

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Theses and Dissertations

2019

Influence of Language Ideologies and Positioning on Emergent Bilinguals Linguistic Identity

Sarah Christine Urbanc

Illinois State University, surbanc@dunlapcusd.net

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/etd>



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

Recommended Citation

Urbanc, Sarah Christine, "Influence of Language Ideologies and Positioning on Emergent Bilinguals Linguistic Identity" (2019). *Theses and Dissertations*. 1146.

<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/etd/1146>

This Dissertation-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISUREd@ilstu.edu.

INFLUENCE OF LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AND POSITIONING ON EMERGENT
BILINGUALS LINGUISTIC IDENTITY

SARAH CHRISTINE URBANC

347 Pages

In this dissertation, the researcher employed critical sociocultural and positioning theories to examine how classroom teachers, ESL teachers, and family members discursively positioned emergent bilinguals in the general education, ESL, home, and community settings, as well as investigated the influence of positioning on the emergent bilinguals' linguistic identity. This study also explored the various ideologies that students, teachers, and parents articulated and embodied while negotiating issues of identity, power, agency, and the social construct of smartness within the figured world of school, in addition to the home and community environments. Data were generated during a six-month qualitative study of emergent bilinguals interacting within a mid-size, suburban district in the U.S. Midwest. The researcher used a microethnographic approach to discourse analysis to examine video-recorded interactions between the emergent bilingual participants and their classroom and ESL teachers, peers, as well as family members. Other data sources included semi-structured interviews, field observations, and artifact collection. Findings demonstrate that participants enacted the hegemonic language ideologies of language subordination and English as a superior language; however, the researcher also observed the performance of counter-hegemonic ideologies such as language maintenance. These ideologies, identified through participants' discursive acts, all led to the co-construction of the focal participants' linguistic identity. Findings also supported the

engagement of an ideology of smartness that limited participant agency and advocacy; however, through a discourse of assertiveness, participants were able to refute unwanted positioning and enact their own construct of smartness. These findings suggest a need for reconfiguring the figured world of school to include emergent bilinguals' funds of knowledge and culturally relevant teaching practices in addition to increased teacher/researcher reflexivity.

KEYWORDS: agency, emergent bilinguals; figured worlds; language ideologies; linguistic identity; positioning; smartness

INFLUENCE OF LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AND POSITIONING ON EMERGENT
BILINGUALS LINGUISTIC IDENTITY

SARAH CHRISTINE URBANC

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

School of Teaching and Learning

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

2019

© 2019 Sarah Christine Urbanc

INFLUENCE OF LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AND POSITIONING ON EMERGENT
BILINGUALS LINGUISTIC IDENTITY

SARAH CHRISTINE URBANC

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Carolyn Hunt, Chair

Lara Handsfield

Sandra Osorio

Mark Pacheco

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the numerous individuals who both encouraged and supported me throughout this six-year journey. I never would have imagined that I would be able to design and carry out a research project of this magnitude, let alone write an entire seven-chapter dissertation. The first person who encouraged me to sign up for the doctoral program was Dr. Haling and had it not been for her gentle nudging, I would probably not be here at the finish line.

Once I signed up, there have been numerous classmates that have offered support along the way and I have been grateful for their friendship, inspiration, and reassurance. Morgan Belcher and I would drive to ISU both in our masters and doctoral classes. She helped me through the early part of the dissertation process by being a critical reader of my early proposal drafts. Sarah Rozny also deserves a huge amount of recognition as being both a critical friend, editor, and cheerleader. She kept me motivated when it felt like I wanted to give up.

Accolades are due to my husband, Mike, and my two girls Isabel and Sophie. Without my husband being a human shuttle and stepping in to be Mr. Mom, this never could have happened. Also, although they were too young to realize it, I do want to thank my girls that never once made me feel bad for missing an activity, event, or putting them to bed at night.

The next group I want to thank is my committee. Dr. Handsfield listened to my ideas and helped guide me in the right direction. Her insightful feedback pushed me to dig deeper and think more critically. I also want to thank Dr. Pacheco and Dr. Osorio for their offerings of relevant literature and feedback along the way. That leaves Dr. Hunt...poor Dr. Hunt. I wonder if she knew what she was getting herself in to when she signed on as my dissertation chair? Many times she was able to calm me down with her delicate ways, yet help me move forward at the same time. I can say with a 100% degree of certainty, that my dissertation would not be what

it is without her. She taught me so much over the course of our MANY meetings (sorry Carolyn!) such as passive voice, Gee's discourse analysis tools, and microtranscription. While I kept giving her crazy time lines, she never once told me no and encouraged me to keep moving forward.

Finally, I want to thank the many participants who welcomed me into their classrooms and homes and allowed me to tag along on their community outings. I learned so much from these observations that will continue to influence me for years to come.

I dedicate this dissertation to my daughters, because while there was a whole lot of mom guilt going on over the past six years, it is with hope that they realize that they too can be strong females that do not let anything hold them back from their big dreams!

S. C. U.

CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	i
TABLES	xi
CHAPTER I: STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Purpose of the Study	12
Definition of Terms	13
Advocacy	13
Agency	14
Discourse	14
Emergent Bilingual (EB)	14
English Learner (EL)	14
English as a Second Language (ESL)	15
Figured Worlds	15
Identity	15
Language Ideology	16
Linguistic Identity	17
Positioning	17
Power	17
Smartness	18
Theoretical Framework	18
Theoretical Foundations	18

Theories of Identity	25
Metaphors of Identity	26
Personal Metaphor of Identity	32
Connecting Metaphor to Theory	33
Summary	35
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	37
Search Criteria and Data Condensation	38
Identity and Language	39
Linguistic Identity	40
Conflicted Identity	43
Macro Level Influences	45
Power	50
Agency	53
Positioning and Language	57
Reflexive (Self) Positioning	58
Interactive Positioning	60
Smartness	65
Figured Worlds	68
Narratives	71
Summary	73
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	75
Situating the Research	75
Qualitative Research	76

Case Study	78
Context for Recruitment and Data Collection	80
Participant Recruitment	81
Participant Overview	83
Participant One: “Aanya”	84
Focal Teacher Participant	85
Non-Focal Student Participants	85
Research Sites	85
Participant Two: “Gabriella”	87
Focal Teacher Participant	88
Non-Focal Student Participants	88
Research Sites	88
Participant Summary	89
Researcher Positionality and Reflexivity	89
Role of the Researcher	89
Data Collection Overview	91
Rationale for Observations as a Research Tool	94
ESL Classroom Observations	95
General Education Classroom Observations	95
Home/Community Observations	96
Contextual Information for Observations	96
Aanya’s ESL Observations	96
Aanya’s General Education Classroom Observations	98

Aanya's Home Observations	99
Aanya's Community Observations	101
Gabriella's ESL Observations	102
Gabriella's General Education Classroom Observations	103
Gabriella's Home Observations	104
Gabriella's Community Observation	105
Rationale for Semi-Structured Interviews as a Research Tool	106
Contextual Information for Semi-Structured Interviews	108
Research Journal	109
Artifacts and Documents	110
Data Analysis	110
First Cycle Coding	113
Second Cycle Coding	114
Discourse Analysis	118
Trustworthiness	122
Ethical Considerations	123
Summary	124
CHAPTER IV: LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AND SMARTNESS	126
Language Ideologies	127
Language Subordination	128
English as a Superior Language	132
Language Maintenance	136
Ideology of Smartness	139

Discourse of Limitation	140
Discourse of Assertiveness	145
Conclusion	147
CHAPTER V: DISCOURSE ANALYSIS FOR AANYA	149
ESL Classroom Observation	150
Contextual Background	150
Summary of the Interaction	151
A Conversation and Discourse of Loss	152
Aanya's Personal Language Narrative	155
Hegemonic Versus Counter-hegemonic Conversations	156
Summary	158
General Education Classroom Observation	159
Contextual Background	160
Summary of the Interaction	160
Identity of Rejection	162
The End of Double "Voicing" Discourse	164
Power Differentials	164
Figured Worlds	165
Bids for Power	166
Big C Conversations of Smartness	167
Conclusion	168
Home Observation	169
Contextual Background	170

Summary of the Interaction	170
Conflicting Identities	172
Language Use	173
Bids for Power	174
Power Struggle in Figured Worlds	176
Summary	178
Macro Level Connections	178
Figured Worlds	178
Smartness	179
Power	181
Language and Nationalism	183
Conclusion	184
CHAPTER VI: DISCOURSE ANALYSIS FOR GABRIELLA	187
Researcher Reflexivity	189
ESL Classroom Observations	189
Contextual Background	191
Summary of the Interaction	192
Passive Discourse	193
Active Discourse	194
Confident Discourse	195
The Other Participant: Further Self-Reflection	196
Summary	198
General Education Classroom Observations	199

Contextual Background	199
Summary of the Interaction	200
Mrs. Kennedy's Use of Pronouns and Leading Questions	200
Rising End Intonation	203
Traditional Student and Teacher Roles	204
Standard American English as a Social Good	205
Summary	206
Home Observations	207
Contextual Background	208
Summary of the Interaction	209
Displays of Self-Advocacy	210
Literacy as a Social Need and Dad's Power	213
Summary	215
Macro Level Connections	215
Smartness	216
Language Ideologies	219
Conclusion	223
CHAPTER VII: DISCUSSION	225
Summary of the Findings	227
Research Question 1	227
Research Question 2	232
Limitations	235
Implications for Practice	237

Reconfiguring the Figured World of School	238
Practitioner Reflexivity	240
Culturally Relevant Teaching	242
Implications for Research	244
Conclusion	246
REFERENCES	248
APPENDIX A: REFLECTIVE MEMO	273
APPENDIX B: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW PROTOCOL	274
APPENDIX C: SYNTHESIS JOURNAL ENTRY	275
APPENDIX D: MICROTRANSCRIPTION KEY	277
APPENDIX E: DISCOURSE ANALYSIS TOOLS	278
APPENDIX F: AANYA ESL MICROTRANSCRIPT	289
APPENDIX G: AANYA CLASSROOM MICROTRANSCRIPT	298
APPENDIX H: AANYA HOME MICROTRANSCRIPT	309
APPENDIX I: GABRIELLA ESL MICROTRANSCRIPT	318
APPENDIX J: GABRIELLA CLASSROOM MICROTRANSCRIPT	329
APPENDIX K: GABRIELLA HOME MICROTRANSCRIPT	340

TABLES

Table	Page
1. Participant Information	83
2. Research Timeline	92
3. Aanya's ESL Observations	97
4. Aanya's General Education Classroom Observations	98
5. Aanya's Home Observations	100
6. Aanya's Community Observations	101
7. Gabriella's ESL Observations	102
8. Gabriella's General Education Classroom Observations	103
9. Gabriella's Home Observations	105
10. Gabriella's Community Observation	106
11. Semi-Structured Interviews	109
12. Themes, Categories, Definitions, and Uses	111
13. Examples of In Vivo Codes	113
14. Second Cycle Coding Sample	115
15. List of Final Categories	116

CHAPTER I: STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In the 2014-2015 school year, the number of K-12 emergent bilinguals (EBs) in the United States public school system reached nearly five million, which is an increase of more than 100% since the early nineties (Snyder, de Brey, & Dillow, 2016). According to the Digest of Educational Statistics (2016), as of 2014, there were over 4.6 million emergent bilinguals in American public schools that accounted for an average 9.4% of the entire country's population. In Illinois specifically, emergent bilinguals were 10.3% of the public-school system's student enrollment (Snyder et al., 2016).

In fact, immigration of those who speak a language other than English has been the fastest growing population in U.S. schools (Cone, Buxton, Lee, & Mahotiere, 2014). In Illinois specifically, Vonderlack-Navarro (2013) projected the class of 2020 to be the first "majority-minority" group of students (Vonderlack-Navarro, 2013). Likewise, by the year 2030, Chen, Kyle, and McIntyre (2008) proposed that the U.S. K-12 school system will be comprised of approximately 40% emergent bilinguals. Therefore, with the continuous rapid growth, the implications of their participation in classrooms are monumental.

However, teachers' beliefs regarding emergent bilinguals can range from diversity and bilingualism viewed as assets (Cavazos, 2019) to limited English proficiency as a deficit that learners should overcome as quickly as possible (Lippi-Green, 2012). EBs' mastery of one language, with English as an additional language, demonstrates that with instruction void of deficit thinking and strategies that tap into their strengths, these students will become bi/multilingual, offering schools and communities many linguistic resources (Pacheco & Miller, 2015). In fact, the benefits of bi/multilingualism have proven advantages such as a better understanding of mathematical concepts and problem-solving (Zelasko & Antunez, 2000),

improved use of logic (Pandey, 2013), increased attention span (Bialystok, 2001), better decision-making skills (Bialystok, 2001), and superior thinking and learning about other languages (Castro, Ayankoya, & Kasprzak, 2011) than in comparison to their monolingual peers.

Bi/multilingualism is not just valuable to the language learner; rather, according to Wells, Fox, and Cordova-Coba (2016) all students in a classroom have potential to benefit. In other words, “students’ exposure to other students who are different from themselves and the novel ideas and challenges that such exposure brings, leads to improved cognitive skills, including critical thinking and problem solving” (Wells et al., 2016, p. 2). Another example, referenced by Moll, Amanti, Neff, and Gonzalez (1992), is a discussion regarding funds of knowledge which they defined as the “historically accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household or individual functioning and well-being” (p. 133). Students bring these different funds of knowledge, such as caring for a sibling or older relative, cooking skills, or the ability to navigate around town using public transportation, to the classroom that teachers can tap into in order to make connections to academic content. Therefore, when teachers engage students of diverse backgrounds, all can benefit from the exchange of knowledge, ideas, and methods of problem-solving incorporated into the daily curriculum (Moll et al., 1992).

However, effectively engaging emergent bilinguals requires teachers to possess knowledge of second language acquisition, yet Kareva and Echevarria (2013) reported that teachers are often ill-equipped to work with emergent bilinguals that are present in American schools, and as a result, it is taking a toll on the students’ academic growth (Nieto, 2010). This is evidenced by a 42- and 48-point deficit on standardized tests in math and science of EBs compared to their native English-speaking peers, as reported on the nation’s report card (Alegria, 2014). In other words, the ever-growing shortage in the number of teachers who are qualified to

work with this diverse group of learners is having negative ramifications; thus, some emergent bilinguals are not being afforded the same level of access to the core curriculum and as a result, are not performing as well as their native-speaking peers on high stakes tests (Kareva & Echevarria, 2013).

Unfortunately, despite the shortage of qualified teachers, Gándara, Maxwell-Jolly, and Driscoll (2005) reported in their study of over 5,000 California teachers, “43% of teachers with 50% or more English learners in their classrooms had received no more than one in-service that focused on the instruction of English learners” (p. 13). Furthermore, half of the teachers with classrooms consisting of one-quarter to one-half emergent bilinguals received absolutely no training (Gándara et al., 2005).

In addition to professional development on second language acquisition, a need also exists for teachers to examine identity and positioning of their students (Kuboto & Lin, 2009). Kayi-Aydar (2014) argued that teachers interact with students all day long; however, they often do not understand the influence of their discourse. In fact, she asserted the importance of teachers identifying how they discursively position emergent bilingual students since these acts can not only shape the decisions students make in the moment, but influence identity over time (Kayi-Aydar, 2014).

Thankfully, the importance of identity relative to emergent bilinguals is becoming more prevalent in research (Handsfield & Crumpler, 2013) as indicated by an increase in recent research with EB’s identities as the focal point (Lindahl & Henderson, 2019; Man Chu Lau, 2019; Nicolaides & Archanjo, 2019). In an EBSCO search of emergent bilinguals and identity as keywords for the years 2000-2009, there were just over 2,000 peer-reviewed articles; however, in the same search for 2010-2019, there were well over 3,000 articles. French, Allen,

Aber, and Seidman (2006) argued, “With the rapid changes in the racial and ethnic composition of our nation, understanding identity development has gained increasing theoretical, empirical, and practical salience” (p. 1). An increase in research in the field of emergent bilingual identity and positioning is beneficial because it may lead to teacher recognition and identification of the hegemonic ideologies that silence student voices (Ginsberg, 2017).

Thus, my study will focus on identity, for as McCarthy and Moje (2002) stated, “Identity matters because it, whatever it is, shapes, or is an aspect of how humans make sense of the world and their experiences in it” (p. 228). Furthermore, no one lives in a vacuum; therefore, language, like identity, is situational and contextual—constantly evolving throughout time and space (McCarthy & Moje, 2002). Therefore, language is both an expression and symbol of our identity, all while shaping and developing it at the same time (Cone et al., 2014). So, while the importance of focusing on identity and language is becoming more established in the academic world, in the next section I claim that its application with emergent bilinguals, in conjunction with positioning, in the elementary educational setting is not. Herein lies a segment of the problem.

Statement of the Problem

Cheat when necessary so no one knows that you’re perpetually behind, confused and lost.

Don’t ever get caught cheating.

Be nice to the popular girls, but not too needy.

Be funny and not too serious or morose. Don’t talk about your previous school or friends.

They don’t care.

Try out for whatever everybody else is trying out for. Blend in.

Don't tell anyone about your problems, that only brings unwanted attention. They will only use that information against you later.

Don't trust. Just blend in. (Wiggins & Monobe, 2017, p. 161)

In the above excerpt from her poem "Survival Rulebook," Wiggins attempts to explain her narrative in reference to her transnational life (Wiggins & Monobe, 2017). Now, as a teacher educator, she uses her positionality to engage teachers in dialogue regarding the influence positioning has on one's identity. My *awareness* of English learners started in 2005 during my second year of teaching. English learners is now a phrase understood by some to be associated with deficit thinking (Cain, 2017); however, in my historical account below, this was the term I personally utilized (and was exposed to) and it will, therefore, be utilized as a place-marker when referencing past experiences.

In my third-grade classroom, I had an adopted student who spoke only French, yet was from Guatemala. I remember feeling sorry for her...that she would miss so much. I was still so new to teaching and concepts such as funds of knowledge were still foreign to me. While it pains me to admit it, these thoughts are not as uncommon as one would hope. Nieto (2010) argued that this type of deficit thinking, "lays the blame primarily on students' individual and cultural characteristics rather than on structural inequality, social class inequality, and racism" (p. 91). Therefore, I was not thinking about what she already knew or how she could add to the culture of the classroom. Instead, my thoughts and worries were selfish ones—what would *I* "do with her" and how would *I* teach her.

I thought that the most good I could do for this child was to help her learn English as quickly as possible so that she could contribute to the classroom conversation and understand the curriculum, instead of focusing on the skills she already possessed and the fact that she was

already literate in two separate languages (Spanish and French). Until then, I just pictured her as an almost a blank slate or sponge that was ready to *start* taking it all in. It turns out my experience is common, because Marx (2009) reported that not only do many teachers have a very limited knowledge base on how to work with emergent bilinguals, but they enter relationships with EBs “assuming the worst” (p. 86).

My principal at the time told me that she was “smart” and would catch on quickly so just include her “as much as I could” in my lessons. Being a novice teacher, with no background in second language acquisition, and even less experience in teaching English learners, I did just that. However, this inclusion did not contain the actual knowledge and skills that she possessed, because, at the time, I did not know how to tap into them. Similarly, Moll et al.’s (1992) research attributes a lack of connection between the curriculum and ELs to the belief that many teachers found them to be “deficient intellectually” and unfortunately the ideology was “well accepted and rarely challenged in the field of education” (p. 134).

A push by progressive educational activists in the 1980s for the inclusion of multicultural education improved the educational setting for some ELs (Díaz-Rico, 2013), but it obviously did not reach all. Therefore, I did what I thought to be best at the time. I spoke slowly, tried to use pictures and hand gestures, but in the end, the girl basically just sat in my room; and that seemed okay to me at the time, because there appeared to be no real expectation from my principal for my teaching beyond what I was doing. However, over time, something about the whole situation did not sit well with me.

Although I felt uneasy, I never thought about the possible long-term influence that my behaviors or actions had on her self-perception or identity. What I now realize is that uneasy feeling was that of prejudice and privilege. I assumed this child to be “less” because she was not

like the other students in the class. She neither looked like me nor sounded like me. York (1991) found that all too often, teachers are “in denial of their own prejudice and oppression, confused about how to teach young children multicultural concepts, afraid to experience conflict ...resistant to change in themselves or in their activities with children” (p. 37). This was my distorted view of reality. Not only did I not think about my personal influence on her identity, but I also did not think about what messages other teachers, peers, or family members “sent” to her. Instead, I just kept feeling sad for her. I did not really know what else to feel, all the while forging through with the daily instruction, yet still maintaining the claim that I was doing the best I could.

Throughout the next few years, I had several English learners in my third-grade class. However, they were often children from “white collar” families. Although English was a second language for them, many had received some instruction in English from their private tutors and/or international school. I thought, with hard work, they would be just fine, right? Is that not *meritocracy at its finest*? I mean, *I* was a poor child growing up whose family received government assistance, and *I* paid for college on my own by working two jobs, so certainly a wealthy child from France could easily learn English if she just tried, right?

And with that mindset in place, the years continued to pass. Yet, that pit in my stomach due to my mediocre education of English learners never faded. However, with most of these students being “smart” (in the sense that they were able to prove themselves academically) they did end up learning English relatively quickly. This was all despite my ignorance of their *actual* needs and the unique strengths, linguistic histories, and rich knowledge brought with them from past experiences. What I failed to recognize at the time was the agency that many of my students exercised. Yoon (2012) discussed the importance of agency to immigrant students in order to

successfully express and convey their identity and unique abilities when teachers overlooked them in the general education setting. For those without limited agency, I began to see what assets and strengths they possessed. However, I unfortunately continued to view others through a lens of needs and challenges, which as Yoon (2012) stated, “has led us to view immigrant students as problematic” (p. 971).

Fast forward to 2012, my seventh year of teaching—seven years had passed of me speaking slowly and ignoring the real needs and strengths of the ELs in my classroom. After that seventh year, I finally decided to increase my understanding of second language acquisition. While I would like to say that going through the coursework to obtain my English as a Second Language (ESL) endorsement was enlightening, unfortunately, it was not. According to Coady, Harper, and de Jong (2015), this type of underwhelming attitude regarding training for working with emergent bilinguals is not uncommon. With the increase of EBs in the general education setting, there has been a push for more teachers to have ESL or bilingual certification. This quick push for more qualified teachers has led to a decrease in standards for ESL certification. In 2017, Illinois granted *all* ESL endorsed teachers the ability to expand their certification to include grades pre-K through twelve, whether they possessed ANY background with those age groups or not (ISBE, 2017). Unfortunately, this can lead to a disconnect between learner needs and teacher skills. According to Coady et al. (2015), teachers of bilinguals often “used some generic accommodation strategies and just-in-time scaffolding techniques, but they rarely instituted specific ELL practices to facilitate the English language development of ELLs” (p. 340).

This change in certification and reduction in the rigor of teaching practices only further marginalizes and devalues the practices of bilingual educators and the needs of learners (Coady

et al., 2015). Of course, my ESL certification provided me with some foundational knowledge that I had previously been unaware of, but it seemed watered down and not fulfilling enough in and of itself. This was partly because there was little application of the content. Until one gets to apply the theories in real-world situations; they simply remain as stored knowledge (Handsfield, 2016). And to also disclose the utmost honesty, I never uncovered and reflected upon my own personal biases and privileged status.

Growing up, I always had a “woe is me” attitude about life in general. As previously stated, times were tough. My mom was a waitress and my dad a carpenter who had suffered a broken arm. The “pull yourself up by your bootstraps” mentality really sunk in. Therefore, having gone to a prestigious private college, and paid for it myself, I felt that others should automatically be able to do it too. It was not until my school held an exercise on privilege during a school improvement day that it all started to click. Although I certainly did have a lot to rise above, part of the reason I was able to do so was due to the privilege and power structures put in place for “people like me.” Rose and Paisley’s (2012) study regarding white privilege in education confirmed that teachers often possess hidden biases that perpetuate ideologies of meritocracy.

Time went on, and I continued teaching in my bubble until around 2014 when I reached a crossroads in my career. Through reflection I realized I had become complacent with my current position and desperately needed a change. Nationally, teacher burnout has reached staggering proportions with one-third of educators leaving the profession within five years and almost half reporting high levels of daily stress (Farmer, 2017). I spoke with my new principal and explained the degree of *my* burnout and how I had also been feeling “unfulfilled.” Farmer (2017) further reported that the ongoing stress of teaching can lead to a decreased quality of

teaching performance over time. I knew that I could not continue to let myself slide and keep doing the same job (or disservice) that I had been doing for years. A few weeks later she called me and said, “Sarah, I have the perfect job for you, but you have to say yes or no right now.” I quickly asked what it was while thinking of all the amazing jobs that it could be. However, her response left me almost as unfulfilled as my current status as a third-grade teacher. “E-S-L.” Just those three letters. While I had often had English learners in my class, I had never thought about actually working with *just* that population—especially when I have felt so underwhelmed by my performance with them throughout the past. However, in desperate need of wanting something different, I reluctantly accepted.

Later in the fall of 2014, I started my first year as an ESL teacher in the same building I had taught third grade in for almost a decade. Immediately I started to recognize the disparities and inequities of power between specialists and classroom teachers. It was almost like I was less important—or at least, less valued. Haneda and Alexander (2015) posited that school systems often devalue the role ESL teachers play in the educational field and marginalize them both socially and physically. Irrelevant professional development, PTO leaving me out of the yearbook, and losing half of my plan time showcased this lack of validation. I also remember teachers asking me how much pay I had to give up leaving a classroom and if I took the job because it was “so much easier.” “No...no less pay,” I would say. “And no, I didn’t do it so that I didn’t have to work as hard.”

While the job was certainly less stressful during the actual school day, since I now worked with small groups of children, as opposed to the thirty that I previously had, it was certainly more demanding in other ways. For the first time in my career, I saw the importance of advocating for a population of learners and their families that seldom had an active, or respected

voice, in the day-to-day operations of the school. This should come as no surprise, as a study by Linville (2016) found that ESL teachers reported advocacy to be equally as important as teaching itself. Advocacy of emergent bilinguals is important for so many reasons. One is because the families of English learners were rarely involved in my school. Was it because they did not care about their child's education as teachers often assumed? Of course, not! Instead, they saw the school as a place that did not welcome or honor their culture and language. Díaz-Rico (2013) argued that a lack of communication exists from the school to the homes of bilingual students, but the families often just sought the schools to meet them halfway. According to Haneda and Alexander (2015), the goal of schools should not just be home to school communication, but rather that schools should work towards parental empowerment in curricular decisions. While this is a lofty goal to strive for, the reality was often an openness to difference masked in perfidious unity. Therefore, in my attempts to uphold and promote the importance of my students' very identity, I felt relegated.

Despite this demotion from power, I could tell that I was in the right place. Fast forward to the spring of 2019, and I just finished my fifth year in the position. As Linville (2016) reported, advocacy is a large part of an ESL teacher's job, and I find myself doing so more than ever. The number of newcomer students I have encountered has multiplied, and I see them with such different eyes and through such a different lens than in the past. However, based on the behaviors I have observed, I still believe that many EBs would find themselves agreeing with parts of Wiggins's (2017) poem. The emergent bilinguals I work with appear to try to fit into a school system and society that is not as welcoming and accepting as it should be. Instead of an additive belief system, too many EBs experience the feeling that they must "blend in" and shed their old way of life (Lippi-Green, 2012). This is due, in part, to hegemonic language ideologies,

such as English as a superior language, that uphold the values and ideals of the dominant group. In fact, even when the government puts policies in place to help *all* students, such as “No Child Left Behind;” the result can be the marginalization of emergent bilinguals (Zhang-Wu, 2017).

This is where my study comes into play. In the classroom, how are teachers including or excluding emergent bilinguals? What are teachers *saying* and, more importantly, what are they *doing* with their language? What larger scale ideologies may be influencing these different acts? Would I find similar observations across different settings? My narrative above told the story of a predicament I experienced in my years as an educator; however, in the next section, I will reiterate my purpose and goals for the study that I will continue to expound upon in subsequent chapters.

Purpose of the Study

Curiosity of the influence positioning has on emergent bilinguals’ linguistic identity led me to begin searching available literature on topics such as those represented and defined in the following section. Through these searches I identified a gap in the literature, as I was not able to uncover research that investigated the intersection of identity and positioning for emergent bilinguals, while taking the broader discourses and policies into consideration across different settings.

Therefore, I conducted a qualitative study grounded in critical sociocultural (Lewis, Encisco, and Moje’s, 2007) and positioning theories (Bamberg & Georgakopolou, 2008; Harré & van Langenhove, 1999) to investigate the different acts of positioning that naturally occurred with two, intermediate-aged emergent bilingual students with different key individuals in their lives, such as their classroom teacher, ESL teacher, and family members across different environments, in addition to the influence these acts had on the participants’ linguistic identity. I

also identified salient ideologies in participants' discourse, as well as examined how these ideologies guided the observed acts of positioning. I obtained the data used in analysis through participant observation and semi-structured interviews. I also conducted micro analysis of participant discourse in order to analyze acts of positioning on a deeper level.

The following research questions guided the investigation and analysis of positioning and ideologies in my study:

1. What ideologies do students, teachers, and parents articulate and embody within the school, home, and community settings?
2. How do emergent bilingual students, their families, and ESL/general education teachers discursively position one another and co-construct their linguistic identities in relation to these ideologies?

In this section I have elucidated the purpose of the study and stated the research questions; however, at this point, I find it essential to define key terms in this study in order to provide a frame of reference for the theoretical framework.

Definition of Terms

To establish a common understanding of key terms utilized throughout my dissertation, I have defined the following words that often have multiple conceptualizations and provided the lens through which the reader should view these words for the entirety of this dissertation.

Advocacy

Advocacy is when either the self or an *other* voices the needs of the learner to ensure the necessary resources are available for a student to be successful in the academic setting (Caldas, 2017).

Agency

This study will follow Lewis et al.'s (2007) definition of agency, that is “the strategic making and remaking of selves, identity, activities, relationships, cultural tools and resources, and histories as embedded within relations of power” (p. 18).

Discourse

Gee (2014) defines discourse (with a lowercase d) as simply being everyday language in use. However, Gee (2014) also identifies another type of discourse that he calls “big D Discourse.” Big D Discourse embodies the combination of words with other cultural constructs such as beliefs or values that lead to the recognition of people having a particular socially recognized identity.

Emergent Bilingual (EB)

Some researchers working with students that speak a language other than English find the term “English learner” to limit the effect that bilingualism has on a child’s learning experience (Bialystok, 2001; García, 2009). Therefore, emergent bilingual is a preferred term amongst some researchers to refer to this group of students since it recognizes bilingualism as a resource and not a deficit to overcome (Pacheco & Miller, 2015). In this study, it will be the term of reference over EL when talking about current or future experiences.

English Learner (EL)

Under No Child Left Behind, the federal government defined the term “English learner” as students acquiring English for their education. More specifically, ELs are: 3 to 21 years of age; enrolled in an elementary or secondary school; come from an environment where a language other than English is spoken or their native language has a significant impact on their learning; and whose difficulties in the four domains of English deny the individual the opportunity to

participate fully in the classroom and society without additional English instruction (Public Law, 2002).

I no longer utilize the term English learner, as I agree with Pacheco and Miller (2015) that it views the student from a deficit perspective. However, this was the phrase that I personally utilized throughout the first half of my educational career and I will, therefore, incorporate it in reference to past experiences.

English as a Second Language (ESL)

In my personal experience, some teachers use ESL interchangeably with EL when referring to an individual. However, in my study, ESL refers to the program that I employ that serves emergent bilinguals.

Figured Worlds

According to Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner, and Cain (1998) a figured world is “a socially and culturally constructed realm of interpretation in which particular characters and actors are recognized, significance is assigned to certain acts, and particular outcomes are valued over others” (p. 52).

Identity

Throughout my review of the literature, it became apparent that researchers defined identity in several different ways. My personal definition is rooted in the work of Jones and McEwen (2000) that discussed the role of a “core sense of self.” Although I subscribe to the notion that a core identity exists, to summarize identity by one concept would not acknowledge its complexity. Therefore, I also support Martin’s (2012) multidimensional claim of identities that posits, “we are more than just the sum total of each proposed subtype of identity” (p. 36). I further subscribe to the notion that identities are both (re)constructed/exercised as according to

Gee (2000) and Kim (2003) by narratives and discourse. Finally, I recognize the role of the other in the (re)shaping of one's identity as described in Bamberg and Georgakopolou (2008) and the role of context as extended by Moje and Luke (2009). I will describe each of these studies and their impact on my personal definition of identity in more detail in chapter two.

However, I have synthesized the salient research on identity in order to conceptualize my own personal understanding that I will share here. In this study, I have defined identity as both the "hidden" core and social dimensions of a being that are fluid in nature and influenced by time, audience, context, and power relations that are constantly constructed and reconstructed through acts of positioning by the self and others through the exchange of narratives and other discursive acts.

Language Ideology

According to Apple (2004), an ideology is a system of beliefs and ideas. Therefore, a language ideology is one that incorporates the complex interactions between humans in all forms of communication. However, there are numerous ways that researchers have conceptualized and defined language ideologies regarding emergent bilinguals and those definitions have changed over time (Razfar, 2010). Silverstein (1979) defined language ideologies as "sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use" (p. 193). Definitions of the past appear to reflect one's thoughts and feelings about language. More recently, Martínez (2013) added to Silverstein's (1979) definition to situate language ideologies within the broader social, cultural, historical, and political contexts in order to reflect current power relations.

I conducted much of this study in a school setting; therefore, participants often enacted hegemonic language ideologies as dominant discourses (Razfar & Rumenapp, 2012). While

schools are a place where hegemonic ideologies are performed; they are also a setting where individuals can challenge them (Razfar, 2010). Therefore, it is Martínez's (2013) conceptualization of language ideologies that will guide the focus of this study since it acknowledges the power dynamics and agency that comes into play with both dominant and counter-hegemonic language ideologies.

