediating factors of race and racialized identities as one way to

explain the differences in how certain students approach historical content from multiple sources. For instance, Epstein (1998, 2000) found in her studies of an urban eleventh-grade U.S. history class that while European (White) Americans aligned their own perspectives on history with those they encountered in school, Black individuals' perspectives were more often informed by the race-related experiences of themselves or their relatives. Further, not only did each of these groups of students place different value on historical events, figures, and themes, but they also espoused different notions of how their perspectives related to their role in a democracy: European Americans' perspectives revolved around the ideas of individual rights and democratic rule for everyone, while Black individuals' perspectives aligned only European Americans with democratic rule and non-European Americans with race-based oppression (Epstein, 2000). What might logically result, then, from these Black individuals' mindsets regarding history education and the place of race in it – and their observations that curricula often did not depict people they could identify with – is an inability to attach any real value or significance to American history (Almarza, 2001) or to obtain a deep understanding of the events they learned about in school (An, 2009).

As mentioned, one way to remedy this lack of engagement with history curriculum for all students and fulfill the goals of history education noted above is to expose students to multiple perspectives on the same historical events or figures. But exposure in and of itself is not sufficient, as students have been documented to make selective and superficial connections between various historical sources in the absence of teacher guidance; in fact, several scholars have even identified teachers and their practices as the "difference-maker" in students' curricular interactions in this regard (Milner, 2014, p. 16; see also Barton & McCully, 2005, 2012; Gay, 2010). This finding implies that teachers can moderate students' interactions with curricula in

their attempts to view history from multiple perspectives, especially considering the central role that secondary teachers have in selecting which historical topics to teach and how to convey historical significance (Almarza, 2001; Yoder & Jaffee, in press).

In this vein, though no studies have identified teacher practices specific to multiple perspective-taking on history, several have discussed culturally responsive practices in other content areas that can be applied within history to indirectly facilitate the processes behind multiple perspective-taking and encourage students to engage critically with the curriculum (Kelly et al., 2015; Ladson-Billings, 2009; Milner, 2014; Sampson & Garrison-Wade, 2011). These practices have included approaching historical topics as "alive and vibrant" no matter how long ago they happened (Almarza, 2001, p. 18), allowing CLD students to share stories of personal and historical racism with their White peers and to hear these peers' reactions to them (Flynn, 2012), creating and maintaining meaningful relationships with students, recognizing students' multiple identities, and teaching through a culture of collaboration with students (Bonner, 2014; Milner, 2011, 2014, 2016). They have also entailed teachers connecting their own home lives to those of their students and allowing students to use varied types of language in the classroom (Irizarray, 2007; Milner 2016), teaching and preparing students to operate in purposeful ways (Milner, 2014),[13] becoming self-reflective and self-aware teachers, not making assumptions about students, being willing to learn from students and participate in the larger school community, and seeing students and their experiences as assets and tools on which to co-construct knowledge (Bonner, 2014; Milner, 2016; Taylor, Iroha, & Valdez, 2015). Most generically, all these practices included teaching with energy, humor, and interest in the

[13] Milner (2014) described purposeful teaching practices as those that help students to understand the problems in their community and their role in solving them, and the need for students to develop sociopolitical consciousness and think beyond themselves about their role in their community and the world.

students and the content (Sampson & Garrison-Wade, 2011).

Although these practices have not been directly connected in the literature to multiple perspective-taking, it is fair to acknowledge that they are culturally relevant teaching practices according to Gay's (2010) definition above that can be applied to the task of multiple perspective-taking on history. Additionally, Yoder and Jaffee (in press) argued not only that content and learning were enriched when students can see their own perspectives (and those of others) in the curriculum, but also that incorporating multiple perspectives on historical content was essential if one wanted to engage in culturally responsive teaching in this subject area. In that vein, I now turn to the theoretical frames I used to discuss the specific culturally relevant practices Mr. Stringfellow and Mr. Jordan used in my study classroom in order to engage students in critical, multiple perspective-taking on history.

Theoretical Framing

The theoretical frameworks that I used in this paper emerged almost entirely from early data collection. Hammond & Gibbons's (2005) notion of scaffolding became relevant as I was observing the multi-dimensional practices teachers were engaging in to help students take multiple perspectives on history. Similarly, I chose to employ Critical Race Theory after learning that one of the teachers' goals for the class was to incorporate the non-dominant perspective on history – which this theory could address through its emphasis on a "unique voice of color" (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012, p. 10). Finally, I incorporated Barton & Levstik's (2004) stances on history education once I saw in my observations the different ways the students were taking multiple perspectives (as is related to the ways in which teachers were employing disciplinary principles of historical perspective-taking in the class) and connected what I observed to the ideas behind what students needed to be able to do with this information when

they were “doing” history. As such, I did not approach my data with any theoretical frameworks in mind, but rather let my lenses emerge from the data.

Scaffolding: Designed-in, Contingent, and True

An appropriate framework through which to view my data is the concept of scaffolding, as it can be considered even in its most general sense to be a culturally responsive teaching practice. Scaffolding can have different meanings depending on the educational context in which it is used, but two common blanket misconceptions surround it nonetheless: that it is simply some sort of extra material provided to students who need additional help, and that it is synonymous with the notion of good teaching (Hammond & Gibbons, 2005). In contrast, Hammond and Gibbons (2005) have argued that regardless of context, scaffolding is actually a very complex process that involves much more than is implied in both of these ideas.

In their conceptualization of scaffolding, Hammond and Gibbons (2005) have drawn extensively on the work of Vygotsky (1978) to contend that teaching is a “collaborative and negotiated social process” in which teachers enable students to construct their own meaning and understanding of content through their interactions with others (p. 9). The authors also employed Vygotsky’s (1978) zone of proximal development (ZPD), or the space between what learners can do on their own and what they can do with external help, to classify their understanding of scaffolding. Rather than extra materials or good teaching, then, Hammond and Gibbons (2005) have advanced the notion of scaffolding as “task-specific support, designed to help the learner independently to complete the same or similar tasks later in new contexts” (p. 8).

Hammond and Gibbons (2005) have conceptualized scaffolding as both designed-in,[14] encompassing macro-structures surrounding learning that are consciously planned and selected,

---

[14] Though this list is not exclusive, designed-in scaffolding can constitute the following actions on the part of the teacher: identifying learning goals, organizing the classroom, drawing on students’ prior knowledge

and contingent,[15] occurring spontaneously "in the dynamic unfolding of lessons" and in response to the teaching and learning moments that present themselves spontaneously in the classroom (p. 19-20). The authors have argued that both types of scaffolding are needed for "true" scaffolding to take place (Hammond & Gibbons, 2005, p. 20). This is because the designed-in scaffolding provides the context in which the contingent scaffolding can occur; in other words, both types work together to enable teachers to work with students within their ZPD, where Vygotsky (1978) hypothesized that learning occurs. The authors also contended that such scaffolding is helpful for *all* students but is particularly important for CLD students who are interacting with curricular material and content that was not designed with their needs and abilities in mind.

Critical Race Theory

Because my study addresses the absence of the experiences of CLD individuals in history curriculum and examines the ways in which these students interact with a curriculum that is not reflective of their histories, Critical Race Theory (CRT) is another appropriate theoretical framework through which to view my data. CRT arose during the Civil Rights efforts of the 1970s as a form of legal scholarship oppositional to what many scholars saw as insufficient progress in the proposed racial reforms of the time (Taylor, 1998). To remedy this lack of progress and counter the "experience[s] of whites as the normative standard" (Taylor, 1998, p. 122), CRT was proposed to rely instead on the "subjectivity of perspective" centered around the

---

and experiences, selecting and sequencing tasks, organizing participation structures, using semiotic systems and mediational texts (such as multimodalities), and employing metalinguistic and metacognitive awareness (i.e., by acknowledging that teaching language is part of teaching content; Hammond & Gibbons, 2005, p. 13).

[15] The following actions can be classified as contingent scaffolding, though as with designed-in scaffolding, this list is not exclusive: linking new information to prior knowledge, recapping, appropriating/recasting (i.e., attributing or paraphrasing student discourse), eliciting, and encouraging prospectiveness (i.e., asking a student to clarify or reflect on his/her response to a question or scenario; Hammond & Gibbons, 2005, p. 21).

experiences of people of color (Taylor, 1998, p. 122). As such, race is a central construct to CRT, which identifies it as a "primary tenet of inequality" in the US (Ladson-Billings, 2013, p. 34; see also Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995).

As CRT gained traction in the world of legal scholarship, it further developed to include several main principles that must be adhered to for one to employ it correctly in scholarly work (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001, 2012; see also Ladson-Billings, 2013).[16] One primary tenet is the acknowledgement that race is a social construction that relies on "arbitrary genetic differences" to create a "hierarchy and an ideology of White supremacy" (Ladson-Billings, 2013, p. 38-39). CRT scholars recognize race as such and correlate its existence with a "social reality" in which race is the (unjustified) cause for significant disparities of opportunity for different groups of people (Ladson-Billings, 2013, p. 39).

Expanding on such an understanding of race is another principle of CRT, which asserts that racism, or discrimination of a person based on their race, is a normal (not aberrant) part of everyday life in U.S. society and is a "reflection of the larger, structural, and institutional fact of white hegemony" as the main social structure of the country (Taylor, 1998, p. 122-123; see also Flynn, 2012). Thus, scholars who employ CRT recognize racism as "endemic and deeply ingrained in American life" (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995, p. 55; Ladson-Billings, 1998).

While race and racism undoubtedly play a central role in CRT, they are not the only constructs addressed by this theory in its aim to elevate people of color. Another tenet of CRT

[16] In this section, several of the main tenets of CRT are expanded on, with *interest convergence* and *intersectionality* being two that are omitted because they are not centrally applicable to this paper. Interest convergence builds on the recognition of the social construction of race and the existence of structural racism and asserts that within an existing hegemonic structure, members of the dominant group will only act in ways that benefit non-dominant groups if those actions also benefit themselves (Bell, 1980). Intersectionality entails the examination of how various other factors – such as sex, class, national origin, and sexual orientation – can interact with race and with each other in different contexts and potentially lead to increased marginalization for members of certain groups (Ladson-Billings, 2013).

acknowledges others in its condemnation of *essentialism*, which contends that all members of a group, regardless of how they might vary on certain descriptors, act and think in the same ways (Ladson-Billings, 2013). Rather, CRT holds the belief that differences observed in attitudes and beliefs of members within a demographic group can be just as heterogeneous as those observed across demographic groups (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; Ladson-Billings, 2013).

This push-back against essentialism informs an additional (though not by any means least important) principle of CRT: the recognition of the need for a counter-narrative and presence of a "unique voice of color" within social discourse (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012, p. 10). CRT strongly advocates for these voices and experiences to be heard, particularly via storytelling, which it views as a way to make space for "the experience and realities of the oppressed"[17] (Ladson-Billings, 1998, p. 14) and "challenge claims of neutrality, objectivity, color-blindness, and meritocracy" (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995, p. 56; Ladson-Billings, 2013). As per CRT, then, storytelling is a means by which the existing notion of history can be deconstructed and differing worldviews and narratives can coexist without valuation (Ladson-Billings, 2013).

Additional scholars have applied CRT and its principles to the realm of education to inform critical pedagogies. For instance, Ladson-Billings (1998) has detailed how CRT views school curriculum as a "culturally specific artifact designed to maintain a White supremacist master script" from which Black voices are removed when they challenge this existing hegemonic structure (p. 18). Similarly, as pertains to instruction, CRT argues that current general instructional practices assume that Black students are deficient in their academic abilities and that the general goal of *dealing with at-risk students* is really code for *controlling Black students* (Ladson-Billings, 1998; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; see also Almarza, 2001 and

[17] For the purposes of this paper, the terms marginalized and oppressed can be considered synonymous.

Cummins, 1986 for application of this concept to language-learners). While there may of course be Black students who fit this description of being at-risk, Ladson-Billings (1998) has contended that the "race-neutral" language with which these students are discussed causes these so-called deficiencies to be viewed as group-wide issues, and thus the techniques used to remedy them become generic, not specific to each student's needs (p. 18). This in turn makes it easier to lay blame on the students, not the instructional practices, and continues the unproductive dialogue of Black students as deficient and unresponsive to certain pedagogical approaches when the focus should instead be on adapting these approaches to meet the unique needs of the students (Ladson-Billings, 1998; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995).

Four Stances on History Education

When applied to education, CRT and critical pedagogy are particularly concerned with including the experiences and histories of CLD students in the curriculum. As mentioned above, one way in particular to do this – and to ensure that any set of historical experiences is understood alongside others – is to view them from multiple perspectives. This was a specific goal of the American history class I observed for this study, and within my research questions I used Barton and Levstik's (2004) stances on history education to consider the ways in which the teachers enabled students to do this. In their description of history education, Barton and Levstik (2004) drew on Wertsch's (1998) notion of *mediated action* to conceptualize not what students know about history, but what they are able to do with it. Thus, their four stances focus less on individual cognition and more on social practice to facilitate an understanding of how people can "do history" (Barton & Levstik, 2004, p. 7).

These stances, or "combinations of purpose and practice," are predicated on the four actions the authors identify as what students are expected to carry out when they are doing

history: identify, analyze, respond morally, and display (Barton & Levstik, 2004, p. 8). The Identification Stance is taken up when students are asked to associate themselves with what they are studying (e.g., historical people, events, institutions), either as individuals or members of larger groups (Barton & Levstik, 2004). This occurs, for example, when students are asked to consider how the present relates to the past or to view themselves within a national identity. Within this stance, students might be required to re-enact the first meeting of the Pilgrims and Native Americans.

Though the Identification Stance is currently a centerpiece of history education in the US, what is viewed as a more appropriate action regarding the study of history by many scholars, Barton and Levstik (2004) included, occurs in the Analytic Stance, in which students are asked to "work […] with evidence to construct historical explanations or accounts" and to "identify the connections, relationships, and structures that tie together individual events or pieces of evidence" (p. 69). This stance therefore would be employed when students are asked to establish causal relationships among historical events or break down a larger phenomenon into its parts to analyze its development. Thus, students operating within this stance might be asked to think about how historical evidence can be compiled to create accounts of how Jamestown was formed (Barton & Levstik, 2004). Barton and Levstik (2004) emphasized that the Analytic Stance is the one most often promoted by historians advocating for curricular reform because it enables students to see how historical accounts are grounded in evidence and how the past affects the present.

A third stance presented by Barton and Levstik (2004) is the Moral Response Stance. In this stance, students are asked to regard past events and people with remembrance if they seek to honor people from the past, with condemnation if they want to consider past events that have

caused suffering through a lens of fairness and justice, and/or with admiration if they seek to discuss past figures as heroes. Examples of actions within this stance could be asking students to discuss which historical events and figures within a particular time period are most significant to them or asking them to consider whether they think the past treatment of a particular group of people was fair. Finally, Barton and Levstik (2004) have identified the Exhibition Stance, in which students are simply asked to display their historical knowledge. An example of an action within this stance could be asking students to answer end-of-chapter questions or complete a unit test. Because my research questions focused on how the teachers helped students to examine historical content from multiple perspectives and not on how students displayed their historical knowledge, I did not include this last stance in my analysis.

Barton and Levstik (2004) clarified that these four stances can be but are not always mutually exclusive and that the distinctions among them are purely conceptual; many history lessons often involve students operating within anywhere from two to all four of the stances, and many history teachers would likely advocate for students to be able to take up each of the four stances when context demands it. In this way, this study utilizes Barton and Levstik's (2004) stances on history education as a frame through which to view their scaffolding practices as they relate to multiple perspective-taking on historical content.

Conceptual Framing

Similar to my theoretical frameworks described above, I employed a conceptual framework in my data in a largely inductive manner. I operated in this paper under the definition of *perspective* that the teachers provided to the students, though I did find similarities between this definition and the disciplinary one as it is conceptualized by scholars in social studies and history education. The definition of *curriculum* that I employed here was one that I had

originally planned to apply to my data as-is; however, after examining it more closely, I realized that I needed to expand it to the definition provided below based on how the teachers were enacting their own understandings of the term in the classroom.

Perspective

The teachers explained to the students that multiple perspective-taking on history was one of the class goals for the year on the very first day of class. Mr. Stringfellow specifically defined perspective as “a particular way of regarding something” and “how you see something” (Field notes, 8/23/16), and this is the definition of this term that is used throughout this paper. This definition is in line with Seixas and Morton’s (2013) general definition of the term and its use in history education: “a mental outlook influenced by worldview – how one sees and interprets reality” (p. 215). Mr. Stringfellow and Mr. Jordan employed principles of historical perspective-taking in their class by asking students to imagine events from certain viewpoints and use historical evidence to make inferences when interacting with the content.

Curriculum

I briefly defined curriculum above as educational materials that conform to state standards and are given to teachers by external actors (Joseph, 2011). Though this definition would incorporate the state standards of learning and the three textbooks that the school and/or district had traditionally used in past years (*America’s Story*, *History Alive!*, and *The Americans*) and that Mr. Stringfellow used to various degrees in each unit to provide differentiated readings for students, I have also expanded it here to include materials that the teachers themselves brought into the classroom to complement what they were given, such as pictures/visuals and self-made handouts and slide shows.

Methods

Research Context

This study was conducted at a large public high school in the South-Atlantic region of the US. The school serves approximately 2,000 students yearly who speak over 30 first languages other than English and come from more than 50 countries (School website). In response to their student body demographics and the unsatisfactory academic outcomes that traditionally marginalized students were displaying on standard measures of achievement, the school created an interdisciplinary English language arts/American history program for eleventh-grade CLD students. The goals of this program were to improve educational outcomes in language and content learning for this population of students, to create a positive and collaborative learning environment, and to support students in viewing the academic information to which they are exposed from various perspectives (Interviews, Mr. Stringfellow, 6/2/17, and Mr. Jordan, 5/31/17).[18] This paper focuses on the third of these goals and examines how the teachers employed CRT and Barton and Levstik's (2004) stances on history education to scaffold students in viewing historical events and figures from multiple perspectives, including their own.

Positioning Statement

I am a White, European-American female, and an advanced doctoral student with significant graduate training in qualitative research methods of data collection (such as observations and interviews) and inductive data coding and analysis in studies of CLD students in American public schools. I have been a teacher educator and teacher of CLD students, and my experiences in the classroom have fostered a strong belief in the place of social justice in education and led me to develop research interests, such as the current one, involving CLD students in American public schools. While these characteristics drew me to study this program

[18] Due to the nature of my research questions, the findings of this study pertain only to the history class and not to the literature class.

and sympathize with its aims, I was careful to employ sound research practices, such as checking data analyses with a second coder, that would lead me to well-supported conclusions and help me to avoid overlooking possible shortcomings in the program. I also made a point during data collection not to interfere directly with teachers and students' encounters with each other or the curriculum in order to best capture the intent of the program as the teachers chose to enact it.

Participants

Students.

The program ran four sections during the 2016-2017 school year. For my study, I chose to examine the section with the most diverse student population in terms of race/ethnicity and language backgrounds in order to operate within the parameters of my definition of CLD (see p. 60 above). The section I observed was 53% male, 88% students of color, and 29% ELs. Thirty-five percent of the students in the class had disabilities.[19] A comparison with schoolwide demographics shows why this classroom is considered to be CLD, as the school on the whole was also 53% male, but only 41% students of color and 11% EL (a schoolwide percentage of students with disabilities was not available; see Table 1 for full demographics).