Linguistic Identity

Block (2014) defined linguistic identity as “the assumed and/or attributed relationship between one’s sense of self and a means of communication” (p. 46) and further expresses these relationships in categories such as expertise, affiliation, or inheritance. Expertise revolves around how much of a language that a child knows (Dressler, 2014) while affiliation is the identification or attachment to a language (Dressler, 2014). Finally, inheritance is the familial connection to a language (Dressler, 2014).

Positioning

McVee (2011) synthesized the works of Harré and van Langenhove (1991, 1999) and defined positioning as a discursive process that is social in nature, as well as dynamic. Positioning includes the “rights, duties, and obligations of an individual in any social context that are carried out with respect to the moral order” (McVee, 2011, p. 5).

Power

In this study, power is defined as productive and where “some groups are dominant over others, but this dominance is sustained through processes of different origin and scattered location...that regulate minute details of space, time, and bodies, thus producing and normalizing bodies to enact prevailing relations of dominance and subordination” (Moje & Lewis, 2007, p. 17).

Smartness

Hatt (2007) outlines smartness as a social construct of intelligence that is laden with implications of power.

Since I have defined and conceptualized the key terms of this study, I will now present my theoretical framework, as it influenced every aspect of the study from design, to data collection techniques, all the way to the final analysis.

Theoretical Framework

The ways in which one can view and operationalize identity are vast. Therefore, when embarking on my own journey, I reviewed the literature to understand the various ways in which other researchers had conceptualized identity in the past. So, in this section, I will frame *my* understanding of identity-based on the work of Bamberg and Georgakopolou (2008), Jones and McEwen (2000), and Moje and Luke (2009) in order to provide context for the research questions.

I will start by unpacking the dense topic of identity and discussing the intersection of critical sociocultural and positioning theories as a framework for the study. Then, I will examine ideological assumptions of identity, such as their social and ever-changing nature. Next, I will introduce two metaphors--identity as narrative and position to further frame my understanding of identity. Finally, I will present my own orientation to identity and positioning as a metaphor to further delineate the study.

Theoretical Foundations

In this section I will focus on expounding the theories that serve to frame the overall study. Through my examination of the literature, I found that no one theory alone could

accurately represent my study; therefore, both critical sociocultural theory (CST) and positioning theory will be represented in my theoretical framework.

CST allows one to investigate “identities in learning” in the context of history, agency, and power relations (Lewis & Moje, 2003). Furthermore, it supports educational researchers understanding of identities in relation to “conflict and tension,” as these constructs are always present in a school setting (Lewis & Moje, 2003, p. 1979).

Positioning theory is complementary to CST and is consistent with my understanding of identities as evidenced by the social and fluid nature of positions (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999). Also, positioning is situational and includes relations of power (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999). It is through the intersection of these two theories that I outline a more complete framework for this study.

Critical Sociocultural Theory. Critical sociocultural theory builds on the foundation of sociocultural theory that “emphasizes the roles of social, cultural, and historical factors in the human experience” (Tracey & Morrow, 2017, p. 248). Researchers in education often apply sociocultural theory to their work with emergent bilinguals, because they can use it to frame both cultural and educational acts (Lee, 2015). Reeves (2009) utilized sociocultural theory to describe how teachers construct their identity in relation to emergent bilinguals. Kibler, Palacios, Simpson-Baird, Bergey, and Yoder (2016) included sociocultural theory due to its perspective of “interactional and sociolinguistic aspects of sibling language use” (p. 65). However, while sociocultural theory seems well-aligned to my work with emerging bilinguals, I posit that it lacks depth in the areas of researcher reflexivity and positioning, learner agency, and relations of power. Therefore, I found it pertinent to view the work of this project through a *critical* sociocultural lens.

Critical sociocultural theory is Lewis et al.'s (2007) retake on Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory that aims to target the perceived missing components of his seminal work by incorporating agency, power, and researcher positionality. According to Lewis and Moje (2003), agency is a discursively produced power that controls how one (re)negotiates his/her identity throughout different times and space. Agency is not something that one either does or does not possess, rather, it is situational and dependent upon the power differentials between those in discursive acts (Lewis et al., 2007). The classroom is a setting of power differentials that can influence an emergent bilingual's ability to act agentially, and in some ways, can also influence their level of participation (Yoon, 2015). However, agency is not a state of mind; rather, it is an act of reflexive positioning that allows for new ways of being (Lewis et al., 2007). When an emergent bilingual resists or refutes an unwanted act of positioning, the results can be transformative (Lewis et al., 2007). However, acts of agency and positioning do not simply occur between teacher and student. Researchers also play a role in ascribing agency to students in the way that they interpret classroom discourse, behaviors, and data (Lewis et al., 2007). Therefore, researcher positionality becomes a crucial part of any study encompassing acts of positioning and power in relation to learner identity.

Positionality outlines how researchers come to make sense of the data they collect based upon their world views (Merriam, 1998) while semiotic mediation describes the ways in which people ascribe meaning to various signs, such as language (Vygotsky, 1981). Each researcher's positionality is unique since the meaning ascribed to various signs and symbols is dependent upon the individual and his/her lived experiences (Vygotsky, 1981). Therefore, researcher positionality is the combination of one's worldview and the adopted position for the phenomenon studied (Foot & Bartell, 2011). However, when conducting research with emerging

bilinguals, it is especially important for researchers to identify their own possible hidden biases and deep-seated beliefs since emergent bilinguals are often in situations and environments that encompass ideologies and structures of power (Merriam, 1998). If researchers do not address their positionality, it can possibly have an adverse effect on the outcome of a study since researchers determine whose voice to present (and how to present it) in their findings (Merriam, 1998).

Thus far I have addressed agency and researcher positionality. These both involve dynamics of power that are multidimensional; for example, power can be either institutional, symbolic, or a combination of both (Bourdieu, 1989). In the educational environment, institutional power is visible when the government passes mandates down to the schools, such as No Child Left Behind or the Common Core Standards. Symbolic power is associated with societal signs such as language (Bourdieu, 1989). In application to research with emergent bilinguals, it becomes obvious that some groups are dominant over others. However, power is not a static entity; instead, it can shift from one person or group of persons to another (Bourdieu, 1989). Also, the way students perceive power can affect how they position themselves in the classroom (Foucault, 1980). As previously discussed, how others position emergent bilinguals influences their level of agency and ability to fully participate in the classroom environment (Foucault, 1980; Yoon, 2012).

Under sociocultural theory, there is a “separability of individual and community” (Linehan & McCarthy, 2001, p. 130). However, critical sociocultural theory questions the influence that communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) have on learner identity by asserting an elevated focus on the influence of institutional, historical, and cultural contexts on identity (Lewis et al., 2007). In addition, CST takes the role of macro-level Discourses into

account as well as their influence on the micro level discourses in relation to learner identity. While critical sociocultural theory explains the context from both a macro and micro level, I am incorporating a second theory to further capture the dynamic micro level discourses that occur daily in the school setting.

Positioning Theory. Positioning theory explores the discursive practices of individuals and the “local moral orders as ever-shifting patterns of mutual and contestable rights and obligations of speaking and acting” (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999, p. 1). According to LaBelle (2011), we, as individuals, do not have full control of our identity. Instead, our ability to be agentive is dependent upon our position in society. Schools often position emergent bilinguals as outsiders due to recognizable differences from the mainstream, such as language, that result in teachers approaching emergent bilinguals from a deficit perspective (Valencia, 2012). Therefore, emergent bilinguals may enter school with a limited type of social capital that is often honored within the school system, and as a result may have restricted ability to act agentically. Likewise, emergent bilinguals are not always able to easily challenge positions because of the social structure of power and limited social capital that appears to exist in the educational system (Bourdieu, 1989; Kroskrity, 2010). This does not mean that the opportunity is not available, but a struggle can ensue “between persons as authors of their own identity and as animators of identity that are authored for them” (Kim, 2003, p. 138).

In the same narrative, speakers can both position themselves as well as others (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008). Bamberg (1997) stated that individuals discursively position themselves and others in a number of different ways and for a number of different reasons necessitating a process for analysis (Bamberg, 1997). Therefore, Bamberg (1997) outlined the analysis of positioning as a way to investigate how speakers want to be understood and

recognized by others. These three levels of positioning will be explained in-depth in chapter three in order to emphasize what the participants attempted to accomplish with their narratives in relation to the co-construction of identities.

As is evident in the literature, there is quite a connection between the newfound critical portions of sociocultural theory and positioning theory regarding the moral order of rights and obligations (Kim & Viesca, 2016; Martin-Beltrán, 2010; Reeves, 2009). Both critical sociocultural theory and positioning theory take into account the macro and micro structures of power and agency in the school setting that influence emergent bilinguals. However, positioning is a mediational tool that helps to better explain the in-the-moment identity-building processes, as well as making acts of agency more visible (Bamberg, 1997; Lewis et al., 2007).

However, despite positioning theory's direct application to the study, it lacks several critical points; and therefore, cannot be the sole theory to ground this study. Tirado and Galvez (2008) argue that it lacks application to the current nature of society. Harré and van Langenhove (1991) referred to discourse in the face-to-face sense and that episodes of discourse are "sequential." This sequential nature of episodes means that you cannot be part of more than one at a time. However, the internet and social media have shown us that, indeed, we can exercise more than one and even conflicting positions at any given time based on the audience and context of the discourse (Moje & Lewis, 2007). Black (2006) found that EBs portrayed as struggling students were able to successfully position themselves as active participants in online communities. Therefore, critical sociocultural theory considers macro-level Discourses that positioning theory does not always bring into question.

Tirado and Galvez (2008) have also critiqued positioning theory for its overemphasis on the self without attention to the "listener." With the social nature of positioning, the "listener"

plays an equal role in identity construction (Bamberg, 1997). As previously referenced, dimensions of identity are only brought into being when they are recognized by a “listening” other (Moje & Luke, 2009). Again, critical sociocultural theory continues to explain the social aspects of identity development where positioning theory leaves off.

A final reason positioning theory needs critical sociocultural theory falls with the emphasis placed on the exact moment of discourse. Some researchers believe with the historical nature of identity that the relationship between the previous, current, and future narratives would be better explained using time scales (Anderson, 2009; Holland & Leander, 2004; Tirado & Galvez, 2008). I believe Anderson’s (2009) proposal of discussing positioning through various levels such as the micro (lived), meso (categorized) and macro (ideological) provides a more holistic representation of identity.

With both theories lacking in their application to emergent bilinguals, I deem that neither positioning theory nor critical sociocultural theory fully capture the full essence of identity as I see it. Instead, it is at the intersection of these two social theories that a fuller and more encompassing conceptualization of identity exists. I have found critical sociocultural and positioning theories to be highly compatible. In fact, McVee (2011) argued, “With its focus on individual and social attributes, positioning theory is clearly compatible with Vygotskian approaches of learning and teaching and highly relevant to educational studies” (p. 7). What I have provided above is a working theoretical framework that outlines the conceptualization of identity for this study, as well as the intersection of two theories; however, In the next section, I will outline two key theories of identity.

Theories of Identity

Researchers conceptualize identity in numerous ways. While the belief that identities are social and ever-changing have been insinuated thus far throughout this dissertation, I feel it is relevant to explicitly expatiate these ideological assumptions in order to further situate my study's working definition within the literature. Therefore, below are two theories of identity that are pertinent to my personal view.

Identities are Social. Individuals are not solely responsible for the shaping of their identity; instead, an “other” plays a large, influential role (Norton & Toohey, 2002). In fact, Gee (2000) stated, “What is at issue is always how and by whom a particular identity is to be recognized” (p. 109). The individual certainly plays a role in shaping their identity through lived experiences in historical and social contexts; however, with no one to recognize an identity, it would serve little purpose (Andreouli, 2010; Davies, 2000; Gee, 2000; Hagood, 2002; Reeves, 2009).

Social surroundings also mold identities (Andreouli, 2010; Matthews, Banerjee, & Lauermann, 2014; McCarthy & Moje, 2002; Reeves, 2009; & Tirado & Galvez, 2008). These surroundings exist in the concrete form such as social/visual media, peers, and family; however, they can also reflect more abstract concepts such as race, gender, language, and institutional membership (Matthews et al., 2014). García (2009) argues that emergent bilinguals often experience both positive and negative interactive positioning by others related to their language in the general education setting.

Identities are Ever-Changing. With the evolving nature of identities, researchers have tried to capture its complexity by repositioning it as something more fluid and ever-changing (Gee, 2000; Lewis & Moje, 2003; McCarthy & Moje, 2002; Mishler, 2004; Moje & Luke,

2009). Instead of asking “Who will I become?” the question has shifted to an essentialist perspective asking, “Who am I?” at this point in time. Therefore, if another negatively positions an EB in a classroom setting, it does not mean that the learner must forever internalize it. For example, Yoon and Haag (2010) found that newcomers identified their negative positioning as situational and were confident it would change in the future. So, while the participants accepted the negative positioning at *that* moment, they planned for a change in the future.

Hence, my view of identity is situational. It is dependent on time and space, in addition to being historically situated. I also believe identity is an ever-changing and active “verb” (Lewis & Moje, 2003; McCarthy & Moje, 2002). This, combined with the social nature and recognition of the role of the other, guides my exploration and discussion of positioning’s influence on identity that I will now incorporate into a series of metaphors.

Metaphors of Identity

As previously stated, researchers conceptualize identity in several ways. Therefore, instead of merely reviewing these ways, I synthesized the literature through an analysis of metaphors that further frame my understanding. Moje and Luke (2009) discussed the metaphors of identity as difference, sense of self/subjectivity, mind or consciousness, narrative, and position. However, for the purpose of this study, I will only discuss narrative and position, as they are central to the framework underlying the research questions and provide a robust view of my understanding of identity.

Identity as Narrative. While many scholars conceptualize identity as difference (Oyserman, Bybee, & Terry, 2003; Roeser, Peck, & Nasir, 2006; Rowley, Chavous, & Cooke, 2003), other researchers such as Bamberg and Demuth (2016) and Mishler (1999) characterize narratives as the stories we tell of our lives that define who we are. Other differences exist

regarding the claims researchers make regarding identity. For example, while Bamberg and Demuth (2016) conceptualize the construction of identity as the *telling* of narratives, Moje and Luke (2009) posit that narratives are *interpretations* of existing identities. I have synthesized these two varying conceptualizations of identity as *identity as a verb* and *identity as a noun*.

Identity as a verb captures the “doing of identities” that are on display (Moje & Luke, 2009). For example, when a child comes back to school on Monday and shares what he did over the weekend, the story he tells emphasizes key components of his identity, because what we choose to do and say is reflective of who we are at that moment. As Bamberg and Georgakopoulou (2008) posited, “Narratives are aspects of situated language use, employed by speakers/narrators to position a display of situated, contextualized identity” (p. 378). Furthermore, narratives are not shaped solely for the self; rather, they are constructed and reconstructed with others as an audience through actions of discourse (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008).

In addition to identity as a verb, other researchers such as Sfard and Prusak (2005) conceptualize it as a noun and the compilation of stories one tells. In fact, they argue that “Rather than treat the stories as windows to another entity that stays unchanged when the stories themselves evolve, the adherent of the narrative perspective is interested in the stories as such, accepting them for what they appear to be” (Sfard & Prusak, 2005, p. 21). Furthermore, discourse can influence identity in the sense that if a teacher often refers to a student as “bright,” that child can live out the identity and become what the discourse outlined for them (Moje & Luke, 2009). However, even from this standpoint, the social nature of the narrative still exists. An “other” must still recognize the narrative, yet the identity is subject to change based upon perceived time bound contexts and constraints (Fincher, 2011).

Another debate is how individuals form identity as narrative. On one side, Mishler (2004) conceptualizes narratives as the glue that holds identities together. He further asserts that individuals have multiple perspectives on the same concept, and it is the context that will dictate which identity an individual displays for others (Mishler, 2004). Likewise, McCarthy and Moje (2002) posit that an individual's identity is simply a "cluster of stories that we tell ourselves and others tell about us" (p. 231). Holland and Lave (2001) hold similar beliefs that an identity forms through layers called "laminations" of narratives that begin to "thicken" over time. However, some researchers have criticized this conceptualization of identity (Moje & Luke, 2009), because if the layers "thicken" over time, how can one easily "recall" them when needed in a dialogic act? (Moje & Lewis, 2007).

On the other side of this debate, Jones and McEwen (2000) conceived of a more static and stable entity. Gee (2000) posits that while the narratives we tell, and the ones people tell about us, shape our identity, we possess a stable inner core that is not as easily influenced. The emphasis and value placed on the narrative depends upon its proximity to the core identity (Jones & McEwen, 2000). So, while Mishler (2004) views the identity as multiple layers of narratives, Jones and McEwen (2000) conceptualize it as the salience of narratives in relation to its proximity to the core. Therefore, the narrative may change over time and context, but the core remains relatively stable.

Identity as Position. Identity as narrative focused on the stories one tells of his/her life; however, it also has a strong connection to identity as position. Positions occur due to differences played out and revealed through discourse and narratives (Norton & Toohey, 2002). In fact, Tirado and Galvez (2008) define positioning as "the discursive construction of personal narrations" (p. 230). Therefore, identity as position addresses the relationship between identity

and discursive acts of positioning through positioning theory—meaning that it recognizes the importance of an *other* in either assigning or recognizing a position, which in turn, becomes how a person identifies his/herself through narratives and discourse in order to continue the identity (re)construction process over time and across spaces (Norton & Toohey, 2002).

Identity as position illustrates the importance of both discourse and Discourse in positioning and identity building with emergent bilinguals (Gee, 2014). Discourse, with a lowercase d, indicates everyday language in use, while Discourse, with an uppercase D, explores the ways individuals use language in association with other artifacts, beliefs, or values in order to identify themselves as a member of a social group (Gee, 2014). According to Gee (1996) these Discourses, in a way, can be thought of as “identity kits” that individuals take on that prescribe how to think, act, and be in the world according to a socially significant identity. Big and little D discourses are not separate entities, instead discourses are embedded within Discourses, and together they create a system for how we think, act, and speak (Gee, 2015). These socially constructed systems are fluid in the nature in that they are ever-changing and evolving, like identities.

Both types of discourse can be applied to working with emergent bilinguals. Gee posited that Discourses are not a construct that can be simply taught to another, instead one goes through a socialization process, almost like an apprenticeship, in order to learn the social practices of that Discourse (Gee, 2001). Therefore, students learning English must do more than just recite the language in order to be recognized as enacting this Discourse. Instead, identity work must occur, because in order to be “in a Discourse,” one must first identify or position themselves as a member of that Discourse before it can be recognized by others (Gee, 2014).

It is this trying to get recognized as a specific type of person that brings acts of positioning into the equation. Harré and van Langenhove (1999) define positioning theory as “the study of local moral orders as ever-shifting patterns of mutual and contestable rights and obligations of speaking and acting” (p. 1). Positioning is similar to both identity and social theories in the sense that it is a dynamic construct; however, positioning also contends that identity development is a discursive practice (Harré & van Langenhove, 1994). Discursive practices, according to Foucault (1972), encompass the power relationships in society and the dominant social groups’ use of language and Discourse to establish the rules and practices that become social norms; hereby perpetuating their power and status in society. It is also discursive in the sense that “people negotiate meanings by strategically positioning themselves and others throughout a social exchange” (Harré & van Langenhove, 1994, p. 366). Andreouli (2010) summarized the overall connection to identity when she argued that “positioning can be seen as a conceptualization of ‘doing identity’ in talk” (p. 14.4). However, discourse includes other physical communicative systems such as gestures (Handsfield & Crumpler, 2013). Discourse and other physical communicative practices do not, in and of themselves, fully explain the depth and complexity of the narrative (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008). Likewise, a narrative often cannot capture the fine and subjective details provided through discourse (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008). Therefore, both narrative and positioning showcase different, yet compatible aspects of identity.

Individuals can carry out positioning using different approaches. One way is through reflexive, or self-positioning (Davies & Harré, 2007; Harré & van Langenhove, 1999). Reflexive positioning helps to shape how individuals see the world by guiding the ways in which one thinks and acts about the roles and memberships in which he/she subscribes to (Yoon, 2008).

One type of social construct that shapes learner perspective is through affiliations with particular figured worlds (Holland et al., 1998). As previously stated, figured worlds are social and cultural constructs that develop and evolve through the work of the participants and prescribe how one speaks and acts, in addition to dictating which outcomes are valued (Holland et al., 1998). Within each figured world, a distinct social language, that is indicative of a particular Discourse exists (Gee, 2001). These social languages have a situated meaning within a particular identity; therefore, Discourses and identities get played out in figured worlds, first through reflexive positioning, where an individual makes a claim to a particular identity, and then interactively where individuals recognize each other as a particular sort of actor (Holland et al., 1998). Positioning occurs in figured worlds based upon the structure of power; therefore, positions can either be accepted, rejected, or negotiated.

Another example of positioning that plays out in the figured world of school is the social construct of smartness (Hatt, 2007). Smartness is tied to learner identity as it affects the way people determine what knowledge is important to know (Hatt, 2012). Within this figured world, micro level artifacts, such as grades, shape how ability is conceptualized at the macro level (Hatt, 2007; 2012).

An example of reflexive positioning relative to smartness in the figured world of school found in the literature was when a participant believed he had nothing meaningful to add to a classroom conversation; and therefore, chose to remain silent (Yoon, 2008). Obviously, not all acts of reflexive positioning are negative, because agency is involved in each reflexive act, in the sense that there is always choice involved in how one presents themselves (Lewis et al., 2007). Using the same example from above, even though the student remained silent, he still acted

agentially throughout the decision-making process by withholding discourse in the classroom environment.

Positioning can also be interactive, meaning that what one person says or does positions another (Davies & Harré, 2007). For example, when a teacher crosses out an emergent bilinguals use of his native language on a writing project and replaces it with English, it positions the student's native language as being less correct than English. However, positions are situational and negotiable in the sense that individuals can question and refute an interactive position (Tirado & Galvez, 2008). In an agentic act, the same student could explain that the use of his native language was a stylistic choice because the word in his native language holds a stronger meaning; thereby not accepting his teacher's positioning attempts.

In this section, I have synthesized the literature respecting identities to reflect two salient metaphors--identity as narrative and identity as position; accordingly, in the next section of my theoretical framework, I will offer my own individual metaphor of identity.

Personal Metaphor of Identity

Since I have discussed identity in terms of metaphors throughout this progressing framework, it is only logical for me to further illustrate my own conceptualization of identity through a personal metaphor. While I support identity as both narrative and position, I present my metaphor of a wardrobe to serve as a synthesis of my viewpoints of identity.

Identity as a Wardrobe. During a recent vacation from work, I spent five days going through my clothes. This led me to realize how our identity actually mirrors a closet. We all have a "core" set of clothes--the clothes that we wear every week, and in some cases almost daily. In a way, our acts of wearing them define who we are. They say something about us. Each outfit tells a story of the past, present, and possibly future. The little black dress can

predict a future night on the town, where the sweatpants remind us of fond memories binge watching our favorite series on the couch.

However, we obviously have more clothes than just the core group. We have some that almost make the cutoff for the core set, but for whatever reason...an itchy tag, just a little too big, or a little too small, it never becomes part of the weekly rotation. Then we have the other set of clothes that we love the way they look and make us *appear* to others; however, they just do not represent us like the core group does, so, they rarely, if ever get worn. So why do we keep them? Some of them are there because we so desperately want to “be” that girl who wears the leather skirt. Some are there because we look so fondly in the past at who we used to be...I mean; those bell bottoms could make a comeback...right? Others just do not fit right even though they are perfectly in style.

The above description has outlined my personal metaphor of identity as a closet. However, the following section will more explicitly make the connection between the closet and identity. It will also connect the metaphor to existing studies to further situate and support my theoretical framework in the literature.

Connecting Metaphor to Theory

Jones and McEwen (2000) claim that all individuals possess a core sense of self. While I do not believe that this core sense of self is innate, I do believe that it begins forming and evolving at birth. As stated above, identity is social (Norton & Toohey, 2002) and I believe it is through interactions within our social group that the core self emerges. Jones and McEwen’s (2000) outlined examples of core dimensions, such as personal attributes and characteristics that are unable to be visibly identified by others. These were the adjectives where the dimensions

that are visible to others are more often the nouns—such as gender, religion, race, etc... The steady core of our identity is just as reliable as our favorite blue jeans!

One aspect of the core and surrounding dimensions that I disagree with Jones and McEwen (2000) about is their claim that people can “live comfortably with multiple identities, rather than simply describing multiple dimensions of identity” (p. 408). I believe that a weave of the most salient narratives in our lives construct the core. Therefore, I do not believe that we all have multiple identities, but rather, we have one identity that consists of multiple dimensions. None of these dimensions alone can fully describe one’s identity. Martin (2012) supports this notion, “we are more than just the sum total of each proposed subtype of identity” (p. 36). This further speaks to the complex nature of identity. We have one core set of clothes that has multiple pieces that come together, and we coordinate them to define our current self. However, the intersection between our different clothes are always there, even if we are not currently wearing a particular item.

Furthermore, I believe individuals use narratives to both construct and exercise identity (Gee, 2000; Kim, 2003) which showcases the important role an “other” plays in identity (re)formation since the narratives we possess and tell are not solely for the self (Bamberg & Georgakopolou, 2008). Instead, identities are “taken on and negotiated by individuals to help them structure their social world and orient themselves within the world” (Andreouli, 2010, pp. 14.2-14.3). The “other” provides an audience, context, and feedback to dimensions of identity. It is the “other” who could breathe life back into those bell bottoms or cause a shift in a current fashion trend that leads one to move something to the back of the closet.

In addition, I believe context is extremely important to identity (Moje & Luke, 2009). Its construction is not part of a developmental process that one finally achieves in adulthood; rather,

it is something that is continuously evolving as one interacts with others and the world around them (Moje & Luke, 2009). However, one's identity is not solely based on life at a particular moment, as identity is historical as well (Holland & Leander, 2004). The past world, and even past self, informs the present and future self; however, over time the core remains relatively stable (Jones & McEwen, 2000). While, yes, clothes may come and clothes may go, there are some pieces that remain constant, it is solely our justification for the pieces that change over time.

Therefore, identity, for the purpose of this study is defined as: both the "hidden" core and social dimensions of a being that are fluid in nature and influenced by time, audience, context, and power relations that are constantly constructed and reconstructed through acts of positioning by self and others through the exchange of narratives and other discursive acts.

In this section I have conceptualized my understanding of identity that will guide my exploration and discussion of the research questions. I have tied this back to the theoretical foundations and offered my own personal working definition of identity in which will provide context for the remainder of this dissertation.

Summary

Overall, this qualitative dissertation pursued the investigation of both reflexive and interactional positioning in respect to ideologies of culture and language and its influence on linguistic identity. I have grounded the study in positioning and critical sociocultural theories and operate from an interpretivist perspective. I utilized a case study methodology to gather data since I sought an in-depth understanding of a phenomenon (Merriam, 1998). I conducted observations of the participants in their general education and ESL settings to gather data regarding the discursive practices between teacher and student. In addition, I conducted home

visits to document positioning occurring between the participant and family members. Finally, I conducted interviews to gather more in-depth information regarding observations of positioning and to triangulate the data. This investigation aimed to reveal the influence of various positioning bodies on emergent bilinguals' linguistic identity in light of prominent language ideologies.

This dissertation consists of seven chapters. In the second chapter, I will present an in-depth synthesis of the available literature in order to help ground the study and further explain the background of emergent bilinguals, applications of positioning theory, and identity (re)negotiation. I will also examine the macro power structures and language ideologies that influence contexts on the micro level. Chapter three includes my detailed explanation of the research methods utilized to carry out the study, in addition to a comprehensive discussion of the design, participants, instruments, and procedures for analysis. Then in the fourth chapter I will identify the salient themes that emerged from the data relative to positioning, as well as how these acts of positioning led to the co-construction of the participants' linguistic identities in relation to macro level ideologies. In the fifth and sixth chapters I outline acts of positioning investigated through micro level discourse analysis, in addition to connecting these micro level analyses back to the larger data set, language ideologies, and salient themes from the fourth chapter. Finally, in chapter seven I summarize the study, note limitations, and indicate implications for future research before offering a few concluding remarks.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

The foundation of this study lies at the intersection of identity and language in relation to acts of positioning that I expounded upon within the theoretical framework in the first chapter. In this chapter, I provide a rationale for the current study by reviewing research literature pertaining to the three major categories identified in the research questions: identity, language ideologies, and positioning.

I first review the literature respecting the topics of identity and language and argue that it is not just students or teachers that influence emergent bilinguals' linguistic identity, but rather other macro level power structures, such as hegemonic language ideologies, that also influence emergent bilinguals' linguistic identity and their ability to act agentially (Flores et al., 2015; Ghiso & Low, 2013; Turkan & Iddings, 2012).

I then turn to review literature on positioning and language where I indicate that positioning can either be reflexive, which is the positioning of the self, or interactive, where one is positioned by an "other," such as family (McConnochie & Figueroa, 2017), teachers (Handsfield & Crumpler, 2013), or peers (Yoon, 2012). As the literature will illustrate, interactive positioning can influence more than just identity, but also other social and cultural constructs such as smartness (Hatt, 2007) and figured worlds (Holland et al., 1998).

The final section will serve as a bridge to the study's methodology chapter by reviewing narratives of young emergent bilinguals. I assert that the emergent bilinguals in these studies recount a narrative of loss relative to their native language and culture (Ghiso & Low, 2013; Hickey, 2016). The literature will reflect that this loss can be partially attributed to teachers comparing emergent bilinguals to themselves when they were in school, and thus positioning

them in ways conforming to the “master narrative,” leading to the othering of emergent bilinguals (Kim & Viesca, 2016; Lyotard, 1979).

Throughout this review of the literature, I will expound upon each area discussed above in relation to the intersection of identity, language, and positioning. Accordingly, I assert the need for further research of identity, language, and positioning by highlighting a gap in the literature pertaining to emergent bilinguals that I will now present in the following review of the literature.

Search Criteria and Data Condensation

I sought to find articles regarding identity, language, and positioning that highlighted emergent bilinguals in the classroom setting, where the majority of the data collection was to take place. I first accessed the EBSCOhost search engine through Illinois State University’s library website and utilized it to conduct an initial search. I input the following filters into the advanced search criteria box: academic journals, full text, scholarly (peer-reviewed), and the years 2012-2019. I also set the search parameters to identify the following important keywords: positioning, cultural identity, family positioning, teacher positioning, positioning and culture, and positioning and language in the abstract of the articles. I utilized these keywords in order to keep the focus on the theoretical framework, since it was the lens through which I would evaluate the research questions. I conducted each search, except for the final one, in conjunction with both of the phrases *emergent bilinguals* and *English language learners* to ensure semantics did not lead to the exclusion of articles.

In the next step, I condensed the number of articles and sorted them into salient categories, selecting only those that were truly relevant to the research questions. I also went through other journal articles previously read dated prior to 2012 that I felt were pertinent to the

study and included them in the list of articles found through EBSCOhost. I then read the abstracts to gain a better understanding of the nature of each article and included only qualitative studies, because I wanted to identify other researchers who have engaged in investigating the same topic in similar ways. Also, since a literature review can also help to refine the research questions (Patton, 2002), I found it meaningful to review other qualitative studies. It was my goal to find articles with intermediate aged participants; however, the majority of the studies were of the lower grades, such as kindergarten or first, or of the older grades, such as middle through high school. I also found that there were some articles about positioning, some on identity; however, after reviewing the existing literature, I still had questions that were not being answered. Therefore, in this review, I incorporated articles that situate my study, as well as indicate a gap in the literature. I will now expound upon the articles read that examined themes of identity and language.

Identity and Language

Identity and language are two prominent constructs in my theoretical framework. Language is used by individuals through in-the-moment discourse, influenced by macro level Discourses, in order to construct and reconstruct identity. Therefore, in this section, I outline studies that highlight identity and language and argue that it is influential for the adults in schools, and emergent bilinguals alike, to see each other as language learners, as it can foster a healthy perception of one's linguistic identity (Dressler, 2014). In addition, I investigate student perceptions of linguistic identity and posit that the grade of the learner is influential to one's perceptions of bilingualism (Martin, 2012). However, I also conclude that the academic ability of the learner can also be influential (McHatton et al, 2007).

In addition to linguistic identities, I will also examine conflicted identities of emergent bilingual students. A conflicted identity is when an EB experiences a mismatch in their linguistic identity compared to the social expectations (Cone et al., 2014; Flores et al., 2015; Norén, 2015). Lapayese (2016) referred to this space between identities as “los intersticios.”

I will then investigate macro level factors that play a role in the positioning of emergent bilinguals in this middle space. For example, hegemonic language ideologies, such as subtractive language assimilation and meritocracy, that are both rooted in structures of power, influence views of bilingualism (Flores et al., 2015; Kim & Viesca, 2016; Turkan & Iddings, 2012). I will also review other literature regarding power and claim that middle school students can be aware of the organization of power in the school setting and may position themselves around the existing structure, strongly influencing their ability to exercise agency (Yoon, 2012).

I will also examine contrasting literature and report the presence of ideologies that countered, or challenged, the dominant Discourses, leading to the acceptance of a bilingual identity (Achugar, 2008; Martínez; 2013; Shibata, 2004). Furthermore, under these counter-hegemonic ideologies, students refuted the negative positioning and resisted the monolingual expectations by positioning themselves as bilinguals (Achugar, 2008; Kibler et al., 2016; Lapayese, 2016).

Linguistic Identity

I reviewed 15 qualitative studies that directly discussed the linguistic identity of emergent bilinguals and will report on the four most salient (Dressler, 2014; Martin, 2012; Martin-Beltrán, 2010; McHatton et al., 2007). Dressler (2014) and Martin (2012) recognized that although identities can be “acted out” in utterances and through body language, they are not physical, tangible entities. Therefore, they sought ways in which to make the intangible more concrete.

Dressler (2014) conducted a qualitative study with six to eight-year-old German bilinguals in Canada. The students utilized a language portrait silhouette, which is an outline of a body, to identify their “expertise, affiliation, and inheritance” in regards to language (Dressler, 2014, p. 42). The researchers asked the participants to color their languages on the silhouette and then conducted follow-up interviews.

In the interviews, participants provided rationales for color choices, placement of languages, as well as any words that may have been present on the silhouette. Dressler (2014) conducted the language silhouette activity with all members of the class, not just bilingual students. Dressler (2014) identified the activity as a catalyst for discussion that allowed her to explore outside influences on linguistic identities. In addition, she found that the bilingual students in the class benefited from seeing others, especially adults, describe their own linguistic identity (Dressler, 2014). Students and teachers reportedly appreciated the language expertise of the bilinguals on a higher level after the activity. The researchers attributed this to participants seeing that everyone is a language learner and that emergent bilinguals have a high degree of language knowledge that can span across and between multiple languages.

Martin (2012) also documented similar findings. She utilized the language portrait silhouette to collect data for her study of bilingual students in Germany. Seventy-six total children in grades one and four completed the silhouette, as well as answered a questionnaire to provide more information about the languages they spoke and their attitudes towards them. While Dressler (2014) focused predominantly on influences from the outside in, Martin’s (2012) concentration was on the inner thoughts of the bilingual, therefore, taking more of an inside out approach.

Martin (2012) argued that schools often approach bilinguals from a monolingual perspective which leads to inaccurate portrayals of children's linguistic identities. However, the grade level of the learner appeared to be a contributing factor. The first-grade students reported a higher level of support and success with maintaining and improving their native language skills. They also reported higher levels of acceptance and inclusion. This led to a more positive linguistic identity for the younger participants. Overall, the majority of fourth-grade students reported that teachers did *not* support the use of their native language(s) in the classroom. Students whose native language(s) were unsupported at school started limiting their use of the language and began to feel less comfortable, overall, in the school environment (Martin, 2012).

It is important to note that Martin (2012) did address that these beliefs were simply *perceptions* and that perceptions may not always mirror reality. However, even perceptions can have a strong impact on a child's linguistic identity (Martin-Beltrán, 2010). Martin-Beltrán (2010) stated, "Although a learner's perceived proficiency is not necessarily an accurate representation of language competence, such perceptions are reified and enacted through everyday interactions that are an important part of the learning environment" (p. 273). Therefore, students that perceived their language to be unsupported started to develop a negative association with bilingualism and utilized their native language less frequently.

Researchers such as McHatton et al. (2007) also addressed the perceived differences between the uses of language by bilinguals participating in a gifted program compared to their peers in the general education setting. McHatton et al. (2007) conducted a qualitative study with sixteen middle school participants. They formed two separate groups--one of gifted bilinguals and the other of general education bilinguals. Each group met separately with the researchers over a five-day period.

McHatton et al. (2007) found that the groups' perceptions of bilingualism were quite different. The gifted group felt that bilingualism was an "occupational asset" that would benefit them in the future as they entered the workforce (McHatton et al., 2007). They identified the major benefit of bilingualism to be financial gains; whereas the general education group concluded that bilingualism had a more positive impact on relationships. The general education group also had a greater sense of pride in being bilingual. However, they used their native language more for family support through translation services, as well as communicating with others in the home and community (McHatton et al., 2007).

The gifted group appeared to have conflicted viewpoints regarding their bilingualism; however, it is important to note that the researchers did not address this conflict nor were the students observed in environments outside of the school. It is possible that had McHatton et al. (2007) conducted observations in the home and community environments they may have also found a connection between bilingualism and relationships for the gifted group.

Conflicted Identity

In the previous section I outlined how researchers framed the broad topic of linguistic identity within the literature; however, in this section, I shift focus to reviewing research that features the influences and outcomes that dominant ideologies, ingrained within structures of power, have on learner agency.

Identities are shaped neither in isolation nor without the actions of an *other* (Norton & Toohey, 2002). Therefore, unsurprisingly, emergent bilinguals often find themselves in a state of conflicted identity that often presents itself when a child's linguistic identity does not match social expectations (Lapayese, 2016). Lapayese (2016) suggested that even when students position themselves and their linguistic identity in a certain way that it does not mean it will be

accepted by others. Instead, bilinguals often find themselves challenged and in “perpetual tension between self-chosen identities and others’ attempts to position them differently” (Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2001, p. 249).

Norén (2015) documented similar findings from her study that investigated the discursive practices of multilingual first-grade students during a mathematics class. Unlike the first grade students in Martin (2012), Norén (2015) concluded that teachers typically did not value bilingual students’ native languages nor include them in lessons. In addition, teachers ignored EBs’ experiences and funds of knowledge as well (Norén, 2015). This lack of recognition of the students’ native languages led to “their full identities being denied thus imposing monolingualism on the bilingual young students” (Norén, 2015, p. 180).

It is important to note that Lapayese (2016) had comparable results. She argued that in the school setting, bilinguals often find themselves pressured to juggle their identities between two worlds, in a space referred to as *los intersticios*, or the space between identities. Flores et al. (2015) postulated that teachers compelled bilingual high school students into this *in-between space* due to their linguistic identities. Their research examined the placement of twenty-eight native Spanish speaking high school students labeled as long-term English language learners’ (LTELLs) in a *specialized* Spanish class. The class’s intent was to *empower* the students and provide them success in school by teaching them *proper* academic grammar (Flores et al., 2015; Lippi-Green, 2012). Instead, the participants found the class to be demeaning, as they believed it devalued the expertise they held in regards to their native language (Flores et al., 2015). Therefore, the researchers argued that students felt forced into remedial classes simply for being bilingual (Flores et al., 2015). Their study suggested that some bilinguals are accused of *knowing* a language without really *Knowing* language.

While Flores et al., (2015), Lapayese (2016), and Norén (2015), found students living out their identities in *los intersticios* due to both reflexive and interactive positioning from their teachers and peers; Cone et al. (2014) referred to a much larger, global force pushing for the reconceptualization of their linguistic and learner identities. Cone et al.'s (2014) study investigated the renegotiation of twelve middle school, Haitian immigrants' identities. The researchers emphasized the differences in what is valued as educational capital in the Haitian education system versus that in the United States for the lack of Haitian participants' academic success in the United States school system. In Haiti, schools place an emphasis on establishing a large factual knowledge base (Cone et al., 2014). However, in the United States, rote memorization is often devalued, and instead, emphasis is placed on the application of learned content. Therefore, this conflict between modes of learning left students feeling like the schools pulled them in competing directions (Cone et al., 2014). Cone et al. (2014) stated, "it is extremely difficult for students to resist the urge to conform, even if the cost of this conformity is academic success" (p. 291). Therefore, it is often the case, when examining the narratives of emergent bilinguals who find themselves stuck in the middle of a battle of language and identity, to find stories that showcase "struggle, loss, excitement and disjuncture" (Ghiso & Low, 2013, p. 32).

Macro Level Influences

As discussed in the theoretical framework, critical sociocultural theory (Lewis et al., 2007) outlines macro level influences, such as language ideologies, and situates their role in shaping a learner's language experiences and discourse. In reference to emergent bilinguals, Bommer and Laman (2004) stated, "They may believe they possess free choice, but they are actually always subjected to the workings of state apparatuses that make them desire and intent

to inhabit the roles that ideology has already prepared for them” (p. 426). Lippi-Green (2012) defined ideology as “the promotion of the needs and interests of a dominant group or class at the expense of marginalized groups, by means of disinformation and misrepresentation of those non-dominant groups” (p. 67). Blommaert (1999) further outlined hegemonic language ideologies often embodied by those in school settings as the dominance of one language over another leading to an asymmetric relationship that often reinforces the language of the privileged. While there are certainly hegemonic language ideologies enacted in the school setting, there are also those that counter the dominant Discourses; therefore, a review of the literature on both will be explicated in the following sections.

Hegemonic Language Ideologies. Ultimately, unmarked standard English is the valued language in school settings in the United States and speakers of other forms or languages often assimilate in order to be accepted and validated (Lippi-Green, 2012). Numerous studies referenced influences from hegemonic language ideologies such as subtractive language assimilation, neoliberalism, meritocracy, and language subordination that were used to both intentionally and unintentionally *other* speakers of languages other than English (Cone et al., 2014; Martin-Beltrán, 2010; Yoon, 2015).

First, Ghiso and Low (2013) explored the transnational and linguistic identities of immigrants. Their study concentrated on the narratives of emergent bilinguals ranging from elementary to high school during a summer school program that focused on English language acquisition. After analyzing the narratives, Ghiso and Low (2013) concluded that students referenced incidences of identity renegotiation to fit their preconceived notion of “being American.” They further stated that the participants altered their ethnic identity to make the transition to their new country more comfortable for those around them.

Turkan and Iddings (2012) also documented similar findings by highlighting the *master myth* that immigrants often face. This master myth is also known as a master narrative in that it is the *story* that is blast into society by policymakers that hold a stake in American schools (Lyotard, 1979; Martínez, 2013). English equals success (Martínez, 2013). This hegemonic ideology is in the background of many American schools and outlines valued knowledge and languages (Morales, 2016). So what knowledge is valued in the United States? According to the U.S. government, schools measure *smartness* through the prescribed mandates and assessments such as those put forth by No Child Left Behind (Turkan & Iddings, 2012). While these policies start at the national level, they eventually trickle down to the classrooms to outline what knowledge and language are valued to possess. This further explains why teachers in Cone et al.'s (2014) study perceived the Haitian students to lack the appropriate knowledge to succeed in American academics.

Furthermore, Flores et al. (2015) called the hegemonic practices by the U.S. school system *epistemic racism* against our countries emergent bilinguals. The current educational system *others* bilinguals and is simply not prepared to accept students whose cultures, identities, and languages are more fluid and cannot fit into the current rigid system of labels (Flores et al., 2015). This rigid system negatively affects the educational opportunities available to bilinguals through the “narrowing curriculum and denying access to instruction that supports questioning, critiquing, and curiosity” (Hickey, 2016, p. 14). In fact, Kim and Viesca (2016) found meritocratic subscriptions to assign labels leaving students from diverse backgrounds without a place in schools. Curriculum and assessments highlight an absence of emergent bilinguals’ heritage, language, and knowledge (Kim & Viesca, 2016).

Darvin and Norton (2014) sought to identify one of the underlying causes of this meritocracy by conducting a study on the conceptualization of social class to pinpoint if class differences influenced the social and educational trajectories of high school migrant students. They found that social class does, indeed, position students and leads them on different trajectories that afford them different (but not always equal) educational opportunities.

Counter-Hegemonic Language Ideologies. Despite the negative influences of hegemonic ideologies performed in the school system, many researchers observed counter-hegemonic practices throughout their study that challenged dominant Discourses (Achugar, 2008; Bloome, Katz; & Champion, 2010; Martínez, 2013; Razfar, 2012; Reyes & Zermeño, 2018; & Shibata, 2004). Social practices provide the foundation for language ideologies and reflect a link between in-performance language use and the broader institutional practices and beliefs of whole groups of people (Razfar, 2012). Since ideologies are social practices, they are fluid in nature and can change to reflect current understandings, beliefs, and historical phenomena. Therefore, other studies emphasized counter-hegemonic language ideologies that stood in opposition to the dominant beliefs (Achugar, 2008; Bloome et al., 2010; Martínez, 2013; Razfar, 2012; Reyes & Zermeño, 2018; & Shibata, 2004). These ideologies challenged dominant ideologies and shook the status of those in power (Hurie & Degollado, 2017). Other studies found that language practices such as translanguaging embraced the native languages and preserved participants' cultural and linguistic identities (Martínez, 2013).

Notably, Bloome et al. (2010) and Razfar (2012) both examined the use of narratives as a linguistic ideological practice. Although Bloome et al.'s (2010) study consisted of African American participants, it still highlighted how non-dominant and marked discourses led to the negative evaluation of participant narratives. Razfar (2012) explored how emergent bilinguals'

narratives and language ideologies could be used as a framework for understanding the beliefs teachers of emergent bilinguals possessed. This is important because according to Palmer and Henderson (2016) teacher perceptions of emergent bilinguals affect their practice and interactions with students. Bloome et al. (2010) reported that viewing narratives as both texts and performances could raise the awareness in school settings that educators should not place value on one type of narrative over another.

In addition to not valuing one type of narrative over another, Martínez (2013) argued that schools should not place significance on one language over another. Martínez (2013) conducted a study investigating student ideologies regarding the use of *Spanglish*. He reported that students showcased a mixed discourse regarding this merging of languages. On one hand, students described Spanglish as “deficient and deviant;” however, there were other discourses that countered the dominant ideologies (Martínez, 2013, p. 285). In the end, the classroom became a hybrid space where the students framed Spanglish as a method of language maintenance. By maintaining their native language, the students also maintained important ties to their cultural identity (Martínez, 2013).

Similarly, Achugar (2008) examined how students contested dominant language ideologies. Like Martínez (2013), Achugar (2008) posited that bilingualism is a capital that has both economic and familial advantages and benefits. Therefore, other researchers offered the native language and bilingualism (Achugar, 2008) and translanguaging (García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017; Man Chu Lau, 2019) as alternatives to monolingual hegemonic practices.

Teacher perceptions of emergent bilinguals, fueled by dominant language ideologies, led to the false interpretations of student behavior (Reyes & Zermeño, 2018). Reyes and Zermeño (2018) posit that through teacher reflection, an awareness and understanding of the hegemonic

ideologies that influence instructional practices can lead to a better understanding of student reality. For example, one child was late to school every day; therefore, the teacher assumed that it was because the parents were too lazy to get up and prepare the child to be at school on time. However, in reality, the parents both worked third shift jobs and it was the young child's and his sibling's responsibility to get themselves ready (Reyes & Zermeño, 2018).

Shibata (2004) conducted a study, that much like Achugar (2008), aimed to provide evidence against hegemonic beliefs regarding bilinguals. Her study outlined how parents of bilinguals often do not push for maintenance of the native language in school, because they believe it will slow down English acquisition (Shibata, 2004). However, Shibata (2004) argued that negative effects on academic performance, nor English proficiency, existed from the participants who continued bilingual education. Therefore, Shibata (2004) recommended that families resist the push from schools to adopt a monolingual identity, despite the inherent nature of the power ingrained in the school setting.

Power

Language ideologies that influence the educational experiences of emergent bilinguals are rooted in structures of power (Kroskrity, 2004). As discussed in my theoretical framework, under critical sociocultural theory (Lewis et al. (2007), power is associated with societal signs such as language (Bourdieu, 1989) and numerous researchers (Bomer & Laman, 2004; Handsfield & Crumpler, 2013; Martin-Beltrán, 2010; Yoon, 2015) have examined how power, relative to both macro level Discourses and micro level language use influence students' level of agency and their ability to fully participate in the classroom environment (Foucault, 1980).

Language ideologies that influence the educational experiences of emergent bilinguals are rooted in structures of power (Kroskrity, 2004). As discussed in my theoretical framework,

under critical sociocultural theory (Lewis et al. (2007), power is associated with societal signs such as language (Bourdieu, 1989) and numerous researchers (Bomer & Laman, 2004; Handsfield & Crumpler, 2013; Martin-Beltrán, 2010; Yoon, 2015) have examined how power, relative to both macro level Discourses and micro level language use influence students' level of agency and their ability to fully participate in the classroom environment (Foucault, 1980).

Handsfield and Crumpler (2013) examined power structures in relation to language, literacy, and identity in a fourth-grade bilingual classroom and discovered, "Teachers' and students' discursive negotiations of curricular expectations are infused with power relationships and develop in concert with processes of identity construction" (p. 112). Furthermore, Yoon (2012) reported that middle school students were aware of power dynamics in schools and that they positioned themselves differently depending upon who had the perceived power in the classroom.

Bomer and Laman (2004) conducted a year-long study that investigated how students in the first and second grades negotiated power and privilege through their discourse amid writer's workshop. The conceptual framework consisted of talk in writing workshops based upon the work of Graves (1983) and Vygotsky (1986). Bomer and Laman (2004) coupled this with positioning theory in order to provide justification for conducting positional microanalysis of conversations during writers' workshop. Bomer and Laman (2004) argued that power, in relation to discourse and positioning, was a shifting subjectivity dependent upon the salient storyline.

Martin-Beltrán (2010) examined the discursive practices of fifth-grade students in a linguistically diverse, dual immersion classroom. She drew from the fields of discourse studies, positioning theory, and sociocultural theory to construct her theoretical framework (Martin-

Beltrán, 2010). Her main research question was “What do students and teachers say about their own and others’ proficiency?” (Martin-Beltrán, 2010, p. 262). The results of her study conflicted with Bomer and Laman (2004) in regards to quick shifts of power. Instead, Martin-Beltrán (2010) observed teachers and students living out perceived proficiencies that positioned learners as *less*. This exercise of power and authority resembled a cyclical pattern. Martin-Beltrán (2010) stated that these patterns were likely to continue unless a teacher (re)positioned the student as a legitimate learner and contributor in the classroom.

Lastly, through the lens of Bourdieu’s cultural capital theory, Yoon (2015) investigated the dynamics of a middle school general education classroom through the direction of her two research questions: “How do the middle school ELLs portray themselves when they participate in literacy activities in the classroom?” and “In what way, do the classroom contexts influence the way the middle school ELLs construct voices and position themselves?” (p. 1). The participants were two Russian emergent bilinguals. Yoon’s (2015) findings appeared to support Martin-Beltrán’s (2010) cyclical positioning observations, as she noted that different positioning acts outlined the participants as either powerful or powerless. The teacher positioned these students in a way that they experienced a limited ability to act agentically. Yoon (2015) then concluded that identities are social and “closely related to ELs’ positioning” (p. 10).

Although the above studies address numerous aspects of power relative to emergent bilinguals, many questions still remain, such as what role did language and culture play in affecting power and privilege in Bomer and Laman’s (2004) study? Macro level discourses will influence the structures of power in a classroom (Lippi-Green, 2012); therefore, in my study, I will take both macro and micro level D/discourses into consideration when examining issues of power.

Martin-Beltrán (2010) helped me gain a deeper understanding of the influence of student perceptions of their own, and others, language proficiency. However, their study was solely with older students; therefore, I wonder what age do students start to gain the self-awareness needed in order to refute unwanted and negative directives of power in the classroom? This means that additional research, analyzing intermediate-aged student discourse is necessary in order to solve this question.

Finally, when examining the studies' research questions and theoretical frameworks, I speculate whether certain studies were missing opportunities to further ground their work in positioning theory in order to explain the acts of positioning on both the macro and micro levels that they observed in the classroom. Therefore, in my study, I made it an essential component of the theoretical framework.

Agency

There is an unmistakable connection between power and agency, in the sense that power can influence the level of agency an emergent bilingual can exercise (Lewis et al., 2007; Yoon, 2015). In addition, it is viewed by Lewis et al. (2007) as being a discursively produced power controlling the renegotiation of identity. From a theoretical standpoint, agency has strong ties to both critical sociocultural theory (Lewis et al., 2007) and positioning theory (Harré & van Langenhove, 1991). Critical sociocultural theory takes macro structures of power and agency into consideration; however, positioning theory utilizes the tool of positioning to make in-the-moment identity building processes, such as agency, more visible (Bamberg, 1997; Lewis et al., 2007). For example, agency can be viewed as an act of reflexive positioning that allows for new ways of being.

While agency is not something that one either does or does not possess, there are varying degrees based on the power differentials in a classroom setting (Foucault, 1980; Lewis et al., 2007); therefore, in this section, the literature will illustrate emergent bilinguals acting agentially as well as demonstrating a limited degree of agency.

Agentic Practices. Refuting negative positioning is one way that emergent bilinguals can exercise agency. Alvarez (2017) reported that language brokering conducted by emergent bilinguals in a New York City after school literacy program highlighted student agency. The children participants exercised their bilingualism to broker language in order to translate, interpret, and advise family members within the school setting.

Flores et al. (2015) found that high school students acted agentially by positioning themselves as bilinguals and not participating in the monolingual expectations of the school and society. This is supported by Achugar (2008) who cited bilingualism as an alternative to monolingual hegemonic practices. However, even though the students resisted their teacher's positioning, it came at a cost. Flores et al. (2015) found that students disengaged academically to *save face* socially. Goffman (1967) defined the term *face* as a construct for an individual's self-image that is visible to others. He argued that individuals make attempts to save face in order to maintain the identity put on display for others (Goffman, 1967).

Lapayese (2016) reported findings similar to Flores et al. (2015) who concluded that schools often impelled bilinguals into a space referred to as *los intersticios* (Lapayese, 2016). However, her study also indicated that while others may use language to negatively position bilinguals, EBs may also use language to position *themselves* in certain ways. She further reported that students would use their native language to *get out* of unwanted situations where English was the expected language. For example, when a participant did not want to

communicate with two English speaking boys who needed help, he pretended to only know Spanish. However, other participants utilized their bilingualism for positive communications, stating that it allowed them to engage with a larger population. One participant declared, “I’ve traveled to countries like Mexico and Spain where I could use my Spanish, and it really made me feel powerful to understand what people were saying” (Lapayese, 2016, p. 167). Therefore, enacting a discourse of agency brought the participants a sense of power that allowed them to position themselves in a way that reinforced a positive linguistic identity.

Kibler et al. (2016) also documented bilingual children’s acts of agency. They conducted a qualitative study of nine immigrant Latino(a) families. The study focused on young children, age’s four to six and their older siblings, age’s seven to ten. Specifically, they observed and analyzed the ways in which an older sibling assisted in the language and literacy development of a younger child through discourse. Their analysis indicated that through their interactions, the older sibling carried out agentive behaviors that scaffolded language and literacy for the younger sibling. Through these acts of *modeled expertise* by the older sibling, the younger child had a positive role model as they became school-aged.

Moses and Kelly (2017) also examined the agency exercised by younger students. First-grade students whose teachers perceived them to be struggling readers applied agency and repositioned themselves throughout the course of the school year. Their research supported Martin-Beltrán (2010) in regards to how learner identities “contribute to what they can or cannot do and how they participate in the classroom” (Moses & Kelly, 2017, p. 394).

Acts of Limited Agency. Power structures play a pertinent role in shaping agency in the classroom. Unfortunately, many bilingual students find themselves lacking the necessary degree of agency to position themselves in a positive manner (Yoon & Haag, 2010). Some participants

in Flores et al. (2015) acted with more agency than *others*. In the rudimentary Spanish class that the school required the participants to take, the emergent bilinguals often found themselves in a state of *learned helplessness*. Instead of repositioning themselves, they accepted the position and allowed the teacher to repeatedly correct their Spanish and undermine the language knowledge they possessed.

Yoon (2012) also reported on *learned helplessness*. “All of the participants had difficulty speaking under conditions of marginalization. If they felt inferior, they were hesitant to speak” (Yoon, 2012, p. 976). Overcoming this challenge can be difficult for emergent bilinguals, especially if they are the only student in the class that speaks a language other than English. Yoon (2015) investigated the positioning of a Russian student named *Emily* who was the only non-English speaking student in the class. Emily’s teacher did not support her native language in the classroom; therefore, Yoon (2015) claimed that she was at risk of not constructing a positive linguistic identity without an exchange of the proper agentic discourse. Furthermore, Yoon and Haag (2010) argued that Korean middle school students felt “powerless” when teachers only valued English in the general education setting leading the to act passively towards the teacher and other students.

Yoon and Haag (2010) also posited that even when teachers believed they were fostering students’ agency; their discourse could still be marginalizing them if not done in a way that treats students as individual agents. In their study, a teacher in a global studies class grouped two female Korean students together. Even though the girls had adopted new American names, thinking it would make it easier for others to pronounce, the teacher continued to call them both *ladies*. The girls recognized that the teacher called all of the other female students in the class by their names. This act by the teacher positioned the two students as outsiders; therefore, reducing

their ability to act agentially in the classroom. This negative positioning affected one of the participant's linguistic identity. The student did not believe that her English was good enough to challenge the positioning by the teacher; and therefore, she remained feeling like an illegitimate member of the classroom community (Yoon and Haag, 2010).

While the studies above thoroughly addressed described emergent bilinguals acting with both full agency and agency in a limited capacity, they all, except for Kibler et al. (2016) focused on emergent bilinguals in the classroom setting. Therefore, emergent bilinguals and agency in the classroom has been well document, thus, additional research is needed with agency and emergent bilinguals across alternative settings. Hence, with my study I will examine agency and positioning across various settings in order to document how these acts play out in different environments.

Positioning and Language

As previously stated in the theoretical framework, positioning occurs in many ways. It can be reflexive--how an individual positions his or herself, therefore, shaping how he/she sees the world (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999). However, it can also be interactive as well--when what one person says positions another (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999).

Numerous studies utilized positioning theory as a theoretical framework (Kim & Viesca, 2016; Martin-Beltrán, 2010; Reeves, 2009; Yoon, 2015) or analyzed acts of positioning in the school setting (Pinnow & Chval, 2015; Moses & Kelly, 2017; Yoon, 2015).

The first section reviews reflexive positioning (Davies & Harré, 2007; Harré & van Langenhove, 1999) by emergent bilinguals in the school setting. Studies, such as Norén (2015), highlights positive acts of self-positioning by first-grade students. The second major section is interactive positioning. This part has three subsections to further breakdown the role different

individuals play in the positioning of emergent bilinguals. The three subsections include literature on positioning by family members (McConnochie & Figueroa, 2017), teachers (Turkan & Iddings, 2012; Handsfield & Crumpler, 2013); and peers (Yoon & Haag, 2010). Finally, I will touch on two macro level social/cultural constructs that position emergent bilinguals. The first is Hatt's (2007) framework of *smartness* and the second is Holland et al.'s (1998) construct of figured worlds.

Reflexive (Self) Positioning

While the importance of an *other* on identity (re)formation has been well established (Andreouli, 2010; Davies, 2000; Gee, 2000; Hagood, 2002; Reeves, 2009), one cannot discount the impact of the self. McHatton et al. (2007) noted that students identified as gifted had communication styles more in-line with the mainstream students than the bilinguals in the general education group. The gifted students used a more formal register when talking and communicated with fewer hand gestures. This self-positioning of the gifted students as being similar to the mainstream may have led to their identification of heightened intellect, as compared to the general education bilingual group.

Norén (2015) reflected on acts of positive self-positioning. The teacher utilized a discussion between two students on what seemed like an irrelevant matter (what age one becomes a teenager) to engage the group in academic discourse regarding numbers. Due to previous discussions regarding teenagers with an older sibling, the first-grade participant positioned herself as an active contributor of knowledge and exercised a high degree of agency. However, students can also negatively position themselves as seen in Yoon and Haag (2010). They found that the Korean participants negatively positioned themselves in regards to language. For example, Kyung and Eun sensed that other students were talking about them while walking

through the hallway. While they did not know what the students said, they did hear a boy utter “That’s okay—they do not understand, anyway” (Yoon & Haag, 2010, p. 17). The girls attributed the problems with peers as their fault, due to their low level of English proficiency.

Dressler and Dressler (2016, 2019) reported about the connection between language, self-positioning, and identity. They investigated the reflexive positioning of one teenager as she studied abroad in Germany. Dressler and Dressler (2016, 2019) argued that individuals utilized social media to assert a new linguistic identity as a way to *show off* what they had learned. Furthermore, the participant utilized social media to make connections and further probe into the L2 community. Yoon (2008) followed this viewpoint by stating that the acceptance of an L2 community plays an important role in positive self-positioning.

In a different study, Yoon (2012) found that *negative* interactive positioning by teachers could actually be a motivating factor for *positive* self-positioning. In the study, she reported that Junsuk’s negative interactive positioning encouraged him to be better academically (Yoon, 2012).

Finally, Pinnow and Chval (2015) examined the role of positioning in a third-grade mathematics classroom in relation to the interactional competence of English learners. Their findings support the importance of EBs learning how to effectively position themselves in a classroom setting. In the study, this positive positioning allowed them to interact constructively and navigate the ever-changing classroom dynamics (Pinnow & Chval, 2015).

While the studies in this section did address acts of positioning in different environments; in some of the studies, such as Dressler and Dressler (2016) and Yoon (2012), there appeared to be unanswered questions regarding positionality since they were both researchers collecting data on their own children--one in the school setting and one digitally. Therefore, since researcher

positionality is laden with acts of positioning and dynamics of power; I attempted to fully elucidate my own researcher positionality in my personal study.

Interactive Positioning

With the social nature of identities (Andreouli, 2010; Davies, 2000; Gee, 2000; Hagood, 2002; Reeves, 2009), it is no surprise that positioning occurs between students and others. While not all interactive positioning is purposeful, it can still occur simply by confirming the contributions of mainstream students, highlighting an unequal balance of power. “Every position exists only as the reciprocal of some other position” (Raggatt, 2007, p. 362). Constant inferior positioning through social interactions can lead to an overall negative reflection of self (Yoon, 2008). Even perceived proficiencies, reified in the school setting, can lead to negative interactive positioning that perpetuates the labels often attached to bilinguals (Martin-Beltrán, 2010). Therefore, this section will investigate studies that explore interactive positioning by family members, teachers, and peers.

Family. McHatton et al. (2007) found children to be aware of the discrimination that their family members have endured in regards to language. Instead, McConnochie and Figueroa (2017) conducted a study that investigated family involvement in reproducing or refuting school derived ideologies of language, academic success, and identity. Specifically, they sought to learn what families would do when school literacy practices undermined the rich linguistic background and diverse heritages that children brought to the classroom environment. What they found was that mothers, in particular, wanted to understand the school practices in an attempt to reproduce them in the home environment, despite the fact that it negatively positioned their child. The families decided that instead of fighting the system, they would align themselves with the school so their child could meet the school expectations and achieve the school’s

definition of *success* (McConnochie & Figueroa, 2017). Similarly, Cone et al. (2014) found that the Haitian parents in the study wanted their children to be *successful* in their new school system. “For parents, student conformity meant shedding their dream of preserving Haitian traditions and values” (Cone et al., 2014, p. 291). Therefore, the parents understood that a narrative of loss evolved from the positioning that occurred in the school setting.

From a more additive approach, Kibler et al. (2016) explored the literacy and language practices that occurred between older and younger siblings. In this scenario, positive family positioning existed as the older sibling often acted as a model for the younger. However, Kibler et al. (2016) also found that a good deal of co-constructing of learning and knowledge occurred between the siblings. Kibler et al. (2016) also posited that sibling language scaffolding consisted of expertise unique to bilinguals and helped to prepare the younger sibling for linguistic success in school.

Although these studies discussed the role families played in the interactive positioning of emergent bilinguals, many of the studies, such as McHatton et al. (2007) failed to address the influence of these acts on student agency; therefore, neglecting to take a major contributing factor of identity (re)formation into consideration.

Teachers. The highest represented social group in the literature involving the positioning of emergent bilinguals included teachers, due to the discursive and social nature of education (Macedo, Dendrinos, and Gounari, 2003). Everyone, but particularly teachers, needs to be aware of positioning since some level of it occurs in every conversation (Harré & van Langenhove, 1991). In addition, the effects of negative positioning can lead to the preservation of the hegemony of English over the inclusion of students’ linguistic identities (Turkan & Iddings, 2012). A number of studies focused on teacher positioning of emergent bilinguals and

the majority of them conveyed the same message—that teachers need to beware of the power they hold in the positioning of students and the influence their positioning has on EBs’ agency and identity (Handsfield & Crumpler, 2013; Martin, 2012; Martin-Beltrán, 2010; Moses & Kelly, 2017; Pinnow & Chval, 2015; Reeves, 2009; Turkan & Iddings, 2012; Yoon, 2008; Yoon, 2012; Yoon, 2015).

Menken, Rosario, and Guzmán Valerio (2018) documented one school district’s transformative journey to be more inclusive of student heritage and culture by making their schoolscapes more multicultural. What they found was that these external, tangible changes that positioned bilinguals in a positive light, led to a shift in ideological and pedagogical changes within programs across the district (Menken et al., 2018).

Teacher positioning occurs through words, gestures, and actions; however, homework and assignments as part of a school’s educational program can also negatively position students (Martin, 2012; Yoon, 2012). Therefore, Moses and Kelly (2017) declared that teachers could empower emergent bilinguals during literacy instruction by using language frames, decoding fix-up strategies, comprehension strategies, partner coaching, and discussion group participation. Handsfield and Crumpler (2013) also suggested a need for teachers to be aware of their own practices in order to help students in their social positioning and identity (re)visions.

Yoon (2008) and Reeves (2009) supported Handsfield and Crumpler’s (2013) stance. They suggested that how a teacher envisioned their role as teachers of EBs influenced their practices. A participant in Reeves (2009) positioned himself as a *good* teacher. However, he characterized the definition of *good* as the *equal* treatment of all students. Therefore, with a rigid definition of equal, the teacher did not make linguistic accommodations for his bilingual students. Reeves (2009) asserted that the teacher used his power to negatively position the

bilinguals in the class. The EBs did not activate their primary language knowledge nor participate fully in the classroom environment due to this lack of engagement (Yoon, 2015).

Yoon (2015) stated, “Individuals need to be recognized and accepted as group members in order for them to become active participants in learning” (p. 10). Luckily, Martin-Beltrán (2010) proposed that negative positioning is not static. Instead, EBs’ *perceived* academic proficiency is fluid, in the sense that it can easily change based upon the teacher’s positioning of the student. “Teachers are in a position to strategically empower learners by publicly declaring and reifying their proficiency and to remind learners of what they can do to participate in the classroom discourse communities” (Martin-Beltrán, 2010, pp. 273-274). When the teacher positioned students as important members of the classroom community, the learners more readily participated in classroom activities. Therefore, teacher positioning is an important factor in student engagement and also influences EBs relationships with peers (Pinnow & Chval, 2015; Yoon, 2008).