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

Some individual student cases must be expanded on to understand the true demographic nature of the class. To begin, there were several students who were identified on the class roster as one race/ethnicity but either self-identified as or were phenotypically similar to another, such as a roster-identified Black male who self-identified as Hispanic, a roster-identified White male who was phenotypically of mixed race, and a roster-identified Hispanic male who was phenotypically Black. Additionally, there was one other White student in the class, a female

[19] The school website defines *students with disabilities* as "those that are identified for special education services, from speech pathology and learning disabilities to severe and profound disabilities."

EL. Of the students whose home language is not English in the class, two are not included in the EL percentage reported in the table: one female Spanish-speaker who was reclassified,[20] and another male Spanish-speaker who tested out of the EL classification system upon arrival to the US and was thus never classified as an EL in the first place.

Teachers.

The lead teacher of the American history class, Mr. Stringfellow, is a White, English-Spanish bilingual male in his late thirties. Though English is his first language, he learned Spanish from his students and from living in Central America and now uses Spanish to communicate with his family at home. At the time of the study, he was in his fourteenth year of teaching but had also spent time previously working in other educational contexts. Most recently, he served as the school district's English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) coordinator. He holds a doctorate in education and his research has specialized in the community organization of immigrant populations. He also served as a co-researcher on this study: his involvement in this role included conducting student focus groups (which formed part of the larger study but are not analyzed in this paper) and assisting with Spanish-to-English translations of audio-recorded student conversations.

Mr. Stringfellow was accompanied in this class by Mr. Jordan, an African American male special education co-teacher in his mid-thirties.[21] At the time of the study, Mr. Jordan was in his seventh year of teaching. Prior to teaching at this school, he was an elementary and middle school teacher and programs specialist and had also worked outside of education in the field of

---

[20] This term is used to describe a student who was previously identified by the school as an EL according to performance on a standardized English language proficiency test but exited the system within the previous two years based on state-level reclassification criteria and is no longer considered to be an EL.
[21] Though I have used Black throughout this paper in place of African American, I use the term intentionally here because that is how Mr. Jordan identified himself in his interview.

mental health. Though he was assigned to this class due to the large number of students with disabilities in it, he interacted with all students on a regular basis in my observations.

Due to the highly diverse nature of this class population (see Table 1), I must acknowledge here the potential roles that the races/ethnicities of the teachers could have played in the students' curricular interactions and their attempts to take multiple perspectives on history. It is important for the reader (and me) to be cognizant of the fact that Mr. Stringfellow was the lone White male in the classroom. As the content teacher, he was primarily responsible for organizing the history curriculum (though the teachers in this program met extensively at the beginning of the school year and periodically throughout it to make decisions on curriculum, scheduling, and assignments). He thus made it known to the students through his curricular selections and explicit emphasis on multiple perspectives on history that despite his outward appearance as a member of the dominant societal group, he valued his CLD students' input and experiences within the learning process. Additionally, Mr. Jordan was an African American teacher in a room of CLD students, many of whom self-identified as Black or mixed race. Despite his status as a special education teacher, his dealings with students at times included a facilitation of their interactions with curriculum, as is evidenced in an example in my discussion of the findings below. Like Mr. Stringfellow, Mr. Jordan also indicated to the students through his use of metaphors and popular culture that he was interested in seeing them bring their backgrounds and prior knowledge into their curricular interactions. Thus, although I am not attempting to identify any causal relationships in this study among the teachers' races/ethnicities, their instructional practices, and the students' actions or thoughts regarding multiple perspective-taking on historical content, I do understand that these factors might have in fact influenced how (or if) students were able to consider history from multiple perspectives.

Data Collection

This study arose from a larger one for which I collected data via observations, student and teacher interviews, and student focus groups. I informed students of my intent to observe this class, which qualified as documenting normal educational practice by the Institutional Review Board. I then created an observation schedule that allowed me to observe 51 class periods, each of which was approximately 95 minutes long, at various levels of depth over the school year. I based my selections of in-depth units on the demographic characteristics of the students in the class (see Table 1) and the proclivity of certain content-area topics to lend themselves more easily to perspective-taking activities and assignments than others. For instance, I hypothesized that Hispanic students might be highly engaged in the topics of Native American colonization and immigration, and that Black students might have high levels of interest in the topics of slavery and Civil Rights. As a result of these criteria, I chose three out of the possible 10 units to observe in-depth over the course of the entire year.

The first unit I observed in-depth was Unit 1. This unit addressed the colonization of Native Americans and the formation of the early US, and my observations of it occurred at the beginning of the school year in August and September of 2016. The second in-depth unit that I observed was Unit 5, which covered westward expansion and Progressivism (including immigration), and I observed this unit in the middle of the school year in January of 2017. The third and final in-depth unit was Unit 9/9A, which addressed the Cold War and the Civil Rights Movement and took place at the end of the year in April and May of 2017. Because I was interested in examining the processes behind the teacher’s treatment of multiple perspectives on these (and other) historical events, observing these three units in this way also gave me a snapshot of how the teacher was doing this at the beginning, middle, and end of the school year.

During my observation of these in-depth units, I observed the class each time for the entire period. I conducted 10 observations of Unit 1, three of Unit 5, and nine of Unit 9/9A.[22] This structure enabled me to document how students approached the curriculum, reacted to the assignments given, transitioned between tasks, and interacted with peers on topics of interest. In these in-depth visits, I used video and audio recorders to capture the events of the classroom while also taking detailed field notes. In any portion of the class where Spanish was used by students and/or teachers, I noted the occurrence for Mr. Stringfellow to translate into English, which he did wherever the quality of the audio recording allowed it. As such, my observation schedule and decision to observe certain units in-depth enabled me to document as many of the class meetings as possible while also maintaining a high level of detail and specificity in my field notes and gathering the data needed to address my research questions.

In addition to my in-depth observations, and to maintain a presence in the classroom and document as many significant interactions or events as possible during the rest of the units that I did not observe in-depth, I visited the class and took field notes once a week at minimum throughout the year. I also used video and audio recorders during these visits to make sure that I captured as much of the classroom dynamic as possible while simultaneously taking field notes.

Teacher interviews collected for the larger study were utilized marginally for this study, but the student interviews and focus groups served as contextual information and were not used as primary data for this analysis because the information obtained from them did not directly relate to my research questions and my examination of ways in which teachers prepared students to view history from multiple perspectives.

[22] The significant discrepancy in the number of observations I conducted for Units 1 and 9/9A and Unit 5 was due to scheduling difficulties surrounding the school's winter break, which occurred in the middle of the unit. Despite this, I nonetheless chose to include Unit 5 in my study due to its treatment of topics that might be of increased interest to members of this class's population.

Data Analysis

I began analyzing my data by open coding (Marshall & Rossman, 2011) all field notes and inductively identifying any instructional materials, formative or summative tasks, and teacher practices (defined here as things teachers did or asked students to do) that were related to multiple perspective-taking on history. This step allowed me to identify all relevant information for research question 1a (focused on instructional materials and tasks used as designed-in scaffolding). To analyze contingent scaffolding (research question 1b), I grouped similar teaching practices into categories according to the actions the teachers were carrying out in the moment as they related to multiple perspective-taking; these actions became my process codes (Saldaña, 2015). I conducted a first round of coding in which I identified all instances of relevant teacher practices both according to when (i.e., the calendar date/observation number) and how often they occurred during the year. I used the results of this step to observe which instructional practices were most common within and across units.

In consultation with an experienced qualitative researcher, I refined my process codes to focus on these common practices and create my codebook (see Table 2 for how my process codes were revised and used in the codebook).[23] I then conducted a second round of field note coding in Dedoose software, applying the revised code(s) to the relevant teacher practices. Once all field notes were coded, I re-examined each coded excerpt individually and reviewed excerpts with a second coder in any instances in which code fit was ambiguous or when codes were more difficult to interpret.

[23] I included two teacher practices in my codebook that did not happen frequently but were nonetheless central to my research questions and to the processes of multiple perspective-taking for the students: defining the word perspective for the students, which the teachers did once at the beginning of the year, and introducing the idea of taking multiple perspectives on history, which the teachers did several times in one class at the beginning of the year.

Of the seven practices that appeared more than ten times across units, I focus in the findings on the practice of asking students prompting questions in the process of multiple perspective-taking on history. This choice was made because of the likelihood that prompting questions were the most contingent form of scaffolding identified in my data, in that they could not be pre-planned but truly had to be devised in the moment of teaching and in response to reactions and questions students had about the content. As a result of this focus, the second coder read and coded all excerpts pertaining to the teachers guiding students via prompting questions to facilitate multiple perspective-taking.

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

Once coding was complete, I aligned each prompting question with both CRT and Barton and Levstik's (2004) four stances on history education to elucidate the types of critical multiple perspective-taking that the teachers were asking the students to do. Finally, I analyzed contingent scaffolding alongside instances of designed-in scaffolding to answer my second research question regarding how both types interacted in this classroom.

Findings

Several themes emerged from my analysis regarding teachers' treatment of multiple perspectives on history and the instructional supports that they provided to aid students in their perspective-taking practices. The teachers provided students with various perspectives on historical events and figures via the curriculum and the assignments, both of which constituted their designed-in scaffolds and allowed students to draw on their own racial/ethnic identities to inform these multiple perspectives. They also contingently supported students in their interactions with this content via prompting questions that facilitated their ability to see history from more than one viewpoint and actively let them construct their perspectives in meaningful

ways, which constituted their contingent scaffolds. Finally, the teachers engaged in both of these types of scaffolding frequently and in conjunction when asking students to view history from multiple perspectives to enable them to bring their racial/ethnic identities into the classroom, and they utilized these scaffolding processes to ask students to engage in different types of perspective-taking, as described by CRT and Barton and Levstik's (2004) four stances.

Designed-in Scaffolding: Varied Perspectives on Historical Content

Mr. Stringfellow and Mr. Jordan used designed-in scaffolds to present the students with multiple perspectives on the historical events and figures identified as important by the state standards of learning and by the teachers themselves. In doing this, the teachers often followed the structure of broaching the topic of multiple perspectives on a certain historical event via instructional and curricular materials (i.e., videos, slideshows, handouts, manipulatives), and then assigned students to take certain perspectives on the content in their formative and summative tasks throughout the year (see Table 3 for a description of perspectives and tasks by unit).

INSERT TABLE 3 HERE

The following description depicts how the teachers facilitated multiple perspective-taking through designed-in scaffolds throughout the course of one full unit, Unit 1, which is largely representative of how the teachers did this in other units as well. The students began the unit by discussing Native American colonization and the formation of the early United States. At the beginning of this unit, the teachers used videos, slideshows, handouts, lectures, and additional visuals (i.e., pictures) to present the students with Native American, African, British, and French perspectives on colonization. For instance, the following text is taken from a slide show Mr. Stringfellow used when doing this in one class:

> The French usually had friendly relationships with the Native Americans. This is because not many French people came to the land they colonized. They traded with the Native Americans. The English, on the other hand, came to North America with many people and families. They often took the land from Native Americans and had many violent conflicts. (Class slide show, 8/29/16)

This text shows one of the first instances in which Mr. Stringfellow exposed the students to multiple perspectives on one historical event, providing them with information on how the French and English likely viewed the Native Americans they encountered during colonization. This particular example invokes multiple perspectives on colonization but also reflects the state standards of learning closely, as they frame the Native American interactions with these colonizers almost exactly in this way. However, within this unit, the teachers supplemented their adherence to the state standards by including additional perspectives from historical materials that were not as present in the standards. For instance, in addition to discussing the processes of colonization itself and these perspectives on it, the teachers also introduced the students to the presence of slavery via the treatment of rebellion leader Nat Turner. In their approach to this topic, the teachers and students discussed various perspectives on his actions and on the institution of slavery, including those of White supremacists, free Black people, and Southern and Northern colonies who at the time were arguing for or against slavery. For example, they presented the class with two paragraphs written about him, one by a white lawyer and one by Nat Turner himself, and asked the class to identify the perspectives on the rebellion leader in each one. Like the previous example, this one also supports the teachers' goals of multiple perspective-taking on history, yet it does so in a way that deviates from the state standards of learning that only cursorily reference Nat Turner. Rather, in centralizing Nat Turner during this

part of the unit, the teachers provide distinct and extensive opportunities for the CLD students in this class to potentially align their racial/ethnic identities with the historical figure they were studying. In this way, the teachers used existing and self-created curricular materials to enable the students to achieve the class's stated goal of viewing history from multiple perspectives.

During these curricular interactions, the teachers also interspersed formative tasks that prepared students to engage in related summative ones at the end of the unit. In one of these formative tasks, the students were asked to conduct role plays that depicted likely interactions between the Native Americans and their colonizers. For example, one group's skit showed Native Americans encountering the British, and another showed them interacting with the French. Additionally, students were asked in another formative task in this unit to address water shortages experienced by Navajos in present-day New Mexico. During this task, the teachers showed two videos explaining how many Navajos in Albuquerque cannot access running water, and then they asked the students to form groups and create a solution to this problem that they could present to a hypothetical governing body. At the end of the unit, the students' summative task was to tell an untold story of their choice from this period of history via a short film; students created movies about Nat Turner, Pocahontas, and various Native American figures and families. Thus, the teachers gave the students the opportunity via these assignments to bring their own racial/ethnic identities into their learning and use them to form their own perspectives on the content that could be supplemented by additional curricular perspectives provided by the teachers.

As evidenced by this description of Unit 1, Mr. Stringfellow and Mr. Jordan used designed-in scaffolds to present the students with more than one perspective (Native American, African, French, and English) on a historical event (the colonization of Native Americans and the

formation of the new nation), and they asked them to negotiate this content as informed by their own racial/ethnic identities via formative and summative assignments. In other words, Mr. Stringfellow and Mr. Jordan planned to introduce students to multiple perspectives on the same historical event via their curricular materials and assignment choices. Their inclusion of certain perspectives, particularly in the assignments, also employed elements of Barton and Levstik's (2004) Identification, Analytic, and Moral Response Stances, when they asked students to complete a role play from a certain point of view, discuss ways in which the Navajo water problems could be solved, and tell an untold story that they thought to be important, respectively. Additionally, the teachers' treatment of the material focused on these perspectives on history that were mentioned but not foregrounded in the state's standards of learning.[24] Their inclusion of the points of view of the marginalized figures who experienced the events first-hand and their use of a final assignment that conveyed an untold story employed a CRT focus on the centrality of a "unique voice of color" (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012, p. 10) to tell the stories of marginalized groups while simultaneously recognizing that people experience events differently – thus pushing back against the essentialist angle with which these stories are often presented in history textbooks.

Contingent Scaffolding: Supporting Students in the Moment of Perspective-Taking

In addition to providing students with multiple perspectives to take on historical events and figures via their curriculum choices, the Mr. Stringfellow and Mr. Jordan supported students in the moment of teaching in various ways that aided them in their multiple perspective-taking by giving them opportunities for racial/ethnic identity incorporation. In this regard, the teachers'

[24] For instance, slavery as an element of colonization is mentioned sparsely throughout the state standards curricular framework that Mr. Stringfellow used. When it is included, it is referenced in relation to the economic development of the newly-formed colonies, but the forcible transport of Africans to the colonies is mentioned cursorily.

instructional practices revolved around reminding the students of previously-learned information, asking them prompting questions that guided their perspective-taking, connecting perspectives on historical events or people to the students' lives, and encouraging students to share their perspectives on historical topics.

As explained above, because of their truly contingent nature, the focus of this paper is the prompting questions that teachers asked students to facilitate their multiple perspective-taking on content, which I have aligned with the first three of Barton and Levstik's (2004) stances on history education. The first includes those that asked students to associate themselves with a particular action or scenario presented in the content and is reflective of the Identification Stance. A representative example of a question reflecting this stance is seen in the following exchange, which occurred during a conversation about the condition of slave ships in the Middle Passage in Unit 1:

> Mr. Stringfellow changes the slide to show a blueprint of what the slave ships looked like. The picture shows a cross-section of the ship with people laying down next to each other. He tells the class that more people on the ships meant more money for the traders and owners. Then he asks the class, "What do you think this was like?" Kiara [Black, female] calls out that it was "nasty" and "contaminated." Amir [Black, male] quietly says that the ships were very cramped from the start of the journey to the finish and that people would go to the bathroom on themselves and others would die because it smelled so bad. (Field notes, 9/13/16)

In the process of preparing students to take multiple perspectives on this particular topic, Mr. Stringfellow utilized designed-in scaffolds to expose students to the material, but he did not let their interactions with it stop there. Rather, his prompting question of "What do you think

this was like?" encouraged the students to engage more deeply with the content and draw on their own racial/ethnic identities by imagining themselves on one of the Middle Passage ships. This practice on the part of Mr. Stringfellow asks students to operate within Barton and Levstik's (2004) Identification Stance because he is encouraging students to establish a connection between themselves and a past event or person and imagine what it would be like to experience it firsthand.

While Mr. Stringfellow and Mr. Jordan asked students to employ this stance often throughout the year while they interacted with the content, they also adjusted their questioning at times to ask students to do more than simply associate themselves with history. Additionally, they prepared students to examine the processes behind historical events so as to understand why they happened, undertaking Barton and Levstik's (2004) Analytic Stance. A representative example of when this occurred for Mr. Stringfellow in Unit 1 is below:

> Mr. Stringfellow transitions to talk about the group project. He tells them that the purpose of the project is to tell a story from history that wouldn't have been told otherwise. Then he asks the class whose perspective we usually hear in history. One student says, "The winners?", and Mr. Stringfellow answers, "Who are the winners?" Zion [Black/Hispanic, male] asks, "When?" Mr. Stringfellow says, "In history." No one answers, so Mr. Stringfellow tells a story about how [this school district] used to be controlled by White supremacists when his mom went to school here. He defines White supremacists as people who think that White people are better than all other people of any color. He asks the class if this was the case, who controlled what was taught in schools then? Zion says White people did. Mr. Stringfellow says, "White supremacists." Then he asks, "How will they tell Nat Turner's story?" Zion says that they will make

> him seem like a bad guy and then pauses and exclaims “OH!” Mr. Jordan laughs at this and asks him, “You gettin’ it now?” (as in, do you see what we’re trying to get you to think about?). Zion says, “Yeah, I'm getting it.” (Field notes, 9/13/16)

Mr. Stringfellow’s prompting questions in this excerpt come about in the moment of teaching as a way to help students, specifically Zion, understand the reasons why history is often conveyed from one particular viewpoint and how that relates to Nat Turner’s story potentially being told by different people in different ways. Thus, his questioning here helped Zion to see how particular viewpoints are formed and how they can lead to certain events occurring.

Mr. Stringfellow employed this analytical method of questioning frequently throughout the year, even coupling it with other stances of Barton and Levstik (2004) to prepare students to take multiple perspectives on history. Another of these other stances he often employed was the Moral Response Stance, as evidenced by the representative field note excerpt below from Unit 1. Just prior to this example, Mr. Stringfellow and Mr. Jordan had been discussing multiple perspectives on Nat Turner with the class (see above for further detail). Mr. Stringfellow presented the class with two paragraphs written about Nat Turner and the following exchange occurred after the teachers read both paragraphs aloud:

> Malia [Black, female] raises her hand and says that she doesn't think it's fair that Nat Turner got killed for doing what he did while people were allowed to own slaves at the same time. She says that people aren't understanding Nat Turner and his reasons for doing what he did. She calls this “stupid” several times […] After Malia is done talking, Mr. Stringfellow asks the class: in Malia’s perspective, is Nat Turner justified with his violence? Some students call out yes […] Amir raises his hand and says that Nat Turner did have a reason but he shouldn't have killed kids. Mr. Stringfellow adds that Amir is

saying that maybe Nat Turner took the violence a little too far. (Field notes, 9/15/16)

In this excerpt, Malia expresses her perspective on certain historical treatments of Nat Turner. Mr. Stringfellow's follow-up question of whether or not this treatment of Nat Turner is fair aligns with Barton and Levstik's (2004) Moral Response Stance, in which students are asked to invoke a value judgment on a historical event or person (a judgment which, as mentioned above, can be informed by one's understanding of his/her own identities). As such, my findings show that Mr. Stringfellow and Mr. Jordan supported their students in multiple perspective-taking on history by (a) providing them with curricular materials on events and figures that described these events from various perspectives and assigning formative and summative tasks that asked students to acknowledge these perspectives (including their own), and (b) supporting their students' encounters with these materials in the classroom moment via their use of prompting questions that served to allow them to bring their racial/ethnic identities into the classroom and guide their multiple perspective-taking. Their scaffolding in this way also invoked the tenets of CRT in their classroom by acknowledging the role that race plays in the historical treatment of certain groups of people and incorporating a "unique voice of color" (the students') in the way that historical events were portrayed and discussed (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012, p. 10).