Peers. Society often recognizes that teachers enact a role of power in the classroom environment; however, one should not overlook the influence that peers have on linguistic identity (Palmer & Henderson, 2016). Yoon and Haag (2010) used the perspective of positioning theory to examine how peers regarded two participants as *invisible*. One student in the class stated, “Our team is bad,” enunciating that he did not perceive the two participants to be *good enough* to contribute to his group (Yoon & Haag, 2010, pp. 16-17). Based on this negative positioning, Yoon and Haag (2010) described how Kyung and Eun repositioned themselves by proving they were *acceptable persons* by making successful contributions to the group project.

An interesting aspect of this study was the discussion of generational positioning. Their analysis suggested that newcomer immigrants considered the negative positioning by peers to be

their own fault, but only temporary (Yoon & Haag, 2010). The participants shared that they believed that when they acquired a high enough proficiency level of English, the negative positioning would stop. Therefore, to them, the positioning was personal and assimilation was the key to success. However, Yoon and Haag (2010) further concluded that the 1.5/2nd generation immigrant participants believed that the problems they faced in school were someone else's fault. The positioning in these cases was social. Likewise, the 1.5/2nd generation participants reported that they felt like they were living in two cultures and constantly (re)negotiating these dual identities (Yoon & Haag, 2010).

Yoon (2008, 2012) shared a similar perspective in two of her studies. In Yoon (2008), she focused on three English language arts middle school teachers and three emergent bilinguals. Again, she utilized positioning theory as a conceptual framework to interpret classroom dynamics (Yoon, 2008; Yoon 2012). Yoon (2008) sought to understand how teachers perceived their role in regards to English learners in their language arts classroom. Yoon (2008) found that the teachers' pedagogical approaches and interactions with EBs were based on how they envisioned their role working with EBs—as a general education teacher, teacher of all, or the teacher of a subject. The role that teachers ascribed to was a factor in the type of positioning that occurred between teacher and student (Yoon 2008; 2012). Yoon (2008) expanded on this finding to include that mainstream students followed the teacher's lead by participating in the same type of positioning. Yoon (2012) suggested that the participants felt the need to exercise agency and succeed academically in order for their peers to position them in a more positive manner. Therefore, Yoon (2008, 2012) argued for teachers to see their role as educating *all* students while respecting the funds of knowledge that diverse students bring to the classroom.

While the breadth of Yoon's work closely aligns with the purpose, theoretical framework, and methodology of this study; it is important to note a few things. First, like mentioned in the previous subsection, although she discussed her bias as a parent of her participants (Yoon, 2012); she did not address the sheer impact of her presence in the educational setting. It would be interesting to know how her children felt about her participation in their middle school classrooms. Also, she presented the analysis of her sons' ability to act agentially in order to reposition themselves as being relatively simple. However, I think she failed to consider that her presence and continuous advocacy in the school environment may have contributed to her sons' efforts to reposition themselves in a positive manner. Therefore, in this study, I incorporated numerous checks to identify effects of insider positionality on my data analysis, such as keeping a reflexive journal and peer debriefing. Also, I structured the project to include observations across various settings that included locations where I was, and was not, an insider in order to minimize researcher influences.

Smartness

Some of the above mentioned acts of positioning, such as that discussed in Yoon and Haag (2010), allude to the perception of emergent bilinguals, especially those with a limited English proficiency, as being less intelligent than native speakers. Although intelligence has been framed in the past as being biological, Hatt (2007) has approached what she calls smartness from a social framework. While the construct of smartness is one that an *other* socially imposes, making it a form of interactive positioning, its deep ties to this study's theoretical framework warrants a more in-depth discussion.

Hatt (2007) conducted a study exploring smartness within a group of at-risk ethnic teens and young adults. She postulated that the word *smart*, and therefore the construct of *smartness*,

was a socially loaded concept defined by schools. Therefore, smartness, like agency, is not something someone either does or does not possess. Instead, it is a social construct laden with power implications (Hatt, 2007).

In her study, Hatt (2007) found that the school had labeled the participants in the study as *not smart*; therefore, she aimed to redefine smartness in the eyes of the participants. Hatt (2007) reported that practices, such as tracking and teacher expectations, shaped students' academic identities and influenced their perceptions of self-efficacy. Therefore, she argued that educators should counter the traditional narrative of smartness with the agentic practices of the participants known as *street smarts* (Hatt (2007)).

While Hatt's (2007) study only briefly mentioned tracking as a social practice that *others* emergent bilinguals, Palmer and Henderson (2016) conducted a three year, longitudinal study that explored the influence of teacher perceptions regarding students in a three-track program had on their overall *smartness*. Their theoretical views aligned with Hatt (2007) in the belief that smartness is a social construct and schools are institutions that enforce hegemonic language practices while reifying relationships of power (Palmer & Henderson, 2016). However, in this study, the student participants were in a dual language program set up to advance bilingualism and engage students in their native language(s) within the school setting. The school placed students in one of three tracks: the general education classroom, a one-way bilingual class, or a two-way dual language bilingual classroom. The classroom teachers perceived the two-way dual language classroom to contain the *smart* students, while the teachers perceived one-way students to be *low* academically. Therefore, the classroom teachers identified smartness as a fixed trait that teachers assigned to students based on the track they were placed in (Palmer & Henderson, 2016).

Palmer and Henderson (2016) reported that the teachers in the study interacted differently with the students based on the track they were assigned to. The longitudinal data supported that students in the two-way dual language track outperformed those in the one-way track; reifying the perceptions and positioning by the classroom teachers. Therefore, the tracking of students based on perceived smartness had long-term consequences on student academic performance. While the study used longitudinal data, it relied on the perceptions and reporting of teachers and not actual student performance data.

Hatt (2012) followed her 2007 research with young adults with a one-year ethnographic study in a kindergarten classroom. She investigated the role(s) teachers played in students' self-perceptions of smartness. Hatt (2012) reiterated that smartness was a social construct that positioned students and used as a "mechanism of control" to divide along racial and class lines (p. 438). She went on further to establish smartness as cultural capital that all students aimed to obtain. However, Hatt (2012) reported that "English learners are more likely to be perceived as less intelligent" (p. 441). Therefore, she posited that it is not that they are less intelligent, but rather they lack the cultural capital that is most valued by their teachers. In the study, the young students equated smartness with compliance (Hatt, 2012). Fulfilling the teacher's expectations led teachers to view their students as smart, which in return, led to gains in power in the classroom setting. Like in Palmer and Henderson (2016), Hatt (2012) reported that teacher perceptions are tied to the social construct of smartness and affect a student's self-perception of their own ability and intelligence.

Positions made available to students shape their self-perceptions. In Thorstenson's (2013) study, she found that the participants, newcomer refugee high school students, were unable to enact a "legitimized smartness" in the general education setting (p. 8). The master

narrative linked English proficiency with intelligence and future success. Therefore, the newcomer students faced barriers in achieving an identity of smartness due to their low English proficiency levels, despite efforts to position themselves as willing to learn both English and academic content (Lyotard, 1979; Thorstensson, 2013). This led to a negative self-perception and heightened doubt in their own abilities. However, Thorstensson (2013) reported that the ESL classroom was a space where the newcomer students enacted “culturally relevant smartness” and began to rebuild a positive identity of intelligence (p. 12).

Thorstensson (2013) reported one environment where students exercised the degree of agency that allowed them to redefine smartness. Chang’s (2017) study revolved around the refusal of a group of participants to accept the culturally and socially prescribed norms in regards to smartness in their high school. Much like how I outlined identity as a verb, Chang (2017) views smartness as something one does and not a rigid biological construct that would be a noun that someone takes ownership of. Chang (2017), much like Hatt (2012), discussed the use of artifacts such as grades to define achievement of teacher constructed smartness. In the study, participants agentially redefined their own construction of smartness through counter-storytelling, which led to improved use of capital that included their own funds of knowledge (Chang, 2017).

Figured Worlds

Hatt (2007, 2012) and Thorstensson (2013) specifically outlined intelligence as a social construct built and rebuilt within the figured world of school. Therefore, smartness is directly tied to student self-identities based on how they “perceive their own positions within the figured world” (Thorstensson, 2013, p. 4). Holland et al. (1998) outlined figured worlds to include

artifacts, discourse, and identity--all of which play a major role in the theoretical framework and analysis of the data for this study.

As previously stated, smartness is a social construct shaped within the figured world of schools (Hatt, 2007). Holland et al. (1998) suggested that people (re)produced identities within these figured worlds. "In figured worlds people learn to recognize each other as a particular sort of actor" (Urrieta, 2007, p. 108). Actors (re)position each other based on the power structure within the figured world. Positions can either be accepted, rejected, or negotiated. In addition, positions within figured worlds are historically situated and are constantly changing throughout time and space. Figured worlds take both the macro level ideologies and the micro level discourses into consideration (Urrieta, 2007).

Colón and Heineke (2015) further outlined the connection between ideologies and discourse. First, they examined the multiple layers and actors in educational policy and the trickle down that occurs from federal and state policymakers, to district and school leaders, and eventually classroom teachers (Colón & Heineke, 2015). Colón and Heineke (2015) found that high stakes testing at the federal and state levels created an environment that pushed for English proficiency, despite the language needs of the bilingual student population. Other initiatives implemented at the school level, such as an International Baccalaureate program, also placed the teachers desire to implement a two-way immersion program on the back burner. Therefore, the trickle-down of macro-level ideologies and policies led to a halt in the dual language instruction offered to the students (Colón & Heineke, 2015). In the figured world of bilingual education, the macro level policies in this study dominated the practices of the teachers, despite their knowledge of best practices that dictated a more additive instructional approach.

Rubin (2007) investigated the influence of school-level ideologies and policies on teacher performance. Specifically, she explored the evolving identities of low-income African-American students at an urban high school serving low-income students. Even though her study did not specifically involve English learners, I felt it was an important connection to social groups and figured worlds.

Within the figured world of school, Rubin (2007) found that teachers linked low-income students with low levels of academic achievement. Therefore, this social categorization of *deficient* had “devastating consequences for school persistence and engagement” (p. 218). The teachers reduced smartness to student compliance with rote assignments which did not provide them with the skills necessary to succeed in higher education (Rubin, 2007). Participants grew dissatisfied with the type of learner identity offered to them. Therefore, the students were reluctant participants that did not possess the degree of agency necessary to refute the socially accepted practices within the figured world of school.

Colón and Heineke (2015) examined the macro level influences, Rubin (2007) investigated the school level policies, and Wiggins and Monobe (2017) reflected on the role of the learner in the figured world of school and education. Wiggins and Monobe (2017) exercised reflexivity of their transnational experiences through the use of poetic inquiry. The authors found that four themes captured their experience navigating through the figured world. Those themes included: isolation, vulnerability, adaptation, and survival (Wiggins & Monobe, 2017). Wiggins spoke of being in “survival mode” when she first immigrated to the United States and the limiting effects this had on her identity. “When people are positioned in survival mode, they are not engaged in self-making, but rather limited to varying degrees of accepting, rejecting, or negotiating the identities being offered to them” (Wiggins & Monobe, 2017, p. 166). It was only

through time and reflection, in the event of sharing narratives through poetry, that the researchers were able to quit being “cultural chameleons” and focus on thriving instead of surviving in the figured world of school (Wiggins & Monobe, 2017, p. 158).

Narratives

Wiggins and Monobe (2017) provided an example of the use of narratives in the reflection of bilinguals in the figured world of schools. Therefore, in an effort to connect research and methodology, I will provide a brief review of the literature on narratives in relation to emergent bilinguals.

Hickey (2016) reported that the narratives of the emergent bilinguals in his study reflected “the immense silence surrounding their home languages and cultures in their narratives of school” (p. 35). Unfortunately, Ghiso and Low’s (2013) study also supported this. Their results indicated a series of micronarratives of loss. Their loss was in the form of family (living far away), language, and culture. The competing narratives led the participants to seek the American narrative of meritocratic individualism: “one arrives in the country, learns the English language, assimilates, and prospers” (Ghiso & Low, 2013, p. 30). However, for many, these competing narratives fueled a cycle of conflicted identities.

One study of teacher identity illuminated possible reasons for the negative positioning of EBs. Kim and Viesca (2016) found that teachers new to the profession often relied on their personal past experiences in education. They positioned students based on comparisons of the current students to themselves when they were in school (Kim & Viesca, 2016). Unfortunately, this usually presented itself in the application of the dominant culture’s master narrative leading to the othering of bilingual children (Kim & Viesca, 2016; Lyotard, 1979).

Through the use of participant narratives, Nicolaides and Archanjo (2019) described the journey of two transnational students as they negotiated and renegotiated their identities based on the language ideologies they came in contact with through discursive actions. They posited that dominant Discourses and relations of power played a major role in the negotiation process; however, they also recognized the complex nature of identity building and highlighted that there were many other social, cultural, and historical processes that also influenced participant identity reformation (Nicolaides & Archanjo, 2019). Overall, both participants changed their identities to match their new surroundings leading to a monolingual identity.

Why, when we live in a world connected so globally, do we see such narratives of loss in those (re)negotiating transnational identities? This question fuels my investigation. I seek to understand the narratives of young emergent bilinguals, their families, and teachers to examine the positioning that is occurring with respect to ideologies of language. I explored the focal students' discourse to determine how acts of positioning influenced their linguistic identity. While Kim and Viesca (2016) aimed to shed light onto the othering of bilinguals, they failed to take learner agency into consideration when discussing acts of positioning. Therefore, I have also examined agentic discourses of emergent bilinguals.

The literature discussed above all discussed the influences of macro level ideologies on student identities. However, few studies made the connection between these ideologies and emergent bilinguals (Colón and Heineke, 2015; Wiggins & Monobe, 2017). Also, the focus was on the ideologies and not the connection to student discursive acts; therefore, warranting the need for additional studies investigating student enactment of discourses reflective of dominant ideologies.

Summary

A review of the literature on acts positioning, by different individuals, and across various settings indicated that, indeed, there is interest in positioning and identities of emergent bilinguals. Researchers such as Dressler (2014) and Martin (2012) conducted studies with emergent bilinguals, as well as displayed specific tools used by teachers as a catalyst for discussions regarding the linguistic identities of this population of learners. However, they did not discuss acts of positioning.

Another key finding involved the conflicted identities of some emergent bilinguals. Lapayese (2016) introduced the term *los intersticios* to describe this space between identities. While the term was specific to Lapayese's (2016) study, there were other researchers who referred to a similar *middle space* (Flores et al., 2015; Norén, 2015). However, these studies investigated both the very young and children in middle school.

Finally, I discussed literature in reference to outside influences, power, and agency on emergent bilinguals. Studies, such as that by Turkan and Iddings (2012), highlighted ideologies such as meritocracy and the power that accompanies them by examining the American *master narrative* (Lyotard, 1979). However, the study lacked the connection back to linguistic identity.

Positioning is how all of these acts played out, whether it was reflexive or interactive. There were studies that outlined positive positioning in the form of agency (Kibler et al., 2016) in addition to those reflecting negative positioning (Yoon & Haag, 2010) of emergent bilinguals in the school setting. While the researchers discussed all of these concepts, they did not discuss the combination of these concepts and ideologies for the intermediate-aged emergent bilingual. Therefore, I designed a research study in the combined areas of positioning, language, and identity in the intermediate grades in order to construct a more complete narrative of the

experiences of emergent bilingual students across their different environments. In the following chapter, I will provide a detailed explanation of how I carried out my study, including a discussion of the design, participants, instruments, and procedures for analysis.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

In chapter one, I outlined the importance and significance of the study and concluded with a presentation of the research questions. I then situated these questions in the literature and identified a gap pertaining to the reflexive and interactive positioning of intermediate-aged emergent bilinguals, illustrating a need for further research. Therefore, in chapter three, I will outline the study I designed to help fill this void by discussing the methodological approaches, a context for the study, and participants. I will also describe my own positionality and its potential effects on the study. Data sources and their analysis will follow, with a final consideration for issues of trustworthiness and ethics.

Situating the Research

“Research is producing knowledge about the world” (Merriam, 1998, p. 3). However, each investigator approaches a topic through a different lens depending upon his/her background, life experiences, and theoretical/methodological frameworks (Creswell & Poth, 2017). In this study, I have conceptualized identity as a “verb.” This view embodies the process of individuals acting out and performing who they are (Bamberg & Georgakopolou, 2008). However, researchers should place emphasis on more than just the action. A sense of who one is can also become apparent through close examination of what the individual is trying to *do* with the action and how, in return, it can position the self and others (Bamberg & Georgakopolou, 2008).

In my theoretical framework, I outlined two fundamental metaphors I concluded to best characterize this view of identity. These metaphors are identity as narrative (Bamberg & Georgakopolou, 2008) and identity as position (Tirado & Galvez, 2008). Identity as narrative describes how speakers conduct identity work using narratives to position themselves and others (Bamberg & Georgakopolou, 2008). Some researchers believe they can “capture” identities

through narratives (Moje, Davies, Luke, & Street, 2009). On the other hand, identity as position focuses on acts of positioning and their influence on identities (Tirado & Galvez, 2008). It takes both discourse and narrative into consideration when examining identities. (Moje et al., 2009).

For this study, I situated the above views of identity in critical sociocultural (Lewis et al., 2007) and positioning theories (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999). These two theories support the use of qualitative research methodologies (Moje et al., 2009). Furthermore, my proposed synthesis of identities and research questions support small story analysis as a methodological approach (McAlpine, 2016) since it provides a window for the researcher to observe identity “in the making” (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008). I have analyzed the data in pursuit of answers to the following questions:

1. What ideologies do students, teachers, and parents articulate and embody within the school, home, and community settings?
2. How do emergent bilingual students, their families, and ESL/general education teachers discursively position one another and co-construct their linguistic identities in relation to these ideologies?

Qualitative Research

I selected qualitative methods for my study, because they afforded me the opportunity to best achieve an emic perspective from which to answer the research questions (Bloome et al., 2005). I desired this because it allowed a deeper connection with the participants, which, in return, led to richer data and understanding (Corbin & Strauss, 2015). Since little is known about the positioning of intermediate-aged emergent bilinguals across settings in relation to language ideologies, utilizing qualitative methodologies allowed for the exploration of this

phenomenon. In addition, it adds to the literature on the application of positioning and critical sociocultural theories relative to emergent bilinguals and their linguistic identity.

Qualitative research also allows for a “fluid, evolving, and dynamic” approach to studies, in the sense that the researcher does not impose already existing “labels” to the collected data (Corbin & Strauss, 2015, p. 5). Instead, the researcher captures the experiences of the participants and uses these to construct the most appropriate way to share and disseminate the collected data. This granted me, not only the opportunity to use the participants’ voices in the study, but to evolve and grow as a researcher throughout the study as well. Accordingly, I adjusted the research tools used, and questions asked, during the inquiry process to accurately reflect the investigated phenomena.

Finally, as discussed in my theoretical framework, an identity is a social construct. Therefore, the methodology must also be social in nature as well (Patton, 2002). Qualitative research allows the researcher to “understand the nature of the setting—what it means for participants to be in that setting, what their lives are like, what’s going on for them, what their meanings are, what the world looks like...” (Patton, 1985, p. 1). Therefore, as a participant researcher, my goal was to understand and share the socially constructed reality that the participants displayed across the various observational settings. This sharing further allowed me to achieve an emic perspective, which was an “insider’s view” to the phenomena of the investigation (Patton, 2002, p. 268).

Overall, through this study I sought to better understand and describe both reflexive and interactive acts of positioning of emergent bilinguals across different environments. While qualitative methodologies do not ensure or even claim to generate data that researchers can reproduce, they do offer in-depth accounts and life stories of the participants that could be useful

in understanding the types of positioning that *may* occur for emergent bilinguals in various educational settings. Therefore, I utilized qualitative methodologies, such as the case study, throughout the investigation in order to examine the co-constructed identities of the participants through their discourses and lived experiences.

Case Study

I utilized a case study format since I desired to gain an understanding of and the meaning behind the phenomena of positioning and co-construction of identities with emergent bilinguals (Merriam, 1998). More specifically, I utilized a multiple case study format since attrition in a study of this time length is a valid concern, as is student mobility. Manfield Elementary's mobility rate was 11% at the time of the study and, according to attendance data, higher for students enrolled in the ESL program. However, despite these personal reasons, there are also methodological advantages to a multiple case study, such as "strengthening the precision, the validity, and the stability of the findings" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 29). Therefore, my study employed a multiple case study approach with two, intermediate-aged, emergent bilingual students.

First, I bound the case, meaning that I drew "boundaries" around the specific case to be studied so that it is clear what is and is not a case (Patton, 2002). The case is the unit of analysis, and for this study, it was the emergent bilingual student. Also, it was an instrumental case study comprising of two cases (Stake, 2003). Participants for instrumental case studies are not hand-picked because they are unique cases; rather, I chose the participants to provide insight into the phenomena of positioning and identity co-construction between teachers and family members with emergent bilingual students (Stake, 2003). Therefore, the emergent bilingual student was the case, but I did not seek specific students, instead I selected the participants because they met

the criteria for participation that included enrollment in the ESL program, a student in a general education classroom that had a teacher that already provided consent, and a in grades three through five.

Once I selected and bounded the case, the next step was to select the data collection tools. Data collection is one of the most important activities in a case study since the quality of the data collected is determined by the effectiveness of the methods utilized (Stake, 2000). Since I sought to explore the ideologies that the participants articulated and embodied, as well as how they discursively positioned one another, I first conducted observations in order accurately describe the phenomena, by witnessing it first-hand. In addition, observations allowed participant voices to become part of the data collected. I then followed with interviews in order to ask questions about those things that I could not directly observe but were necessary to answer the research questions (Creswell, 2003).

Once I selected and utilized the tools, I then sought patterns of data to develop key points of discussion (Stake, 2000). I utilized a two-cycle coding process, allowing me to identify patterns in the data throughout the analysis process. I achieved triangulation of the data by using multiple data sources that allowed me to capture various dimensions of the same phenomena (Stake, 2000).

Finally, I pursued alternative interpretations and assertions about the case (Stake, 2000). I discussed common themes with committee members to corroborate emerging arguments and ensure that I did not overlook additional interpretations after the coding process. I then applied Gee's (2014) discourse analysis tools to the data in order to provide a more in-depth analysis, while allowing for the study of language in-use.

I will discuss all the steps introduced in this segment in more depth in different sections throughout the remainder of this chapter; however, I will first provide a full description of the recruitment process in order to provide context for data collection.

Context for Recruitment and Data Collection

I collected data in a rapidly growing school district, in a town I will refer to as Langdale (all people and place names are pseudonyms) in the U.S. Midwest with approximately 4,500 students in grades pre-k through high school. The district has a history of high academic achievement, in addition to a very diverse population.

The two leading fields of employment of the district's families are engineering and medicine. With ties to the engineering and medical fields, the district has students from all over the world. For the 2018-2019 school year, 64% of the population identified as white, 20% as Asian, and approximately six percent as African American. The remaining ten percent identified as either Hispanic, Native Indian, or two or more races. The ESL program has contained an enrollment of approximately six percent of the district's population, speaking nearly 48 different languages. However, there are numerous other students who speak a language other than English who the district reclassified or never qualified for ESL services.

I collected data at one of the district's five elementary schools. I selected Manfield Elementary as the site for data collection because it is my current place of employment. Manfield is a kindergarten through fifth-grade building of approximately 370 students with demographics like the district as a whole. For the 2018-2019 school year, twelve percent of the student population qualified for ESL services, according to the Illinois Report Card, and the students receiving services speak a total of 15 different languages.

Participant Recruitment

I obtained permission from the school district's superintendent on January 31, 2018, to conduct research within the district. I also procured consent from Manfield's principal on the same date. Finally, I obtained Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval on February 28, 2018, prior to the start of data collection.

After building, district, and IRB approval, recruitment of classroom teachers was a priority, because only emergent bilinguals in a general education classroom with a consenting teacher were eligible for the study. Recruitment of the classroom teachers and students took place at Manfield Elementary and relied on convenience sampling. While it is not the most ideal method of recruiting participants, it is the most commonly utilized sampling strategy (Patton, 1990). Researchers consider the sampling convenient because I selected participants from my current place of employment.

I initially recruited all classroom teachers in the second, third, and fourth grades at Manfield Elementary. I selected this age of student participants since several studies relating to the positioning and identity of middle and high school-aged students had already been conducted (Yoon, 2012; Yoon & Haag, 2010). While research has shown that the very young can identify acts of positioning, they may not have reached a maturity level where they can actively discuss it in relation to their linguistic identity (Hatch, 1990). Therefore, I selected intermediate-aged students to fill a gap in the literature.

Two teachers provided consent and I sent letters home as an invitation to participate to the eight emergent bilinguals in those classes. In early March of 2018, two students and their families demonstrated an interest in the study. A university colleague obtained consent/assent of

these students and families on March 15, 2018, at their homes in order to minimize possible coercion felt by potential participants to join the study (Patton, 2002).

Once I received consent from the families and assent from the focal student participants, I held an informal meeting on March 21, 2018, with non-focal student participants in their general education setting. I recruited all the students in both classrooms, as they would potentially be video recorded, and therefore have a role in the data collection process. I then sent a letter home for parental consent with all students in the two classrooms. I obtained non-focal student participant assent for those who returned the signed consent forms. I only included those students who returned both consent and assent forms in the video recordings during the classroom observations.

Once I selected the participants, I spent the first few weeks of the study building trust and rapport. According to Janesick (2000), “By establishing trust and rapport at the beginning of the study, the researcher is better able to capture the nuances and meanings of each participant’s life from the participant’s point of view” (p. 384). Although I had already established relationships with teachers and students, they were not in the researcher capacity; therefore, I met with the teachers to discuss any questions or concerns they had regarding the study since providing consent. I discussed the process of videotaping their lessons and I conducted trial sessions prior to the start of actual data collection.

In regard to the students, I strived for the data collection process to be as unobtrusive as possible for them and their families. I held meetings outside of the school setting at locations selected by the participants that were strictly for building rapport and trust and ensuring both the students and their families were comfortable with the study. Finally, I conducted home visits where data collection was not the focus.

Participant Overview

With trust and rapport established, I then began the data collection process for both focal student participants. I will first report on “Aanya” by providing a brief overview of the focal and non-focal participants and research sites before moving on to “Gabriella,” the second focal student participant. See Table 1 below for a list of general information regarding the different participants; however, I will provide more detailed information regarding the participants in the sections below, as well as provide my analyses of each focal participant in chapters four through six.

TABLE 1
Participant Information

Reference	Pseudonym	Role	Years of Experience	Gender	Race	Languages Spoken
Participant One	Aanya (A)	Focal Student One	4 th Grade Student	Female	Asian	-Telugu -Some Hindi -English
Participant Two	Gabriella (G)	Focal Student Two	4 th Grade Student	Female	Asian Hispanic	-Mandarin -Some Taiwanese -English
Focal Teacher One	Mrs. Cooper (C)	4 th Grade Teacher	5 years teaching overall; 1 year in K-6 Title 1 Reading 4 years in 4 th	Female	White	English

(Table Continues)

Table 1, Continues

Reference	Pseudonym	Role	Years of Experience	Gender	Race	Languages Spoken
Focal Teacher Two	Mrs. Kennedy (K)	4 th Grade Teacher	36 years of teaching overall; 2 years in ESL 1 year in 1 st 6 years in 3 rd 27 years in 4 th (25 years in current job)	Female	White	English
Researcher	Researcher	Primary Investigator /Researcher	15 years of teaching overall; 1 year in 4 th 9 years in 3 rd 5 years in ESL	Female	White	-English -Some Spanish
Non-Focal Student Participants	N/A	Non-Focal Student participants	4 th Grade Students	-20 Males -19 Females	African-American Asian Hispanic White	-Arabic -English -Gujarati -Hindi -Mandarin -Spanish -Tagalog -Taiwanese -Tamil -Telugu -Urdu

Participant One: “Aanya”

I will refer to participant one as “Aanya.” Aanya was a ten-year-old, female, fourth-grade student at the time of assent. She is from a middle-class family and has one younger brother named Paarth. Her father works as an engineer and her mother is a homemaker. The 2016-2017 school year was Aanya’s first year at Manfield Elementary. Aanya was born in India and came to the United States in the summer of 2016. She attended an international school in

India where much of her instruction was in English. Telugu is the family's native language and the one predominantly spoken in the home. However, Aanya can also speak some Hindi, which is India's national language, and one of her mother's known languages.

Focal Teacher Participant

Her teacher, Mrs. Cooper, had previously provided consent in March of 2018. Mrs. Cooper is a white, middle-class female in her twenties. She has five years of overall teaching experience. She taught one year in a K-6 Title 1 reading program and then had four years of experience in her current fourth-grade position. She possesses a master's degree in Teaching and Learning and holds an ESL endorsement.

Non-Focal Student Participants

In addition to Aanya and Mrs. Cooper, I also recruited the other students in the class as non-focal student participants. Aanya's class had a total of 23 students, eight of which were Asian, two Hispanic, one African American, and the rest white. Eight students in the class spoke a language other than English; however, only four of these students received English as a Second Language services. Of the 23 total students, 18 students and families provided assent/consent.

Research Sites

Identity work occurs in everyday situations (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008). Therefore, I selected the study's research sites to reflect environments that Aanya was in on a frequent or even daily basis. These settings included my ESL classroom, Mrs. Cooper's fourth-grade classroom, Aanya's home, and the community center at the apartment complex where she lived.

I selected my ESL classroom as a research site because I wanted to ensure that as a researcher, I was being reflective of my own influences on participant's identity. Furthermore, I

wanted to investigate and document the language ideologies that influence my teaching practices and felt the best way to do this was by making myself a participant. The methodologies selected for the study also support participant observation (Patton, 2002). Patton (2002) argued that “participant observation is the most comprehensive of all types of research strategies” (p. 21). This is due to the presence of the researcher before, during, and after the observation, which allows for a higher level of understanding of the complex nature of an observed situation, more so than simply viewing a recording of the event (Patton, 2002). Therefore, this allows me to collect rich data in which to answer the research questions.

Next, I observed Aanya in Mrs. Cooper’s fourth-grade classroom. As discussed in my theoretical framework, I conducted small story analysis utilizing participant narratives in order to observe not just what the participant said, but rather what Aanya was trying to accomplish by saying it (Bamberg & Georgakopolou, 2008). Therefore, I selected the classroom as a research site because it allowed a window to view “identities in the making” as Aanya engaged in discourse with Mrs. Cooper and other peers (Bamberg & Georgakopolou, 2008).

The second and third settings revolved around the family. I conducted three observations at Aanya’s home in the summer of 2018. She lives in a large apartment community where, according to school enrollment information, many Manfield Elementary students live. I selected the home, as it would provide a setting that Aanya felt comfortable in for data collection to occur. In addition, it allowed me to compare and discuss in my findings the types of positioning that occurred between Aanya and her teachers to that with her family members.

Finally, I conducted two community observations of Aanya in the summer of 2018. I asked her parents what location they would feel most comfortable for the community observations to occur in, and they stated that their apartment complex had many tenants from the

same native country as them. According to Aanya's father, families would gather in the complex's "quad" area outside the main clubhouse building to converse after dinner while the kids would interact and play. He expressed that he would prefer observations to take place at the clubhouse; therefore, I conducted two community observations outside Aanya's apartment during these nightly gatherings.

The combination of all these settings allowed me to triangulate data and make assertions about how Aanya positioned herself and others positioned her in different environments. Triangulation is ideal in qualitative studies, because as Denzin (1978) argued, "No single method ever adequately solves the problem of rival causal factors. Because each method reveals different aspects of empirical reality, multiple methods of observations must be employed" (p. 28). Therefore, I conducted observations across multiple environments, in addition to multiple participants, so I will now turn my attention to the second focal student participant, "Gabriella."

Participant Two: "Gabriella"

In this study, I will refer to participant two as "Gabriella." Gabriella was a nine-year-old, female, fourth-grade student at the time of assent. She is an only child from a middle-class family. Both of her parents work at a local university in the health science field. The 2017-2018 school year was Gabriella's first year at Manfield Elementary. Gabriella was born in the United States but has lived abroad in her mother's homeland of Taiwan. Her mother speaks Mandarin, Taiwanese, and English. Her father's native language was Spanish; however, he has not spoken it since childhood. Gabriella speaks both English and Mandarin fluently; however, English is the predominant language spoken in the home as it is the only language Gabriella, her mother, and father all have in common.

Focal Teacher Participant

Gabriella's teacher, Mrs. Kennedy, is a white, middle-class female in her fifties. She has thirty-six years of overall teaching experience. She taught ESL for two years, first grade for one year, third grade for six years, and fourth grade for 27 years. Twenty-five years of her experience comes from her current position. Her educational background includes a bachelor's degree in elementary education.

Non-Focal Student Participants

Gabriella's fourth-grade class had a total of twenty-four students with ten being Asian, three Hispanic, and the rest white. There were nine students who spoke a language other than English; however, only four of those students participated in the ESL program. Nineteen students and their families provided assent/consent to fully participate in the study. One student provided consent/assent to participate in the study, but consent was not provided for him to be video recorded; therefore, he was excluded from the study.

Research Sites

I first collected data for Gabriella at Manfield Elementary. Observations began in my ESL classroom where Gabriella received language support through ESL services five days per week, for thirty minutes each day. I then collected additional data in Mrs. Kennedy's fourth-grade classroom. The focus then shifted to Gabriella's home where I conducted three observations in the summer of 2018. Gabriella lives in a single-family home in a suburban-style neighborhood not far from Manfield Elementary.

Finally, in order to observe Gabriella's family in the community, allowing me to further document acts of positioning in "every day, mundane situations," I conducted one community observation (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008, p. 378). The family invited me to attend a

Dragon Boat Festival in Menomonee Falls, Wisconsin. This is a traditional Taiwanese celebration that Gabriella and her family have attended for many years.

Participant Summary

I recruited participants in the spring of 2018 from Manfield Elementary. These participants included the two main focal participants: Aanya and Gabriella. However, it also included me as their ESL teacher, their classroom teachers (Mrs. Cooper and Mrs. Kennedy), their classmates, as well as their family members. There were also three main sites for data collection: school, home, and community. I outlined all the participants in detail. However, I did not address my own positionality; therefore, I will elucidate my role as a researcher below.

Researcher Positionality and Reflexivity

Qualitative researchers act as a human instrument and data research tool (Patton, 2002). With the “hands-on” approach that often accompanies qualitative investigations, researchers must take their own positionality into account when collecting, analyzing, and presenting data. Positionality is the combination of one’s worldview and the adopted position for the phenomenon studied (Foote & Bartell, 2011). The formation of one’s worldview and position is rooted in possible hidden biases and deep-seated beliefs/values. These biases and beliefs will have a direct impact on the outcome of a qualitative study (Patton, 2002). Therefore, in order to increase the level of transparency and reduce researcher influence, I will elucidate full disclosure regarding positionality.

Role of the Researcher

As a teacher conducting research in my own school setting, I have aimed to build strong relationships with my students over the course of my many years working with them in a teacher-student capacity. Despite this conscious and blossoming relationship, in some ways, I

am still an outsider in my participants' communities. However, one does not need to be an insider in order to collect and analyze data. In fact, even insiders can face challenges regarding positionality. Rose (1985) stated, "There is no neutrality. There is only greater or less awareness of one's biases" (p. 77). Therefore, it is my goal to identify my positionality as it pertains to emergent bilinguals, but also situate it in ways that recognize the evident power structures that influence data collection and analysis (Linville, 2016).

Although I am an outsider to my participants from a cultural and linguistic standpoint, I also consider myself an insider due to our teacher-student relationship. Insider research refers to when researchers take part in studies of populations in which they are also members (Dwyer & Buckle, 2009). While I am not the participants' classroom teacher, I am their English as a Second Language teacher and with this position often comes acts of advocacy, agency, and power (Linville, 2016). One example of power relations may be that participants tell me something they think I want to hear and not the actual truth. Another example is that because of our teacher-student relationship participants may withhold pertinent information out of embarrassment.

These close relationships with both teachers and students have undoubtedly impacted the study. Patton (2002) stated, "The issue is not whether or not such effects occur; rather, the issue is how to monitor those effects and take them into consideration when interpreting data" (p. 326). For example, my sheer presence in another's home likely influenced the data collection process. The parents might have said and done things that they normally would not have if an outsider was not present in the home. This means that the acts of positioning that would I observed and were present in discourse may be different than what occurs outside the realm of the study. Therefore, I utilized multiple data collection tools to triangulate the data (Patton,

2002). I also took these potential influences into consideration during data analysis. However, through the ongoing building of rapport and reflexive practices, it is my hope that I minimized the influences.

Through years of retrospective analysis, I have and continue to, peel away layers of confusion, guilt, prejudice, “othering,” negative positioning, that I have taken part in. Therefore, throughout the study, I continued my reflexive practices while trying to minimize power relations between researcher and participants. I exercised reflexive practices such as keeping a journal, member checking and discussing my findings with my dissertation committee (Patton, 2002). I utilized the journal, coupled with additional reflective notes and memos surrounding ideologies of language and power, during the analysis process to construct the most accurate response to the research questions. See Appendix A for an example of a reflective memo.

I have elucidated my personal role in the research study and how it could influence the data collection process. I next discuss the specific tools used for data collection as well as the rationale for their use.

Data Collection Overview

In the following section, I describe the multiple sources of data utilized in this study in order to tell the most complete story of my participants as possible. First, I conducted video recorded classroom and ESL observations. Next, I audio recorded home observations and kept field notes for community observations. Following observations, I conducted a semi-structured interview with each focal student, teacher, and parent. In addition, I collected artifacts and documents relevant to the study from the home, school, and community environments. See Table 2 for a detailed timeline of the data collection process.

TABLE 2
Research Timeline

Month	Task	Analysis
January 2018	-Proposal hearing -Obtained permissions from district and school administration	
February	-IRB Approval	
March	-Recruited participants and obtained consent/assent	-Took and wrote up field notes -Wrote analytic notes in researcher journal
April	-5 ESL observations for Participant One -5 ESL observations for Participant Two -4 classroom observations for Participant One -8 classroom observations for Participant Two -1 home observation for Participant Two	-Took and wrote up field notes -Wrote analytic notes in researcher journal -Began verbatim transcription of observations -Constant Comparative analysis (CCA)
May	-4 classroom observations for Participant One -3 home observations for Participant One -2 home observations for Participant Two -2 community observations for Participant Two -Student interview for Participant One -Student interview for Participant Two -Parent interview for Participant One	-Took and wrote up field notes -Wrote analytic notes in researcher journal -Continued verbatim transcription of observations -Began verbatim transcription of interviews -CCA

(Table Continues)

Table 2, Continues

Month	Task	Analysis
June	-1 community observation for Participant One -Parent interview for Participant Two	-Took and wrote up field notes -Wrote analytic notes in researcher journal -Continued verbatim transcription of observations -Continued verbatim transcription of interviews -CCA -Began coding observation transcripts
July-October	-Further analysis of data -Member checks	-Wrote analytic notes in researcher journal -Finished verbatim transcription of observations -Finished verbatim transcription of interviews -CCA -Finished coding observation transcripts
November-January 2019	-Further analysis of data -Member checks	-Wrote analytic notes in researcher journal -CCA -Microethnographic analysis of one classroom, home, and ESL observation transcript for both participants -Began drafting dissertation chapters 1 & 3
February-June	-Further analysis of data -Member Checks -Writing & Revising Dissertation	-Wrote analytic notes in researcher journal -Finished microethnographic analysis -CCA -Finished drafting/revising dissertation
July 2019	-Defend Dissertation	

Rationale for Observations as a Research Tool

I employed the use of observations in this study to document the acts of positioning students engaged in within various settings. As previously stated, three different observation locales existed: the school, home, and community. First, I will provide a detailed justification for the use of observations as a data collection tool. Then I will outline the context for the different observations.

Observing is something that everyone does naturally on a daily basis. Adler and Adler (1994), characterize it as “the fundamental base of all research methods” (p. 389). However, the *art* of observation as a data collection source is more detailed. For this dissertation, observational techniques went beyond noting the spoken words of participants. They also included inspecting body language and gestural cues of participants (Angrosino & Mays de Perez, 2000; Handsfield & Crumpler, 2013) as well as the physical surroundings and participants’ interactions in those settings (Angrosino & Mays de Perez, 2000).

Regarding settings, the natural environment of participants was of key importance. Therefore, I conducted naturalistic observations. This means that the observations took place in the natural environment of the phenomenon being investigated (Merriam, 1998). For example, since, according to Bamberg & Georgakopoulou (2008), identities are shaped in everyday places through everyday conversations, I found it important to conduct observations in places the participants would often be, such as the school or their home.

Finally, the role the researcher plays in observations will impact the data collection process (Patton, 2002). I became both a researcher and participant, which Merriam (1998) referred to as “observer as participant” since the participants understood my role and the purpose of the study (Merriam, 1998). However, my actual role was not black and white. In regard to

observer involvement, Patton (2002) described how the extent of participation is really on a continuum and not static throughout the course of a study. I found this to be true as my role with each participant was different and fluidly evolved over time. For example, Gabriella and I had a very good teacher-student relationship prior to the study; however, she did not quite welcome me into her home environment. Instead, she tended to distance herself, making observations difficult at times. Aanya, on the other hand, embraced the study and became disappointed when observations concluded. Aanya and her family often included me in dinner and took it upon themselves to also make the observations a cultural and educational experience for me as a person, not necessarily as a researcher, by sharing personal stories of their native country, foods, and religion.

ESL Classroom Observations

I did not engage in the participants' natural ESL setting beyond the role of my current job. As the participants' ESL teacher, I made the decision to select five consecutive lessons in order to showcase a unit from start to finish. I utilized an iPad that was set on the chalkboard ledge to record the lessons. Prior to the onset of the study, I discussed the presence of the camera with the students and answered questions regarding the study, while still maintaining the two focal students' anonymity. All the other students present for the ESL lessons had provided assent/consent to participate in the study.

General Education Classroom Observations

It was my intent to minimize interference to the natural educational setting in the participants' classrooms. Therefore, I had each observation video recorded. Although video recording can be more difficult to interpret, it was a less obtrusive way to collect data than being physically present in the classrooms (Creswell, 2003). Mrs. Cooper and Mrs. Kennedy selected

the days, times, and lessons for the observations. They took a more active role in the data collection process by starting and stopping the recording devices and selecting the least obstructive position for the camera.

Home/Community Observations

It was also my intent to not interfere with the natural interactions that took place in the home and community settings. Due to the longevity of the observations and to respect participant privacy, I only audio recorded home observations. Audio recordings can still be reviewed over and over allowing for a more detailed account of what happened rather than relying on researcher memory (Creswell, 2003).

I documented community observations with extensive field notes. Field notes are an imperative part of any qualitative research project and “are the fundamental database for constructing case studies” (Creswell, 2003, p. 305). They allowed me to capture basic information such as the setting and direct quotations, as well as my feelings, reactions, and reflections.

Contextual Information for Observations

Now that I have justified the use of observations as a data collection tool, I will now provide detailed accounts of their use in each of the research settings for both focal student participants. First, observations took place in the ESL and general education classrooms concurrently. Next, a series of home observations occurred in the summer of 2018. Finally, I conducted community observations for each participant.

Aanya’s ESL Observations

For Aanya, I conducted a series of five observations in the ESL classroom. I video/audio recorded these observations, producing approximately 128 minutes of data for analysis. Aanya

was absent one day so the observations took place over a two school week period. In addition, I created extensive field notes and memos after each observation for analytic purposes. I also kept a research journal that allowed me to capture personal reflections during the observation process that I referred to at later times throughout the analysis process (Hébert & Beardsley, 2002).

I read the book *Encounter* by Jane Yolen (1989) to the group during the ESL observations. Yolen (1989) presented Christopher Columbus’s visits to the New World from the perspective of the Taino Native American tribe. I broke the book into parts and facilitated group discussions on each section, all while documenting the students’ evolving thoughts, feelings, and opinions regarding Christopher Columbus, and perspective in general. See Table 3 below for a summary of Aanya’s ESL observations.

TABLE 3
Aanya’s ESL Observations

Setting	Date	Participant	Activity	Videographer	Time
ESL Room	April 11, 2018	Aanya	Activity on perspective	Researcher	25:55
ESL Room	April 13, 2018	Aanya	Continuation of perspective activity & began reading <i>Encounter</i>	Researcher	-Video A: 2:06 -Video B: 12:13 -Video C: 8:59
ESL Room	April 16, 2018	Aanya	Continued reading and discussing <i>Encounter</i>	Researcher	28:42
ESL Room	April 17, 2018	Aanya	Game Day	Aanya & Anise	25:31

(Table Continues)

Table 3, Continues

Setting	Date	Participant	Activity	Videographer	Time
ESL Room	April 18, 2018	Aanya	Finished reading <i>Encounter</i>	Researcher	24:55

Aanya's General Education Classroom Observations

Observations in Mrs. Cooper's fourth-grade classroom took place during the spring 2018 semester. Each observation took place in the classroom, an environment where Aanya felt free to exercise her linguistic identity. Bamberg and Georgakopoulou (2008) stated, "It is in the everyday practices...that identity work is being conducted" (p. 379). For Aanya, Mrs. Cooper recorded eight lessons, producing approximately 121 minutes of classroom instruction in the areas of math and ELA. See Table 4 for more information about the video/audio recorded observations.

TABLE 4
Aanya's General Education Classroom Observations

Setting	Date	Participant	Activity	Videographer	Time
General Education Classroom	April 11, 2018	Aanya	Whole group math lesson on Metric length	Mrs. Cooper	17:26
General Education Classroom	April 11, 2018	Aanya	Small group math lesson on Metric length	Mrs. Cooper	11:27
General Education Classroom	April 11, 2018	Aanya	One-on-one book teacher/student discussion about <i>Tracker</i>	Mrs. Cooper	6:34

(Table Continues)

Table 4, Continues

Setting	Date	Participant	Activity	Videographer	Time
General Education Classroom	April 12, 2018	Aanya	Whole group math lesson on the Metric system	Mrs. Cooper	37:35
General Education Classroom	April 12, 2018	Aanya	Small group math discussion on the Metric system	Mrs. Cooper	7:40
General Education Classroom	April 12, 2018	Aanya	Small group discussion of <i>Tracker</i>	Mrs. Cooper	8:14
General Education Classroom	April 16, 2018	Aanya	Small group math discussion on Metric weight	Mrs. Cooper	3:57
General Education Classroom	April 16, 2018	Aanya	Whole group math lesson on customary weight	Mrs. Cooper	28:07

Aanya's Home Observations

The home observations assisted in the triangulation of data by corroborating or refuting evolving themes. They also allowed for further documentation of both reflexive and interactive acts of positioning relative to linguistic identity that occurred in the home environment between family members, allowing me to answer parts of my research questions. I created extensive field notes and memos to further document the observations and continue the analysis process.

These audio recorded observations took place evenings after school during the spring 2018 semester. I shadowed Aanya as she left the school environment and transitioned to her home environment. The total amount of observation time was six hours and 42 minutes. The

setting was Aanya’s apartment where mom, dad, brother, and a friend (another ESL student) were often present. The observations frequently included the children doing their homework and playing games together. Aanya would get displeased when I did not participate in games, so I decided to become a more active participant throughout the observations. The parents also took an interest in educating me on the food and customs of their culture. They included me in the family dinner and dialogue each night I was there, and it was a remarkable learning experience. The children also enjoyed creating and putting on skits that were often culturally fueled and provided rich data for narrative analysis. Table 5 provides a summary of the information regarding home observations.

TABLE 5
Aanya’s Home Observations

Participant	Date	Location	People Present	Activity/Discourse	Time
Aanya	April 5, 2018	Aanya’s Apartment	Aanya, Mom, Dad, brother	Homework, playing a game on Alexa	1:48:00
Aanya	May 10, 2018	Aanya’s Apartment	Aanya, Mom, Dad, brother, friend	Homework, playing a game on Alexa, played Monopoly Jr., Dinner,	46:33 & 55:38
Aanya	May 26, 2018	Aanya’s Apartment	Aanya, Mom, Dad, brother, friend	Playing Uno, talk of the study, kids put on skits, playing Monopoly Jr., Dinner, Differences between American and Indian food	1:38:16 & 1:01:28

Aanya’s Community Observations

Finally, during the summer of 2018, I conducted observations that expanded from Aanya’s home environment into the community. Her parents selected the dates and locations, and each observation lasted between one and three hours. With these observations I sought to document identity work that took place during everyday practices and acts of positioning in the community environments.

I conducted two community observations with Aanya. These observations took place outside the apartment complex’s clubhouse and were such an amazing experience. I observed approximately one hundred mothers, fathers, and children all from the same country gather together to talk in their native tongues after dinner. While I only observed on two separate occasions, Aanya’s father told me that this occurred nightly throughout the summer months. The parents gathered in groups by language; however, the children all intermingled since they had English as a common language. Some played “hand slap games” and rode bikes, while others told stories to each other or played imaginative role-playing games. See Table 6 for more information regarding community observations.

TABLE 6
Aanya’s Community Observations

Participant	Date	Location	People Present	Activity/Discourse	Time
Aanya	May 10, 2018	Outside at the Apartment Club House	Aanya, Mom, Dad, brother, and approximately 75 other people	Adults chatted in groups of like languages while the kids all intermingled for play	6:53 P.M. – 7:49 P.M.

(Table Continues)

Table 6, Continues

Participant	Date	Location	People Present	Activity/Discourse	Time
Aanya	May 24, 2018	Outside at the Apartment Club House	Aanya, Mom, Dad, brother, and approximately 25 other people	Went for a walk, kids talking about languages, ESL, bike riding, speaking Hindi	7:46 P.M. – 8:30 P.M.

Gabriella’s ESL Observations

For Gabriella, I also conducted five ESL observations. Gabriella was in a different ESL group than Aanya; however, the lessons were the same. It is important to note that I grouped students by classroom teacher, not language proficiency levels, in order to provide ease during the scheduling process. Mrs. Cooper and Mrs. Kennedy both had an equal number of ESL students in their class, so it made for an even split for the two fourth grade groups. Gabriella’s ESL observations occurred over five consecutive meetings of her group and produced approximately 116 minutes of footage. See Table 7 below for a summary of Gabriella’s ESL observations.

TABLE 7
Gabriella’s ESL Observations

Setting	Date	Participant	Activity	Videographer	Time
ESL Room	April 10, 2018	Gabriella	Activity on perspective	Researcher	27:00
ESL Room	April 11, 2018	Gabriella	Continuation of perspective activity & began reading <i>Encounter</i>	Researcher	28:27
ESL Room	April 16, 2018	Gabriella	Continued reading and discussing <i>Encounter</i>	Researcher	18:35

(Table Continues)

Table 7, Continues

Setting	Date	Participant	Activity	Videographer	Time
ESL Room	April 17, 2018	Gabriella	Game Day	Researcher	17:56
ESL Room	April 18, 2018	Gabriella	Finished reading <i>Encounter</i>	Researcher	-Video A: 5:34 -Video B: 18:50

Gabriella’s General Education Classroom Observations

For Gabriella, Mrs. Kennedy captured a series of six observations documenting whole and small group ELA lessons for a total of 132 minutes of dialogue. Mrs. Kennedy also pulled Gabriella into an office for a one-on-one discussion to review her project for a book study the class participated in. See Table 8 for more information about the video/audio recorded observations.

TABLE 8
Gabriella’s General Education Classroom Observations

Setting	Date	Participant	Activity	Videographer	Time
General Education Classroom	April 24, 2018	Gabriella	ELA whole group vocabulary lesson	Mrs. Kennedy	20:58
General Education Classroom	April 24, 2018	Gabriella	ELA whole group reading comprehension lesson	Mrs. Kennedy	26:22
General Education Classroom	April 24, 2018	Gabriella	ELA whole group reading comprehension lesson	Mrs. Kennedy	14:43

(Table Continues)

Table 8, Continues

Setting	Date	Participant	Activity	Videographer	Time
General Education Classroom	April 25, 2018	Gabriella	ELA small group vocabulary discussion	Mrs. Kennedy	10:05
General Education Classroom	April 25, 2018	Gabriella	Small group discussion of <i>The Mouse and the Motorcycle</i>	Mrs. Kennedy	21:29
General Education Classroom	May 22, 2018	Gabriella	One-on-one discussion with teacher and student about an ELA assignment	Mrs. Kennedy	21:29
General Education Classroom	May 22, 2018	Gabriella	Small group discussion of <i>The Mouse and the Motorcycle</i>	Mrs. Kennedy	17:03

Gabriella's Home Observations

The three home observations for Gabriella lasted a total of four hours and 12 minutes and took place in her home, where in addition to Gabriella, her mom and dad were present. The conversations across the three observations would often be about the parents' perception of Gabriella's academic struggles. I tried to remain an inactive participant; however, at times the parents would bring me into the conversation by asking my opinion. I documented the observations with field notes that I typed into analytic memos within 48 hours of the observation. See Table 9 for more information regarding Gabriella's home observations.

TABLE 9
Gabriella's Home Observations

Participant	Date	Location	People Present	Activity/Discourse	Time
Gabriella	April 18, 2018	Gabriella's Home	Gabriella & Mom	Chores, dinner, play	1:34:05
Gabriella	April 23, 2018	Gabriella's Home	Gabriella, Mom, and Dad (half way through)	Homework, dinner, school talk, piano	1:20:34
Gabriella	May 29, 2018	Gabriella's Home	Gabriella, Mom, Dad	Talk of Gabriella's work ethic, dinner, book reading	1:16:20

Gabriella's Community Observation

With Gabriella, I only conducted one community observation. Her parents invited my family and me to attend a Dragon Boat Festival celebration with their family and friends in Menomonee Falls, Wisconsin. The attendees all spoke Taiwanese but were very welcoming to my family. A group of attendees took me aside and taught me how to make rice dumplings. While I did get to observe Gabriella playing with children at a playground at the park, most of the observation was actually more of a cultural experience for myself. Table 10 provides a summary of Gabriella's community observation.

TABLE 10
Gabriella's Community Observation

Participant	Date	Location	People Present	Activity/Discourse	Time of Observation
Gabriella	June 9, 2018	Willow Wood Park	Gabriella, Mom, Dad, & approximately 50 other guests	Dragon Boat Festival celebration, making of rice dumplings, most talk was in Taiwanese, children played	11:52 A.M. – 2:45 P.M.

Rationale for Semi-Structured Interviews as a Research Tool

I utilized semi-structured interviews as another data collection tool. Dexter (1970) described interviews as “conversations with a purpose” (p. 136). The intent of these “conversations” was to learn from participants those things that I could not directly observe (Creswell, 2003; Patton, 1990). Therefore, the interviews for this study provided a context for understanding participants’ past experiences and perceptions regarding language and identity through acts of positioning which assisted in the answering of the first research question.

With the semi-structured interviews, I used a list of topics that I wanted to cover so that I discussed the same basic information with each participant (Corbin & Strauss, 2015). This allowed for consistency, yet flexibility, in data collection across participants. However, it was important to remember that each participant brought to the interview their own unique history. Therefore, as Yoon and Haag (2010) argued, it is imperative to not group participants together, even if they appear to be of similar backgrounds.

The student participants and families are from a culture and have a native language different than me. “Interviewing someone of another culture rather dramatically highlighted the interrelated notions of positionality, power, and knowledge construction” (Merriam & Muhamad,

2000, p. 61). However, issues of power lie in the very framework of the interview itself, but when conducting interviews with a person from another culture, the power structure is heightened. For example, when a researcher asks a question, he/she assumes that the asker has the right to expect a response from the participant and has the power to determine the “accuracy” of the response (Merriam & Muhamad, 2000). Different cultures respect different frameworks for questioning and conversation (Merriam & Muhamad, 2000). Therefore, being an outside researcher means that I had to take extra precautions in the scheduling and conducting of interviews to ensure they did not infringe on the participants’ daily routines, cultural beliefs, or norms surrounding dialogue.

For example, Merriam and Muhamad (2000) discussed how a lead researcher unknowingly scheduled an interview that would overlap with a daily time of prayer for the participant. However, one should not consider interviewing a participant of another culture as a negative event; instead, “it can be an event for learning about ourselves” (Merriam & Muhamad, 2000, p. 61). With researcher reflexivity as a goal of this study, I welcomed learning more about the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of the participants. I was able to achieve this goal using observations and interviews.

Another example of care while interviewing participants from another language was the possibility that a translator needed to assist in either the interview itself or the transcription process. The use of a translator adds another level of biases, meanings, and interpretations of the data (Fontana & Frey, 1998). However, with the goal of the study being to capture one’s linguistic identity, I encouraged the participants to freely use the language that best represented themselves at any time during the study. Therefore, although they declined, I offered a translator to the participants for their use at any time throughout the study. The participants utilized their

native language at numerous points during the home and community observations.

Unfortunately, due to researcher time and monetary constraints, I did not have the native language in the transcripts translated. I will discuss this in more depth in the limitations section of this dissertation.

Contextual Information for Semi-Structured Interviews

One semi-structured interview took place with the focal students, family members, and general education teachers. During the interviews, I explored topics of identity and language that did not present themselves during observations. While I only conducted one interview, I did take early conclusions and follow-up questions back to the participants throughout the analysis process. I conducted the interviews at mutually agreed upon locations with each interview lasting approximately 30 to 45 minutes. I audio recorded each interview, allowing for verbatim transcription.

The topics of discussion were predetermined (Appendix B), yet broadly drafted, in order to allow the participants the opportunity to share a personal response. However, I asked additional questions of participants based upon their responses during the interview. This provided the flexibility to veer from the initial path in order to follow a participant where they wanted to take their response or story (Merriam, 2002). Follow-up questioning took place to clarify data previously collected and to delve deeper into salient points for analysis. See Table 11 for general information regarding the interviews conducted for this study.

TABLE 11
Semi-Structured Interviews

Participant	Date	Who Was Present	Length of Interview
Aanya	May 24, 2018	Researcher & Aanya	27 min., 12 sec.
Mrs. Cooper	May 25, 2018	Researcher & Mrs. Cooper	24 min., 50 sec.
Parents	May 31, 2018	Researcher, Mom, Dad, brother, & Aanya	45 min., 0 sec.
Gabriella	May 24, 2018	Researcher & Gabriella	24 min., 53 sec.
Mrs. Kennedy	May 25, 2018	Researcher & Mrs. Kennedy	35 min., 4 sec.
Parents	May 29, 2018	Researcher, Mom & Dad	41 min., 24 sec.

Research Journal

Reflexivity in research has numerous benefits for any study (Glesne, 2016). Like with field notes, I used a research journal to document what had been observed (Glesne, 2016). However, my research journal went beyond the basic description of people, places, and things, it became a retrospective documentation of my evolving meaning-making of the positioning and identity co-construction discussed in my research questions (Maxwell, 2013). For example, after conducting all five ESL observations with participant one, I wrote a reflective entry synthesizing my thoughts for the overall setting. An excerpt of a synthesis entry can be found in Appendix C. My initial levels of analysis provided a roadmap of my thought process from start to finish. Also, my research journal also helped to minimize the effects of researcher bias (Peshkin, 1988),

by documenting my thoughts, feelings, and hidden biases, it increased my awareness of how internal influences may affect data analysis; thereby strengthening the trustworthiness of the study (Glesne, 2016).

Artifacts and Documents

In addition to the observations and interviews, I collected artifacts and documents throughout the course of the study to provide an additional data source. Merriam (1998) discussed how a document that may initially appear irrelevant to a study can end up leading to “serendipitous discoveries” (p. 121). Examples of artifacts I collected in the school setting were classroom projects, teacher feedback, and writing samples. I also took photographs from observations in the home and community environments. These artifacts and/or documents provided additional context to acts of positioning to the study, as well as triangulation of the data.

Data Analysis

According to Corbin and Strauss (2015), data analysis is the “assignment of meaning to data” (p. 58). The goal of data analysis for case studies is to provide a detailed and holistic account of the phenomena in question (Merriam, 1998). In addition, it is important to remember that data collection and analysis are recursive and dynamic (Miles et al., 2014). Even without consciously applying data analysis techniques, researchers are always sorting or categorizing data as they receive it (Corbin & Strauss, 2015). However, I employed a systematic plan for data analysis throughout the dissertation process. First, I utilized a two-cycle coding process to analyze the observation and interview data allowing me to condense the data into codes, categories, and eventually themes (Miles et al., 2014). I then carried out small story analysis after the production of micro transcripts for excerpts of the data. I applied Gee’s (2014)

discourse analysis tools to the data to connect the macro concepts that emerged in the first two coding cycles to the micro level acts of positioning through discourse.

In the following section, I will describe, in detail, the steps I took to arrive at the final themes, definitions, categories, and uses that you see below in Table 12. I offer this information here in order to provide context for the descriptive process that follows.

TABLE 12
Themes, Categories, Definitions, and Uses

Sub Theme	Definition	Categories	Uses
Overarching Theme 1: Language			
Language Subordination (Hegemonic)	Devaluation of all that is not mainstream, and validation of the social and linguistic values of the dominant institutions (Lippi-Green, 2012, p. 65)	-Dominance -Social Emotional -Loss -Colonization	Codes that showed mainstream language is superior to native language & that examine the more global, outside influences of language positioning
English as a Superior Language (Hegemonic)	A dominant ideology that is produced or held by those that speak English that both reflect and serve the interests of groups with social, economic, and/or political power-- they can also be recognized and accepted by the nondominant group (Gal, 1998)	-Deflecting -Defending -Projection -Positioning Other -Status	Individual thoughts put out there that paint the focal students' language acquisition and use in a negative light

(Table Continues)

Table 12, Continues

Sub Theme	Definition	Categories	Uses
Cultural Maintenance (Counter-Hegemonic)	Connecting language with maintenance of their home language competence and by extension maintenance of cultural identity, including ties to their home country	-Acceptance -Connecting -Cultural Connection -Nationalism -Self-Preservation	Codes that showed what Gumperz (1982) referred to as “covert prestige” –solidarity amongst members of a bilingual community
Overarching Theme 2: Smartness			
Linguistic Identity (+)	The assumed and/or attributed relationship between one’s sense of self and a means of communication” (Block, 2012, p. 46). The positive aspects of the focal student’s linguistic identity are explored.	-Advocacy -Assertive -Positioning Self	Seen in codes where participants asked for help/clarification, defended their own responses, inserted their viewpoints, interject, make directives, reiterate a statement, or make a claim
Linguistic Identity (-)	The assumed and/or attributed relationship between one’s sense of self and a means of communication” (Block, 2012, p. 46). The negative aspects of the focal student’s linguistic identity are explored.	-Effort -Self-Verification -Separating	Codes that indicated a perspective that the focal student would do better academically or learn English if they just gave forth an increased effort. Codes such as “try harder.” This was also seen in uncertainty in the focal students’ responses.

First Cycle Coding

While data analysis is a recursive process starting with data collection (Miles et al., 2014), a more formal process began with the verbatim transcription of each ESL, classroom, and home observation. I followed this by reading the transcripts one at a time, looking for anything that stood out and wrote notes in the margins regarding my thoughts. Next, I read the transcripts again, underlining salient points for coding and journaled my initial thoughts and analyses (Patton, 2002).

I then began organizing the emerging data into an Excel sheet to document the start of the coding process. Coding is a method used by researchers that allows for easy retrieval of information by assigning an abbreviated tag, called a code, to the data (Merriam, 1998). I utilized a specific type of coding, called In Vivo coding, which is the verbatim quoting of the participant's own language (Miles et al., 2014). I utilized In Vivo coding because it helped to capture and honor the participant's voice, as well as achieve an emic perspective (Bloome et al., 2010). This perspective allowed me to better answer the research questions since I was able to establish a deeper connection with my participants (Miles et al., 2014).

See Table 13 below for examples of In Vivo codes from the first cycle of coding.

TABLE 13
Examples of In Vivo Codes

Participant	In Vivo Code	Abbreviated Code
Aanya	I always hear that word.	I always
Teacher	Not necessarily a profit, but how do you benefit?	Not necessarily
Aanya	Because they will learn something from their job	Because they
Teacher	We can maybe assume that one of the reasons that they say yes...	Maybe assume

(Table Continues)

Table 13, Continues

Participant	In Vivo Code	Abbreviated Code
Teacher	You might have to get shelter, yeah.	You might

Second Cycle Coding

In the first cycle, I summarized the raw data into meaningful segments through In Vivo coding. Then in the second cycle, I condensed the data. Data condensation is “the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and/or transforming the data” (Miles et al., 2014, p. 12). During this process, I assigned categories to the codes from the first cycle. Originally these categories were obvious such as “example.” However, categorization is a recursive process and the categories eventually evolved into more abstract entities such as “loss” and “advocacy” (Miles et al., 2014). During the coding process I shifted the focus from capturing the “verbs” in the research, such as “leading” and “interjecting,” to a deeper analysis that involved explaining the *why* behind the coded actions.

Through the lens of the theoretical framework, this second cycle of coding allowed me to inductively locate patterns and links in the data that became the categories, and eventually themes, for my study (Miles et al., 2014). I then utilized the themes to answer the first research question, which was “What ideologies do students, teachers, and parents articulate and embody within the school, home, and community settings?”

See Table 14 for examples of the full data set that includes the codes and categories discussed above.

TABLE 14
Second Cycle Coding Sample

Participant	In Vivo Code	Abbreviated Code	Renaming	Primary Category	Secondary	Tertiary
Aanya	I always hear that word	I always	Positive (self)	Positioning Self (as leader)	Defending	Smartness
Teacher	Not necessarily a profit, but how do you benefit?	Not necessarily	Correcting	Projection		
Aanya	Because they will learn something from their job	Because they	Interjection (Aanya over student)	Assertive	Positioning Self (as leader)	Dominance
Teacher	We can maybe assume that one of the reasons that they say yes...	Maybe assume	Leading	Projection	Positioning Self (as leader)	
Teacher	You might have to get shelter, yeah.	You might	Alternative Response	Positioning Other	Smartness	Projection

Once I coded and categorized all the observations, I moved on to the interview data. Like with the observation transcripts, I identified salient information and utilized verbatim In Vivo coding. However, with the interview data, I took a more deductive approach by utilizing the list of 34 categories from the observation data and applying it to the interview transcripts (Miles et al., 2014). Although the process was deductive in nature, I did not rule out the possibility that new categories might emerge or exist (Miles et al., 2014). As I went through this process, I

continued condensing the data. I deleted or renamed some categories, while I merged others with similar categories, resulting in a more comprehensive list of 24 categories. See Table 15 below for the full list of the final 24 categories.

TABLE 15
List of Final Categories

Category Name
Acceptance
Advocacy
Assertive
Colonization
Comparison
Connecting
Cultural Connection
Defending
Deflecting
Dominance
Effort
Explanation
Language
Loss
Nationalism
Positioning Other
Positioning Self
Projection
Self-Preservation
Self-Verification
Separating

(Table Continues)

Table 15, Continues

Category Name

Social Emotional

Smartness

Status

Through continued analysis, I identified the salient themes (Corbin & Strauss, 2015). I carefully reviewed my research questions and concluded that the themes would be related to language ideologies and identity. I concluded that two main themes were present: language ideologies and smartness. With language ideologies, two main types prevailed—dominant language ideologies, that exist in the form of hegemonic ideologies and ideologies that counter the hegemonic dominant language practices (Martínez, 2013). I identified smartness as the second overarching theme with positive self/linguistic identity and negative self/linguistic identity as sub-themes.