True Scaffolding: The Interaction of Designed-in and Contingent Scaffolding

Though the previous sections treat the teachers' designed-in and contingent scaffolding practices separately for purposes of clarity, that does not mean that they are mutually exclusive in the classroom. Rather, as Hammond and Gibbons (2005) have argued, both types of practices must work in concert to constitute "true" scaffolding (p. 20). In this classroom, the students' understanding of the multiple perspectives with which they were presented via the teachers'

designed-in scaffolds was facilitated by the teachers' contingent scaffolding – in this case, prompting questions, which asked the students to interact with the content in deeper ways than if they had just been given a handout and asked to approach it on a more superficial level by, for instance, reading it to themselves with no deeper treatment or expansion. Conversely, the students would not have been able to engage with the teachers' prompting questions if there were no materials on multiple perspectives to which they could apply them; it is difficult (if not impossible) to think about how you associate with a historical event or to understand the causes of it if you know absolutely nothing about the event (from any perspective) in the first place. Thus, both types of scaffolding co-occurred in order to provide value to students in their interactions with curriculum and, in this case, to prepare students to view historical events from multiple, critical perspectives that were informed to varying degrees by their own identities (Hammond & Gibbons, 2005). Were these types of scaffolding not to occur, both in isolation and together, then students would find themselves in a general education classroom with few tools to access curricular and instructional practices that were not designed with their experiences or learning needs in mind. Therefore, the scaffolding that Mr. Stringfellow and Mr. Jordan used throughout their class not only inserted the experiences and interests of marginalized groups into the curriculum, but it also made the curriculum more accessible to these students via various types of instructional and interactional support.

Conclusion and Discussion

The above analysis outlines the ways in which the teachers in my study classroom enabled their CLD students to approach history from multiple perspectives: they presented the students with multiple viewpoints on historical content and supported them in their interactions with this content via their instructional choices in ways that made these curricular interactions

meaningful for the students. With these findings in mind, I now turn to a larger question for the field of education: Why does this type of curricular support for CLD students matter in the first place? As discussed above, marginalized students frequently find themselves in (history) classrooms that are not designed with their needs and interests in mind, but rather cater to and reflect the values of members of the dominant group as the "normative standard" (with the dominant group most often not including CLD students; Taylor, 1998, p. 122). Teaching practices like those used by Mr. Stringfellow and Mr. Jordan can remedy this issue by acknowledging, as advocated by CRT, that CLD individuals most likely form what would constitue a counter-narrative on history (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012). They can allow students to access the material in ways that bring their identities into the classroom and thus enable their backgrounds and experiences to inform their learning. In other words, they can create space in their classrooms for CLD students' "unique voice of color" to be heard (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012, p. 10). Wertsch (2002) pointed out that history is fundamentally connected to the concept of identity, as a person's identities often inform how he or she views or values particular historical events or figures. Similarly, Barton and McCully (2010) noted how students often approach historical narratives through their own school and non-school experiences, which inarguably create heuristics for understanding new material that are informed by their identities. If teachers do not understand the interaction of students' identities and academic content – particularly as it pertains to history – then students are at risk of viewing history as "an alienated body of facts that appears to have little to do with their own lives" (Almarza, 2001, p. 7; see also Barton, 2005).

Additional research referenced above has discussed the incorporation of students' identities as one factor correlated with successful measurable learning outcomes (e.g., Cummins,

1996; Duff, 2002; Hong & Cheong, 2010; Ivanič, 2006; Sutherland, 2005; Zirkel, 2008). Within Mr. Stringfellow and Mr. Jordan's course goal of preparing students to take multiple perspectives on history, it is not hard to see how students' identity incorporation plays a central role. For example, it can happen when the teachers present these students with materials that address the perspective of a member of a marginalized group on a historical event or figure, as this would undoubtedly facilitate their ability to view that event from the perspective of people with which they might identify – and would also fall within Barton and Levstik's (2004) Identification Stance on history education. It can also happen to an even greater extent when the teachers ask students to operate within the Moral Response Stance and, for instance, provide an opinion on the treatment of a group of people in history or place a value judgment on which historical events were most important to them – both of which actions the students were repeatedly asked to do in formative and summative assignments in this class. Therefore, while multiple perspective-taking is important both for the purposes of history education as described by Barton and Levstik's (2004) stances and for reasons aligned with social justice (as informed by CRT and discussed above), it is also a way for teachers to enable students to bring their identities into the classroom and thus facilitate their access to the curriculum and enhance their prospects for learning.

Implications and Suggestions for Future Research

If we understand the importance of students taking multiple perspectives on history for their own understandings, for their classroom performance, and for the purpose of social justice, we must now consider what the findings of this study imply for K-12 curriculum, for teachers and their practices in the CLD general education classroom, and for future research on this topic. Primary curricular implications could entail providing teachers with materials in addition to the

curriculum they are given that address history from various perspectives – thus giving them concrete opportunities to incorporate their CLD students' voices and experiences in the material – and training teachers to recognize instances in the existing curriculum in which additional perspectives on content can be incorporated. These implications naturally call for the creation of individualized curricular materials by designers, perhaps with teacher input, that steer the curricular focus away from just a dominant societal group and towards an understanding of historical events as experienced by people from multiple social, cultural, ethnic/racial backgrounds.

In terms of teacher practices in CLD classrooms, one implication of the current study pertains to the precise role that the teacher plays in students' curricular interactions. This can be discussed from several angles. First, this study showed the importance of scaffolding marginalized students' encounters with the curriculum in various ways: not only was it important for the teacher to provide materials for students that encouraged multiple perspective-taking on history, but it was equally as vital for teachers to aid the students in the moment of their encounters. As is also evidenced from the literature on this topic, students' self-guided approaches to the curriculum can be insufficient, and teacher direction is needed for proper facilitation of these interactions (Barton & McCully, 2005, 2010, 2012). Therefore, it is crucial for teachers to be highly involved in CLD students' interactions with general education curriculum, as simply alerting them to alternative sources of information is not enough. Future research in the arena of teacher involvement in the multiple perspective-taking of CLD students on American history could seek to document into additional ways that teachers can scaffold students' curricular encounters; in fact, several such ways, like reminding students of previously-learned information or connecting new information to students' lives, were identified for the

larger study and could be analyzed in the future alongside the findings presented here.

Another implication that can arise from this study expands on this idea of teacher involvement. As referenced above, one of Mr. Stringfellow and Mr. Jordan's goals for the class was to increase educational opportunities and outcomes for their school's CLD students. They aimed to achieve these goals in their classroom by equipping their students to view history from multiple perspectives. Research has identified the teacher's level of engagement in approaching curriculum as an important factor in how students themselves do the same. For instance, Barton and McCully (2012) argued not only that a teacher's curiosity for and engagement with academic material is a prerequisite for students to hold similar attitudes, but also that both of these factors are forgone in the educational systems of many countries in favor of a more analytic approach to history. Similarly, Almarza (2001) acknowledged that CLD students disengage from curriculum when teachers do not welcome their values, backgrounds, and identities into the learning process. In the current American culture of high-stakes testing, it is easy to take these arguments as valid. Both of these studies and the current one support the notion that teachers can make a difference in CLD students' curricular encounters in the general education classroom; without their knowledgeable and enthusiastic leadership, students' interactions with materials can remain superficial, stagnant and uninspired (Gay, 2010). This means that it is not only the presence of the teacher in students' curricular encounters that matters, but also the degree to which teachers facilitate these interactions. Additional research on this topic might thus examine the strategies teachers use to encourage their CLD students to approach curriculum positively and enthusiastically: How do they make the material "alive and vibrant" for students? (Almarza, 2001, p. 18) What other strategies do they use to help the students identify with and see themselves in the material? Future research in all of these areas will continue to inform teachers

(and all professionals in the field of education) of the complex processes behind CLD students' interactions with general education history curriculum.

Table 1

School- and Class-level Demographics

Demographic Groups	**Class**	**School**
Males	52.9%	53.3%
Females	47.1%	46.7%
Students with disabilities	35.3%	12.4%
Language status (% EL)	29.4%	10.9%
White students	11.8%	58.7%
Hispanic students	29.4%	12.9%
Black students	47%	14.6%
Other students	11.8%	13.8%

Notes. Classroom data were obtained from the class roster and school data were retrieved from the school website. All values are presented as percentages of the total population. This table does not include students who left the class during the year, but it does include those who joined the class at any point. In the case of the class, the race/ethnicity of members of the Other category was Nepali. In the case of the school, the race/ethnicity of members of the Other category was not specified on the school website.

Table 2

Example of Evolution of Process Codes for Contingent Scaffolding

First Round: Process Codes	Second Round: Codes	Total Frequency (Code Count)	Number of Units in Which Code Occurred
Defining 'perspective'	Defining 'perspective'	1	1
Introducing idea of multiple perspective-taking on history	Introducing idea of multiple perspective-taking on history	3	3
Guiding students to facilitate multiple perspective-taking on history	Asking prompting questions	29	8
	Reminding students of previously-learned information	14	7
	Sharing own perspective on history	9	6
	Connecting multiple perspectives to students' lives	16	7
	Encouraging students in multiple perspective-taking on history	8	5
	Praising students for considering multiple perspectives on history	11	5
	Inviting students to share multiple perspectives with small group/class	27	7
	Incorporating students' own perspectives on history	36	8
	Asking students to identify perspective of historical document	3	2
	Highlighting different perspectives on history	34	9

Notes. Codes listed as pertaining to guiding students in their multiple perspective-taking are organized according to how contingent they are, from the most contingent practices at the top to the least contingent at the bottom.

Table 3

Assigned Perspectives and Tasks for Three In-Depth Units

Unit Number	Presented Perspectives	Assigned Perspective(s) to Take in Tasks	Formative Task(s)	Summative Task(s)
1	Native American / African / English / French on colonization; White supremacists on Nat Turner; Nat Turner on slavery; disciplinary perspective on slavery; White lawyer on Nat Turner; free Black man on slavery; New York / Virginia on slavery	Native American, student	Solve Navajo water problem; conduct role-play on European interactions with Native Americans	Tell an untold story via film from this time period in history
5	Washington / Du Bois / Wells on discrimination; slaves on slavery and Southern economy; Blacks on voting rights; Union and Confederate on KKK	Student	Discuss student perspectives on which Black activist had the best strategy and the most important things to learn about	Complete Modern Muckraker project with solution to current problem in society

			Theodore Roosevelt	
9	Chinese on Tiananmen Square; North Koreans on US; Americans on Vietnam; North / South Koreans on Korean War; Cuban-Americans on Castro; Khrushchev and Russia on Cuban Missile Crisis	North / South Korean; advisor to JFK; student	Discuss student perspectives on which document is most important for guaranteeing freedom in the US today; summarize Korean War from North / South perspective; advise JFK on how to approach Cuban Missile Crisis	Propose solution to Cold War from the perspective of a United Nations worker; write a letter to your parents from the perspective of a soldier drafted to fight in Vietnam
9A	Non-racial perspectives on Civil Rights Movement; differing perspectives on NAFTA	Student	Create a film about the most important parts of Cesar Chavez's life	Final Project (Butterfly Effect)

References

Almarza, D. (2001). Contexts shaping minority language students' perceptions of American history. *Journal of Social Studies Research, 25*(2), 4-22.

An, S. (2009). Learning US history in an age of globalization and transnational migration. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 41*(6), 763-787. doi:10.1080/00220270903095993

Assaf, L. C., Garza, R., & Battle, J. (2010). Multicultural teacher education: Examining the perceptions, practices, and coherence in one teacher preparation program. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *37*(2), 115-135.

Banks, J. A. (2013). Multicultural education: Characteristics and goals. In J. A. Banks & C. M. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (pp. 3-23). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Barton, K. C. (2005). "Best not to forget them": Secondary students' judgments of historical significance in Northern Ireland. *Theory & Research in Social Education, 33*(1), 9-44. doi:10.1080/00933104.2005.10473270

Barton, K. C., & Levstik, L. S. (2004). *Teaching history for the common good*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Barton, K. C., & McCully, A. W. (2005). History, identity, and the school curriculum in Northern Ireland: An empirical study of secondary students' ideas and perspectives. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 37*(1), 85-116. doi:10.1080/0022027032000266070

Barton, K. C., & McCully, A. W. (2010). "You can form your own point of view": Internally persuasive discourse in Northern Ireland Students' encounters with history. *Teachers College Record, 112*(1), 142-181.

Barton, K. C., & McCully, A. W. (2012). Trying to "see things differently": Northern Ireland

students' struggle to understand alternative historical perspectives. *Theory & Research in Social Education, 40*(4), 371-408. doi:10.1080/00933104.2012.710928

Bell, D. (1980). Brown v. Board of Education and the interest-convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review, 93*, 518-533. doi:10.2307/1340546

Bonner, E. (2014). Investigating practices of highly successful mathematics teachers of traditionally underserved students. *Educational Studies in Mathematics, 86*(3), 377-399. doi:10.1007/s10649-014-9533-7

Bower, B., & Lobdell, J. (2002). *History alive! The United States.* Teachers' Curriculum Institute.

Carrasquillo, A., & Rodríguez, V. (2002). *Language minority students in the mainstream classroom*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review, 56*(1), 18-36. doi:10.17763/haer.56.1.b327234461607787

Cummins, J. (1996). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society*. Ontario, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Danzer, G., Klor De Alva, J., Krieger, L., Wilson, L., & Woloch, N. (2002). *The Americans.* Great Source Education Group, Inc.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2012). *Critical race theory: An introduction (2nd ed.).* New York, NY: New York University Press.

Dimitriadis, G. (2000). 'Making history go' at a local community center: Popular media and the construction of historical knowledge among African-American youth. *Theory &*

Research in Social Education, 28(1), 40-64.

Duff, P. (2002). The discursive co-construction of knowledge, identity, and difference: An ethnography of communication in the high school mainstream. *Applied Linguistics*, *23*(3), 289-322. doi:10.1093/applin/23.3.289

Enright, K. A. (2012). Making it matter: Relevant instruction for new mainstream students. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, *48*(2), 67-71. doi:10.1080/00228958.2012.680368

Epstein, T. L. (1998) Deconstructing differences in African-American and European-American adolescents' perspectives on US history. *Curriculum Inquiry, 28*(4), 397-423.

Epstein, T. L. (2000). Adolescents' perspectives on racial diversity in US history: Case studies from an urban classroom. *American Educational Research Journal, 37*(1), 185-214.

Flynn, J. (2012). Critical pedagogy with the oppressed and the oppressors: Middle school students discuss racism and White privilege. *Middle Grades Research Journal, 7*(2), 95-110.

Fuller, M. L. (1992). Teacher education programs and increasing minority school populations: An educational mismatch? In C. Grant (Ed.), *Research and multicultural education: From the margins to the mainstream* (pp. 184-200). London, UK: The Falmer Press.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, & practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Gay, G. (2004). The importance of multicultural education. *Educational Leadership, 61*, 30-35.

Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice (2nd ed.)*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Hammond, J., & Gibbons, P. (2005). Putting scaffolding to work: The contribution of scaffolding in articulating ESL education. *Prospect, 20*(1), 6-30.

High school website.

Hong, C., & Cheong, C. (2010). Literate identities among Korean students learning English in the USA. *English Teaching, 65*(4), 131-154.

Irizarry, J. (2007). Ethnic and urban intersections in the classroom: Latino students, hybrid identities, and culturally responsive pedagogies. *Multicultural Perspectives, 9*(3), 21-28. doi:10.1080/15210960701443599

Ivanič, R. (2006). Language, learning and identification. *Language, Culture and Identity in Applied Linguistics*, 7-29.

Joseph, P. (2011). *Cultures of curriculum.* (Ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kelley, H., Siwatu, K., Tost, J., & Martínez, J. (2015). Culturally familiar tasks on reading performance and self-efficacy of culturally and linguistically diverse students. *Educational Psychology in Practice, 31*(3), 293-313. doi:10.1080/02667363.2015.1033616

Ladson-Billings, G. J. (1992). Culturally relevant teaching: The key to making multicultural education work. In C. Grant (Ed.), *Research and multicultural education: From the margins to the mainstream* (pp. 106-121). London, UK: The Falmer Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. J. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 11*(1), 7-24. doi:10.1080/095183998236863

Ladson-Billings, G. J. (1999). Preparing teachers for diversity: Historical perspectives, current trends, and future directions. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession* (pp. 86-123). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Ladson-Billings, G. J. (2005). Is the team all right? Diversity and teacher education. *Journal of*

Teacher Education, *56*(3), 229-234. doi:10.1177/0022487105275917

Ladson-Billings, G. J. (2009). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children (2nd ed.)*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Ladson-Billings, G. J. (2013). Critical race theory – what it is not! In M. Lynn & A. Dixson (Eds.), *Handbook of critical race theory in education* (pp. 34-47). New York, NY: Routledge.

Ladson-Billings, G. J., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record, 97*(1), 47-68.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (2011). *Designing qualitative research (5th ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Milner, H. R. (2011). Culturally relevant pedagogy in a diverse urban classroom. *The Urban Review, 43*(1), 66-89. doi:10.1007/s11256-009-0143-0

Milner, H. R. (2014). Culturally relevant, purpose-driven learning & teaching in a middle school social studies classroom. *Multicultural Education, 21*(2), 9-17.

Milner, H. R. (2016). A Black male teacher's culturally responsive practices. *The Journal of Negro Education, 85*(4), 417-432.

Mohan, E. (2009). Putting multiethnic students on the radar: A case for greater consideration of our multiethnic students. In S. Steinberg (Ed.), *Diversity and multiculturalism: A reader* (pp. 131-141). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2017a). English language learners in public schools. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cgf.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2017b). Racial/ethnic enrollment in public schools. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cge.asp

O’Dell, A. (2017). *America’s story*. Green Forest, AR: Master Books.

Saldaña, J. (2015). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers (3rd ed.)*. London, UK: Sage Publications, Inc.

Sampson, D., & Garrison-Wade, D. (2011). Cultural vibrancy: Exploring the preferences of African American children toward culturally relevant and non-culturally relevant lessons. *The Urban Review, 43*(2), 279-309. doi:10.1007/s11256-010-0170-x

Scott, J., & Scott, B. (2015). They *really* don't speak English: Helping preservice teachers experience cultural and linguistic diversity. *AILACTE Journal*, *12*(1), 17-34.

Seixas, P., & Morton, T. (2013). *The big six: Historical thinking concepts.* Toronto, ON: Nelson Education.