I think it is important to recognize that language ideologies and smartness are not two stand-alone themes, rather they are intertwined and influence the other. Gee (2014) recognized this symbiotic relationship when he discussed how language can be used to allow one to take on a certain identity or act out a specific role. However, it is not just the role that one takes on for themselves, people can also use language to prescribe identities to others. In this study, participants used language to either paint the picture of being “smart” or lacking intelligence.

In summary, I conducted a two-cycle coding process in order to begin the data condensation process (Corbin & Strauss, 2015). First, I transcribed all observations. Then I reviewed the transcripts for salient points. From there, I utilized In Vivo coding that allowed for the preservation of the participants’ actual words (Miles et al., 2014). I collapsed codes into

categories and categories into two overarching themes that I will describe in more detail in chapter four.

Discourse Analysis

The coding process described above allowed me to answer the first research question which was: What ideologies do students, teachers, and parents articulate and embody within the school, home, and community settings? However, to answer the second question: How do emergent bilingual students, their families, and ESL/general education teachers discursively position one another and co-construct their linguistic identities in relation to these ideologies? I utilized a more formal approach to analyzing language. Therefore, in addition to coding, I performed a type of narrative analysis introduced by Bamberg and Georgakopoulou (2008). While researchers once defined narratives only as actual texts, they have evolved to now be ways in which individuals make sense of self (Georgakopoulou, 2006). In fact, “people actually use stories in everyday, mundane situations in order to create (and perpetuate) a sense of who they are” (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008, pp. 378-379). Georgakopoulou (2006) recommends examining “how we do self” in a variety of sites. Likewise, Bamberg (2016) describes schools as “storytelling systems;” therefore, I selected schools, in addition to other “storytelling systems” such as the home environment, for further language analysis.

Micro transcription. First, I produced microtranscripts in order to carry out further analysis, following the process developed by Green and Wallat (1981) and Bloome et al. (2005). See Appendix D for a key of the transcription conventions. I selected two to five-minute excerpts from the observation transcripts for closer examination. I selected one excerpt from each of the three settings (ESL, classroom, and home) for each participant for small story analysis.

The microtranscription process, and the analysis that followed, supported my investigation into how the participants discursively positioned each other across various settings. In addition, this process aided in procuring an emic perspective (Bloome et al., 2005), which allowed me to provide an in-depth and culturally rich description of the data in order to answer my second research question.

The process continued by examining the participants' narratives, in the form of small stories. Small stories can be "tellings of ongoing events, future or hypothetical events, shared (known events), but also allusions to (previous) tellings, deferrals of tellings, and refusals to tell" (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008, p. 381). Therefore, I performed additional close readings of the transcribed observations for each student participant. I selected the excerpts for microtranscription because I had multiply coded sections of the original transcript. For example, in participant one's classroom microtranscript, I collapsed fourteen different lines of coded text into six different categories indicating that it provided a rich source of data.

Once I selected the six overall transcripts, I then marked the boundaries. According to Bloome et al. (2010), boundaries are socially constructed and allow those participating in the discussion to "signal to each other what is going on" (p. 14). I often noted boundaries in the microtranscripts by a shift in the discussion pattern or a concluding narrative structure. While discourse is not the only aspect that researchers should take into consideration when determining boundaries, it can be used in connection with contextualization cues from the participants to determine the beginning and concluding boundaries (Bloome et al., 2010).

Once I identified the boundaries, I re-examined the previously produced transcript for phase one analysis in order to break it into contextualization cues and message units. Contextualization cues are what Gumperz (1982) refers to as "a feature of linguistic form that

contributes to the signaling of contextual presupposition” (p. 131). Contextualization cues include those “verbal, nonverbal, and prosodic signals, and manipulation of artifacts” that provide a deeper understanding into the intent of the participant’s discourse acts (Bloome et al., 2010, p. 9). A non-exhaustive list of examples includes shifts in tone, volume, rhythm, stress patterns, velocity in addition to pauses, facial/body expressions, and register/syntactical shifts (Bloome et al., 2010).

Next, I broke the excerpt into message units. According to Green and Wallat (1981), message units are the smallest unit of conversational meaning. Once I determined the message units through the analysis of contextualization cues, I then identified the interaction units. Interactional units are “a series of conversationally tied together message units” (Green & Wallat, 1981, p. 200). I often determined boundaries of interaction units by the change in conversational patterns or narrative structures.

This process of identifying contextualization cues, message units, and interact units allowed me to begin the discourse analysis process by examining not just what the participants said, but what they were trying to accomplish by saying it (Bloome et al., 2005). In return, I was able to begin answering research question number two, in the sense that I was then able to identify, using the participants’ own words, how they discursively positioned one another.

Small Story Analysis. Small story narrative analysis, as described by Bamberg and Georgakopoulou (2008) outlined three levels of analysis. Level one positioning investigates agency, in the sense that it identifies who is in control of the speech act/discursive move (Bamberg, 1997). In this first level, I examined what structure(s) the speaker was employing with their narrative, looking at the organization, setting, and context of the story. I also

examined how the speaker positioned the characters within the story and within the context of the narrative structure (Deppermann, 2013).

Next, I examined the micro transcripts for level two positioning. Level two positioning seeks to analyze “the linguistic means that are characteristic for the particular discourse mode that is being employed” (Bamberg, 1997, p. 63). I analyzed the segments of data to figure out what the speaker was attempting to accomplish with the narrative structure(s) discussed in level one positioning (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008). In addition, I examined the relationship between the speaker and characters for positioning related to the interactive nature of narrative discourse.

It was at this point in the analysis process that I turned to Gee’s (2014) tools for discourse analysis. According to Gee (2014), discourse analysis is “the study of language at use in the world, not just to say things, but also to do things” (p. 1). Gee’s (2014) tools allowed me to analyze positioning related to discursive moves and actions on both a micro and macro level going through each message unit and corresponding contextualization cues one at a time. As a result, I was able to identify the prescribing and uptake of various identities, allowing me to answer another part of research question two that sought to describe how the participants co-constructed their linguistic identities through the above mentioned acts of positioning. See Appendix E for a complete list of the tools utilized during the discourse analysis process and the justification for their selection.

The third level brings together the first two levels going beyond the actual narrative itself--connecting the micro to the macro. Instead of reflecting on being understood by the listener, the speaker focuses on larger questions of identity (Bamberg, 1997). Therefore, I examined how the participants used language to construct themselves as being a particular kind

of person in relation to the dominant ideologies of language (Gee, 2014). I examined the relationship between the dominant Discourses and how the participants asserted a sense of self. I referred to the complete data set in order to make a complete and detailed final analysis. It was this third level of analysis that allowed me to answer the remaining portion of the second research question that tied together the positioning and identity co-construction to the dominant ideologies that answered research question number one.

Through the use of a two-cycle coding process, I identified and described the language ideologies embodied by those working with emergent bilinguals across various settings. Then through small story positioning analysis and the application of Gee's (2014) discourse analysis tools, I answered how teachers and family members discursively positioned one another and co-constructed their linguistic identities in relation to dominant language ideologies. Now I will conclude this chapter with a few thoughts on trustworthiness and ethical considerations.

Trustworthiness

Researchers should conduct all studies in a trustworthy manner (Merriam, 1998). Therefore, I took numerous steps to ensure I carried out the study producing the utmost level of trustworthiness. First, I documented step-by-step accounts for data collection and analysis, in addition to tying the analyses and conclusions back to the theoretical framework. This has allowed the reader to come as close to a first-hand experience with the project as possible, in addition to following the project from theory to practice to application (Creswell, 2007).

Next, triangulation of the data occurred due to the use of multiple data sources. Triangulation is a method of verifying and confirming findings using either multiple data sources, methods, or theories (Miles et al., 2014). Peer debriefing and member checking also took place. Peer debriefing, in the form of engaging colleagues, such as my committee

members, in the analysis of data occurred to ensure that I did not overlook or overemphasized important details (Creswell, 2007). During the member checking process, I took questions back to the participants for clarification or validation (Miles et al., 2014). Finally, I addressed researcher bias throughout the study by keeping a reflexive research journal to ensure to the highest degree possible that I minimized the effect of personal worldviews and theoretical orientations at every stage of the dissertation process.

Ethical Considerations

Bringing no harm to participants should be another top priority in research (Miles et al., 2014). I exercised numerous considerations and precautions in order to guarantee the utmost level of ethical behavior. First, I minimized the potential psychological, social, and loss of confidentiality risks to the participants (Patton, 2002). I outlined each of these types of risks in data collection agreements that I created for each different type of participant (teachers, students, and family members). The agreements outlined the exact length of time of involvement in the study, that participation was voluntary, and that it could they could end participation at any time without any detrimental influences.

I explained and discussed these risks of participation with all participants prior to obtaining consent (Miles et al., 2014). I first attained parental consent when recruiting minor participants. Once the parents consented, the same process took place with the minors in order to obtain assent. A university colleague obtained the assent from the focal minor participants in order to minimize any coercion they may have felt about participating in the study had I been the recruiter. Furthermore, since participation in the study could expose strong feelings, I closely monitored participants throughout the study to ensure continued willingness to proceed.

I also addressed the risks of privacy and confidentiality. I kept the data that I collected from the participants in a locked filing cabinet and/or on a password protected computer. Also, I protected the participants' anonymity by using participant selected pseudonyms in all documentation of the study.

Finally, I discussed the benefits of participation. I advised the participants that while their participation was voluntary and could be recalled at any point, their participation could be invaluable to other emergent bilinguals. While they may not have directly benefited from the study, their responses and participation may help other classroom teachers, family members of emergent bilinguals, and emergent bilinguals themselves have a richer understanding and awareness of the possible effects of positioning on linguistic identity.

Summary

I sought to describe the different acts of positioning that occurred in the ESL, general education, home, and community settings between the self, teachers, and family members. Furthermore, I desired to better understand the relationship between ideologies of language and identity for both the participant and researcher. I designed a qualitative study and carried out a case study methodology, as it allowed for the participants' stories to be told in a personal and in-depth manner. I utilized convenience sampling to recruit participants in the school in which I work at. Data collection tools included observations, semi-structured interviews, and artifacts. These tools allowed me to collect similar types of data across the different participants. Once I collected the data, I applied two cycles of coding in order to answer the first research question. The first cycle focused on summarizing the data into meaningful bits of information, while the second grouped these bits into themes. I then conducted three small story analyses, one for each setting, for each student participant. Finally, I enhanced trustworthiness by using techniques

such as triangulation of the data, peer debriefing, and member checking. I then elucidated the risks of the study, issues of privacy, and confidentiality in accordance with ethical guidelines.

In the following chapter, I will identify and discuss the salient themes from the data in order to discuss the positioning that occurred between the participants and others across the different settings. I will also examine how these acts of positioning, influenced by dominant ideologies and carried out through discourse, led to the co-construction of the participants' linguistic identities.

CHAPTER IV: LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AND SMARTNESS

As referenced in the review of the literature, the foundation of this study lies at the intersection of identity and language in relation to positioning through discursive acts. However, identity is defined and conceptualized in a vast number of ways (Moje & Luke, 2009).

Throughout this study, I have maintained that identities are not innate, but rather constructed (and reconstructed) as individuals make sense of the world around them through the discursive tool of language (Flores et al., 2015). Therefore, in this chapter, I will identify the salient themes that emerged from the data in order to discuss the positioning that occurred between the participants and others in various settings. In addition, I will expound upon how these acts of positioning led to the co-construction and reconstruction of the participants' linguistic identities in relation to the language ideologies that influenced the nature of participant discourse.

I will first present my analysis of the macro level language ideologies prevalent in the data. These ideologies will help to situate and give meaning to the micro level discursive acts of the participants examined throughout this chapter and chapters five and six. Language subordination and English as a superior language are two hegemonic ideologies that I specifically identified. As with other hegemonic beliefs, they serve the interest of groups in power in society by legitimizing the worldview of the dominant group (Gal, 1998).

Unfortunately, the disenfranchised group, at least partially recognizes and accepts these dominant beliefs as will be illustrated throughout this chapter (Gal, 1998). Therefore, dominant, hegemonic ideologies influence and fuel the cycle of deficit thinking present in U.S. schools, and in particular at Manfield Elementary, relative to emergent bilinguals (Valencia, 2012). These acts of positioning stemming from the embodiment of dominant language ideologies will be taken up in the first section of this chapter.

I will then examine participant discourses that embodied counter-hegemonic language ideologies, such as language maintenance, in the second segment. Counter-hegemonic ideologies challenge dominant beliefs currently in existence (Hurie & Degollado, 2017). One such challenge to dominant assumptions is exemplified through Gabriella and her mother's acts of *covert prestige*. Covert prestige is what Gumperz (1982) referred to as the solidarity amongst members of a bilingual community. I will present discourse surrounding not only maintenance, but also enrichment of the native language for both participants.

Finally, I will connect the participant discourses back to the socially constructed ideology of smartness (Hatt, 2007). I will elucidate the prominent discourses of limitedness and assertiveness. In addition, I will dedicate special attention to the roles agency and advocacy play in the shaping of identities. Overall, this chapter in its entirety provides a context for the in-the-moment agentic moves and positioning presented in-depth in chapters five and six.

Language Ideologies

Ideologies are the *ideas* or *ideals* of an individual or group (Woolard, 1992). However, when referring to ideologies of *language*, the term takes on a different level of complexity. Woolard and Schieffelin (1994) stated, "Ideologies of language are significant for social as well as linguistic analysis because they are not only about language" (p. 55). Instead, language ideologies highlight the link between the personal beliefs and discourses one holds and speaks and the macro level societal structures that influence them (Kroskrity, 2004). In addition, one's opinion regarding language is never solely their own. Instead, as alluded to, these beliefs are socially and historically rooted and compared to the group in power (Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994). These comparisons often lead to hegemonic beliefs regarding languages other than

English (Kroskrity, 2004). Therefore, I will begin by presenting the enactment of hegemonic language ideologies through participant discourse.

Language Subordination

Hegemonic ideologies are those that perpetuate and uphold the beliefs of the social group in power while at the same time marginalizing the needs, feelings, and beliefs of the non-dominant social group (Lippi-Green, 2012). One such ideology is referred to as language subordination. Language subordination is a hegemonic language ideology that places any non-dominant language, language variety, or accent at a lower rank than standard English (Lippi-Green, 2012). These beliefs are readily accepted by those in positions of power. Likewise, the stigmatized group often follows the dominant group leading to a diminished use of the native language (Lippi-Green, 2012). Therefore, I will conduct an in-depth discussion regarding the discourse of loss. This type of discourse highlighted instances where speech acts positioned the mainstream language superior to the participants' native languages. Along with this theme, I will also examine the larger, more global, outside influence of language positioning.

Discourse of Loss. Aanya's discourse in the ESL classroom displayed an ability to identify a narrative of loss in texts. Before reading *Encounter*, I asked the students to rate how they felt about Christopher Columbus on a scale of one to ten. After reading the story and discussing the significant loss the Native Americans experienced at his expense, I asked them to rate him again. Aanya said, "I'm upset with myself" (Observation, 4/18/18). When I asked her why, she stated, "Because he's a mean guy and I put him on ten" (Observation, 4/18/18). The fact that she had previously believed he had done so much good triggered an emotional response. However, after our discussion of how Christopher Columbus initiated the loss of the tribe's

language, culture, and heritage, Aanya's discourse reflected that some of the hegemonic practices of Christopher Columbus are still in effect and still *affects* language practices today.

In fact, through reflection, Aanya came to recognize and describe her own narrative of loss. She was very vocal about her feelings regarding this loss of her native language. She stated, "It's my native language, right? So if I forget it, I will be very sad" (Interview, 5/24/18).

Aanya expressed the desire to maintain her native language, but also discussed how teachers expected her to use English for the majority of her day. Martínez (2013) expressed that the message sent from school systems is that immigrants' native languages are not as important as English. Therefore, English-only policies in schools perpetuate a cycle of language loss

(Martínez, 2013). While Manfield Elementary does not have an English-only policy, the practices put in place, such as ESL versus bilingual instruction, tend to support this ideology.

Overtime, Aanya converted from a fluent bilingual, who was also biliterate, to a child who has forgotten how to read and write Telugu. In fact, her parents stated that "She can speak Telugu easily, of late she doesn't know" (Interview, 5/31/18). Aanya, herself, also sensed her native language was slipping away. She stated, "I have been here for two years and after that I forgot all my Telugu. Words first from India I used to speak like went somewhere. I have forgot how to read Telugu" (Interview, 5/24/18). Therefore, although she did not pinpoint at this time why it had happened, Aanya discursively outlined the continuing loss of her native language.

Over the course of this chapter, I will lay the foundation to illustrate how others' performance of language subordination led to the positioning of Aanya's native language as less than English. However, at times Aanya's own discourses reflected the same ideology. In her interview she asked, "English is all over the world and everyone knows English, right?" (Interview, 5/24/18). She further stated that "English should be everywhere you go" (Interview,

5/24/18). This discourse provided evidence that Aanya had accepted the positioning that Telugu is not as *good* as English as reflected in the belief that English is and should be everywhere. Therefore, in order to communicate effectively, she believed she needed to exchange Telugu for English (Lippi-Green, 2012). For example, Aanya accepted the language positioning by Mrs. Cooper, because when discussing how Mrs. Cooper would feel if Aanya used Telugu at school, she stated, “not ok, because people would not understand it (Interview, 5/24/18).” Therefore, Aanya has learned to put the language needs of others ahead of her own.

In addition to Aanya, the teachers’ discourses, at times, carried out the ideology of language subordination. When referring to Aanya’s native language use, Mrs. Cooper stated in her interview that “there are times and places where it is absolutely ok” (Interview 5/25/18). However, those places only included the lunch room or when students were at recess—non-academic situations. Mrs. Kennedy’s discourse also possessed a similar message, positioning Gabriella’s native language as less important for use in school. She stated that it was ok for Gabriella to use her native language to *impress* her classmates, but not to use in the general education setting. This type of discourse reflects Martínez’s (2013) findings regarding social spaces in public schools. He reported that public schools were environments that reproduced the hegemonic ideologies and kept those in power at an elevated status.

At Manfield Elementary, the focal teachers both unknowingly reproduced the dominant ideologies and engaged in discourse that recognized the role that the school system played in perpetuating these dominant ideologies. Mrs. Cooper stated, “I think they’re [U.S. citizens] welcoming of people from other countries, but they want you to adapt and to especially have our language” (Interview, 5/25/18). Mrs. Kennedy’s performance of this ideology went one step further when she stated, “There is a mistrust when you hear people using some of those

languages” [languages from the Middle East] (Interview, 5/25/18). Both of the teachers’ statements are reflective of the language subordination process as outlined by Lippi-Green (2012). Their discourses both represented speech acts that trivialized and marginalized the non-dominant language, in support of English. Although they did not take ownership of the ideology, it was still present in their discourse.

Outside of the school space, both participants’ fathers also told their own narratives of loss. First, Gabriella’s father explained how his was at the hands of his own father. He stated that he really only considered himself to speak English anymore because, “My dad encouraged us, we got in trouble actually if we spoke Spanish” (Interview, 5/29/18). His dad encouraged the use of English, because he believed there would be better opportunities for economic growth if he spoke English instead of Spanish. In fact, Gabriella’s father stated that his family lived in a poor neighborhood that wanted *more* for their children so “it was the entire culture of the neighborhood to just assimilate” (Interview, 5/29/18).

Lippi-Green (2012) described how one part of the language subordination model involved targeting the non-dominant language, but also then *holding up* the conformers as positive examples. The conformers are then promised a better future, just as Gabriella’s Dad was promised a better economic future by his father (Lippi-Green, 2012). Gabriella’s Dad regrets complying with this coercive assimilation because now, as a second generation Mexican-American, he cannot communicate in Spanish. Proctor, August, Carlo, and Barr (2010) confirmed this erasure of the native language by second generation children and reported that in most families by the third generation the native language has been completely replaced by English.

Aanya's father also confirmed a story of erasure, but he contributed his to the British colonization of India. He went into detail about how Britain owned India for some years so "it forced us to know English" (Interview, 5/31/18). The British invasion led to the establishment of numerous Catholic/missionary schools teaching in the English language. Her dad also expressed how citizens of India do not hold the public school system in in high regard. Therefore, families that can afford to send their children to private schools typically do. Today, immigration and colonization, coupled with technology and globalization has led to an even more rapid exchange of native languages for English (Proctor et al., 2010). So as witnessed in Gabriella's family, without intervention, Aanya's family risks the erasure of Telugu from their linguistic repertoire in the next generation (Proctor et al., 2010).

English as a Superior Language

English as a superior language is a hegemonic language ideology similar to that reinforced by the language subordination model. They both enact the ranking of the English language above all others (Blommaert, 2010). However, language subordination is more of a process that explains the steps taken to marginalize a language or culture where English as a superior language lends itself more to examining the policies and history that has led to the hegemony of the non-dominant language (Lippi-Green, 2012). In this section, I will examine a category I have labeled a *discourse of hierarchy* that participants took up in reference to English as a superior language.

Discourse of Hierarchy. English as a superior language rests on the notion that there is a hierarchy not only between two different languages, but even between marked and unmarked variations of the same language (Lippi-Green, 2012). In fact, Shannon (2010) stated, "Whenever more than one language or language variety exist together, their relationship to one another is

often asymmetric. One will be perceived as superior, desirable, and necessary, while the other is seen as inferior, undesirable, and extraneous” (p. 172). The political climate and policies put into place and reproduced at the macro level have influenced ideologies that position immigrants and their native languages as less than that of the dominant social class in the United States (Lippi-Green, 2012).

Aanya’s father and I exchanged a discourse of hierarchy laden with dominant language ideologies regarding the impact of current policies put in place by the President of the United States. Aanya’s father stated, “There is a lot of impact that is going on at work right now (Interview, 5/31/18).” This “impact” was in reference to discourse from President Trump similar to that in the speech he delivered on August 29, 2016. On that day, the President stated, “It’s our right as a sovereign nation to choose immigrants that we think are the likeliest to thrive and flourish and love us” (Montanaro, Kurtzleben, Horsley, McCammon, & Gonzales, 2016). According to Aanya’s father, this *cherry picking* of immigrants has caused those in the United States, even if here legally, much cause for concern. He further stated that the current climate and policies will force him to make important decisions. He must decide to either become a U.S. citizen, denouncing his home country, or face potential revocation of his Visa, returning him and his family back to India indefinitely.

In addition to policy, when speaking about the English language, both Aanya and her father engaged in ideological discourse that framed English as a global language. Aanya discussed how when she grew up and had kids, she expected them to learn English because it is a language everyone should know. Likewise, her father stated, “Wherever you go, that is the language the people speak about in common” (Interview, 5/31/18). This discourse positioned English above the native language. In fact, Aanya’s father stated that he speaks in English the

majority of the time outside of the home. However, there is still stigma attached to his English use due to his accent (Lippi-Green, 2012). Unfortunately, it is not uncommon for individuals to begin to accept the stigma associated with their marked English use (Martínez, 2013). This is evidenced in Dad's discourse when he defended and excused the recurring mispronunciation of his name by others. He declared, "And maybe it's because my name itself nobody knows...John? I know John" (Interview, 5/31/18). Therefore, his discourse reflected that he had accepted the lower hierarchical position because his name is *different*.

On the other hand, Gabriella's parents were aware of the influence of the dominant ideologies as they spoke of the prominence of bilingualism on a global level. They stated, "In Taiwan she's more confident. Everyone makes her feel so good. You speak two languages..." (Interview, 5/29/18). Her mom expressed that in the United States people seldom acknowledge her bilingualism as an asset. Therefore, Gabriella and her mother both independently discussed how she did not like people to know that she was bilingual.

Gabriella preferred to speak only English to others or when in front of others. The only way she will speak Mandarin is being in a setting where it is just her and another person who speak the language, such as at home with her mother or at a friend's house. This is due to the discrimination that her mother stated that she felt when other kids knew she was bilingual. "Because she's bilingual, so sometimes people laugh at her. Thinking her English is not good enough (Interview, 5/29/18)." This mentality of English being held to a superior status over her other language is exactly what this hegemonic ideology reflects. Lippi-Green (2012) stated, "If an individual cannot find any social acceptance for her language outside her own speech communities, she may come to denigrate her own language, even while she continues to use it" (p. 68). Gabriella's discourse embraced this when she stated that she both *enjoyed* using

Chinese, because she could speak a language that others would not understand, but also felt *discriminated* at the same time for the same reasons. It was so prevalent in her daily life that Gabriella's mom said, "they don't really make her feel like Chinese is good...so she doesn't want people to know" (Interview, 5/29/18).

So where do these discourses originate from? Macias (2014) made the assertion that English has historically been imposed on other populations in the United States over time. When examining the enactment of this ideology specifically in schools, Palmer (2009) postulated that they often devalue students' linguistic repertoires by positioning English as having a higher status over the non-dominant language. However, Pavlenko (2002) took it one step further and stated, "We have room but for one language here, and that is the English language" (p. 163). Therefore, it is no surprise that the focal teachers' discourses when referring to the climate in our country regarding bilingualism displayed the embodiment of hegemonic ideologies. Mrs. Cooper stated, "I think they're welcoming of people from other countries, but they want you to adapt and to especially have our language" (Interview, 5/25/18). This emphasis on the need for English over the native tongue reflects an enactment of hegemonic ideologies. She also spoke from a monolingual framework when she stated, "If you are only learning English in school, it just takes time to pick up the language" (Interview, 5/25/18). This type of discourse matched Blommaert's (1999) findings that American society still supports practices of monolingualism in the school environment.

Mrs. Kennedy embodied these ideologies as well. She discussed how when working with emergent bilinguals early in her career, administrators told her that they will learn the language quickly and "just assimilate" (Interview, 5/25/18). Blommaert (1999) discussed how teachers in American schools often enact this ideology of monolingualism because there are no policies to

guide them to act any differently. When Mrs. Kennedy asked her administrative team what she needed to do in order to ensure the students understood the instruction, she was told, “You can't expect to have them understand what you are doing” (Interview, 5/25/18). Reflecting on bilingualism in the present day in the United States she stated, “I want this to still feel like my country. But what's my country look like?” (Interview, 5/25/18). This discourse showed a struggle with the dominant language ideologies present in the United States. Would Mrs. Kennedy's country be the one maintaining the ideals and language she had grown accustomed to being a member of the dominant social group? If so, she still recognized that the hegemonic ideologies may not be what is best for students and hints at the possibility of alternative ideologies such as bilingualism.

Language Maintenance

Despite the current hegemonic practices, there are those that counter or challenge dominant language ideologies currently in existence. Counter-hegemonic language ideologies both challenge dominant ideologies but also connect maintenance of the native language to cultural identity (Hurie & Degollado, 2017). What I observed and could deduce from the data is that rhetoric that challenged ideologies symbolic of monolingualism were also performed in participant discourse. Therefore, I will also discuss the counter-hegemonic language ideology of cultural maintenance through participant discourses of bilingualism.

Discourse of Bilingualism. Aanya often spoke with hegemonic discourses when she discussed the ways in which she loved the United States and the English language. One such example was when she created and sang a song that contained the following lines: “United States of America. It's the best land ever and that's where we live” (Observation, 5/26/18). She also proposed that English “should be everywhere you go” (Observation, 5/24/18). However, at

other times she positioned herself as bilingual through her discourse. She stated, “Sometimes it, it's hard to speak it because I only know some of the Telugu words so I just switch it to English and it will make more sense” (Interview, 5/24/18). Achugar (2008) found that whenever more than one language is present, the two languages can appear to be in competition. However, while this discourse showed a loss of the native language, Aanya still stated that she liked to use both languages at the same time to make her message clearer. She further elaborated, “If I don't know a word to say in Telugu I just use it in English and the same for English” (Interview, 5/24/18). Aanya's discourse highlighted value and respect for both languages.

In addition, she realized the importance of maintaining her native language. When asked how she would feel if she completely lost Telugu, she stated, “Because it's my native language, right? So if I forget it, it will be very sad” (Interview, 5/24/18). Therefore, Aanya's parents are attempting to maintain her Telugu by teaching her reading and writing at home during the summer months. According to Suarez (2002), “proficiency in both languages is a successful strategy of resistance” (p. 515). Aanya continued to resist the push for monolingualism by sharing her native language with others. She said, “I am happy that other people also like my language...my native language” (Interview, 5/24/18).

In addition to helping her convey a more complete message, Aanya also maintained her native language to help foster a deeper bond with monolingual Telugu speaking family members. In his interview, her father stated, “We want to talk to their grandparents and aunt back in India so they can communicate with them...that's why they feel emotionally bonded when they speak in their own language” (Interview, 5/31/18). Therefore, Aanya used her bilingualism as a source of capital from which she could promote a healthy cultural identity (Achugar, 2008).

Gabriella's also enacted a translanguaging ideology through her discourse (Man Chu Lau, 2019). When asked about which language she preferred to speak, Gabriella did not accept the positioning that one language was superior to the other. Instead, she stated, "English is ok for me and Chinese is like the same, but I don't really prefer one" (Interview, 5/24/18). She continued with this bilingual discourse when she articulated that she does not really think about which language to use. She simply stated, "I just speak" (Interview, 5/24/18). However, she did elaborate by expressing that "sometimes I speak English and Chinese in a mix" (Interview, 5/24/18). By speaking both fluently when it made sense for her to do so, Gabriella's discourse produced an identity that embraced bilingualism (Achugar, 2008).

Like in Aanya's case, Gabriella's parents were also pursuing avenues to ward off hegemonic ideologies from further shaping their daughter's cultural and linguistic identity. Morales (2016) found that even when family desires were strong to maintain the native language, there were often "no institutional avenues to support this desire" (p. 386). Gabriella's parents expressed that she was losing her Asian culture. Therefore, they moved to Taiwan for a few years to reconnect. Her dad stated, "I believe she is a Taiwanese girl" (Interview, 5/29/18). The parents' desire for Gabriella to maintain her native language and cultural heritage was strong. They stated, "When she goes to Taiwan she has a whole community of friends and relatives and always things to do" (Interview, 5/29/18). While their attempts in the United States to enrich this facet of her culture are difficult, they continue to encourage the use of Mandarin through conversations at home with her mother to promote Gabriella's bilingualism.

At times, Mrs. Cooper's discourse also promoted bilingualism. When asked about how she felt about the language diversity at Manfield Elementary, she stated, "It's just the culture of Manfield" [to be accepting] (Interview, 5/29/18). Mrs. Cooper and I also reminisced about a

previous student we both had from two years ago. This student was a newcomer in her class and did not speak any English when he joined her fourth grade class. However, I could tell that the student was very bright, despite his inability to use English to communicate. The class was reading the novel *A Cricket in Time Square*; therefore, I purchased the book for him in his native language so that he could read it and still be an active participant in the group discussions and activities. Reflecting on this event, Mrs. Cooper stated, “It was such a beautiful example of teaming together, making him feel like we wanted him to be a part of it and we knew that he would in a year be able to sit down and read this, but that's a great example of why not let the language be a part of the classroom” (Interview, 5/25/18). This discourse reinforced the maintenance and enrichment of the native language of the participant and could benefit her overall self-esteem, academic success, and language proficiency (Shibata, 2004).

Ideology of Smartness

The second overarching theme revolves around the enactment of an ideology of smartness. For the purpose of this study, I define smartness as the cultural construct of intelligence that affects the way people determine what knowledge is important to know (Hatt, 2012). With it being a social construct, smartness is linked to ideologies of power, status, and social inequity (Chang, 2017). Within the figured world of school, smartness, and its associated artifacts at the *micro* level, such as grades, acts as a social positioning tool that shapes how ability is defined, conceptualized, and deemed acceptable at the *macro* level (Hatt, 2007, 2012).

In the following section, I will explore the ways in which smartness intersects with the actions of agency and advocacy. Agency is a discursively produced power that controls how one negotiates and renegotiates his/her identity throughout different times and spaces (Lewis & Moje, 2003). Therefore, agency is not something that one simply either does or does not

possess. It is situational and dependent upon the power differentials between those involved in discursive acts (Lewis et al., 2007).

Advocacy, on the other hand, is when either the self or an *other* voices the needs of the learner to ensure the necessary resources are available for a student to be successful in the academic setting (Caldas, 2017). So in the upcoming section I will be referring to the ability to act agentially as well as the use of discourses of advocacy. Acts of agency can produce discourses of advocacy and one can advocate for the right to act agentially; however, advocacy is much more specific in the purpose of its dialogical acts (Caldas, 2017). To the focal participants, agency appears to be more about being able to make choices about one's own learning, while advocacy is fighting for a specific educational outcome.

All three constructs, smartness, agency, and advocacy are relevant in school settings as according to Bourdieu (1977) they are spaces that reinforce hierarchies and relationships of power. Therefore, taking all three constructs into consideration, I will analyze the participant discourses of limitation and assertiveness at both the micro and macro levels. This allows me to gain a better understanding of the ways participants are both positioning themselves and being positioned in their homes and school setting relative to the social construct of smartness.

Discourse of Limitation

Limitation was said to be present in discourse when the words or actions of one participant led to the negative positioning of a focal participant relative to smartness. This discourse of limitation reflects what Valencia (2012) discussed as deficit thinking. Deficit thinking is visible when a power differential exists between individuals of different mindsets or cultures (Valencia, 2012). Rules often reflect the person in power, which in a classroom setting, is often the teacher; therefore, students must subscribe to the policies of the teacher in order to be

deemed as a “good” students. However, deficit thinking can occur between family members as well.

For example, Gabriella’s mother reduced her perceived academic struggles to an issue of effort. During a home observation, Mom said, “I told her that if you want to rid of the class [ESL classes] you have to work harder” (Observation, 5/18/18). Mom appeared to be associating the discourses of effort, language, and smartness as equals. Gabriella also equated effort with smartness in her own personal definition of the word. She stated that in order to be smart, “you work really hard” (Interview, 4/29/19). In addition, mom then stated that Gabriella “doesn’t work hard enough” and that she “would just sit there playing and wasting her time” which pointed to a perceived lack of effort (Observation, 5/29/18). Mom and dad also referenced in their interview their desire for Gabriella to learn Spanish, but since she struggled so much in English they were not going to introduce another language. Finally, in regard to academics, the parents expressed that if she lived in Taiwan, she “would die” due to the rigor of the school work (Interview, 5/29/18). In other words, the parents’ discourses of effort, language, and smartness limited her agency to produce artifacts of intelligence that *the parents* valued, such as good grades; thereby positioning her as lacking smartness. Their discourses also reflected deficit thinking in the manner in which they “blamed the victim” (Valencia, 2012). Instead of placing the blame on the educational system that most likely overlooked Gabriella’s need for bilingual education, leading her to “miss out” on educational opportunities and content in her younger years, her parents blamed Gabriella, the victim, making her lack of academic content knowledge a reflection of effort on her part (Valencia, 2012).

Another example of Gabriella being positioned as lacking smartness occurred in a conversation between her and her father. His distinction between the importance of formal

language over informal or conversational speech positioned Gabriella as a marked English speaker that needed to increase her accurate use of standard academic English. In general, when Dad perceived her to incorrectly use a word, he stated, “You are just saying a lot of stuff right now. Think before you talk” (Observation, 5/29/18). This positioned Gabriella as one whose language use was insufficient. He further mocked her language use by making statements such as “Always Miss know it all” (Observation, 5/29/18). When asked if her parents thought she was smart, Gabriella simply stated, “I don’t know” (Interview, 4/29/19). Thus, by correcting her own speech, Gabriella demonstrated that at least on some level she accepted the position that her language use was not good enough.

The focal participants negotiated the task of school work and discourse related to agency and advocacy in different ways. The majority of Aanya’s discourse positioned herself as not knowing and therefore lacking smartness. Numerous times she stated, “I don’t get it!” or “I need help!” (Observation, 4/11/18). Likewise, Gabriella’s discourse indicated the need for self-verification when she said, “And then, I can, can I put a period there?” (Observation, 5/22/18). Therefore, the focal participants’ discourses reflected times when they positioned themselves as being unable to enact their own concepts of legitimized smartness.

As shown, positioning relative to smartness occurred in the school setting as well. Hatt (2007) posited that the ways in which smartness is conceptualized in schools can marginalize students not from the mainstream culture. In fact, emergent bilinguals are more likely to be perceived as less intelligent than their monolingual peers (Sue & Sue, 2003). When this occurs and emergent bilinguals are positioned as inferior, they are more likely to lose self-confidence (Yoon, 2012). Again, this is tied to the concept of deficit thinking where leadership in schools

often aim to change the victim instead of the system that made them a victim in the first place (Valencia, 2012).

At Manfield Elementary, the focal teachers discursively positioned the ideas of the main participants as less than they had expected. First, in her interview, Mrs. Cooper stated that Aanya often “confuses phrases” (Interview, 5/25/18). Throughout the classroom observations Mrs. Cooper offered her own ideas in substitution of Aanya’s. For example, Mrs. Cooper said, “or you can even say why is that a good thing” (Observation, 4/12/18). Similarly, she offered, “or you can even say that he’s still looking forward to life” (Observation, 4/12/18). In this situation, smartness was defined as compliance with teacher expectations (Hatt, 2012). When asked if she thought Mrs. Cooper thought she was smart, Aanya explained how she always helped her understand things when she was wrong (Interview, 4/29/19). Therefore, Aanya’s ability to be recognized as smart by the teacher was limited due to her positioning as a *recipient* of knowledge instead of that of capable *producer*.

Mrs. Kennedy’s discourse regarding Gabriella eluded to a judgment based on perceived smartness, but not language. Thorstensson (2013) reported that teacher perceptions of smartness impacted their teaching practices and in return can affect learner agency. Mrs. Kennedy posited “I think she has some ADD issues that interfere with that” [participation] (Interview, 5/25/18). However, Mrs. Kennedy did not believe Gabriella’s struggles were relative to her bilingual status. This counters the findings of Thorstensson (2013) who reported that teachers often equated proficiency in English with smartness. Instead, when asked why she believed Gabriella struggled academically she stated, “It’s more that they are a lower reader and not necessarily because they are an English language learner” (Interview, 5/25/18). Since she did not equate

bilingualism to a lack of smartness, Mrs. Kennedy did not make accommodations to enhance Gabriella's learning.

In fact, both teachers expressed that they did not make accommodations or modifications for any of their current emergent bilinguals. Mrs. Kennedy stated that "I haven't had anyone that low that I felt the need to accommodate that much" while Mrs. Cooper's discourse reflected a narrative of hierarchy (Interview, 5/25/18). She stated she also had special education students in her classroom and their individualized education programs (IEPs) "trumped" the emergent bilinguals' needs since IEPs are legally binding documents. She further stated, "ESL parents were not advocating that much" (Interview, 5/25/18). This discourse placed the blame for the lack of accommodations on the families and not the school system which is central to deficit discourses (Valencia, 2012). In summation, both teachers' discourses reflected a plan for instruction based on monolingual ideologies and perceived levels of smartness.

However, as the ESL teacher, I also did not arrange the discursive environment to support student agency. Instead, like the other focal teachers, I positioned the students as recipients of knowledge. Also, my discourse framed smartness as obtaining the teacher's expected response. This was evident in the way I would say, "could be" when the participants would offer a response. In a way, I was saying that what they were saying *could be* correct, but in fact was not, because it did not match what I had envisioned to be the precise response.

The adult participants in the study placed constraints on student agency by creating spaces that produced situations where the students advocated for themselves in a manner that positioned them as *not knowing*. This advocacy gave a false illusion of power because the participants were still reliant on the adults to verify the expected response. It became a cycle of diminished agency that most participants (including myself) were not even aware of.

Discourse of Assertiveness

In the previous section I outlined numerous ways in which discourse was either intentionally or inadvertently used to limit the agency, advocacy, and perceived smartness of the focal participants. However, assertive discourses were also prominent and reflected participants positioning themselves as active learners and knowers. This led to the enactment of their own constructs of smartness (Chang, 2017).

In the home setting, there were times when Gabriella accepted her parents' positioning as lacking their constructed notion of smartness. However, there were other times when she successfully exercised agency that allowed her to positively advocate for herself. Flores et al. (2015) reported that the best way for emergent bilinguals to refute negative positioning is through acting agentially. This was evident in the authoritative discourse Gabriella used when speaking to her mother. When Mom tried to position Gabriella as not knowing because Gabriella got half of her spelling words incorrect on a test, Gabriella responded with, "No. I got one wrong. I got most of them wrong, because we were in Washington, D.C." (Observation, 4/23/18). Thus, Gabriella's discourse refuted a position that attacked her smartness and at the same time advocated for her own knowing.

In the general education classroom environment, there were acts of agency and advocacy on the part of both focal participants. Yoon (2012) reported that agency is a necessity for emergent bilinguals in the classroom in order to find academic success. Aanya found success by advocating for the right to comprehend the instruction when she asked Mrs. Cooper questions such as, "What did you say again?" and "Can we take turns like first I read, then you can?" (Observation, 4/11/18). Gabriella, however, took her assertive discourse a little further. This was evident in the way she interjected her opinions into small group conversations. She would

lead discussions with discourse such as, “I think he...” or would refute ideas through the use of statements such as “But instead he...” (Observation, 5/22/18). Gabriella also spoke with assertive phrases to advocate for her own learning. For example, she said, “What I am trying to say is...” (Observation, 4/10/18). This shows she believed what she had to say had value and meaning and was worthy of being heard and accepted by others instead of only placing the value on the teacher’s knowledge.

The ESL classroom was a space where both participants exercised advocacy as evident in their assertive discourses. There were times where Aanya would still phrase her responses in ways that indicated she was seeking verification. However, the majority of her responses were assertive in nature. For example, she stated, “I have something to say...” as well as refuting other student’s responses when she said, “Actually it said...so I am thinking that they are saying...” (Observation, 4/16/18). She would advocate for her own learning by interjecting when I was going to move on to a new topic to say, “Wait, I have a question.” She further showed confidence in her responses when she said, “It had to be a canoe” (Observation, 4/13/18).

Gabriella exercised a high degree of agency in the ESL space when she selected the game that the group would play and then took over the role of teacher for the class period. She greeted students as they came in the room. One example is when she said “Hi, Andy, we are playing a card game because today is our prize day” (Observation, 4/17/18). She positioned herself as the leader of the group and was assertive in her discourse with other students. She stated, “somebody pick a card” and “come on, let’s finish the game, we have to go soon” (Observation, 4/17/18). She even guided the play by setting up the rules. “First, there will be a passer. I will go first” (Observation, 4/17/18).

Overall, both focal participants were able to exercise agency by positioning themselves as advocates for their own learning. The ESL classroom appeared to be the environment that best promoted both agency and advocacy in order for the participants to enact what Thorstenson (2013) referred to as “culturally relevant smartness” (p. 12).

Conclusion

This chapter focused on the embodiment of ideologies of language and smartness as evidenced through discursive acts. First, I discussed two prevalent hegemonic language ideologies that I identified in the data. These hegemonic ideologies fueled the cycle of deficit thinking between the participants and the adults they interacted with. One such hegemonic ideology was language subordination that was enacted by participants’ discourse of loss. Aanya and her family spoke of English as a global language that should be everywhere, but Gabriella’s discourse focused more on the discrimination she felt when using her native language. I also discussed a second hegemonic ideology referred to as English as a superior language that was enacted through the use of a discourse of hierarchy. Aanya’s father spoke of the impacts macro level political influences may have on their family. In the school setting, the three focal teacher participants led with discourse laden with monolingual beliefs, thereby limiting the use of the native language in the school setting.

The last language ideology I discussed was the counter-hegemonic ideology of language maintenance that participants displayed through a discourse of bilingualism. Both focal participants discussed the importance of their native language to their identities.

In the final section, I reviewed the data pertaining to the enactment of an ideology of smartness. This was reviewed in relation to discourses of limitedness and assertiveness. The parents in the study had constructed their own view of smartness that made it equivalent to

effort. In the school setting, the teachers socially constructed smartness to mean obtaining the expected responses. Despite these constructs of smartness, both focal participants were able to enact agency and advocacy across their different environments. This was often accomplished through authoritative discourses.

Hegemonic ideologies were both reproduced and resisted across the various settings. I examined these macro level ideologies in order to situate the micro level analyses that will be discussed over the course of the next two chapters. I will explicate the micro level discourses through in-depth discourse analyses for both participants across three different observational settings. Finally, I will highlight how the participants negotiated their identities based on acts of positioning conducted through discourse.

CHAPTER V: DISCOURSE ANALYSIS FOR AANYA

Aanya can be a strong-willed and verbal child in certain environments; however, she can also be quiet and reserved in others. She moved to Langdale from India in the summer of 2016. According to her family, she has adjusted well to her move to the United States (Interview, 05/31/18, Father). Her fourth grade teacher Mrs. Cooper described her as an overall strong student, with math and language being her greatest assets (Interview, 05/25/18, Mrs. Cooper).

When Aanya first came to Manfield Elementary in the fall of 2016, her English screener scores on the WIDA-APT test were 2.0 (listening), 5.0 (speaking), 2.0 (reading), and 3.0 (writing). Each of these scores are reported on a 1.0-6.0 scale with a 6.0 being an English proficiency level equivalent to that of a native speaker. Aanya exited ESL services in the spring of 2018 with an overall composite score of 5.4. Mrs. Cooper believes Aanya acquired English quickly because she was “really motivated to learn,” and she partly attributed this to Aanya’s “wanting to interact with her peers and the teacher” (Interview, 05/25/18).

Aanya’s native language is Telugu; however, she also understands a little bit of Hindi. According to her father, she attended a private school whose language of instruction was English (Interview, 05/31/18). Aanya declared that she is proud to be bilingual, but is finding it more difficult to carry on extended conversations in Telugu: “Sometimes it’s hard to speak it [Telugu] because I only know some of the Telugu words, so I just switch it to English and it will make more sense” (Interview, 05/24/18). Aanya believes that English is very important; however, she has also expressed the importance of preserving her native language, stating that she would be sad if she completely lost Telugu. During her interview she said, “English is all over the world, and everyone knows English, right? So everyone should know English” (Interview, 05/24/18). Her father executed a similar ideology regarding English during his

interview, stating “Wherever you go, it’s the language the people speak about in common. So you need to know that language” [English] (Interview, 05/31/18).

One goal for my study was to identify the language ideologies embodied by emergent bilinguals and those around them, which I examined in chapter four. I also sought to further explore how these ideologies influenced the (re/co)construction of the participants’ linguistic identities through the micro examination of the discursive positioning that occurred between participants across various settings. Therefore, in this chapter, I will share narratives derived from the discourse analyses conducted with Aanya from each of the three observation environments—ESL classroom, general education classroom, and home.

ESL Classroom Observation

In this first discourse analysis, I will share Aanya’s narrative surrounding her native language. Throughout the excerpt, Discourse pertaining to loss was present. After a solicitation for narratives regarding language loss, Aanya and the other students shared their own personal stories that were bound to deficit laden ideologies of language. However, self-reflection on my part as the teacher and researcher revealed that perhaps I was leading the discussion through a deficit lens of loss; thereby influencing the Discourse surrounding language.

Contextual Background

I created the microtranscript from a larger data set derived from an observation that took place on April 18, 2018, which was the final of five ESL observations conducted for this study. The observation took place during an ESL lesson in my classroom with a group of four fourth grade students. In the microtranscript, the students are referred to as A, Ab, Ay, and H as seen in Appendix F, more specifically, A is Aanya (the focal student), Ab is Abjit, Ay is Ayda, and H is Hiran. I referred to myself as S in the transcript.

The full observation context was a group discussion about a book entitled *Encounter* by Jane Yolen. This fictional book is based on the real explorations and discoveries of Christopher Columbus as told from the perspective of a Native American tribe. At the point of the excerpt, we had just finished reading the book and the main character (who had been a young Native American boy) was grown up and telling a story about the loss of his land, heritage, language, and religion, sparking a discussion about loss amongst the students. I chose this excerpt for further analysis due to the rich level of discussion regarding loss from young children's perspectives.

Summary of the Interaction

For all of the microtranscripts in this study, I employed Gee's (2014) Stanza Tool in order to determine interactional units. I identified three different interactional units present in this first microtranscript. In the first interactional unit, the members of the group had a discussion that focused on the text and characters. Consisting of only three turns, its function was to set the scene, beginning with me reading the ending of *Encounter* and then leading a group discussion of the types of loss the Native Americans suffered at the hands of Christopher Columbus. I reiterated key points of the text and Aanya was eager to offer an explanation of the loss of the tribal peoples' language, setting the scene for the discussion of loss that was present throughout the remaining interactional units.

The second interactional unit began with my solicitation of a personal narrative of language loss from the students. If the first interactional unit was setting the scene, the structure of the second revolved around problem identification through sharing personal narratives of language loss. Ayda and Hiran both made statements of loss and the interactional unit ended with Aanya stating that she had "forgot all of her Telugu letters" (lines 60-61).

While there was some general discussion of loss in the first two interactional units, it was really the third that marked Aanya's full disclosure of her native language loss, providing a thorough account and narrative documenting the loss. Although she did not offer any solutions, she did identify it as a problem, stating that she was "trying to fix that" [language loss] (lines 117-118). The fourth group member kept chiming in with what at first appeared to be insignificant interjections such as "I lost my shirt" (line 170) and "I lost my bey blade" (line 174). However, closer analysis revealed a more significant meaning behind Abjit's interjections that I will discuss below. The third interactional unit and excerpt ended during a transition from the group discussion to the reading of the actual text.

A Conversation and Discourse of Loss

The excerpt started with my reading of an epitaph at the end of *Encounter*. While the book certainly outlined human death, the hidden narrative that I identified was one of pure and total loss for the Taino people at the hands of Christopher Columbus and the Europeans. The students in the group sat quietly as I read this epitaph, "We took their speech into our mouths, forgetting our own" (lines 8-10). Aanya immediately raised her hand to reflect on this language loss by stating, "They took, like you know, what they are speaking like the Europeans are speaking English so we also started speaking English, but not our own language" (lines 14-20). Aanya's response began with pronouns such as *they* to describe the characters. However, when she spoke specifically about loss, Aanya used the pronoun *we*. The use of *we* was inclusive of herself or alluding to her connection to the text regarding loss. I frequently examined pronouns and the meaning(s) behind their use through the application of Gee's (2014) Diexis Tool that identifies how pronouns tie speech and writing to context.

In this context, Aanya remained silent until I questioned the students about personal loss in lines 27-29; “Has that happened to anyone here?” No one immediately responded; therefore, I followed up with the more specific question: “Do you feel like you have lost some of your language?” (lines 30-31). Ayda was the first in the group to respond orally stating, “I think I sort of” in a very quiet voice. At this point Hiran *half-raised* his hand. Aanya made a long face and shifted her eyes back and forth as if she was either indicating a *no* response or observing how the others were going to respond.

Once Ayda spoke up, Hiran then verbalized his opinion too, stating, “I feel like a little bit” (line 33), then added that he has forgotten some of the words in Tamil. This sparked Aanya’s interest and she verbalized, “Yeah, same, same” and included an agreeing hand gesture (lines 49-50). It was interesting that at this point, through the application of Gee’s (2014) Big D Discourse Tool, I discovered an emerging group identity of language loss. Chiang and Schmida (2002) discussed how participants in their study understood language to be a synonym for culture. In a way, the students in this study did as well. They equated language loss to be a loss of their culture, heritage, and identity.

Aanya took this identity loss one step further when she stated, “I forgot all of my Telugu letters” (lines 55, 60-61). When prompted to tell more, she then used language to narrate an identity of complete loss when she verbalized in line 93, “I forgot all of my Telugu.” Since this excerpt, I conducted observations in her household and witnessed the speaking of Telugu, so I knew this statement was not completely accurate. In fact, during her parents’ interview, they stated that she still spoke Telugu very fluently (Interview, 05/31/18). So why did she use language to narrate this type of identity?

One possible answer became apparent during the excerpt's discourse analysis. While examining quantifiers, I noticed I said, "She [Aanya] kind of feels sad by that" (line 122). After investigating the meaning of *kind of*, I went back to verify which word *that* was referring; however, I was unable to locate it in the excerpt because Aanya never *actually* said it. I must have just assumed that loss equaled sadness, and it became apparent at that moment I had inadvertently pushed this narrative of language and identity loss on her. Ortmeier-Hooper (2008) found that emergent bilinguals often have language identities forced upon them due to the nature of the ESL identification. Clearly, I tried to tie the text to the life stories of my students in the group, and three out of the four students readily took on this identity and shared their own personal stories.

Aanya appeared reluctant at first. After the question about loss, she shifted her eyes side to side to see how others would respond. Once she told her story, she seemed to take ownership of it by stating that she had forgotten her Telugu letters. However, based on other observations, I was forced to question whether or not she truly identified with the narrative. Had she spoken from truth and actually identified with the narrative of loss or was she acting out Bakhtin's double voicing discourse and telling me what she thought I wanted to hear? (Bakhtin, 1963/1994). Under Bakhtin's (1963/1994) theory, speakers might try to understand what the listener is thinking or feeling and adjust their actions to try to meet the desired outcome. It is also possible that she could be distancing herself from her parents and taking on a socially desired response to immigration by assimilating to English; thereby, losing Telugu and repositioning language loss as an almost achievement.

Perhaps her discourse had to do with the way that I set up the discussion of language. In line 25, I stated that the Taino "took on the Europeans' language." Upon reflection, I could have

said the Taino started *speaking* the Europeans' language. The verb *take on* signals a burden, so I believe my verbiage here set the stage for negative contexts and conversation related to language, despite being unintentional. The majority of the group picked up the negative talk and shared similar stories that reflected this. Hiran told us that he “forgot like a lot, like a little bit of Tamil” (lines 45-48). Ayda stated in lines 51-54 that “my mom thinks I should go to Mexico so I can learn more words.” Finally, Aanya followed with her own example of loss, and afterward I solicited her personal narrative.

Aanya's Personal Language Narrative

At the onset of her narrative, Aanya stated she had been *here* now for two years “and after that I forgot all of my Telugu” (lines 90-94). The use of the indicator *here* spurred many questions: What exactly did she mean by *here*? The school? The United States? To what actual place, thing, or entity did Aanya attribute this loss of language? I then asked her, “Why do you think that's happened?” (line 103) to which she replied, “Because I change it with English more” (lines 106-108). She could have said that she spoke more English or had more opportunities for English, but I think her use of the phrase *changes it* was interesting because *change* can be associated with a conscious choice. Did Aanya see the loss of her language as a conscious choice such as with codeswitching? (Gumperz, 1982).

Whether she felt the loss of her language had been a choice or not, she *did* state it was something she wanted to *fix* (lines 117-118). To me, the word *fix* connotes that something is broken and in need of repair, which I found intriguing as a way, even if just on a subconscious level, for Aanya to express that she wanted to maintain her language. Cenoz and Gorter (2017) found that those who speak the minority language can feel shame and often choose the dominant language to achieve a higher social status. Was Aanya feeling conflicted--like she had to choose

one language over the other? Either way, a deficit perspective approached from hegemonic ideologies guided the focus of language discussions. And perhaps my in-the-moment choice of the verb *take on* was a driving force in leading with a hegemonic ideology, without realizing it at the time. Had it not been for this micro level analysis, I may have never identified my own speech laden with hegemonic discourse.

Ayda, however, had built an identity around her language loss. In lines 135-140, she stated, “You lost some of your language and then the language you speak is sometimes just lost.” If it is lost, where did/does it go? This murky middle ground seems to be described well by Lapayese (2016) with a concept she refers to as “los intersticios” or the space between identities. It was almost as if Ayda was trying to say you may be losing a little bit of your language at a time but one day you may go to retrieve it and it will not be there. I believe she was making the connection between a loss of language and a loss of identity.

Hegemonic Versus Counter-hegemonic Conversations

Gee’s (2014) Big C Conversation Tool allowed me to investigate deeper into the Conversation of loss and hegemonic language ideologies such as language subordination present in the students’ discourse (Lippi-Green, 2012). The students in Aanya’s ESL group were faced with a change in their language. Aanya alluded to the fact that she believed if she learned more English, her use of Telugu would dwindle when she stated, “So we also started speaking English, but not our own language” (lines 19-20). Kim (2003) discussed the struggles bilinguals often face when negotiating an identity that they want, versus an identity that is authored by others much like Lapayese’s (2016) “intersticios.” Aanya appeared to be in the middle of this struggle-identifying as one who lacked the social good of multilingualism (Bourdieu, 1989; Kroskrity, 2010). Gee (2014) defined social good as “anything a social group or society as a whole takes as

a good worth having” (p. 96). It appeared as though she did not perceive multilingualism to be an identity available to her despite stating, when prompted in the interview, that she was proud to be bilingual. In fact, to most of the group members, language appeared to be black and white, an either/or. Either one spoke English *or* Telugu, English *or* Tamil, English *or* one went to Mexico and spoke Spanish.

By examining Ayda’s statement, “My mom thinks I should go to Mexico so I can learn more” [Spanish] (lines 51-54) through the lens of Gee’s (2014) Politics Tool, that addresses how social goods should be distributed in society, it became apparent that language is political in nature. In addition, it appeared that a country was the determinant to learning and speaking a language--not a conscious choice by a person. Ayda and Aanya twice referred to their mother countries by name; however, she referenced the United States as being *here*, which I interpreted to mean that the United States had become a more personal, or at least more immediate, entity to both participants.

On the surface level, the Conversation seemed to lack counter-hegemonic language ideologies, such as the fluid language practice of translanguaging (García & Wei, 2014), that would allow my students to preserve and enrich their native language while learning English at the same time. So why did I not bring up such fluid language practices? Perhaps I did not due to a time constraint on my part or perhaps it was because I kept the discussion tied directly to the text. Either way, the wording of the question, “Do you feel like you have lost some of your language” (lines 30-31) constructed a one-sided conversation of language that framed the students as the victims and those speaking another language were the oppressors. It is also possible that the pronoun use may indicate who is responsible for the language loss since a dominant ideology of individualism in the U.S. combined with a lack of systemic critique would

place the blame on the student/family to either keep or lose their language and not on the system (Crawford, 1996).

Until this point, I have not discussed one group member, Abjit, who at first seemed not to be taking the conversation seriously; however, Abjit may have been highlighting his multilingual identity and refuting the hegemonic language ideologies that I enacted through my discourse with the other students (Martínez, 2013). When Ayda, Hiran, and Aanya were relating their stories of loss, Abjit told an opposite story in the background looking directly at the camera. He said, “I know a lot of languages. It’s easy” (lines 57-59). I quickly silenced Abjit’s goofy behavior by saying, “Hey guys, I want to hear *her* story. She is telling us the story of the loss of her language” (lines 82-88). What I did not realize at the time was that Abjit may have been attempting to tell *his* counter-story of multilingualism.

Disconnections in the conversation continued as Abjit inserted himself into Aanya’s narrative by saying, “I know nine languages” and then proceeding to list them (lines 116-119). While not all nine were traditional spoken languages, such as the HTML coding language, clearly Abjit attempted to communicate that not only had he not *lost* his native language, but he also continued to expand his linguistic repertoire. Abjit positively identified himself as a multilingual; however, I appeared to be in continuous pursuit of the “one right answer” and did not accept his bids of agency.

Summary

The ESL discourse analysis was very eye opening for me as it allowed me to identify the hegemonic ideologies I disseminated to my students. In this excerpt, I asked for (and received) a narrative of language loss from Aanya. While at first she did not actively relate, she eventually told her story about moving to the United States and the language switch from Telugu to English.

The language Aanya utilized when speaking of her native language loss indicated that she did not identify as a multilingual; instead, she perceived language as a choice that she had to pick (Lapayese, 2016). Either she used her native language or she used English. A middle ground of keeping and nurturing both languages was not apparent.

The discussion of loss went on amongst three of the group members and myself. However, a fourth student's counter-narrative almost went undiscovered. Again, only through micro level analysis did I realize that what I originally interpreted as a student trying to be disruptive was actually his way of refuting the identity that I was pushing onto the group. In his own way, Abjit told his counter-narrative of language *gained*.

In the next two discourse analyses, I will examine Aanya's use of language, positioning, and identity in two other settings. First, I will turn to the observation conducted in Aanya's general education setting with Mrs. Cooper, and then I will shift my focus to the home observation.

General Education Classroom Observation

In the ESL classroom, Aanya discursively positioned herself and was positioned around an ideology of loss. She told the story of how over the past two years she had been slowly losing full access to her native language of Telugu, and she attributed this loss to replacing Telugu with English. Through self-reflection, I also discovered that I may have pushed the ideology of loss onto Aanya by soliciting a narrative of loss from the students, misquoting Aanya, and at the same time positioning her as a victim. Aanya did not discuss a loss of language during the general education classroom observation; however, a loss of power became apparent. As you will see, ideologies of power dominated the discourse in the general education setting.

Contextual Background

The microtranscript utilized for this second analysis is a subset of the data from an observation conducted on April 11, 2018, the third of eight classroom observations conducted in Mrs. Cooper's fourth grade classroom at Manfield Elementary. I selected this observation for microanalysis, because it was unique, in the sense, that Mrs. Cooper pulled Aanya aside within the classroom to introduce a new book *Tracker*; by Gary Paulsen, that the entire class was going to begin reading. It is unknown why Mrs. Cooper singled Aanya out to participate in this one-on-one introductory conversation as Mrs. Cooper controlled the recording device, and she and Aanya were the only two present in the video. I further chose to select it, because with it being just the two individuals, it would be easier to analyze positioning occurring in the conversation. In addition, it was multiply coded and showcased an overall rich display of power differentials that I collapsed into fourteen different categories such as advocacy, self-preservation, and self-verification.

Appendix G contains a full copy of the microtranscript for this analysis. In the transcript, Aanya is referred to as A and Mrs. Cooper is E. The entire conversation consisted of Aanya and Mrs. Cooper, except when Abjit (one of the students from the ESL observation) interjected his opinions.

Summary of the Interaction

The entire transcript/observation is six minutes and thirty-four seconds. The excerpt starts at the onset of the video and concludes at 5:41; however, I did not use the entire five minutes and forty-one seconds for micro transcription. Within the excerpt there are parts where Mrs. Cooper and Aanya were simply reading from the book without discussion, so I eliminated those sections from the transcript, so the video used for discourse analysis was 3:42. Although I

did not use the transcript in its entirety in the microtranscription process, I did list the removed portions in a separate at the bottom of Appendix G to provide an additional layer of context for the discussion between the two participants. The beginning boundary was the start of the video, and the end boundary of 5:41 was selected because that is where Aanya started writing and Mrs. Cooper started talking to other students about unrelated content until the end of the video.

I broke the microtranscript into three interactional units. The function of the first unit was to set the stage for Aanya's reading of the new classroom text. Mrs. Cooper attempted to build Aanya's interest in the text by having her make predictions about *Tracker*. This conversation would foreshadow the difficulty Aanya would face with Mrs. Cooper about not being able to come up with her expected responses. Since Aanya failed to come up with the responses Mrs. Cooper expected, it resulted in a power differential that led to Aanya building a wall between herself and Mrs. Cooper/the text.

The second interactional unit began when Aanya and Mrs. Cooper started reading the text and discussing its vocabulary. Aanya's inability to articulate Mrs. Cooper's expected responses firmly rooted her positioning as "not knowing" while Mrs. Cooper established her position as the holder of knowledge by providing Aanya with the *correct* answers. Aanya made a bid to establish power; however, it went unrecognized.

Finally, the third interactional unit began when Aanya and Mrs. Cooper moved to a discussion about people with cancer. Instead of just discussing the text though, Aanya tried to establish a tie to the book (the main character's grandpa was dying of cancer) by making a personal connection stating that she knew people with cancer. Again, the theme of Aanya being unable to offer an expected response continued, and Mrs. Cooper persisted to reject Aanya's bids for participation, power, and agency.

Identity of Rejection

The excerpt began with Mrs. Cooper soliciting predictions from Aanya about the text in an attempt to build interest. Based on the illustrations found on the cover, Aanya guessed that the book would be about deer. Mrs. Cooper's response included the word "maybe" with an increasing intonation as well as "um" in lines 11 and 12. Mrs. Cooper then followed with a second question, "Do you know what it means to track something?" to which Aanya responded, "To go after it?" (lines 13-17). Both of Aanya's responses appeared appropriate given the context provided to her thus far. As valid as her responses may have seemed, they did not appear to match Mrs. Cooper's expected responses.

Hatt (2012) found that students consistently seek the cultural capital most valued by the teacher and that consistent rejections of the cultural capital can influence students' self-perceptions of their own personal abilities. In this instance, the cultural capital that Aanya sought was the *correct* response. Aanya was twice discouraged that she had not provided Mrs. Cooper's expected response, as indicated by her frowning when Mrs. Cooper rejected her answers. At this point, through analysis using Gee's (2014) Big D Discourse Tool, I identified that Aanya began exercising an identity of rejection when she stopped putting forth personal responses to Mrs. Cooper's questions regarding the text. It appeared that since Mrs. Cooper did not recognize Aanya as one who *knows*, she distanced herself from the book and instead, led the conversation with an identity of rejection. In lines 31-33, Aanya said, "I don't think that I am going to like this book." Mrs. Cooper then tried to induce interest by comparing the text to another written by the same author, but Aanya stated she did not like *that* book either (line 39). Mrs. Cooper continued trying to gain her interest by calling the book *a survival story* to which Aanya replied, "I don't like survival stories" (line 44). A student walking by overheard

the conversation and tried to come to Mrs. Cooper's aide, stating, "It's actually darker than um *Hatchet*" (lines 45-46). And again, Aanya reiterated, "I don't like dark books" (line 47).

Throughout the conversation, Aanya showed she accepted the positioning and identity of *not knowing* authored by Mrs. Cooper. Thorstensson (2013) found that ESL students not only situationally take on this type of positioning, but also internalize it, limiting conversations, actions, and relationships they believe to be available to them. Aanya often used *I* to relinquish her responsibilities for *knowing* in this book; however, I feel I should note that she did not utilize language that would direct the problem to the book/author. After some failed attempts at answering the teacher's questions *correctly*, she stated, "I don't think I am going to finish this" (lines 107-109). By making such *I* statements, she was setting the stage for not knowing based on a lack of connection to the text; however, once she saw Mrs. Cooper did not judge her responses as acceptable, she then painted a picture of not liking the book so she could guard herself from negative judgement. If she stopped giving answers, there was no responsibility for giving a *wrong* answer.

Also aligned with the identity of rejection came the increased reliance on body language. At the onset of the video excerpt, Aanya's body language supported her oral utterances, such as in line 10, when Aanya answers "deer" to what she thought the book was going to be about. At the same time, she shook her head side to side to indicate that she was uncertain of her oral response. However, it appeared that when Mrs. Cooper evaluated Aanya's spoken language as inaccurate or failing to meet the expected response, she relied more heavily on her body language, rather than spoken words, to communicate and position herself. When she did produce oral utterances, they were often reduced to simple phrases such as "Unh uh" as in line 39. Also, a review of the contextualization cues revealed that multiple times Aanya shook

her head quickly side to side to supplement her negative verbal responses. For example, when the teacher said in lines 27-30 that Aanya's response was incorrect, Aanya started shaking her head side-to-side and frowned. Handfield and Crumpler (2013) found that positioning can reach beyond simple discourse to include physical communicative systems as well as gestures; therefore, the connection between Aanya's two sign systems told a more complete story of the positioning and identity she was exercising at that moment in time.