Sutherland, L. (2005). Black adolescent girls’ use of literacy practices to negotiate boundaries of ascribed identity. *Journal of Literacy Research, 37*(3), 365-406. doi:10.1207/s15548430jlr3703_4

Tatum, B. D. (2003). “*Why are all the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?” and other conversations about race.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Taylor, E. (1998). A primer on critical race theory. *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 19*, 122-124. doi:10.2307/2998940

Taylor, J., Iroha, O., & Valdez, V. (2015). Culturally responsive teaching with visual art in the social studies. *The Councilor: A Journal of the Social Studies, 76*(1), 1-18.

Tichnor-Wagner, A., Parkhouse, H., Glazier, J., & Cain, J. (2016). Expanding approaches to teaching for diversity and justice in k-12 education: Fostering global citizenship across the content areas. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 24*(59), 1-31. doi:10.14507/epaa.24.2138

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009). Current population reports, United States. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov

U.S. Department of Education. (2016). Non-Regulatory Guidance: English Learners and Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/essatitleiiiguidenglishlearners92016.pdf

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Waddell, J. (2011). Crossing borders without leaving town: The impact of cultural immersion on the perceptions of teacher education candidates. *Issues in Teacher Education*, *20*(2), 23-36.

Wertsch, J. V. (1998). *Mind as action*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Wertsch, J. V. (2002). *Voices of collective remembering*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Yoder, P. J., & Jaffee, A. T. (in press). Multiple perspectives: Engaging diverse voices in the social studies classroom. In L. C. de Oliveira, K. Obenchain, R. Kenney, & A. Oliveira (Eds.), *Approaches to teaching the content areas to English language learners in secondary schools*. New York, NY: Springer.

Zirkel, S. (2008). The influence of multicultural educational practices on student outcomes and intergroup relations. *Teachers College Record*, *110*(6), 1147-1181.

STUDY THREE

"You ARE Immigrant…but Not Like Us": A Discourse Analysis of Immigrant Students' Positioning of Undocumented Immigrants in a CLD Classroom

Vonna L. Hemmler

University of Virginia

Abstract

Immigration is a hotly-contested topic of debate in the US, causing immigrants, particularly those at the school age who are undocumented, to experience unique pressures associated with their statuses. With approximately one million undocumented children in America, it is important for educators to understand how such pressures can affect these students' experiences in school. Through a sociocultural understanding of identity, and an acknowledgement of the relationship between language and power, this study utilizes elements of microethnographic and critical discourse analysis to examine how four immigrant students use language to position undocumented immigrants in a CLD public high school history classroom that was designed to foster inclusiveness. Findings reveal that undocumented and documented students use language in various dynamic ways to position undocumented immigrants very differently, and their positionings are often contingent on their own immigration experiences and journeys. Implications of this work are discussed and areas for further inquiry are also presented.

Introduction

The topic of immigration has permeated public discourse, particularly in the US recently. Much of this talk has been conducted with contentious undertones, leading to misunderstandings and mistrust of immigrant populations: the Pew Hispanic Center has for instance estimated that half of the American population believes that immigrants have worsened the U.S. economy and crime rate (2015). Yet at the same time, the DREAMer movement has gained immense visibility, and 74% of Americans actually support some form of legalization for undocumented members of this population currently in the country (Pew Research Center, 2018).

In the midst of these very divided views are immigrants themselves, whose legal statuses penetrate all aspects of their professional and personal lives. While immigration-related stresses and pressures exist to various extents for all immigrants, they are undoubtedly escalated, particularly in the current political climate, for those without accepted documentation. Gonzales (2011) has written extensively about undocumented immigrant children in particular and the transitions they face when going from protected students in U.S. public schools to "unauthorized residen[ts]" once they leave the school system (p. 605; see also Murillo, 2017).[25] Nonetheless, despite a protected status for these students while in school, the pressures of not being documented can often have far-reaching – and possibly detrimental – effects on student performance in the classroom. Pressures that accompany or result from this status can include (but are not limited to) the likelihood of: living below the poverty line, having parents who have not been formally educated, not having health insurance, experiencing a language barrier, and having lower educational expectations for themselves (Abrego, 2006; Child Trends, 2014;

[25] As per the Supreme Court ruling in Plyler v. Doe (1982) and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), respectively, undocumented students in the US legally have a right to K-12 education, and their immigration statuses or records are prohibited from being released by schools to immigration authorities (Gonzales, 2011).

Perreira & Spees, 2011; Suarez-Orozco, Yoshikawa, & Tseng, 2015), all of which can compound to inhibit many developmental, social, and cognitive milestones for this population (Yoshikawa, Suarez-Orozco, & Gonzales, 2017). To be sure, this is not to say that the blame for these outcomes should be placed on undocumented populations, or to imply that they apply to *all* undocumented immigrants. However, the fact that one's documentation status can cause social, economic, and psychological distress must be acknowledged, especially considering not only the Pew Hispanic Center's (2011) estimation that as of 2010, there were one million undocumented immigrant children living in the US,[26] but also Suarez-Orozco et al.'s (2015) observation that socio-emotional school support is particularly important for immigrants at the school age.

Teachers can confirm anecdotally that the pressures associated with documentation status can impact student performance and presence in the classroom, as students are not simply able to ignore this (or any other) part of their identities when they come to school each day. Danzak (2011) in fact contended that the immigration journey directly affects one's definition and understanding of the self, and other research has posited that active identity incorporation in the classroom can mediate students' academic development in positive ways (e.g., Barton & McCully, 2010; Cummins, 1996; Duff, 2002; Hong & Cheong, 2010; Ivanič, 2006; Sutherland, 2005; Zirkel, 2008) and even affect how they approach and view certain academic content (An, 2009). As a result of these relationships, it is important to understand more about how such students negotiate this aspect of their identities in classroom settings.

The discourse analysis conducted in this study addresses this topic in a culturally and

[26] This paper operates under the Child Trends (2014) definition of a first-generation immigrant child as one who was not born in the US and a second-generation immigrant child as one who was born in the US to at least one parent who was born outside of the US.

linguistically diverse (CLD)[27] high school history classroom in the South-Atlantic US that was specifically designed to foster inclusiveness. This is an instructional space in which CLD students' identity incorporation is especially significant for several reasons. First, Wertsch (2002) has argued that history is fundamentally connected to the concept of identity and people's identities can influence how they perceive historical events and figures. Second, it is important to examine CLD students' understandings of their own identities as they relate to a curriculum that most often depicts the historical influence of the dominant social group, of which these students are usually not a part. Third, it is also vital to understand how CLD students bring their own identities into a purposely inclusive and welcoming classroom, especially given Murillo's (2017) findings that undocumented immigrant students, who can be considered to be CLD, were more likely to divulge their documentation statuses in environments steeped in trust and support. Hence, this study is framed by the following guiding question: How do immigrant students use language to navigate their documentation statuses in a CLD high school history classroom where the teachers' stated goal is to foster an inclusive and caring learning community for all? Within this general framing, three specific research questions allow me to analyze: 1) how undocumented immigrant students position themselves to and in response to undocumented and documented peers within larger conversations on immigration, 2) how documented students position their undocumented peers within the same contexts, and 3) what discourse features the students use to do this positioning. In the conclusion section, I consider what these positionings enable the students to accomplish in their conversations on their documentation statuses before

[27] I use this term to describe students who speak nondominant varieties of English or languages other than English in their homes and communities. In U.S. public schools, such students are often (but not always) immigrants and come from diverse racial, ethnic, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds, which can also often mean they are students of color (Tatum, 2003). For the purposes of this paper, this term does not include White students who are considered to be proficient speakers of English.

addressing the implications of this study for teachers and suggesting avenues of future inquiry for researchers.

Relevant Literature

There is currently no discourse-analytic literature detailing the ways in which undocumented immigrant students navigate their statuses specifically with peers in the context of their U.S. classrooms. The extant literature closest to such analysis has been conducted by O'Connor (2016, 2017) in his studies of Mexican-American students learning in high schools in the "toxic" political context of Arizona after the passage of several anti-immigration laws (2016, p. 129). In his 2016 study, O'Connor conducted a discourse analysis of how his participants, which included American-born students of Mexican descent, American- and Mexican-born students who had lived and attended schools in both countries, and both documented and undocumented Mexican-born students, utilized the intersectionality of various demographic factors such as race, gender, and socioeconomic status to place themselves and each other on a spectrum of Mexican-ness in a learning and living environment where, as a result of anti-immigration legislation, being Mexican (to any degree) was rarely viewed positively. For instance, O'Connor examined how his Mexican-American immigrant participants positioned each other in ways that conflated racial/ethnic identities and social class, such that some Mexican-origin individuals were seen by members of this same group as "too good for their own race" (O'Connor, 2016, p. 138). Similarly, in his 2017 work, O'Connor conducted a linguistic ethnography in a science class to examine how these same students negotiated their identities within this tenuous learning environment and found that they used monitoring of their own and each other's speech for out-of-place utterances as a way to voice their experiences of being Mexican in Arizona. For instance, in one exchange, an undocumented participant, Alex, drew

attention to his own use of features of Chicano English in the midst of an academic discussion on spectral classes, suggesting that he was highly aware of the negative connotations of "non-standard" English and in turn consciously policed his own speech at times in the classroom. Both of O'Connor's studies inform the current one via their examination of how the immigrant-origin participants confronted their own and each other's racial/ethnic and linguistic identities in the context of highly-charged contexts for immigration.

In addition to O'Connor's (2016, 2017) work, other research has been done on youth perspectives on immigration that can inform the current analysis. For example, Danzak (2011) examined the immigration stories of predominantly Mexican middle school immigrant students, documented and undocumented, which they were asked to tell via comic strips as part of a school- and community-based project. Though the students were given the option to address immigration more generically in their stories instead of portraying their actual journeys or including their own documentation statuses, the author found that through this project, many of these students did in fact incorporate their family perspectives and attitudes in their comic strips and thus were able to learn more about their individual and family identities as they had been influenced by immigration. Moreover, this pedagogical approach also enabled the students to bring this aspect of their identities into the classroom and share common experiences with similar peers that enabled them to create group identities. In a similar vein, though not from a pedagogical approach, Dabach, Fones, Merchant, and Kim (2017) obtained via interviews the perspectives of first- and second-generation immigrant youths (whose documentation statuses were not divulged) from various countries of origin on immigration policy just prior to and after the 2012 U.S. presidential election and concluded that their participants' attitudes regarding the topic fell on a continuum from highly exclusionary of undocumented immigrants in the US to

unconditionally inclusive of them. This finding was particularly intriguing considering the ways in which the participants often used their own experiences as immigrants to inform their personal stances on immigration policy, which typically fell towards the more understanding and sensitive end of the spectrum. For example, one participant from Somalia referenced his own journey in an attempt to identify with others trying to come to the US:

> I can only imagine what they go through waiting for citizenship and stuff. 'Cause I mean I did go through all that stuff like trying to get citizenship but like, luckily my mom or my dad got it so that we all got it so we didn't have to go experience what they had to go through. (Dabach et al., 2017, p. 9)

Dabach et al. (2017) noted that the majority of their participants took the same sympathetic stance towards undocumented immigrants as exemplified in this excerpt. However, the authors also pointed out that these same students often struggled to reconcile their feelings of understanding with their ideas of what constituted fair immigration policy. As such, Dabach et al.'s study has particular bearing on mine due to the ways in which their participants and mine drew on their own backgrounds to engage in various positionings of undocumented immigrants, particularly when it came to documentation status and the notion that someone's possession of papers could change the way they are viewed by others.

As Dabach et al.'s (2017) participants relied on their own immigration experiences to inform their opinions on immigration policy, Bondy's (2015) participants, high-school-aged first-, second-, and third-generation Latina immigrants, all of whom were either U.S.-born, naturalized citizens, or legal residents, based their understandings of U.S. citizenship on their statuses as immigrants and the public discourses surrounding immigration. Bondy (2015) found through interviews that her participants were largely unable to reconcile being a citizen with

being Latina in a context where being the latter carried negative connotations. The author documented her participants fighting back against these attitudes and perceptions by, for example, distancing themselves from immigrant stereotypes and creating more positive identities that were informed by their statuses as immigrants from Central America *and* as people living in the US.

In addition to this work that described how immigrant students used their own immigration and documentation statuses and experiences to inform their opinions on the topic, other research has illuminated the ways in which immigrant students' interactions with peers and teachers has influenced their understandings of these aspects of their identities. For example, Goulah (2009) used observations, interviews, home visits, document collection, and journaling to document his participants, immigrants to the US from the former Soviet Union who were assumedly documented, internalizing identities of being Russian that were ascribed to them by their peers and teachers in U.S. classrooms. While this ascription made the participants feel inferior to their U.S. peers, it also allowed them to articulate their own perceptions of being superior to fellow immigrant peers from other parts of the former Soviet Union. Goulah (2009) thus argued, similarly to Danzak (2011), that the participants' labels as members of these countries who were in the US as immigrants caused them to reformulate their understandings of their own identities and, similar to O'Connor (2016) and Dabach et al. (2017), place themselves on a spectrum of immigrant-ness as compared to their American and immigrant peers. Goulah's (2009) work therefore informs my own examination of the negotiation of stratified positioning in which undocumented and documented students engage through conversations in the classroom.

Conceptual Framing

Because students' immigration stories and statuses form an important element of their

identities (Danzak, 2011), identity as a construct is a central concept to this study. As such, I employ two frameworks in this paper to conceptualize it: Gee's (1989, 2011, 2015) concept of *Big D Discourse* and the notion of identity and its positioning as a social construction. Additionally, I address the power dynamics inherent in conversations about documentation by conceptualizing language as a tool for (re)producing (existing) societal power structures. These concepts and the ways in which I use them in this paper are informed by the notion of discourse as "an association of socially accepted ways of using language" that occurs during interpersonal interaction (Gee, 1996, p. 114; see also Fairclough, 1992). These frames thus enable me to unpack the ways the participants create and participate in discourse on their documentation statuses in the classroom and how this participation and what it accomplishes is informed by their understandings of their own identities.

Gee's Big D Discourse

Gee's (1989, 2011) understanding of identity is informed by his concept of Big D Discourse, which he called an "identity kit" full of "instructions on how to act, talk, and often write, so as to take on a particular role that others will recognize" (1989, p. 7). As such, in this paper I analyze the ways students use their identity kits to negotiate the Discourse surrounding undocumented immigrants – particularly as they engage in these processes as undocumented and documented immigrants and position themselves and each other in their conversations. In other words, I look at how their tool kits might inspire and enable undocumented and documented immigrants to carry out certain positionings of undocumented immigrants.

Identity and Positioning

If Gee's (1989, 2011, 2015) identity kit is based on taking on particular discursive roles to negotiate identity depending on the context in which individuals find themselves, then identity

itself must be understood as a fluid, dynamic, and socially-created construct that is able to be actively altered through language, among other semiotic resources (Brady, 2015; DaSilva Iddings & Katz, 2007; Ivanič, 2006; Moje, Luke, Davies, & Street, 2009) and does not exist before being created through participation in certain discourses (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Lewis, Enciso, & Moje, 2007). Scholars have as a result described identity as an "intersubjective accomplishment" that develops via interactional processes and is mediated by language (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, p. 587; Kibler, 2017; Ricento, 2005).

According to this perspective on identity, individuals can use language to project their understandings of their own identities depending on their audience and interpersonal interactions, and they can also simultaneously use it to accept or reject identities ascribed to them by others. Such identity navigation is informed by positioning theory, which contends that "identity is the social positioning of self and other" through language (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, p. 586; see also Harré & van Langenhove, 1999; Moghaddam & Harré, 2010) and is related to how Gee (2011, 2015) contends that individuals must position themselves in accordance with a Discourse *and* be accepted (i.e., positioned) by other members of that Discourse in order to be considered a member of it. This understanding of identity as a social construct that is mediated by language informs my analysis of how the undocumented participants dynamically engage in reflexive positioning (i.e., position themselves) and how their documented peers engage in interactive positioning (i.e., position the undocumented students) in the classroom context.

Language and Power

Because of the varied public discourse surrounding undocumented immigrants and its results referenced above – and because "all language is political" – I must also acknowledge the power dynamics present within the participants' discussions about documentation (Gee, 2014, p.

10). Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, and Shuart-Faris (2005) have defined *power* as “a structuration of interpersonal relations, events, institutions, and ideologies” and they have contended that power itself exists not as a measurable commodity but as a “set of relations” that results from linguistic collaboration between people (p. 162). What this relational notion implies is that discourse events are created by the micro-structures that exist for the speakers in the discrete conversations as they are happening but are also undoubtedly always influenced by the macro-structures emanating from the larger society in which the discourse event occurs (see also Erickson, 2004). Both of these types of structures therefore contribute to the distribution of power in conversations via the speakers’ language use, and this distribution can shift the power dynamics in it as a result. This conceptualization supports my analysis because of the ways in which I look at how the positionings that the participants engage in both influence and are influenced by the micro- and macro-structures surrounding them as they make meaning out of their stances on undocumented immigrants.

Methods

Research Context

My data for this analysis come from a larger study at a public high school in the South-Atlantic region of the US, in which I examined the experiences of CLD students in a general education high school American history classroom.[28] The school serves approximately 2,000 students a year who speak over 30 first languages and come from more than 50 countries (School website). Despite this diversity, the school’s student body is still overwhelmingly reflective of the dominant societal group, as the population on the whole is almost two-thirds White and largely comprised of students whose first language is English. Within this larger

[28] I use *general education* to indicate a content-area classroom in a U.S. public school in which enrollment is open to students from all backgrounds and not confined to any subpopulation of students.

student body, the class I observed was overwhelmingly comprised of CLD students, including students of color (including but not limited to those of African, Asian, Latino/a, and Native American descent; Tatum, 2003) and English learners (ELs).[29] Over a third of the students in the class also had disabilities.[30] See Table 1 for complete demographic information, as well as a comparison of classroom with school-wide demographics.[31]

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

This history class was led by Mr. Stringfellow, a White, American-born, Spanish-English bilingual history teacher, and Mr. Jordan, an African American,[32] American-born special education teacher. It was part of an interdisciplinary English language arts/American history program that was created for eleventh-grade CLD students at this school in response to their unsatisfactory academic outcomes on standardized measures of content and language learning (Interview, Mr. Stringfellow, 6/2/17). In addition to improving academic outcomes for this population, the program also aimed to create a positive and collaborative learning environment and to support students in viewing American literature and history from multiple perspectives (Interviews, Mr. Stringfellow and Mr. Jordan, 6/2/17 and 5/31/17). Of these three goals, the second is most relevant to the current study due to the focus of my research questions on

---

[29] All demographic descriptors throughout this paper are consistent with those used on the school website. The website does not provide a definition for *EL*, so I use federal guidelines to define ELs as students who speak a home language other than English and/or grew up in an environment in which a language other than English was dominant, who were not born in the US, and/or whose "difficulties in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language" may prohibit the student from achieving in classrooms in which the language of instruction is English, meeting state academic standards or participating fully in society (U.S. Department of Education, 2016, p. 43). I have employed this definition for this paper despite its deficit orientation since the school in my study also must abide by its tenets in the ways that it classifies students as ELs.

[30] The school website defines *students with disabilities* as "those that are identified for special education services, from speech pathology and learning disabilities to severe and profound disabilities."

[31] In this paper, *Hispanic* is used synonymously with Tatum's (2003) descriptor of *Latino/a*.

[32] I use the term *African American* intentionally here instead of Black because that is how Mr. Jordan identified himself in his interview.

understanding how immigrant students use language to position undocumented immigrants in their classroom community, particularly with peers.

Participants

The current study focuses on conversations about immigration and documentation status that took place during the course of the school year in which four immigrant students in particular participated: José, a documented male Spanish-speaker from Central America who was beginning his third year in U.S. schools at the start of the study;[33] Kayla, an undocumented female Spanish-speaking EL from Central America who was also beginning her third year in U.S. schools at the start of the study; Olga, a documented female Russian-speaking EL from Eastern Europe who had been in U.S. schools for six months at the start of the study; and Marisol, an undocumented female Spanish-speaking EL from Central America who had been in U.S. schools for two and a half years at the start of the study.[34]

Positioning Statement

I am an advanced doctoral student, and my training in this capacity has given me extensive experience in qualitative research methods of data collection, such as observations and interviews, and in inductive data analysis. I have completed work that has utilized other methods of discourse analysis: although this paper represents my first attempt at microethnographic

[33] Though I did not seek to obtain each participant's official documentation status, I inferred this information by how they positioned themselves and each other in the conversations analyzed below. I did not record any instances of the participants divulging their documentation statuses to teachers or non-immigrant peers.

[34] Marisol scored at Level 2 (beginning) on the WIDA English Language Proficiency Test, a standardized English language proficiency test used by many U.S. states to indicate students' assumed levels of English ability. Kayla and Olga each scored at Level 3 (developing) on the same test. As a result of these scores, these three students were categorized as ELs in the system. José tested out of the state's classification system upon arrival to the US and was therefore never officially labeled as an EL during his schooling. Kayla, Marisol, and José were all from the same Central American country and spoke similar varieties of Spanish.

discourse analysis (microethnography), I have conducted studies that have utilized elements of critical discourse analysis (CDA), and I hold graduate degrees in linguistics and education.

Additionally, I am the American-born grand-daughter of an immigrant who did not have access to formal education, and a former teacher of CLD students, many of whom were immigrants to the US. My background and my teaching and learning experiences with my former students have planted an interest in me to conduct this study and have given me a perspective that sympathizes with the unique pressures immigrant students face and how they relate to their educational experiences and opportunities. Such a background has made me particularly aware of the highly sensitive nature of information about students' documentation statuses, and so I have maintained strict measures of confidentiality throughout this study. My position as someone who thus sympathizes with immigrants also naturally informs my treatment of my data, but I have taken measures in my analysis to ensure that I reached sound conclusions. Elapsed time between data collection and analysis has precluded me from completing member checks of my findings, but I conducted a close examination of my transcripts to ensure that I located "rich points" in my discussion for analysis and presentation here (Zuengler, 2008, p. 99). I also shared my interpretation of the data and my conclusions with a second, more experienced discourse analyst and with Mr. Stringfellow, who is a co-researcher on this project; because he is familiar with the participants themselves and the discursive norms of his classroom, his feedback provided for triangulation of data. Finally, I cross-checked the findings of my discourse analysis with my field notes to gauge whether the ways in which these students interactions during other classroom observations were consistent how they did so in the conversations under examination. In the case of one instance in which this practice revealed a misalignment (see Excerpt 5 below), I present several possible explanations for it while also recognizing that due to the indeterminate

nature of the transcript, any potential conclusion drawn is tentative at best, as can be the case with discourse analysis.

Data Collection

For the larger study, I conducted 51 observations over the course of the 2016-2017 academic year, with each observation lasting approximately 95 minutes.[35] For each of the three units at the beginning, middle, and end of the year, I visited the class a minimum of six times per unit and observed the class for the entire period while taking detailed field notes and audio- and video-recording the class. When participants used Spanish in their interactions, I marked the occurrence(s) for Mr. Stringfellow to translate into English, which he did wherever audio quality allowed it.[36] I chose which units to observe after considering the demographic characteristics of the class and the likelihood that certain content topics would be more appealing and relevant to students of certain demographic groups. For instance, I hypothesized that the units on Native American colonization and immigration would be highly relevant to Hispanic students' identities and that the units on slavery and Civil Rights would provide opportunities for Black students to engage with their racial histories and identities. As a result of these considerations, I chose the following three units to observe in-depth: Unit 1 on the colonization of Native Americans (10 observations), Unit 5 on Progressivism and immigration (three observations due to scheduling difficulties), and Unit 9/9A, the final unit, on the Cold War and Civil Rights (nine observations).

Outside of the in-depth units, I observed the class at minimum once a week while continuing to record and take field notes. My structuring of the observation schedule in this way enabled me to maintain a level of specificity in my field notes within the scope of my research

[35] I also conducted teacher interviews and student interviews and focus groups. While I used the teacher and student interviews solely in a contextual manner for this study, I did not use the focus groups at all for the present analysis.

[36] English and Spanish were the only two languages used in the conversations under analysis in this paper.

question while also keeping a presence in the classroom and ensuring that I did not miss any significant interactions or events over the course of the year.

Data Analysis

To begin my analysis, I read through all of my field note write-ups from the larger study and identified every instance in which any students mentioned the topic of immigration, even briefly. This happened 13 times over the course of the school year. Upon closer examination of these 13 instances, I noted which students were participating in them and found that it was José, Kayla, Olga, and Marisol. Of these 13 conversations, there were nine in which Mr. Stringfellow participated alongside the students, and in these instances, the discussion surrounding immigration related directly to the history content and not to the students' own documentation statuses or immigration experiences. Thus, due to the nature of my research questions and my interest in understanding how students positioned undocumented immigrant identities with each other in the classroom, I did not analyze these nine conversations. Of the remaining four conversations that involved only the students talking about their own statuses, three were relevant to my research questions, as the fourth entailed two Spanish-speaking students momentarily talking about how to spell the word *immigrant* in English. Therefore, this preliminary analysis left me with three conversations in which José, Kayla, Olga, and Marisol spoke about undocumented immigrants – two in January of 2017 during a unit on immigration, and one in June of 2017 as the students were working on their final project for the class, which also pertained to immigration.

I employed elements of two methods of discourse analysis to understand the dynamic ways in which José, Kayla, Olga, and Marisol spoke about undocumented immigrants in these conversations in a CLD classroom that was purposefully demographically inclusive and in which

the teachers made a point to value students' varied backgrounds, opinions, and experiences. As a research method, discourse analysis involves the "systematic investigation of signs that participants use to accomplish social action" (Wortham & Reyes, 2005, p. 40). The challenge to this method of analysis is that signs can at any point carry different meanings depending on the context in which they are used (Wortham & Reyes, 2005). This particular challenge of different meanings for different linguistic signs applies uniquely to my study, as my participants are all either ELs and/or students whose first language is not English. Thus, it is vital for me to consider a potential additional explanation for my findings: that the students utilized the (para)linguistic features they did not out of direct intention, but because they were language-learners whose English use could have been unintentional and carried coincidental significance. Utilizing specific methods of discourse analysis, such as microethnography and CDA, as well as leaning on triangulation of data that displayed multiple elements that could coincide to arrive at the same conclusions, allowed me to confront this challenge and arrive at interpretations of the data that are plausible, if not universally agreeable (Zuengler, 2008).

Microethnography.

The first method of discourse analysis that I used was microethnography, which attends to the social, cultural, and political processes behind how people use language as a vehicle to construct and participate in classroom events (Bloome et al., 2005). More specifically, microethnography allows for the "social construction of social identities" from how people interact with each other (Bloome et al., 2005, p. 157). Keeping in mind these tenets of microethnography, I determined that ten Have's (2007) transcription conventions would best allow me to document how the participants used language to locate and make meaning of the speech events they created about undocumented immigrants. Next, I listened to the

conversations again, this time in minute detail, using ten Have's (2007) conventions to document what I heard and begin to construct my transcripts.

In my transcript construction, I bounded transcripts first by message units, which Bloome et al. (2005) defined as utterances whose distinct meanings help analysts to identify and interpret the boundaries around speech events. The particular tools I used to create the message units were *contextualization cues*, or "any [verbal, nonverbal, or prosodic] feature of linguistic form that contributes to the signaling of contextual presuppositions" (Gumperz, 1986, p. 131; see also Erickson, 2004). In other words, I examined features of the participants' speech such as shifts in volume, tone, rhythm, stress, pausing, intonation, register, and even language (i.e., switching from English to Spanish) to understand how the speakers situated undocumented immigrants within their conversations with some of their immigrant peers. I then grouped the message units into interactional units, or related message units (Bloome et al., 2005). Creating these boundaries enabled me to gain an understanding of the thematic coherence (Bloome et al., 2005), or the ways in which the participants organized the meanings they were creating as they positioned themselves and others in nuanced ways as undocumented immigrants in their conversations with each other. (Table 2 provides a representation of the thematic coherence constructed across the three conversations in relation to the positioning of undocumented immigrants.)

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

While constructing my transcripts, I also made several other theoretical and methodological considerations. I first took into account Ochs's (1979) work on theory and transcription and her call to remain conscious of how cultural biases and past experiences as a discourse analysist have the potential to influence the way transcripts are constructed and, thus,

the way data could be interpreted (by external readers and researchers themselves). As I result, I made sure to adhere to strategies within discourse analysis that could offset these potential biases. For instance, I was conscious of places in my data where no patterns revealed themselves and of potential additional meanings of the participants' speech, since in discourse analysis, there is never a singular, universally agreed-upon interpretation of the data (Zuengler, 2008). Finally, I used consistent transcription conventions (see Appendix A) but remained selective in my transcription assembly so as not to overwhelm the reader with too much detail (Ochs, 1979). In other words, I let my data directly impact my transcript construction (Zuengler, 2008). See Appendix B for full transcripts of each conversation.

Critical discourse analysis.

In addition to microethnography, I also drew in my analysis on elements of CDA, which illuminates the ways in which language and discourse structures "enact, confirm, legitimate, reproduce, or challenge relations of power and dominance in society" (van Dijk, 2001, p. 353; see also Rogers, 2014) and claims that "the way certain realities get talked […] about […] are not just random but ideologically patterned" (Cameron, 2001, p. 124). My use of elements of CDA was informed by my conception of power described above (see p. 120), and I employed elements of Rogers's (2014) "survey of linguistic features and functions" to guide my examination of the power dynamics as they are related to documentation status in these conversations (p. 34-35). Though Roger's (2014) list includes 18 discursive features, I focused in my analysis on her features of *lexicalization*, or the selection of vocabulary and how it represents ideas in speech, and *modality*, or the use of modals that express obligation, permission, and probability. I chose to confine my analysis to these two features partially because of the ways in which they could illuminate specifically the power relations instantiated

through the students' language use, but also because there was not significant variation among the students' language use across the other 16 categories as it related to identity positioning. Thus, this CDA-inspired analysis informed my understanding of the power dynamics elicited among the participants in their positioning of undocumented immigrant students.

Findings

My analysis of José, Kayla, Olga, and Marisol's conversations on immigrants revealed that they used language in dynamic ways to position undocumented immigrants reflexively and interactively in their interactions. They did so within a larger conversation on immigrants' financial access to college, an exchange about immigrants' reasons for coming to the US, and a debate on whether or not immigrants pay taxes. Overall, the reflexive positionings of the undocumented immigrants, Kayla and Marisol, differed dramatically from the ways in which Olga, a documented immigrant, interactively positioned them across conversations (research questions 1-2). In the presentation of my findings, I show in Table 2 how each of these positionings can be located in the full transcripts by their corresponding message and interactional units in each conversation. Within these conversations, each student used specific discourse and lexical features to engage in these positionings and align themselves with and convey their attitudes on their own and their peers' documentation statuses (research question 3). Below, I use specific excerpts from the transcripts to highlight in detail the initial positioning that occurs, either by the undocumented or documented participants, and the initial response positioning, in each positioning unit; in most cases, a positioning unit and excerpt are synonymous. I then explain in a more global sense how each of these turns and the discourse features used by the speakers in these initial exchanges sets up subsequent moves and meaning-making events in each conversation.

Undocumented Immigrants and Financial Access to College

The first observed instance of José, Kayla, Olga, and Marisol discussing undocumented immigrants occurs as they are working on a group project at the end of a unit on immigration, progressivism, and westward expansion in the US. For this project, Mr. Stringfellow instructed the class to identify what they saw as a problem in present-day society and create a social media campaign to address it. Through these instructions, he encouraged the students to choose their specific project topic within these more general guidelines, and this element of choice is noteworthy for several reasons. First, it indirectly created a "safe space" in this classroom for students to hold conversations on a topic that is addressed minimally and only from the dominant perspective in the state's standards of learning – even if it was done so only in the context of small group work and never in front of the teachers or whole class. Second, it enabled the students to make concrete connections between what they were learning about immigration within the history of the US and more present-day immigration policy and discourse, and thus made a seemingly historically-distant topic relevant to their own current lives. In addition to this element of choice regarding the project topic, Mr. Stringfellow also allowed the students to form their own groups for this assignment. Thus, by virtue of both of these instructional decisions, Mr. Stringfellow afforded the students a sense of agency within this particular project that is not often observed in high school history classes, as the students were able to dictate how and with whom immigration was discussed in the classroom space. Prior to the interaction described below, José, Kayla, Olga, and Marisol opted to work together and spent time deciding whether their campaign should address immigrants' financial access to college or healthcare. Kayla, whom I often observed to be a vocal participant in whole-class activities and a leader in small group work, presented to the group the importance of having college access and the challenges of

trying to address healthcare before they eventually settled on the former topic. Within their conversations that began to organize the content of their campaign, the students positioned and responded to positionings of undocumented immigrant students using various discursive and lexical features.

Positioning Unit 1: “My case” vs. “your problem”. As displayed in Excerpt 1, the group is introducing the message of their social media campaign, as initiated by Olga’s turns in message units 1 and 2, when Kayla is the first to position undocumented immigrants by contradicting Olga’s claim that immigrants can access higher education without trouble (message unit 3):

Excerpt 1

Olga	1	We have (1) help I mean if you (worry) ( )
	2	°everything and we can help you and you can go to college°=
Kayla	3	=↑Not exactly (.)
	4	because like my (.) my cou↑sins they are go↑ing to col↑lege, and like the government help ↑them, but not a ↓lot.
Olga	5	( )-
Kayla	6	And they and they born ↑here.
	7	And and you ↑see like (.) in my case, would be more difficult to go college. (4) Yeah. ↑Yeah <because> ((whistles)) (1) for us it’s not that (much)-
Olga	8	<It’s not a problem with college> °cause it’s a problem with ( ) so it’s not a problem with college, it’s a problem with (your documents).°

Kayla makes this assertion by latching her contradictory utterance onto Olga’s previous one; this latching along with her rising pitch in the same message unit potentially indicate her enthusiasm at entering the exchange and countering Olga’s opinion (message unit 3). Kayla then indirectly clarifies that Olga’s belief is false for those like her who were born outside of the US and are in the country without accepted documentation (message units 4 and 6). She does this with enthusiasm, using frequent rising pitch (message unit 4) – aside from when she uses falling pitch to strengthen her assertion that the government does not assist them enough financially – and even cutting Olga off in message unit 6 when she makes an attempt in message unit 5 to

respond to her contradiction. Finally, Kayla uses pausing, stress, rising pitch, and whistling to emphasize to Olga how difficult affording college would be for her specifically (message unit 7).

Kayla also implicitly identifies herself in this interaction as an undocumented immigrant through her lexical choices of the pronouns “my” and “us” in message unit 7 when talking about this difficulty as she experiences it. Additionally, she uses the hypothetical modal “would” when talking about her potential for attending college, perhaps to create distance between her status as an undocumented immigrant and the possibility of this occurring given her current status (message unit 7).

In summary, in this exchange Kayla uses the discourse features of latching, interrupting, rising and falling pitch, stress, pausing, and whistling, along with the lexical terms of “my,” “us,” and “would,” to reflexively position herself as an undocumented immigrant who is concerned about being unable to attend college without external financial aid. Olga responds to Kayla’s self-positioning in this manner by informing her that it is her fault that she does not have accepted documentation (message unit 8). She does so in hushed and rushed speech, perhaps conveying either her uncertainty in her opinion or her reluctance to share it with Kayla, or both (message unit 8). She also uses the pronoun “your” to refer to Kayla when she talks about her lack of documentation as “your problem” (message unit 8). Thus, in her interactive positioning of undocumented immigrants, and in response to Kayla’s concern that she will not be able to attend college because of her documentation status, Olga frames Kayla and other students like her as responsible for their own circumstances.

The exchanges detailed in Excerpt 1 set up further interaction between Kayla and Olga regarding whose fault it is that some immigrant students are undocumented (see Table 2): Kayla asserts that it is not their fault, and Olga again tells her that it is. When Kayla then tells Olga that

she did not consciously choose to come to the US without documentation, Olga, who participated in class and group work throughout my observations in a manner similar to what I described above with Kayla, partially concedes that documentation is not Kayla's responsibility while simultaneously maintaining that it is also not the responsibility of the U.S. government or American universities. Thus, while she seems to be willing to share the blame for why certain immigrants do not have documents, she still does not completely absolve the undocumented immigrants themselves for what she perceives as a significant shortcoming on their part.

Positioning Unit 2: Being "equal" vs. following "rules". After these exchanges, Kayla steers the conversation back towards undocumented immigrants' financial aid for college (see Excerpt 2).

Excerpt 2

Speaker	Line	Utterance
Kayla	34	We can be equal ↓too, <because like>, if we are like almost [able to to pay]
Olga	35	[You CA:N'T] [be EQUAL]
Kayla	36	[like we TOO can go college] and and everything.
Olga	37	We have rules everywhere.
	38	If you have everything for these rules, you can be equal. If you don't, you DON'T. It's RULES.
Kayla	39	↑I'm done-
Olga	40	You can you (can't) come in s:ome place and say I have my rules, I wanna live for my rules you know?
	41	because all place have same rules. Everybody. [(I need) ( )]
José	42	[↑It's true.]

Kayla begins by stating with stress and falling pitch – perhaps to indicate certainty in her opinion – that undocumented students could be equal and attend college, even without documentation, if they could afford it (message units 34 and 36). Olga interrupts Kayla's first utterance in an even more emphatic manner, speaking over her with stress and raised volume on "can't" and "equal" to say that undocumented students must have the documentation required by the rules of the country in which they live if they want to be equal (message units 35, 37-38). She further conveys her point by telling Kayla that undocumented immigrants cannot simply

immigrate and create their own rules for how they will live in their new country because everyone must follow the same rules (message units 40-41). In communicating her stance in message units 37-38 and 40-41, Olga stresses and repeats “rules” often. She does this more emphatically, with raised volume, in message unit 38, and then softens her stance somewhat through use of lengthened speech and rising intonation (though she does not change her lexical choice) in message units 40-41. What results from this use of discursive features by Olga is a clear emphasis on her belief that undocumented immigrants must follow the rules to be equal. In response to Olga’s stance, Kayla indicates possible annoyance or disbelief by using rising pitch in message unit 39 to proclaim that she no longer wants to try to convince Olga to change her opinion.

Overall, Kayla uses the discourse features of rising and falling pitch and stress throughout this positioning unit to express her positioning as an undocumented immigrant who wants to be able to afford college and who does not agree with her documented peer’s assessment of what she must do to achieve this equality. Similarly, Olga employs the discursive features throughout this interaction of raised volume, stress, lengthened speech, and rising intonation to express her belief, first forcefully (message units 35 and 37-38) and then more reservedly (message units 40-41), that undocumented immigrants will never be equal if they do not follow established immigration rules – which, in this case, means having accepted documentation.

In addition to the discourse features utilized in this exchange, Kayla and Olga’s lexical choices describing undocumented immigrant students – i.e., their repeated use of “can,” “can’t,” “equal,” and “rules” (message units 34-35, 37-38, 40-41) – and the ensuing debate surrounding the concept create a power dynamic where Olga, the documented immigrant, refutes the attempt of Kayla, the undocumented immigrant, at striving for equality of opportunity in attending

college. In this way, while Kayla aligns herself with undocumented immigrants through her use of "we" when expressing her opinion in message units 34 and 36 and aims to convey what she and her peers need to achieve equality of opportunity, Olga distances herself from undocumented immigrants by using "you" to talk about Kayla throughout the excerpt and thus implicitly uses her own status and the fact that she has accepted documents – which she supports by indirectly appealing often to the "rules" of immigration policy – to attempt to assert herself over Kayla. Thus, both girls use linguistic and paralinguistic discourse features to self-position or position undocumented immigrants as people who are lacking an essential resource within the context of this conversation.

At the end of this exchange, José, the other documented student in this group, agrees with Olga that immigrants need accepted documentation, using rising pitch to do so and thus strengthening his utterance (message unit 42). This is significant because it means that both documented members of this group have positioned their undocumented peers as individuals who will not achieve equal status or financial access to college without documentation deemed acceptable by current immigration policy, and is perhaps a reflection of the macro-structures surrounding immigration having a distinct influence on the localized conversations occurring in this classroom (see above, as well as Erickson, 2004).

At this point in the conversation, Kayla and Marisol have a brief exchange in Spanish where Kayla laments Olga's stance, and then José seemingly begins to support Olga before he is cut off by either Kayla's or Marisol's laughter (the specific student is unclear in the transcript). Olga then tells the group that she personally does not care whether or not the girls have documentation, but they must follow the established rules.

Positioning Unit 3: "We think in a different way". When Olga again appeals to

immigration rules to support her stance, Marisol laughs at her and then tells her with rising pitch and lengthened speech (message unit 53), possibly to signify exaggeration and annoyance, that she holds this opinion because she has documentation and therefore her ability to go to college is not threatened (see Excerpt 3).

Excerpt 3

Speaker	Unit	Utterance
Marisol	53	h That's why, because you have ↑e:verything you need-
Kayla	54	Yeah ex↑actly.
Marisol	55	and we ↑don't. That's (the) big different.
Olga	56	(That's everything) <u>you</u> need, and <u>you</u> need ( ) for ( )-
Kayla	57	That's ↑why like we think in a different way:
Olga	58	But I try [to]
Kayla	59	[<Because like>] we have to: think abou:t what will ↑help us too, <u>not</u> just them.
Olga	60	hh °Okay so you want to say this problem is college (for people)°

Kayla interrupts Marisol with rising pitch and a definitive fall in tone to agree with her assertion (message unit 54). Marisol then finishes her thought from message unit 53, and it is here that she positions undocumented students in opposition to documented ones by virtue of not having the same (or any) documentation (message unit 55). She does this with rising pitch and falling tone, again possibly conveying her feeling not only that her opinion is correct, but also that they are discussing an urgent problem for her. In doing so, she also implicitly (and perhaps unintentionally) elevates Olga in the power dynamic among the three girls in highlighting the fact that she has accepted documentation while Kayla and Marisol do not. When Olga tries to insert herself back into the exchange, Kayla cuts her off and speaks over her, telling her with rising pitch and lengthened speech, perhaps to make what she says in this turn more convincing, why the think the way they do on this matter (message units 57 and 59). Olga then responds to Kayla and Marisol's positionings by laughing and asking them in hushed speech if this is what they want to say in their social media campaign (message unit 60). In other words, Olga does not use her turn to interactively position undocumented students like she had previously in the conversation.

In this excerpt, the three girls utilize the discursive features described above along with lexical positionings via their pronouns to associate themselves with undocumented or documented immigrants. Kayla and Marisol use "we" and "us" to talk about themselves and align themselves with others without documentation, and they use "you" to talk about Olga to identify her as someone who is not a member of their group. Similarly, Olga uses "you" to talk about Kayla and Marisol's opinion in message unit 60. Olga's laughter and change of subject in this message unit can potentially be interpreted in several ways. It can be seen as a symbol of her realization that she has not been effective in communicating her opinion to Kayla and Marisol and is therefore going to stop trying to secure the conversational space she needs to accomplish this goal. On the other hand, it can be interpreted as Olga softening her stance and perhaps beginning to agree with or at least acknowledge her undocumented peers' views on the topic of documentation. This second interpretation is supported by Olga's use of the pronoun "you" in message unit 60 when she frames the content of their project as Kayla and Marisol's message but also concedes herself in allowing it to represent the group's perspective. If this second interpretation is to hold, then it would be an example of the inverse of what happened in Positioning Units 1 and 2; whereas the macro-structures surrounding immigration revealed themselves strongly in Olga's positionings of undocumented immigrants in those two instances, the micro-structures are beginning to do the same in this case, with Olga's stance seemingly being more impacted now by her peers' contributions to their conversation than by a larger societal discourse on immigration and documentation. Thus, the three participants in this interaction use varied discursive and lexical tools to make a clear distinction between undocumented and documented students and frame the lack of accepted documentation as the most problematic factor for undocumented immigrants seeking financial assistance for college.

The turns outlined above set up further conversational moves in this positioning unit by the three girls to end the interaction (see Table 2). When Kayla takes up Olga's steering of the conversation back to the class project, Marisol cuts her off and extends her previous point further by stating that the problem for undocumented students stems not just from their documentation status, but also from the fact that they were not born in the US. In fact, she then cites this as the main reason for undocumented students' need for financial assistance, stating that even if they had accepted documentation, college would still be too expensive. Olga again attempts to direct the conversation back towards the group project by asking if they want to include the opinion that undocumented immigrant students should have equal opportunity to access college. However, when Kayla cuts Olga off to label this access as equal "rights", Olga replies that "rights" is not the correct term for what they are trying to say. It is unclear from the transcript and contextual field notes why Olga does not approve of the use of the term "rights" to describe what Kayla and Marisol are seeking. However, two possibilities are they she was simply searching for a different term that she was not able to locate in the moment of speaking, or that she does not believe that undocumented immigrants should have equal rights. However, it remains unclear as to whether Olga used language in this way to invoke a sense of power over Kayla and Marisol based on her documentation status.

This first conversation ends with Kayla and Marisol again expressing undocumented immigrant students' need for financial assistance for college. They emphasize it to the point of asserting that, no matter how badly they might want to go to college, lack of financial help will prohibit them entirely. Through the discursive and linguistic features that the three girls use throughout this conversation, as described above, Kayla and Marisol reflexively position themselves and their undocumented peers as individuals who are currently not equal because

they do not have accepted documentation, are not from the US, and therefore do not have the ability to attend college without monetary assistance. On the other hand, Olga uses language dynamically throughout this interaction: while she interactively positions her undocumented classmates as being at fault for not having papers and being unable to obtain equal rights without what she constitutes as the proper documentation, she also softens her own stance at point, which effectively gives space to her peers' positionings of themselves.

Undocumented Immigrants and Reasons for Coming to the US

The second recorded instance of José, Kayla, Olga, and Marisol discussing undocumented immigrants occurs in a similar setting two days after the first conversation. In this class, Mr. Stringfellow again allows the students to work on the social media campaign assignment described above, giving them ample time to bridge the gap between historical and current events and create a shared group meaning not only about immigration more generally, but also about undocumented immigrants in particular.

Positioning Unit 4: "He doesn't know us". As these four students are working, their conversation shifts this time to immigrants' reasons for coming to the US (see Excerpt 4).

Excerpt 4

Kayla	1	We can, because like we are not talking to the president. Well, we are talking to EVERYBODY else. It is like discriminating people.
	2	Like you ↑see that, as she says, she was like-
Olga	3	Yeah yeah ↑yeah.
Kayla	4	He uh, °the guy he told, she told him, <he was like saying> ↑yay,
	5	but° he doesn't know us. He doesn't know our culture, how we are, just because we are like (.) <like the way we are>,
	6	they just think we are ↑fine, they don't (know that) we have problems (or: not). (2) Or the reason why we get here.

Kayla begins this exchange by framing the group's audience for the campaign and referencing an unknown male speaker who made a judgment about undocumented immigrants (message units 1-4). She again is the first to position undocumented immigrants in this

exchange. She initially mentions a "she" in message unit 2 and then repairs her own speech to "he" in message unit 4, and although she still does not specify who the male speaker is that she refers to, Olga indicates that she knows what Kayla is talking about (message unit 3). Kayla explicitly alludes to something he said that led her to conclude that he was making incorrect assumptions about undocumented immigrants, a topic about which she believes he knows nothing (message units 5-6). To express her opinion here, Kayla stresses certain key terms – "know," "culture," "are," "fine," "problems" and "why" – and her vocal emphasis on them serves to make her message stronger and more convincing. In addition to stress, she also employs the discursive features of pausing, rising pitch, and continued and falling intonation in these same message units. While her pausing could simply be a mechanism she uses to gather her thoughts before she speaks, her continued intonation and falling tone in message units 5 and 6 might communicate that she has a lot of thoughts on this topic and she believes in her own stance, respectively, while her rising pitch on "fine" could indicate her disbelief in the unidentified man's opinion (message unit 6).

In addition to these discourse tools, Kayla uses the lexical items of "he" and "they" in conjunction with "doesn't know" and "just think" to talk about the unidentified man and others like him. On the other hand, she uses the pronouns "us," "our," and "we" in conjunction with "problems" and "reason" when she talks about herself and others like her. These lexical juxtapositions, along with the discursive features that accompany them, serve to create a reflexive positioning of undocumented immigrants as having significant reasons for coming to the US, despite what others might assume. Kayla's discursive work here is significant because in sharing her perspective with Olga, she is doing precisely what she alludes to in this excerpt: making her position and reasons for immigration known to others whom she feels condescend to

her for being in the US. Similarly, Olga's discursive work is noteworthy because although she does not interactively position undocumented immigrants in this example, her utterance in message unit 3 can constitute supportive backchanneling, which in effect serves to verify and strengthen Kayla's reflexive positioning.

Positioning Unit 5: "Why we are here". The interaction in Excerpt 4 is not taken up by José or Olga in a way that leads to them interactively positioning undocumented students in any way. Instead, Olga attempts to steer the conversation towards a discussion of immigrants in prison (message units 7-26, shown in Table 2), but Kayla directs it back towards a discussion of immigrants' reasons for coming to the US, telling Olga that she had no real problems in immigrating other than waiting for a visa. This leads to a series of tense exchanges between the two girls in which Olga explains that her family came to the US to find work and Kayla divulges that her family came out of fear (see Excerpt 5):

Excerpt 5

Kayla	27	Okay ask ask us why we came here? We were scared.
	28	Our, in my opinion my family? We don't know who killed my father.
	29	They was going to kill us. (.) That's why the reason why we are here.
Olga	30	( )
Kayla	31	Because we didn't want to come here.
Olga	32	You have (you have visa).
Kayla	33	Exactly.
Olga	34	And these people who don't know ↑you, they just ( )-

Beginning in message units 27 and 28, Kayla uses rising intonation after both questions she asks Olga about her reasons for coming to the US, perhaps to indicate to Olga that she wants her to answer them. However, Kayla answers her own questions, still in message units 27 and 28, using falling tone to likely convey the gravity of her family's reasons for immigrating and to support her earlier point that they left their country because of significant problems. She also chooses to stress the terms "why," "scared," and "kill" in message units 27-29 when asking and

answering her own questions, which further supports the notion that she is trying to emphasize the severity of her reasons for immigrating. Finally, in message unit 29, she pauses briefly before using stress again, this time on “that’s,” to further position herself as an undocumented immigrant and emphasize the severity of her reasons for coming to the US.

After Kayla positions herself in this way, Olga offers an unintelligible response, and Kayla tells her in a definitive tone that her family did not want to immigrate to the US (message unit 31). Olga then contributes another turn in which her exact utterance is not clear, as indicated by my enclosure of it in parenthesis in the transcript. It is possible that she does indeed say in message unit 32 that Kayla has a visa. However, due to the context surrounding this exchange and the knowledge from previous conversations and my observations that Kayla does not have documentation, Kayla’s reply of “exactly” in message unit 33 may be at best an indication that I misheard Olga and at worst a perplexing agreement on her part to something that is not true. As a result, no convincing argument can be made for the girls’ exchange in message units 32-33. Nonetheless, Olga begins to sympathize with Kayla in message unit 34 by expressing her opinion about people passing judgment on others they do not know before trailing off. Kayla then agrees with Olga, expressing her frustration that people often judge her without knowing anything about her.

In addition to these features of discourse used by Kayla and Olga in this exchange, the two girls use lexical tools to position undocumented immigrants. Kayla uses the following terms to tell her immigration story and communicate the legitimacy of her reasons for coming to the US: “scared,” “family,” “killed,” “father,” “reason” and “judge.” She again uses the first-person pronouns of “us,” “we,” “our,” and “my” to align herself with these strong terms and talk about her journey as an undocumented immigrant, while simultaneously using the third-person

pronoun of "they" to differentiate herself from the people who judge her for not knowing her situation. Similarly, Olga uses the pronoun "them" to describe the people who judge undocumented immigrants and the terms of "these people" and "explain" and the pronoun "you" to position Kayla as someone who can change the mind of the people who judge her for being in the US without accepted documents.

In this way, Kayla continues to use language to position herself and her undocumented peers as people who are lacking resources for college and are unfairly viewed as a result. In response, Olga slightly opens her positioning of her undocumented peers, from people who had to accept the circumstances into which they entered because of established rules to people who have the power to alter others' perceptions of them (though still not attain equal financial access to college). Because this exchange occurs two days after the conversation containing Positioning Units 1-3, it is plausible to conclude that the same micro-structures that influenced Olga's stance in those interactions are still at work in this one; in other words, Olga's conclusions are potentially still being influenced more by her peers' contributions to the conversations than by the larger macro-structures of immigration as a societal discourse event. However, as is explained below, this relationship seemingly shifts in the third and final conversation about undocumented immigrants.

Undocumented Immigrants and Taxes

This last conversation in which José, Kayla, Olga, and Marisol speak about undocumented immigrants occurs at the end of the school year, five months after the first two exchanges described above, when the students are using class time not within any particular unit, but to work on their final projects. For this project, students were again given agency in their classwork, as Mr. Stringfellow asked them to self-select their groups to choose a historical event

and research how it actually affected the present and how it could have affected the present if it had happened differently. As such, Mr. Stringfellow further created space in the classroom for the topic of immigration to be discussed and connections between past and present to be made, as José, Kayla, Olga, and Marisol again chose to work together and address this topic. This final conversation occurs as the students are discussing the percentage of immigrants in the US and the effect that this population has had on the country, which leads to a debate about whether immigrants help or hurt the U.S. economy.

Positioning Unit 6: "They go and take this money". Though this initial part of the conversation revolves around immigrants in general, Olga confines it to undocumented immigrants beginning in message unit 58. With this move, Olga, not Kayla, is the first person to position undocumented immigrants in this conversation, as shown in Excerpt 6:

Excerpt 6

Olga	58	( ) But many illegals they, they like just uh (.)
	59	Okay, if you ↑legal, you need to go and (.) take a ↑tax, every ↑year,
	60	but illegal make it, like (.) <impossible thing
	61	because they go> and take this money,
	62	but it's money <u>NOT</u>, like for these people-
Marisol	63	°You don't know that.°

Olga situates a lengthy interactive positioning of undocumented immigrants in this brief exchange with Marisol. She begins by using continued intonation to set up her shift in conversation topic, briefly pausing after doing so to likely reframe what she wants to say (message unit 58). Once she does this, she uses rising pitch and further continued intonation and pausing to give emphasis to her belief that documented immigrants pay taxes (message unit 59). Then she uses the same discursive strategies, with the addition of rushed speech – possibly because she anticipates that her opinion will not be favorable to Marisol – to say that undocumented immigrants keep the money they make instead of paying taxes (message units 60-

61). She lends final support to her stance in message unit 62 by claiming that the money undocumented immigrants keep is not their money, applying raised volume and stress to "not" in the process to strengthen her point.

In addition to these discourse features, Olga uses pointed vocabulary to enhance her positioning of undocumented immigrants. Perhaps the most noticeable are the ways in which she chooses to identify immigrants – as "legal" or "illegal" – regardless of whether or not she understands the connotations associated with these labels (message units 58-60; see also Dabach et al., 2017 for treatment of these terms). Similar are the ways in which she describes undocumented immigrants paying taxes as an "impossible thing" and undocumented immigrants themselves as taking "money, not like for these people" (message units 60-62). The discourse and lexical features that Olga uses in this exchange enable her to position undocumented immigrants as people who steal money and thus hurt the U.S. economy – and are also seemingly influenced again more strongly by the global macro-structures of immigration discourse than by the micro-structures created locally by her undocumented peers in the classroom. This noticeable shift in her positioning and what possibly influences it is not surprising considering the time elapsed between the first two conversations and this one, as well as the observation that this interaction is not occurring during a unit on immigration that might closely influence the participants' perspectives, but is happening at the end of the year during final project work time.

In response to this interactive positioning of undocumented immigrants by Olga, Marisol states that Olga's belief is not true. She does this in message unit 63 with hushed speech, which could be attributed to her quiet demeanor as observed over the course of the school year, or to her insecurity at contradicting Olga after her forceful expression of her stance. Additionally, her lexical choices in telling Olga "you don't know that" further support her contradiction of Olga's

interactive positioning undocumented immigrants essentially as government thieves. In this way, while she does not directly position undocumented immigrants with her turn, she is able to contest the positioning by Olga and frame undocumented immigrants as honest, tax-paying workers.

Positioning Unit 7: “Not like us”. This discussion on undocumented immigrants and taxes broadens into a debate on immigrants (of any status) in American prisons, which includes an allusion to an unspecified story the girls read in which a documented immigrant was arrested and imprisoned for something she did, and later a conversation about how many immigrants (of any status) are currently in the US (message units 64-157). After the girls agree on what percentage of immigrants to include in their project, Positioning Unit 7 begins as Kayla tells Marisol why she does not like to talk about this topic with Olga (Excerpt 7):

Excerpt 7

Kayla	158	And °<(Marisol) that's why>
	159	I don’t like to teach her this type of thing.
	160	She's always, ↑she’s ( ), to be honest.
	161	She will (.) not (understand) ( )° because she haven’t lived it ( ).
Marisol	162	Yeah she’s an immigrant but she-
Olga	163	hh she’s not an ↑immigrant.
Marisol	164	Yes you ARE immigrant. You ↑know ↑that right?
Olga	165	hh of ↑COURSE. I ↑know (it)
Kayla	166	But not (.) like (.) U:S.

As Kayla and Marisol position Olga in this exchange – explicitly labeling her as an immigrant and making sure she understands that she is still one even though she has documentation – they also engage in reflexive positioning by holding Olga’s status and experience as a documented immigrant who came to the US looking for work in opposition to theirs as undocumented immigrants who came to the US out of fear (message units 164 and 166). Marisol raises her voice and places stress on “are” in message unit 164, thus emphasizing that being an immigrant simply means you have come from another country and has nothing to do

with documentation status. She further supports her point with rising pitch and intonation by making sure that Olga is aware of this classification (message unit 164). Finally, she uses the pronoun “you” twice in this message unit to make it clear that she is talking directly to Olga. When Olga responds that she knows she is an immigrant, Kayla re-enters the exchange to inform Olga that she might indeed be an immigrant, but she is not similar to Marisol or her because she has not experienced the same journeys that Kayla and Marisol have in coming to the US without accepted documentation (message unit 166). She conveys this point to Olga via her use of pausing in between terms, perhaps to give Olga time to process what she is saying, and her use of stress and raised volume on “us,” potentially to emphasize that Olga is not a part of this group with Marisol and her. Olga does not respond to this positioning by Kayla and Marisol in a way that interactively positions them as undocumented immigrants in any way, thus effectively ending the interaction among the three girls on this topic. However, it is important to note that Olga does acknowledge Kayla and Marisol’s points in message unit 165 when she makes it clear that she does in fact know she is an immigrant. Perhaps she does this because feels cornered by Kayla and Marisol’s joint assertions in this exchange, or to acknowledge their self-positioning – or perhaps she does it for other reasons entirely. Regardless of the intention, her doing so effectively ensures that her undocumented peers’ voices are heard in this classroom environment.

Discussion and Conclusions

Summary of Findings

The detailed discourse analysis presented above outlines how immigrant students reflexively and interactively positioned undocumented students in a purposely inclusive and welcoming high school history classroom. In the exchanges in which they did this, Kayla and Marisol used discursive and lexical features to apply meaning to the social identity construction

of "undocumented immigrant" and position themselves (and, in turn, undocumented immigrants in general) as being prohibited access to certain resources that documented students could access and that they deemed essential to achieve equality of opportunity for higher education because, through no fault of their own, they were not born in the US and did not have the accepted documentation for being here. In sharing their stories of their own immigration journeys with each other and their documented peers, they also identified themselves as unfairly and improperly judged by those who do not know their reasons for coming to the US and open to sharing their stories to challenge other's assumptions about them. Finally, they positioned undocumented immigrants in general as people who pay taxes and are different from documented immigrants because of their often traumatic immigration stories and lack of accepted documentation. As such, Kayla and Marisol's attitudes on undocumented immigrants in the US could be described as defensive and at times accusatory, but also agentive and hopeful for change in opportunities afforded to them and in how they are viewed by others.

In opposition to these reflexive positionings carried out by Kayla and Marisol, and despite her brief agreement with her undocumented classmates that immigrants in general need to educate those who make false and dangerous assumptions about their presence in the US, Olga, the more participatory documented participant, interactively positioned undocumented immigrants as people who lied to avoid paying taxes, stating that they needed to accept responsibility for not having accepted documentation and they could not achieve equality until they had it. In doing so, and in turn putting herself on the offensive, she used the macro- and micro-structures of discourse on immigration, which mediated each other in different ways in her utterances, to create the social identity of undocumented immigrants as liars and criminals who needed documentation to attain equal status in this country. Thus, as outlined thoroughly in the

preceding sections, the three girls used numerous discursive and lexical features of language in dynamic and varied ways to reflexively and interactively position undocumented immigrants – at times more forcefully via interruptions, overlaps, stress, rising pitch, falling intonation, and direct lexical choices, and at other times more reservedly via hushed or rushed speech, pausing, falling pitch, and indeterminate lexical choices – within their learning environment. These findings are particularly significant when one considers the nature of the learning environment under observation, in which the teachers purposely tried to create a nurturing community – perhaps by actively recognizing students' agency in their own curricular encounters – and in which students in turn felt comfortable enough to capitalize on the space created for them by creating and participating in dialogue on such a controversial topic, at least with their similar peers.

Connections to Existing Research and New Insights

The findings gleaned from this study contribute to the related body of literature by echoing elements of the extant research on this topic. The observed language use of José, Kayla, Olga, and Marisol in the conversations above supports and extends the findings of O'Connor (2016), Goulah (2009), and Dabach et al. (2017), as the participants in these studies, as well as those in the current one, all used language politically to place their similar peers on an othered spectrum of sorts. However, there are also key differences between these works and that which is presented here. O'Connor's (2016) and Goulah's (2009) participants used language (and other factors) to gauge each other's Mexican-ness and engage existing power structures to position themselves as superior to other immigrants from similar countries, respectively, and Dabach et al.'s (2017) participants used their own immigration experiences to inform their opinions on immigration policy. Similarly, the participants in my study used both their language and

background experiences – what can be thought of as parts of their identity kits (Gee, 1989) – to indirectly grade each other's immigrant-ness based on their possession of accepted documentation and the relative degrees of difficulty and danger they experienced on their immigration journeys. In other words, I observed the participants in my study using language to bring what proved to be a highly salient identity marker for them – their documentation statuses – into their reflexive and interactive positionings of undocumented immigrants.

Similarly, while O'Connor's (2017) undocumented participant self-monitored ways in which his Mexican-ness revealed itself in his own speech in a classroom in which such language use would be highly marked, both Kayla and Marisol in my study were highly conscious of when they chose to divulge their own documentation statuses, opting to do so only with fellow immigrant peers and never with teachers. Finally, Bondy's (2015) findings are supported by the current ones in that Kayla and Marisol also used language to fight negative stereotypes (and thus power structures) leveraged against them as immigrants – reflexively positioning themselves as honest tax-payers, for example. However, an important difference offered by my study pertains to the idea that Bondy's (2015) participants were documented, while mine were not. Thus, my study stands as an example of undocumented students creating space for their own voices in the classroom environment, a space which often does not allow for this maneuvering by these students.

Though the primary focus of the current study was to document how immigrant students used language to position undocumented immigrants in the classroom, a secondary interest involved the understanding that the teachers in this particular classroom purposely tried to create an inclusive learning environment for all students in the class. As such, this study partially echoes Murillo's (2017) findings that undocumented immigrants in particular were more likely

to reveal their documentation statuses in supportive learning environments, as Kayla and Marisol, the undocumented participants, divulged their statuses to their immigrant peers but not to their teachers in the conversations presented here. However, these findings only partially speak to Danzak's (2011) work in that although it is evident from the ways in which they positioned themselves in these conversations that the immigration journeys of Kayla, Marisol, and Olga in particular impacted their own senses of identity, none of the girls was afforded an official opportunity in class to share this aspect of their identities and build a group identity in a way that was openly sanctioned by the teachers.

Implications and Suggestions for Further Research

This study thus offers new insights into this topic while also supporting existing ideas about what is already known regarding language use in the CLD history classroom by immigrant populations. All of the ideas discussed above rest on the notion that it is important to foster a continued recognition of language as a tool that has the power to create social identities and position the self and other in ways that may or may not be accepted or valued. This is something that bears repeating because language is a tool for this purpose that is often overlooked. However, even the most subtle features of language can work alone or in tandem to create powerful meanings. As such, it is important for teachers not only to recognize, incorporate, and value their students' unique uses of language – whether they be non-English languages or non-dominant versions of English – in their curricular and interpersonal interactions in the classroom, but also to understand that this language use can accomplish a multitude of content, linguistic, and social goals in the midst of communication. Similarly, researchers must continue to look at language use as a means of identity negotiation *and* communication, especially considering the ways that language can capture the intersectionality of different personal characteristics that can

inform one's own identity – as is indicated by the title of this manuscript, in which a student's immigration and documentation statuses intersect to inform a certain identity positioning. Such a recognition is particularly significant for a population like the one under examination here whose voice is often stifled not only in the classroom, but also in the larger dominant discourse. One specific way of doing this as it pertains to this study might be to compare the conversations had by the four participants with the (final) projects that they created for this class about immigration to see how their discussions informed (or were informed by) their assignments. Another would be to follow this same line of inquiry as it related to peer relations between undocumented students and their immigrant and non-immigrant peers. Similarly, future research could examine more discretely how teachers in classrooms like this one position themselves in relation to their undocumented students, and how they might assume these students position them in turn. Additionally, it would benefit this body of research to understand more about what outcomes and relationships occur in a classroom when teachers' and/or peers' positionings of themselves and one another do not match or even complement each other, and how this discontinuity might affect interpersonal relations and learning. A third extension might be to inquire into whether these actors are aware in the first place of their own language use and the power structures it can invoke when positioning the self and others – especially if these are members of CLD (and thus non-dominant) groups.

In the spirit of such awareness, and in acknowledgement of the argument that identity incorporation in the classroom has important mediating effects on achievement outcomes, a pedagogical implication of this study is the reminder that students (at least at the high school age) are highly cognizant of this (and other) aspects of their identities. As such, creating environments where students feel comfortable and safe to divulge such sensitive information as

their documentation statuses will enable them to actively use these aspects of their identities as resources in their interpersonal interactions and learning rather than feel like they have to conceal this part of themselves for any number of reasons. One way teachers can foster such an environment and create an inclusive classroom community is by allowing CLD students to draw on their existing knowledge and access it via their home language(s). Creating a learning environment in which students' unique linguistic backgrounds are thus used as resources for learning and catalysts, not hindrances, to interpersonal interactions can serve to raise the awareness of all students in the class of the advantages of learning alongside diverse peers. Teachers, administrators, and policymakers would do well to keep these findings and their implications in mind when considering the CLD (and, more specifically, undocumented) population in today's K-12 classrooms.

Table 1

School- and Class-level Demographics

Demographic Groups	**Class**	**School**
Males	52.9%	53.3%
Females	47.1%	46.7%
Students with disabilities	35.3%	12.4%
Language status (% EL)	29.4%	10.9%
White students	11.8%	58.7%
Hispanic students	29.4%	12.9%
Black students	47%	14.6%
Other students	11.8%	13.8%

Notes. Classroom data were obtained from the class roster and school data were retrieved from the school website. All values are presented as percentages of the total population. This table does not include students who left the class during the year, but it does include those who joined the class at any point. In the case of the class, the race/ethnicity of members of the Other category was Nepali. In the case of the school, the race/ethnicity of members of the Other category was not specified on the school website.

Table 2

Summary of Reflexive and Interactive Positionings of Undocumented Immigrant Students

Conversation	Topic	Positioning Unit	Interactional Unit(s)	Relevant Message Units	Positioning of UDIs by Self	Positioning of UDIs by Other
1	Financial access to college	1	1-4	1-8	**My family members were born here and they receive financial help for college, but not enough. It's even harder for me to access college because I'm not from here.**	(Response) It's not a problem with college, it's a problem with your documents.
				10-14	(Response) It's not our fault (that we don't have documents).	(Response) It is your fault. It's not the government's problem if you don't have documents.
				20-30	(Response) We didn't decide to come here without documents.	(Response) It's not your fault, and it's not the government's fault, that you don't have documents.
		2	5	34-42	**We can be equal if we can afford college.**	(Response) You can't be equal if you don't have everything required by the rules. You can't just make up your own rules.
		3	7-12	53-60	**You have everything you need (to go to college) and we don't. That's why we think the way we do.**	*(Response) So you want to say (in our project) that the problem is college access (for undocumented immigrants).*
				61-69	(Response) Yes, for us to be able to afford college. But it's not only because we don't have documents. It's because we are not from the US.	*(Response) So we can say that we want everyone to have equal... (stops talking)*
				70-72	(Response) Yes, equal rights.	(Response) No, it's not rights. It's something else.
				74-88	(Response) We need help financially. People who were born here get some help, but people like us who weren't born here don't get any help. That means that we won't be able to go to college, and that's a problem.	
2	Reasons for immigrating to US	4	1	1-6	**People don't know us, our culture, or our reasons for coming to the US.**	
		5	2-3	27-34	**We came to the US because we didn't know who killed my father and we were scared they would kill us. We didn't want to come here.**	(Response) People don't know you.
				36-42	(Response) Exactly. They just judge me without knowing my reasons (for coming to the US).	(Response) We (DIs) have reasons for coming to the US and they (UDIs) have reasons, too. If I don't know you, I can assume things about you. That's why we have conflict.
				43-54	(Response) Yes. If we show people that we each have our own reasons (for coming here), they will understand, and we can change their assumptions and opinions.	
3	Taxes	6	3	58-62		**If you're a legal immigrant, you need to pay taxes every year. But illegal immigrants make this impossible because they keep the money.**
				63-72	(Response) You don't know that.	(Response) I know illegal immigrants who keep their tax money. They do it by lying and changing their documents. So they government spends money on them for nothing.
				74	(Response) They pay their taxes.	
		7	9	158-166	**I don't like to talk to Olga about this topic. She won't understand because she hasn't lived it. She's an immigrant, but she's not like us.**	

References

Abrego, L. J. (2006). “I can’t go to college because I don’t have papers”: Incorporation patterns of Latino undocumented youth. *Latino Studies, 4,* 212-231. doi:10.1057/palgrave.lst.8600200

An, S. (2009). Learning US history in an age of globalization and transnational migration. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 41*(6), 763-787. doi:10.1080/00220270903095993

Barton, K. C., & McCully, A. W. (2010). “You can form your own point of view”: Internally persuasive discourse in Northern Ireland Students’ encounters with history. *Teachers College Record, 112*(1), 142-181.

Bloome, D., Carter, S. P., Christian, B. M., Otto, S., & Shuart-Faris, N. (2005). *Discourse analysis and the study of classroom language and literacy events: A microethnographic perspective.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bondy, J. M. (2015). Hybrid citizenship: Latina youth and the politics of belonging. *The High School Journal, 98*(4), 353-373. doi:10.1353/hsj.2015.0012

Brady, J. (2015). Dialect, power and politics: standard English and adolescent identities. *Literacy, 49*(3), 149-157. doi:10.1111/lit.12058

Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, *7*(4-5), 585-614. doi:10.1177/1461445605054407

Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with spoken discourse*. London, UK: Sage Publications, Ltd.

Child Trends. (2014). *Immigrant children.* Retrieved from: https://www.childtrends.org/indicators/immigrant-children/

Cummins, J. (1996). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society*. Ontario, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Dabach, D., Fones, A., Merchant, N., & Kim, M. (2017). Discourses of exclusion: Immigrant-origin youth responses to immigration debates in an election year. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 16*(1), 1-16. doi:10.1080/15348458.2016.1239538

DaSilva Iddings, A., & Katz, L. (2007). Integrating home and school identities of recent-immigrant Hispanic English language learners through classroom practices. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *6*(4), 299-314. doi:10.1080/15348450701542306

Danzak, R. (2011). Defining identities through multiliteracies: EL teens narrate their immigration experiences as graphic stories. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 55*(3), 187-196. doi:10.1002/JAAL.00024

Duff, P. (2002). The discursive co-construction of knowledge, identity, and difference: An ethnography of communication in the high school mainstream. *Applied Linguistics*, *23*(3), 289-322. doi:10.1093/applin/23.3.289

Erickson, F. (2004). *Talk and social theory: Ecologies of speaking and listening in everyday life*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Oxford, UK: Polity Press.

Gee, J.P. (1989). Literacy, discourse, and linguistics: Introduction. *The Journal of Education, 171*(1), 5-176. doi:10.1177/002205748917100101

Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses.* London, UK: Falmer Press.

Gee, J. P. (2011). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method (3rd ed.).* New York, NY: Routledge.

Gee, J.P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2015). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideologies in discourses (5th ed.)*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Gonzales, R. G. (2011). Learning to be illegal: Undocumented youth and shifting legal contexts in the transition to adulthood. *American Sociological Review, 76*(4), 602-619. doi:10.1177/0003122411411901

Goulah, J. (2009). Navigating identity reformation, marginalization, and "soft" colonization in former Soviet immigrant students. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 8,* 159-173. doi:10.1080/15348450902848510

Gumperz, J. J. (1986). *Discourse strategies*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Harré, R., & van Langenhove, L. (Eds.). (1999). *Positioning theory: Moral contexts of international action*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Heath, S. B. (1982). Questioning at home and at school: A comparative study. In G. Spindler (Ed.), *Doing the ethnography of schooling: Educational anthropology in action* (pp. 102-131). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

High school website.

Hong, C., & Cheong, C. (2010). Literate identities among Korean students learning English in the USA. *English Teaching, 65*(4), 131-154.

Ivanič, R. (2006). Language, learning and identification. *Language, Culture and Identity in Applied Linguistics*, 7-29.

Kibler, A. (2017). The making of a "Mexican feminist": A minoritized bilingual's development of disciplinary identities through writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 38*, 26-41. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2017.10.011

Lewis, C., Enciso, P., & Moje, E. (2007). *Reframing sociocultural research on literacy: Identity,*

agency, and power. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Moghaddam, F., & Harré, R. (2010). Words, conflicts and political processes. In F. Moghaddam and R. Harré (Eds.), *Words of conflict, words of war: How the language we use in political processes sparks fighting (pp. 1-28).* Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Moje, E., Luke, A., Davies, B., & Street, B. (2009). Literacy and identity: Examining the metaphors in history and contemporary research. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *44*(4), 415-437. doi:10.1598/RRQ.44.4.7

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 31*(2), 132-141. doi:10.1080/00405849209543534

Murillo, M. (2017). The art of the reveal: Undocumented high school students, institutional agents, and the disclosure of legal status. *The High School Journal, 100*(2), 88-108. doi:10.1353/hsj.2017.0001

O'Connor, B. H. (2016). Racializing discourse in public and private: Social differentiation and the question of Mexicana's at an Arizona high school. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 47*(2), 130-147. doi:10.1111/aeq.12145

O'Connor, B. H. (2017). Language out of place: Transgressive semiotics and the lived experience of race in borderlands education. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 16*(3), 127-141. doi:10.1080/15348458.2017.1283991

Ochs, E. (1979). Transcription as theory. *Developmental Pragmatics*, *10*(1), 43-72.

Perreira, K., & Spees, L. (2011). Foiled aspirations: The influence of unauthorized status on the educational expectations of Latino immigrant youth. *Population Research and Policy Review, 34,* 641-664. doi:10.1007/s11113-015-9356-y

Pew Hispanic Center. (2011). *Unauthorized immigrant population: National and state trends, 2010.* Retrieved from: http://www.pewhispanic.org/2011/02/01/unauthorized-immigrant-population-brnational-and-state-trends-2010/

Pew Hispanic Center. (2015). *Chapter 4: U.S. public has mixed views of immigrants and immigration*. Retrieved from: http://www.pewhispanic.org/2015/09/28/chapter-4-u-s-public-has-mixed-views-of-immigrants-and-immigration/

Pew Research Center. (2018). *Public backs legal status for immigrants brought to U.S. illegally as children, but not a bigger border wall*. Retrieved from: http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/01/19/public-backs-legal-status-for-immigrants-brought-to-u-s-illegally-as-children-but-not-a-bigger-border-wall/

Ricento, T. (2005). Considerations of identity in L2 learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 895-910). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Rogers, R. (2014). Critical discourse analysis in literacy research. In P. Albers, T. Holbrook, & A. Flint (Eds.), *New methods of literacy research* (pp. 19-39). New York, NY: Routledge.

Suarez-Orozco, C., Yoshikawa, H., & Tseng, V. (2015). *Intersecting inequalities: Research to reduce inequality for immigrant-origin children and youth.* William T. Grant Foundation.

Sutherland, L. (2005). Black adolescent girls' use of literacy practices to negotiate boundaries of ascribed identity. *Journal of Literacy Research, 37*(3), 365-406. doi:10.1207/s15548430jlr3703_4

Tatum, B. D. (2003). "*Why are all the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?" and other conversations about race.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide.* London, UK: Sage.

U.S. Department of Education. (2016). Non-Regulatory Guidance: English Learners and Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/essatitleiiiguidenglishlearners92016.pdf

van Dijk, T. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. Hamilton (Eds.) *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-367). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Wengraf, T. (2001). *Qualitative research interviewing: Biographic narrative and semi-structured methods.* London, UK: Sage Publications, Ltd.

Wertsch, J. V. (2002). *Voices of collective remembering*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Wortham, S., & Reyes, A. (2005). *Discourse analysis beyond the speech event*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Yoshikawa, H., Suarez-Orozco, C., & Gonzales, R. (2017). Unauthorized status and youth development in the United States: Consensus statement of the Society for Research on Adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 27*(1), 4-19. doi:10.1111/jora.12272

Zirkel, S. (2008). The influence of multicultural educational practices on student outcomes and intergroup relations. *Teachers College Record*, *110*(6), 1147-1181.

Zuengler, J. (2008). Conversations on the research process: Questions of reliability and validity. In K. Cole & J. Zuengler (Eds.) *The research process in classroom discourse analysis* (pp. 99-102). New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Appendix A

Transcription Conventions (adapted from ten Have, 2007)

Sequencing

Symbol	Meaning
[	The point of overlap onset
]	The point where one utterance or utterance-part terminates vis-à-via another
=	The point of latching (one at the end of one line and the beginning of the next, indicating no gap between the lines)

Timed Intervals

Symbol	Meaning
(0.0)	Elapsed time in silence, by tenth of seconds
(.)	Tiny gap within or between utterances

Characteristics of Speech Production

Symbol	Meaning
word	Stress, indicated via pitch and/or amplitude
:	Prolongation of the immediately prior sound (multiple colons indicate a more prolonged sound)
-	Cut-off
.	Stopping fall in tone
,	Continuing intonation, such as when reading items from a list
?	Rising intonation
	(Absence of utterance-final marker) Indeterminate contour
↑	Rising pitch in the utterance-part immediately after the arrow
↓	Falling pitch in the utterance-part immediately after the arrow
WORD	Louder volume relative to surrounding sounds
°	Quieter volume relative to surrounding sounds (bracketing the utterances or utterance-parts)
< >	Sped-up utterances or utterance-parts
·hhh	Inbreath (with dot prefix); outbreath (without dot prefix)
w(h)ord	Breathiness (i.e., laughter, crying, etc.)

Transcriber's Doubts and Comments

Symbol	Meaning
( )	Unintelligible speech
(word)	Dubious utterances
(( ))	Transcriber's descriptions (not transcriptions)

Appendix B

Full Transcripts

Conversation #1

Interactional Unit	Speaker	Message Unit	Transcript
1	Olga	1	We have (1) help I mean if you (worry) ( )
		2	°everything and we can help you and you can go to college°=
	Kayla	3	=↑Not exactly (.)
		4	because like my (.) my cou↑sins they are go↑ing to col↑lege, and like the government help ↑them, but not a ↓lot.
	Olga	5	( )-
	Kayla	6	And they and they born ↑here.
		7	And and you ↑see like (.) in my case, would be more difficult to go college. (4) Yeah. ↑Yeah <because> ((whistles)) (1) for us it's not that (much)-
2	Olga	8	<It's not a problem with college> °cause it's a problem with ( ) so it's not a problem with college, it's a problem with (your documents).°
		9	(1) You can explain.
	Kayla	10	It's NOT OW F our fault.
	Olga	11	(5) It's: kind of your problem.
	Kayla	12	↑WHY?
	Olga	13	(2) Because, if you don't have documents, it's not a problem of government.
		14	It's y (.) just your problem.
3	Kayla	15	*Oi'te esto ↑tú?* ((Translation: Did you hear this?))
	Marisol	16	*Qué ↑dice?* ((Translation: What did she say?))
	Kayla	17	*Que (dice) que si ( ) porque no tenemos los documentos eso <es mi pro↑blema* ((Translation: She says that if ( ) because we don't have documents then that's my problem))
		18	*que no me queja.>* ((Translation: that I shouldn't complain.))
	Marisol and José	19	Hhh
4	Kayla	20	Like we didn't decide to come here like ↑thi:s, without documents.
	Olga	21	Yeah I know ( )
		22	I me:an it's not YOUR (.) fault and it's not prob-
	Kayla	23	What did [you say?]
	Olga	24	[lem of] [government.]
	Kayla	25	[Few minutes ago.]
	Olga	26	I didn't say
	Kayla	27	Mmm
	Olga	28	It's: not-
	Kayla	29	[Mmm]
	Olga	30	[my choice], and it's not choice of government also.
5	Olga	31	Because they help ( )-
	Kayla	32	Yeah but like, <the thing is like>-

	Olga	33	here. It's not-
	Kayla	34	We can be equal ↓too, <because like>, if we are like almost [able to pay]
	Olga	35	[You CA:N'T] [be EQUAL.]
	Kayla	36	[like we TOO can go college] and and everything.
	Olga	37	We have rules everywhere.
		38	If you have everything for these rules, you can be equal. If you don't, you DON'T. It's RULES.
	Kayla	39	↑I'm done-
	Olga	40	You can you (can't) come in s:ome place and say I have my rules, I wanna live for my rules you know?
		41	because all place have same rules. Everybody. [(I need) ( )]
6	José	42	[↑It's] [true.]
	Unknown female student	43	[(I need) hhh]-
	José	44	Yeah.
	Kayla	45	*Esta será la peor de todas.* ((Translation: That will be the worst of all of them)).
	José	46	No, but it's kind of:-
	Unknown female student	47	Hhh
	José	48	Hhh
7	Olga	49	I say (the difference),
		50	I don't care ( ) these rules. ( ) problem. You don't want to ( ). So, if you want stay here.
	Kayla	51	I know.
	Olga	52	So I don't care.
	Marisol	53	h That's why, because you have ↑e:verything you need-
	Kayla	54	Yeah ex↑actly.
	Marisol	55	and we ↑don't. That's (the) big different.
	Olga	56	(That's everything) you need, and you need ( ) for ( )-
	Kayla	57	That's ↑why like we think in a different way:
	Olga	58	[But I try to]
	Kayla	59	[<Because like> we have to:] think abou:t what will ↑help us too, not just them.
8	Olga	60	hhh °Okay so you want to say this problem is college (for people)°
	Kayla	61	Li:ke be: (2) able for us to go college too like-
9	Marisol	62	No uh just uh uh just um like to ↑clear?
		63	Um (.) it's not only because we don't have papers or some documents,
		64	you know, him? ((pointing to José)) maybe he has documents, but I don't have documents like,
		65	the problem is that we are not from ↑here.
	Kayla	66	Yeah.
	Marisol	67	We can have documents but the colleges the colleges will be more expensive, for US.
		68	The documents that we have ( )

10	Olga	69	So we can just (like) say that we (.) we want to have equal (1) equal like-
	Kayla	70	Rights.
	Olga	71	No, I don’t (.) I forgot how it’s called.
		72	Li:ke (.) it’s not rights, it’s something like
	Kayla	73	*Bueno.* ((Translation: Good.))
11	Marisol	74	I think that if we can say like help a ↑little, um with the ↑money
		75	because it’s very expensive, college for people who is not from ↑here. (I mean for people who aren’t)-
	Kayla	76	Like, basically it’s for go college because: (.)
		77	some people, who born here, also doesn’t have, like money to pay ↑college.
	Marisol	78	But they have ↑help,
	Kayla	79	Yeah.
	Marisol	80	Or-
12	Kayla	81	Yeah. And we doesn’t but like,
		82	we kinda need like, it equal (.) see? Like, them and u:s like, to be treated equal,
		83	if we, <if we don’t have> like the ↑sources to go college,
		84	like maybe (come) help us ↑too.
		85	<because like if I want to continue> go college,
		86	and like I don’t have the money to go,
		87	so ↑I will not ↑go. (.)
		88	<And that’s a big ↑issue>.
13	Olga	89	So we need to discuss about what we can change. (Like) we can (.) say,

Conversation #2

Interactional Unit	Speaker	Message Unit	Transcript
1	Kayla	1	We can, because like we are not talking to the president. Well, we are talking to EVERYBODY else. It is like discriminating people.
		2	Like you ↑see that, as she says, she was like-
	Olga	3	Yeah yeah ↑yeah.
	Kayla	4	He uh, °the guy he told, she told him, <he was like saying> ↑yay,
		5	but °he doesn't know us. He doesn't know our culture, how we are, just because we are like (.) <like the way we are>,
		6	they just think we are ↑fine, they don't (know that) we have problems (or: not). (2) Or the reason why we get here.
2	Olga	7	°People have to go° ( ) °I explain this (.) in my° ( )
		8	Everybody in prison. ( )
	Kayla	9	It's because you didn't (have) ↑problem to get here.
		10	You just wait to come here.
	Olga	11	I don't have problem? You (.) you ↑kidding! I was waiting ten years. For visa. TEN years. It's ↑not a ↑problem?
	Kayla	12	Okay. (1)
		13	Why was okay-
	Olga	14	( )-
	Kayla	15	Okay just tell me the reason why you got here-
	Olga	16	For visa.
	Kayla	17	Just because you want to travel, or (continue high school)?
	Olga	18	(1) Last, last time-
	Kayla	19	When you first came, why, what was the reason? Just to-
	Olga	20	Becaus:e]-
	Kayla	21	[continue study?
	Olga	22	No, it was my grandmother (work)-
	Kayla	23	Exactly.
	Olga	24	Because my mother-
	Kayla	25	Exactly.
	Olga	26	don't have work in my country-
	Kayla	27	Okay ask ask us why we came here? We were scared.
		28	Our, in my opinion my family? We don't know who killed my father.
		29	They was going to kill us. (.) That's why the reason why we are here.
	Olga	30	( )
	Kayla	31	Because we didn't want to come here.
	Olga	32	You have (you have visa).
	Kayla	33	Exactly.
3	Olga	34	And these people who don't know ↑you, they just ( )-
	Kayla	35	Exactly.

		36	They just judge me because (.) the way I am. They don’t know my ↑reason.
	Olga	37	( ) explain to them-
	Kayla	38	(And I will not explain to) everybody.
	Olga	39	Yeah, I know,
		40	<but I try explain you that> we have reason and they have reason also ↑too.
		41	If I don’t know you I can say, ↑Why she just (want) came in United States but I was waiting 10 years for visa?
		42	That’s why we (.) have this conflict, because-
	Kayla	43	Yeah but like if we show people like (.) that (.)
		44	US, YOU, like all of us have, like their OWN reasons to come here,
		45	and like maybe they under↑stand why (1) li:ke,
		46	you can change that.
		47	<Because like> if I tell you WHY I came here and my reason you will be OH OKAY, ↑that’s ↑why.
		48	And if you tell me ↑your ↑reason I will be like ↑OH I (will) under↑stand.
		49	But if you don’t tell me,
		50	<you just like> you say ↑OH you came here, and that’s not fair>, I wait, and you didn’t ( )-
	Olga	51	Okay, so we need just explain people, like-
	Kayla	52	Like, try to-
	Olga	53	Be ( )
	Kayla	54	make people understand (the point).

Conversation #3

Interactional Unit	Speaker	Message Unit	Transcript
1	Olga	1	°Maybe like we can say°
		2	WITHOUT (.) this percentage of immigrants, we will not have (2)
	Marisol	3	This-
	Olga	4	( )-
	Marisol	5	great econ:omy this ( )-
	Olga	6	This good places. °That's° I: °don't know° (.) something
	Unknown student	7	(Something) ( )
2	Marisol	8	(2) But you ↑don't think (.) °about that (before)° right?
	Olga	9	Hm?
	Marisol	10	(.) You didn't think (.) that way before (right)?
	Olga	11	I didn't (see) it ↑now, that way. I'm just saying (I).
	Marisol	12	Hhh
	Olga	13	You ↑don't think it's a ↑good thing?
		14	I mean immigrants is a good thing and it's a bad-
	Kayla	15	Twelve point five [percent]
	Olga	16	[thing [too]
	Kayla	17	[of the: total population]-
	Unknown student	18	( )
3	Olga	19	Many peoples have work, and try ↑everything,
		20	and <everybody thinks it's 'cause they are>, um: (.) help to grow ↑economy but it don't.
		21	It was many immigrants who came, they just work and send money for other country like, where is their ↑family
		22	so it's not (.) help (.) economy-
	Marisol	23	You, you do that?
	Olga	24	↑Yes.
	Marisol	25	Your p- your-
	Olga	26	↓Yes. My grandmother she did it before ( ) she ↑work and she send us money.
		27	So how (.) this fact that she send money to other country help economy
		28	And many, many [immigrants]-
	Kayla	29	[but you're helping your [family]-
	Olga	30	[we came] YEAH,
		31	but many people who came here, they just send money to other country.
		32	It's not helping America. Is the main idea of this topic.
		33	I mean, I ( )-
	Kayla	34	WHAT?
	Olga	35	I mean,
		36	I know that they have family members in their country ( )-
	Marisol	37	[but they give]-

	Olga	38	[America]-
	Marisol	39	millions and BILLIONS of dollars °for each person that works with them.
		40	And they, they°-
	Olga	41	They (send) money-
	Kayla, Olga, Marisol	42	((unintelligible overlapping speech))
	Kayla	43	They have to pay money (too), to be able to send-
	Marisol	44	And their payments that they get, the ( ) that they get ( ), it's just.
		45	Like ( )
	Olga	46	But they spend money and they jus:t send this money in other ↑country so-
	Marisol	47	Yes but it's ↑not too much,
		48	because you know,
		49	the ↑rent over here is S:UPER [expensive]-
	Kayla	50	[You know, like]-
	Marisol	51	The b- the: the utilities (.) is super expensive,
	Kayla	52	Yeah.
	Marisol	53	[EVERYTHING]-
	Kayla	54	[(Many people) like] [sacrifice]-
	Marisol	55	[the food is expensive,]
		56	you cannot like send a lot, maybe 30 dollar, 50 dollars, (the most)
	Kayla, Olga, Marisol	57	((unintelligible overlapping speech))
	Olga	58	( ) But many illegals they, they like just uh (.)
		59	Okay, if you ↑legal, you need to go and (.) take a ↑tax, every ↑year,
		60	but illegal make it, like (.) <impossible thing
		61	because they go> and take this money
		62	but it's money NOT, like for these people-
	Marisol	63	°You don't know that.°
	Kayla	64	No. Because we are not exactly-
	Kayla and Marisol	65	((unintelligible overlapping speech))
	Olga	66	I KNOW I know immigrants, illegal immigrants who take taxes.
		67	I don't know HOW they did it, but they did.
		68	They just use kind of: (.) lie in everything
		69	they just change documents,
		70	and they just take ( ), but they can't.
	Marisol	71	But ( ) (taxes)-
	Olga	72	So government spends money for nothing.
		73	(1) Because they are like (.)
	Marisol	74	They make their taxes. ( )
4	Kayla	75	To ↑be hones:t, just leave that topic
		76	because every time we talk about it, we are always fighting,
		77	and I feel like this would go (.) ↓bad-
	Marisol	78	No,

		79	I: would like to (like) TEACH her because she don't know what she-
	Kayla	80	[I]-
	Marisol and Olga	81	((overlapping unintelligible speech))
	Kayla	82	have been trying to teach her
	Marisol and Olga	83	((overlapping unintelligible speech))
	Kayla	84	from the beginning of
	Marisol and Olga	85	((overlapping unintelligible speech))
	Kayla	86	last year
	Marisol	87	( )
	Kayla	88	she's not ↑learning.
	Kayla and Marisol	89	((unintelligible overlapping speech))
5	Olga	90	(OKAY). What about ↑PRISONS.
	Marisol	91	Huh?-
	Olga	92	You know how many criminals now in ↑prison
		93	and how many (.) [how much]-
	Kayla	94	[Well sometimes they arrest them for] [nothing]-
	Olga	95	[MONEY] government spend for a prison.
		96	(1) You know?
	Marisol	97	That's why you [( )]-
	Olga	98	[Because they are criminal.]
	Marisol	99	( ) That's why they ( ) money to their ↑country,
		100	so so they don't have to spend
		101	↑money for ↑them.
	Olga	102	(1) I mean look.
		103	Many (.) immigrants came,
		104	they did something bad,
		105	(.) and (government put them) in [prison.]
	Kayla	106	[But not like] you are saying criminals like,
		107	EVERYONE.
	Olga	108	Not everyone,
		109	[I]-
	Marisol	110	[You said] [you said immigrants]-
	Olga	111	[just talk about immigrant]
	Marisol	112	( )
	Olga	113	( ) EVERYone.
		114	Just ↑check. Because [I check]-
	Marisol	115	[Your position is [( )]
	Olga	116	[( ) how many immigrants] in the pri↑sons, and how many Americans.
		117	Immigrants, it's like, maybe: eighty-FIVE percentage of prison. And °Americans in just twenty-five.°

6	Unknown female student	118	( ) learned what (you) learn in ↑English?
	Kayla	119	(1) When like they,
		120	you remember that story we ↑read about the: woman
	Olga	121	Mmm.
	Kayla	122	who was in prison-
	Olga	123	But it was HER [↑FAU:LT]
	Kayla	124	[She was legal but],
		125	NO NO. Was NOT her fault. She didn't ( ).
	Olga	126	She ↑didn't know rules of this government.
		127	It's HER fault that she don't know that-
	Kayla	128	You follow too much the rules [and]-
	Olga	129	[↑YES]
	Kayla	130	you ( ) label everyone with the same thing.
	Olga	131	↑She need to follow the rules. If she ( ), you cannot ( ).
		132	I ↑KNOW that.
		133	I I have same documents why I don't wanna go in (boat)? Because it's illegal.
	Olga	134	↑Why she GO. It's HER PROBLEM.
	Kayla	135	((smiles)) ·hhh okay.
		136	*Ella esta muy hecha aq↓ui.* ((Translation: She is very made here.))
		137	I cannot °say anything (back).°
	Marisol	138	(She didn't)-
7	Kayla	139	Okay twelve percent, °twelve point five percent of the population are immigrants.°
	Olga	140	Twenty-five.
	Kayla	141	TWELVE point five.
	Olga	142	↑Twelve ↑point ↑five?
		143	Why is: I think it's more.
	Unknown female student	144	(↑Really?)
	Olga	145	Why is: I think it's, it's ↓more.
	Kayla	146	(1) That was on two thousand nine.
	Olga	147	°Two thousand nine. (6) I think they don't have it, for uh, yeah.°
		148	<Try to find> for: two thousand sixteen (2) because they: count people in the middle of ↑year. ( )
	Kayla	149	(7) I'm going backwards.
		150	(4) Okay. Around twenty forty-↑eight percent of °immigrants°.
	Olga	151	Yeah. Forty-eight °is okay, I mean.°
	Unknown male voice	152	( )
8	Kayla	153	(4) Yeah. Four minutes.
	Olga	154	(2) °We need to go now?°
	Kayla	155	In four ↑minutes.
		156	(3) Yes (we need to).

		157	(3) But we can like °( )°.
9		158	And °<(Marisol) that's why>
		159	I don't like to teach her this type of thing.
		160	She's always, ↑she's ( ), to be honest.
		161	She will (.) not (understand) ( )° because she haven't lived it ( ).
	Marisol	162	Yeah she's an immigrant but she-
	Olga	163	hhh she's not an ↑immigrant.
	Marisol	164	Yes you ARE immigrant. You ↑know ↑that right?
	Olga	165	hhh of ↑COURSE. I ↑know (it)
	Kayla	166	But not (.) like (.) U:S.
	Marisol	167	(3) *Tu no tienes que decirle a ella que tu eres una, que no tienes papels para que ella ( ).* ((Translation: You don't have to tell her that you are a, that you don't have papers so that she ( )))
	Kayla	168	*No. Es que mira. Si ella es mi ↑amiga y me va a aceptar como yo ↑soy, me va a decir. Que me diga ( ), si ella es mi amiga de verdad me tiene que (aceptar). Si no ( )* ((Translation: It's like, look. If she is my friend and she is going to accept me like I am, she's going to tell me. Like she told me ( ), if she's my friend, she actually has to accept me. If not ( ).)) Right?
	Olga	169	(Well) (4)
		170	↑WHAT you guys you're ↑RIGHT how I can understand in Spanish, oh my God.
	Kayla	171	(1) <Because if you are like> ↑TRULY my ↑friend you will accept ( ). If I am truly ( )
	Olga	172	I ↑don't care ( ).
	Kayla	173	But sometimes like, when you say that kind of thing, people °get offended because ( ) you say immigrants (that involve), not just one person, just not one, one (percent).
		174	(3) And you gotta be ↑careful when you say it.°