The End of Double “Voicing” Discourse

There is more to the story than just a girl saying negative things with a sad face. In line 44, when Aanya said she did not like survival stories, she was looking at her teacher with a smile on her face. Aanya seemed to be engaging in this type of Discourse to guard herself against criticism. This could be her attempt to *save face* while trying to entertain the teacher since her verbal responses were not parallel with Mrs. Cooper's expected responses. However, she already tried saying what she thought Mrs. Cooper wanted to hear and it was not accurate, so she then relied on other cues to try to connect with the teacher to make her point. When attempts to bond and *save face* were ineffective, Aanya stopped responding all together (line 74). Instead, she just shook her head to indicate she did not know. Did she really not know? She might not have, but at this point, she was not even willing to offer a response because Mrs. Cooper had evaluated Aanya's previous responses as incorrect.

Power Differentials

As I have implied, it appeared that Mrs. Cooper exerted her power of knowledge over Aanya. Aanya then acted like a recipient of the knowledge that Mrs. Cooper bestowed upon her, making Aanya dependent on Mrs. Cooper for her own learning, thus supporting Chang's (2017) claim that knowledge and smartness are strongly connected to power and status. Aanya often

needed reassurance when she did attempt to answer a question. In lines 117-118, Aanya said “could we...could I say” showing that she relied on Mrs. Cooper for validation of her ability to *know* and possess a correct answer. Her response was only correct if Mrs. Cooper said it was correct.

As previously mentioned, Mrs. Cooper often corrected Aanya’s thinking, even when the response given followed a logical line of reasoning. Another example of this started on line 119 when Aanya offered a discussion question for her assignment. She said, “Who was sick?” Mrs. Cooper then replied with, “What are you wanting to ask? (line 124). Although Mrs. Cooper made it seem like she was soliciting an open response from Aanya, she still guided Aanya’s train of thought to match her expected response. This is evident in line 130, when Mrs. Cooper said, “You could even ask...” Although this seemed like a suggestion, Aanya interpreted it as a definitive and correct response to the question posed by Mrs. Cooper. Therefore, after a more critical analysis, it appeared that Mrs. Cooper used pronouns to give the illusion of power without actually extending it to Aanya.

In fact, the pattern of language used by Mrs. Cooper and Aanya seemed to go like this: 1) Teacher would ask: Do you know...? 2) Student would give a response. 3) Mrs. Cooper then responded with a question before giving the expected response that she had deemed correct. Therefore, Mrs. Cooper was exercising the power in the relationship as the holder of the knowledge and at the same time positioning Aanya as the vessel to store the information.

Figured Worlds

Gee’s (2014) Figured World Tool allowed me to investigate the figured world of the traditional school setting, where question and answer patterns such as the one above are not uncommon (Collett, 2018). Holland et al. (1998) defined figured worlds as “socially produced,

culturally constituted activities where people come to conceptually and materially/procedurally produce (perform) new self-understandings (identities) (pp. 40–41). Therefore, in this figured world, a teacher has the knowledge and they disseminate this knowledge to the students. One can then assume that the teacher will lead the discussion, the student will respond, and the teacher will evaluate the correctness of the response. Urrieta (2007) found that figured worlds are tied to identity work since individuals can recognize the roles of others and attach significance to some of these roles over others. So was the observed behavior between Aanya and Mrs. Cooper even unique within the environment for this figured world, or was each actor just playing out their prescribed role? A role that would certainly lead to an imbalance of power between the teacher and student through acts of positioning that leave the student as less knowledgeable and therefore constructing an identity of rejection.

Bids for Power

The conversation between Aanya and Mrs. Cooper regarding the book *Tracker* continued. At one point in the text, it is revealed that the main character's grandfather has terminal cancer; it was then that Aanya made a bid for power when she shared a connection she wrote down for her homework assignment. In lines 149-151 she stated, "For a connection, I said many people having cancer." Mrs. Cooper then asked her, "You know many people?" to which Aanya replied "yeah" (lines 153-154). Then in the subsequent lines, Mrs. Cooper asked her to name these people (lines 155-157). Aanya then backed down from her initial response and stated "I mean, on TV;" therefore, relinquishing her bid for power by having this negative identity again reinforced (lines 159-160).

This, however, was not Aanya's first bid for power. In lines 117 and 118, Aanya said, "Could we...could I say..." She started by making a connection to working with Mrs. Cooper

using the pronoun *we*, but quickly took ownership of her response and leading with an identity of *knowing* by changing the pronoun to *I*. Although she made this bid for power, a differential still existed since Aanya used *I* to ask permission for a response she was crafting. Hatt (2012) found that students began to connect smartness to these types of acts of positioning and power. Again, these examples show the power and influence that Mrs. Cooper had on Aanya's ability to respond and interact with confidence.

Big C Conversations of Smartness

When examining the larger scale Conversations present in Aanya's excerpt through the use of Gee's (2014) Big C Conversation Tool, it became more apparent that they revolved around ideologies of power. Power flows to ways of knowing, what is important to know, and eventually the overall theme of *smartness*. In Hatt's (2012) study, she found that "smartness was used as a mechanism of control and social positioning" (p. 438); this appeared to be occurring between Aanya and Mrs. Cooper.

Mrs. Cooper's use of language seemed to keep Aanya dependent on her for *knowing* and learning and this appeared to be an ongoing theme, because Aanya asked if they could take turns reading in lines 60-63. This seemed like a familiar request to the both of them, like it was something they had done before. By asking Mrs. Cooper to share in the responsibility, Aanya positioned herself as incapable of completing the task and exercising an identity of uncertainty and doubt. Another example occurred when Mrs. Cooper asked Aanya if she knew what *ruddy* meant (lines 70-74). Aanya shook her head no, so Mrs. Cooper proceeded to give her the correct definition. This happened again when talking about the word *humor*. Mrs. Cooper asked, "What does that mean if you have *humor* in the corner of your eye?" (line 77). Aanya made a failed

attempt to give the correct answer (line 85) and thus Mrs. Cooper proceeded to tell her the meaning, to which Aanya replied “oh yeah” (line 96).

Mrs. Cooper repeatedly told Aanya either explicitly or through redirections that her answers were not good enough; therefore, Aanya relied on others to reach a higher standard of *correctness*. It became apparent in this and other excerpts that Aanya believed that her teachers were the ones with the correct answers and she needed to connect with her teachers in order to have the correct answers for herself. However, this type of behavior was dependent upon the audience. I have documented in other observations that Aanya was subservient to the teacher, but very dominating when interacting with her peers. Hatt (2012) discussed how smartness is tied to academic identities and “this identity can shape our own self perceptions of efficacy, ability, and success in relation to academic potential, performance, and achievement” (p. 439). An identity of smartness is important to Aanya both in the figured world of the traditional school setting and life in general. Therefore, when an identity of smartness is not available to her in the school setting, she is faced with either accepting this position or exercising agency by reinterpreting the definition of smartness (Hatt, 2007). Since Aanya felt a lack of control in her school setting and faced limitations in her ability to act agentially, she often exerted confidence in other settings with her peers (Hatt, 2007).

Conclusion

Overall, the Discourse of power had a heavy presence in this excerpt. The naturally occurring relationship between a student and teacher was not the only relationship accounted for as there were other more abstract relationships that came into play. Starting at the macro, political, level was the relationship between curriculum publishers and school systems. The publishers determine what gets taught. But who determines what is important to

teach? Teachers are sometimes unwilling recipients of a curriculum that undermines what they may believe to be in the best interest of their students. So the often hidden relationship between standards (and those who write them), publishers, and school systems (including teachers) is definitely one that should be noted here. These hidden relationships and curriculums all work to structure the identity *of the teacher*.

The teacher can control how discussion revolves around a novel study. So is this the reason Mrs. Cooper exercised such control over what was right and wrong? Was it because there was so little else in the actual curriculum that she could control? In a school setting, historically, teachers have the power and students are recipients of the knowledge the teacher is dispensing. So the issues here are really who has the ability to decide what is important for students to learn? How do they make these decisions? How does this then trickle down to a classroom teacher? How does the teacher then decide how to present this material? Where and how does power and control from the teacher's perspective come into play? What role do students have in their own learning and evaluating what they know and is important to learn? Further investigation into Aanya's other settings will help to paint a more complete picture of the co/reconstruction of her identity at the hands of the different actors involved in her ongoing narrative of school and life.

Home Observation

To this point, I have told the story of how Aanya both discursively positioned herself and was positioned around an ideology of language loss during her ESL classroom observations. I then outlined a story of power differentials that were present throughout her general education classroom observations. In my final discourse analysis, I will expand the narrative of power to

include not only her classroom teacher, but her family as well. In this section, Aanya undergoes an identity struggle--one laden with claims to validation, verification, and approval.

Contextual Background

This final observation examined for discourse analysis took place in Aanya's family apartment on May 10, 2018. Appendix H contains a full copy of the microtranscript for this analysis, that was the second out of three home observations I conducted with her family. Aanya's mom (M), dad (D), and six-year-old brother (Paarth-P), in addition to myself (S), were present.

During the observation, Aanya worked on a school reading assignment, while her brother completed his Kumon homework (an after school tutoring program). Most of the interaction took place between Aanya and her father as he tried to help her with homework. However, there was a scene where Aanya and her brother argued over Six Flags tickets. Overall, I selected this observation for further analysis due to the rich level of discussion present between Aanya and her family members. Salient data from this particular home observation displayed acts of positioning that fell under the categories of advocacy and self-awareness.

Summary of the Interaction

The home observations did not provide as much rich data for analysis since Aanya was in her natural setting and would often leave the room, moving freely through her space. This led to long pauses in recordings as well as long discussions on general and random topics. School observations (both ESL and classroom) were more academically focused and information dense; therefore, providing a richer environment for coding to take place. Nonetheless, I selected this observation because there was information that supported findings from other data sets. I will discuss connections to the larger, collective data set at the end of the chapter.

This excerpt, which started 16 minutes into the 46-minute observation and concluded at the 20-minute mark, provided an account of positioning both by Aanya and her family for analysis. I identified the beginning boundary as a shift in group discussion. I was talking to the family about plans my family had for summer break, but at 16:25, the conversation shifted to Aanya working on a class reading assignment. This provided a natural break from one topic of discussion to another and therefore is the beginning boundary. I also bounded the end of the excerpt by a shift in discussion from talk of a homework assignment to that of general conversation about violin lessons.

I then broke the excerpt into interactional units. While three distinct sections existed, I labeled them 1a, 2, and 1b. 1a and 1b carried out the same function as they were both Aanya's attempt to complete the last problem on her reading homework assignment. A problem/solution structure was evident in 1a since the participants were either working together (or against each other) to complete a task. Aanya tried to get her assignment completed while Dad was there for support and guidance, but Paarth appeared to come in and out of the scene as a distraction.

In interactional unit two, a complete break from the original problem and any possible solution took place. Aanya engaged Paarth in a discussion about Six Flags tickets. At first, it appeared that Paarth tried interjecting himself to annoy Aanya. However, further analysis suggests that Aanya drew Paarth in as a welcomed distraction. She then called for assistance from the adults when she was *done with the distraction*.

Once the Six Flags discussion came to an end, I marked the start of interactional unit 1b, that I labeled as *da capo*. In music, a *da capo* is a return to the top, which is why I labeled it interactional unit 1b instead of three. Interactional unit two was really just a distraction from the problem/solution structure and in 1b the discourse returned to the same general conversation that

was in 1a. The interactional unit ended when Aanya solved her final problem and the conversation transitioned to something outside of the scope of the original conversation.

Conflicting Identities

This excerpt began with Aanya trying to figure out the answer to her last homework problem. She was sitting on the couch in the living room across from her father who was there to assist her with homework. In class, she had been reading the book *A Cricket in Time Square* and Mrs. Cooper gave her the following question to answer: “What did Chester do to prepare for the party.”

From the onset, I applied Gee’s (2014) Doing and Not Just Saying Tool that led me to examine the acts of self-positioning on Aanya’s part that displayed a conflicted identity in relation to smartness. It appeared that Aanya substituted confidence for insecurity within the same conversation. In line 16, she stated, “I am sure” when describing where the answer to the question was located in the text; however, in the next turn she recanted this statement by saying “but I don’t know” (line 19). She then followed up with, “I don’t get it” (line 22). It is speech acts like these that leave me unsure of the true meaning behind Aanya’s statements.

The listener must infer additional information from the given context. For example, what does Aanya mean when she says “I don’t get it.” What is *it*? Is *it* the question? The format required for the answer? Words in the text itself? Not only is there uncertainty in what Aanya actually said, it then made the listener wonder what she was trying to accomplish by phrasing her discourse in the chosen way. I analyzed additional turns to help identify the *why* behind her language use.

Language Use

The turns above showed that Aanya used language to position herself as *not knowing*. Aanya then uttered speech acts such as “I don’t get it” as well as “Am I correct?” in the first and third interactional units (lines 22 & 82). However, I started to identify clues to their hidden meaning. She often placed emphasis on the word *I* in her dialogue as indicated in the lines noted above (lines 19, 22, 82). This emphasis situated the fault for the lack of understanding on herself and not with the problem.

Interestingly enough, dad also used pronouns in a similar manner. His use of the pronoun *you* when speaking to Aanya made *her* the focus of the speech act. He stated, “Why *you* don’t know?” instead of *what* is uncertain or confusing? Again, both Aanya and her father use language to position the problem with the person and not with the complexity of the task. We see this further in lines 170-172 when Dad said, “*You* write it, I told *you*. It’s up to *you*.” So not only was Aanya responsible for the confusion, but she was responsible for solving the problem as well. Therefore, when Aanya displayed an identity of uncertainty by seeking confirmation or verification of her responses, dad would appear to get frustrated, but continue to position Aanya as the one responsible for *knowing* and *doing*.

Aanya also used language to exercise avoidance. Instead of simple back and forth communication with her father while he was helping her answer the homework question, Aanya used side-conversations to avoid the academic task altogether. Dad repeated the question, “What did Chester do to prepare for the party?” (lines 60-62). To this, Aanya responded, “It’s a really big one, but I don’t know how to sharpen it” (lines 63-65). Parallel conversations presented themselves throughout the excerpt where there was not cohesive dialogue between the two people engaged in the conversation.

Another example was when dad asked the question anew, “What did Chester do to prepare for the party?” (lines 129-130). Once again, Aanya diverted the conversation by stating “There’s a big word daddy” (lines 132-133). Thus, Aanya used language to evade work and her father supported her bids for self-verification as evidenced by her conflicted identity in relation to smartness.

While the first two examples show Aanya using language to avoid work, the most drawn out instance of this spans the entire length of the second interactional unit. At the onset of this portion of the excerpt, dad got a phone call and walked into another room. Instead of working on her homework assignment, Aanya engaged in an argument with her brother about a Six Flags ticket that she had received from a reading program at school. Paarth expressed interest in also going, but only Aanya had received a ticket.

Bids for Power

In order to examine what identities Aanya tried to enact or get others to recognize, I employed Gee’s (2014) Identities Building Tool. Aanya used language to both avoid work, as well as make claims to power. Throughout the entire second interactional unit, she dominated the conversation with her brother and further used language to both make a bid for power and exclude Paarth at the same time. In lines 107-109, she stated, “It’s only one ticket Paarth and it’s for me!” Another exclusionary statement was present in line 105, when she stated, “It’s only for me!”

Paarth made bids for power in his conversation with Aanya, so in response to her attempts at taking control of the power, he used language to undermine something that has put her above him--the Six Flags ticket. He led with the mentality that if he could not go, then his

sister should not be able to go either. An example of his attempt to undermine Aanya came in line 110 when he asked, “Then who will go with you?”

Aanya did not accept Paarth’s bid for power and instead wanted to establish *herself* as the dominant person in the relationship. Until this point, I had observed Aanya being submissive and reliant on others for recognition. However, this is one example where she attempted to build an identity of power. This could be attributed to Aanya not reinterpreting the definition of smartness authored by Mrs. Cooper in the school setting; therefore, she chose to exercise agency in a time and location where she had more control and power (Hatt, 2007). Aanya accomplished this by verbally and physically repudiating Paarth’s bids for power. For example, when Paarth stated that Aanya could not go to Six Flags because “Daddy will be in office,” (line 112) Aanya refuted this by saying, “Well it’s on summer vacation” (line 114). This type of bickering continued when Paarth said, “He will still be in office” (lines 117-118) to which Aanya countered, “He won’t be on the office in weekends” (lines 120-121). Finally, Aanya took the altercation to a physical level after they both said “eh eh uh” to each other. She proceeded to put her hand in Paarth’s face and pushed him away to end the argument, and in her mind, further solidify her claim to power and dominance over him (line 123).

Aanya also exercised an identity of power in interactional unit three. When dad returned to helping her after his phone call ended, he stated, “So she, she wanted to be perfect on that...” (lines 149-151). Aanya immediately corrected her father on the gender of the main character, “It is...it is he” (lines 152-154). In the next turn, Aanya again corrected her father. He stated, “It wanted to be perfect on that particular thing, right?” (lines 158-159). Again, Aanya immediately corrected her father’s use of the word *thing* by saying “evening” with a rising intonation. Through the use of Gee’s (2014) Intonation tool, it appeared that Aanya used rising,

end of phrase intonation to show emotion, as well as confidence. With respect to English, Aanya became the *knower* relative to her father.

Aanya's corrections of her father's speech miscues was another way she tried to build an identity of power. He immediately apologized for his miscue by saying, "Sorry...it...sorry" (lines 155-157). However, it is interesting to note that while dad appeared to have accepted this positioning and Aanya's bid for power, he did not *correct* his miscue to match Aanya's expected response of *she*. Instead, he altered his response to be gender neutral by using *it*. So while at first glance it appeared that he accepted responsibility for the miscue, one of two things might have guided his thoughts. Either, he did not believe that what he had said was wrong, or he did not believe that what Aanya had said was completely right. Either way, this could be why he left his corrected response as the gender neutral *it*. This type of bid for power appeared to reflect Aanya's respect of the social language exercised in the figured world of school by teachers. Aanya exercised her identity of power through a reversal of the teacher/student roles when she corrected her father.

Power Struggle in Figured Worlds

Aanya's observed bids *for* and acts *of* power were associated with the figured world (Holland et al., 1998) of school that I examined using Gee's (2014) Figured Worlds Tool. While her home was outside of the physical realm of the figured world, Aanya still subscribed to school rules while working on her homework, as did her father since he insisted that she do the work and figure it out. This was due to the fact that identities are often influenced by how one perceives their position within given figured worlds (Thorstensson, 2013). Aanya still sought validation, verification, and approval for her work from adults, but did not appear to interpret it with the same level of authority that she did from Mrs. Cooper, because to Aanya, the teacher

was the one who decided what was right or wrong in academic terms. This power by the teacher to impose *rightness* linked the figured world of school to concerns of smartness, which appeared to be important to Aanya. In fact, Chang (2017) discussed how smartness can actually be its own figured world that is culturally and socially constructed through possessing artifacts such as grades and test scores. However, from the observations conducted with Aanya, it seemed that the most important artifact was securing the teacher's expected responses.

Aanya also apparently subscribed to a hierarchy of power that started with adults, flowed to her, and finally her younger brother. Hierarchies of power, rank, and status are not uncommon in figured worlds (Urrieta, 2007). However, even though her father and teacher were both adults, they did not have equal power in her eyes because they were part of two different *worlds*. The relationship with her father was familial and the other was the student/teacher relationship tied to *knowing* and smartness. Aanya valued both types of relationships, but they were separate; and therefore, she treated them in two different ways. During this observation, Aanya displayed an identity laden with power struggles as she negotiated ties between the two types of relationships and figured worlds.

When Aanya felt that she had lost power, she tried to make up for her lack of knowing by showing dominance over individuals in areas that she *could* control. Dad was exercising power over Aanya, in the familial sense, so she sought power over Paarth as evidenced in the argument over the Six Flags ticket. Another example was when dad was arguing with Paarth about completing his Kumon work. Dad told him, "Now complete it!" (line 40). Aanya then inserted herself into the conversation when she said, "I am done with mine" (line 50). This bid for power placed her superior to her brother in the hierarchy. Dad further reinforced Aanya's ranking and

bid for power/status when he replied to Aanya's statement in line 50 with, "Yeah, very good," before turning to Paarth and saying, "See, DD [Aanya] has completed" (lines 51-52).

Summary

In Aanya's final discourse analysis, I identified her consternation as she tried to navigate through both her figured and actual worlds. In the school setting, Mrs. Cooper, the teacher, was the one with the knowledge and power, in addition to holding the ability to judge correctness. Aanya recognized and observed this hierarchy of power in the school setting. However, in her home environment she made bids for power to make up for limited power in the school setting. Overall, Aanya exercised conflicted identities tied to hierarchies of power and smartness.

Macro Level Connections

I identified numerous categories from the data through the use of Gee's (2014) discourse analysis tools. While I did not apply these tools to the transcripts in their entirety, I was still able to draw conclusions that were consistent across other data sources, as well as across the various environments.

Figured Worlds

Separating smartness from power proved to be near impossible, in addition, figured worlds made it an even more significant challenge. This is due to the reality that "smartness is contextual, relational, and rooted in power and privilege" (Thorstensson, 2013, p. 4) and figured worlds are the stages for acts power and smartness to play out on (Hatt, 2012). However, even though smartness, power, and figured worlds appear interlaced, I will attempt to address each individually.

Aanya appeared to internalize a hierarchy of power associated with the figured world of school. In this figured world, Mrs. Cooper and myself were the ones with the knowledge and power to judge correct answers. Therefore, Aanya was acting out her role as student and recipient of knowledge. This became observable with the uncertainty in her responses. Across the classroom, ESL room, and one-on-one groupings, Aanya framed an assertive response; however, she would then follow with the word *right* at the end. This showed that she was still seeking teacher approval and validation of her responses. Also across the environments, Aanya would ask permission to frame her response in a certain way. She would often say, “Could I say...” After Aanya presented her thoughts, Mrs. Cooper would often respond with the expected response that *she* had in mind. Aanya would then work diligently to erase her answer, even if it appeared to be an acceptable alternative response, in order to write verbatim what Mrs. Cooper recommended. In the ESL classroom, Aanya followed my lead in the construction of a narrative of loss, showing that she would accept positioning, even if invalid, from a teacher in the figured world of school.

Smartness

Hatt (2007) postulated that smartness was not biological, but rather a social and culturally constructed ideology. She also stated that “teacher perceptions of ability can be connected to teacher expectations, which directly relate to low achievement among culturally and linguistically diverse students” (Hatt, 2012, p. 440). This supported Sue and Sue’s (2003) findings that emergent bilinguals were more likely to be labeled as less intelligent than their native English speaking peers.

When I asked Aanya in her interview how she believed Mrs. Cooper felt about her languages, she replied that Mrs. Cooper was happy because her English was

improving. Therefore, as a student relatively new to the country, Aanya received the message that acquiring English would please her teacher. This is supported by Thorstensson (2013) who postulated that the American school system is set up so that English is the validating language for smartness.

In whole-group class settings, Aanya was uncertain she could obtain Mrs. Cooper's expected response. Mrs. Cooper's positioning of Aanya as someone who needed extra help in order to apply her knowledge to *tricky* problems was a contributing factor. According to Mrs. Cooper, Aanya's knowledge base was insufficient to achieve the expected response put forth by both herself and the textbook. Therefore, Mrs. Cooper was demonstrating what Chang (2017) referred to as an "implicit theory of intelligence." Mrs. Cooper's theory of intelligence, led to the positioning of students as *knowers* or deficient of knowledge. Mrs. Cooper repeatedly asked those perceived as *knowers* of concepts to demonstrate their understanding and explain the steps to the rest of the class. Aanya was not one of those students. Therefore, she eventually accepted this positioning while re-negotiating her identity around another's authored ideology of smartness, because as Hatt (2012) found, students that are constantly positioned as lacking smartness eventually take on the identity and display it to others.

I also witnessed Aanya's inability to obtain the expected response in small group math lessons in the general education setting. Similar to the whole group lessons, Aanya appeared to lack confidence in her own abilities, because her voice appeared to be silenced by Mrs. Cooper when she could not achieve the expected response. However, obtaining Mrs. Cooper's approval was very important to Aanya and was also tied to her definition of smartness.

In the ESL classroom, where there were four students and myself, Aanya would demonstrate the conflicted identity previously referenced as her both knowing and not

knowing. She would position herself as knowing when she would interject and make attempts at refuting the statements of others. However, she would position herself as not knowing when she would make statements such as “I don’t understand.”

In her home, she would often call to others to help with her homework. She very much wanted to obtain the expected response. Therefore, she solicited the help of adults at home to complete her homework.

Overall, across the settings, smartness was something Aanya interpreted as part of a larger scale guessing game. Mrs. Cooper was the one who could determine the accuracy of her responses; therefore, she was the one whom Aanya sought to impress. Grades also held a high importance to Aanya as another form of capital, so it appeared that the individual with the power was the one whom Aanya also positioned as the holder of smartness.

Power

Power was a theme that cut across all locations and meant different things to different participants. In the whole group general education setting, there were two main bids for power. According to Aanya, it was Mrs. Cooper with the power; however, to Mrs. Cooper, it was the textbook. Aanya looked to Mrs. Cooper for the knowledge, and most times Mrs. Cooper was quick to make corrections to Aanya’s thinking; positioning herself as the one with the power. However, when Mrs. Cooper would make a mistake, she would then try to position herself as equals with the students. She incorrectly taught a concept and when two students refuted her statements, Mrs. Cooper then responded with, “we were wrong.” This use of *we* shows that Mrs. Cooper wanted to maintain her power status in the classroom. If she took full responsibility for the mistake, it may have lessened her claims to power. Aanya never questioned Mrs. Cooper’s bids for power; instead, she displayed a conflicted identity across all environments.

Aanya presented a conflicted identity in small group settings where she would lead with an assertive statement; however, she would then use the word *right* at the end to request validation from Mrs. Cooper. In small group settings, Mrs. Cooper often positioned Aanya as an outsider to knowledge by often ignoring Aanya's raised hand.

There were many instances across the observations where Aanya exerted power and authority over others. As stated above, she often dominated conversations when in small group settings and interjected when her peers were talking. Her voice was prominent in the discussion for both opinion and fact type questions. When she was one-on-one with a peer, she was very assertive and exercised a high degree of agency. Aanya realized she could not be seen as powerful to Mrs. Cooper; therefore, she took an authoritative stance with her peers (Hatt, 2007). In one ESL observation, she and another student were role playing. Aanya positioned herself as the parents, not the kid and as the zoo manager, not the patrons. She spoke with leading questions during the unstructured play and interjected over her partner to demonstrate her authority due to the natural power ingrained in the various roles she selected to play. I also witnessed this type of assertiveness and agency at times during ESL lessons. This could be due to Thorstenson's (2013) claim that the ESL classroom is a space in which students are able to be more assertive and exercise "culturally relevant smartness."

It became apparent when looking across all of the observations that Aanya sought a higher degree of confirmation from adults than her peers. In the school, home, and community settings, Aanya freely asserted herself into conversations and stated how she felt with other students. She also subscribed to a hierarchy of power that started with her teacher, followed by her parents, self, peers, and then her brother.

Language and Nationalism

I grouped language and nationalism together as categories, because this is often how the participants referred to them. In the community setting, the children all played together despite differences in the home languages. In the parent interview, Aanya's father stated this was because they all spoke English to each other, because it was the only common language they all shared. In the ESL classroom, availability and learning of language appeared connected to the country of origin. Ayda stated that her mom wanted her to go to Mexico to learn more Spanish, and Aanya stated that she had lost all of her Telugu since leaving India. Aanya reiterated this loss of language during her interview when she stated, "I only know some of the Telugu words" (Interview, 05/24/18). Therefore, many of the students in the study did not possess a bi- or multilingual identity, instead enacting the monolingual ideology that in the United States one speaks English (Hurie & Degollado, 2017).

Aanya did not readily accept an identity of bilingualism; however, she did talk in her interview about not wanting to lose her Telugu. Both Aanya and her father expressed in their interviews that English was known around the world and according to Aanya "everyone should know English" (Interview, 05/24/18).

Although she did not possess a consistent bilingual identity, she did demonstrate multinational pride for her two countries. There were times though that Aanya appeared conflicted as to whether she could *love* two countries or had to choose one over the other. Her behavior and discourse seemed dependent upon her location and the individuals present. She made comments about the U.S. in the home observation that "life is easier here" and that "it's the place I live, love, and will live forever and ever" (Observation, 05/26/18). She reiterated this in her interview by stating that she would live in the United States and vacation in India (Interview,

05/24/18). However, she also *bragged* during various observations about India, for example, once while reading she boasted, “It’s the only country with 54 languages!” (Observation, 04/05/18). I also find it interesting to note that the way in which Aanya talks about languages positions them as something a country or a person has, rather than as something people use or do.

Even though Aanya *bragged* about the number of languages in India, she positioned English as the valued language. Sue and Sue (2003) found that it was student perception that those lacking English were of a lower status than native speakers. During the community observation, an unknown child noted, “You need ESL when you have grammar issues. I only needed it in kindergarten.” Therefore, this child was positioning Aanya as less because Aanya was in fourth grade and enrolled in the ESL program.

The participants also used language throughout the different observations in different ways. However, it was the use of the native language that was most interesting. In both the home and community environments, Aanya used Telugu as a way to show someone she was angry with them. She would yell at her brother in Telugu signaling that she was upset; however, she would then switch to English so that he would fully understand her complaint. She stated that she used Telugu to be *sweet* and English to be stern (Interview, 05/24/18).

Conclusion

As I have identified through the discourse analyses for Aanya, she both discursively positioned and was positioned around hegemonic ideologies of language. First, in the ESL observations, it became apparent that as the teacher, I was not only soliciting, but also *authoring* Aanya’s discourse of loss. She eventually constructed a narrative around this evolving group identity; however, as noted, Abjit’s attempt at sharing a counter-narrative did not influence

Aanya. Was this because of the power differential in the figured world that Aanya subscribed to?

In the general education setting, Aanya relinquished some of her rights to power in the relationship with her teacher. She presented herself as having an identity of rejection. This rejection came from her teacher's sometimes dismissive behavior as evidenced when Aanya would make an effort to contribute to an academic conversation. Aanya began by wanting to impress her teacher by pursuing the expected response. However, after failed attempts at reaching this goal; Aanya eventually stopped responding.

Aanya did, however, initiate bids for power. I observed this in some capacity in the classroom environment, but it was not until her home observation that she became more assertive and dominant with her discourse. Aanya used language to exercise a hierarchy of power and influence over her brother and father. She respected the relationship that existed in the figured world of school; however, did not like relinquishing her rights to smartness. Aanya believed that Mrs. Cooper was the one with the ability to determine the correctness of a response; therefore, she needed Mrs. Cooper's approval to be deemed as *smart*.

Overall, Aanya was positioned and positioned herself as someone who needed others to be identified as *smart*. The opinions of respected adults in the figured world of school aided in the co/reconstruction of her identity. This identity; however, was based on monolingual ideologies. Aanya's response to the question, "How do you feel about being bilingual" in her interview was *proud* (Interview, 05/24/18). However, this did not support the fact that Aanya seemed unaware that a multilingual identity was available to her as it appeared that language was very black and white in her eyes. She embodied hegemonic language ideologies such as language subordination. As a result, Aanya started replacing her Telugu language with English,

leading to a deficiency of her native tongue--especially when it came to reading and writing. Therefore, Aanya discursively positioned herself around hegemonic ideologies of language, resulting in a relatively monolingual identity.

CHAPTER VI: DISCOURSE ANALYSIS FOR GABRIELLA

Throughout the duration of this paper, I will refer to participant two as Gabriella. At the time of data collection, it was Gabriella's first year as a fourth-grade student in Mrs. Kennedy's class at Manfield Elementary. Both her mother and Mrs. Kennedy reported that she struggled academically and received some failing grades. In fact, Mrs. Kennedy believed that Gabriella may be dyslexic due to the nature of her reading miscues, although no formal testing, to my knowledge, was ever completed to indicate this.

Gabriella was aware of her perceived academic struggles and displayed anxious tendencies such as a lack of eye contact and picking at her fingers when discussing school issues. When asked in her interview if she was smart, she simply stated, "I don't know" (Interview, 4/29/19). In addition, she referenced how "I used to be bad at reading. Now it's the opposite" [bad at math] (Interview, 4/29/19). However, Gabriella made significant language gains in regards to her English acquisition. Her 2017 ACCESS scores in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing were as follows: 2.8, 3.2, 1.9, and 3.4. One year later she exited from the ESL program with a composite score of 4.9.

Gabriella is an only child who lives at home with her mother and father. Her family's linguistic background is rather rich. Her mother is trilingual, speaking fluent English, Mandarin, and Taiwanese. Gabrielle, too, is fluent in Mandarin and English; she understands some Taiwanese, especially during family trips to Taiwan where she is fully immersed in the language. Her father's linguistic story is a bit more complicated. He grew up in a Spanish-speaking household however, his parents wanted the children to be fluent in English so his father forbade the use of Spanish in the home. As a result, he lost his ability to converse in Spanish; however, he can understand some parts of a conversation if the speaker relays the message

slowly. English is the predominant language in the home since it is the only language that all three have in common.

At first encounter, Gabriella is a quiet and shy girl. She often comes across as nervous regarding academic content in her general education setting. She also does not appear to exude pride when discussing her cultural background. Gabriella is very reluctant to say any words in her native language in front of her peers. Also, during the consent meeting, her mom stated that she did not like to speak Mandarin outside of the home. However, in the home, she initiated speech in Mandarin with her mother in order to exclude Dad from the conversation. This type of language use was confirmed by both Mom and Gabriella during their interviews.

Both parents have Ph.Ds. in the health sciences field and have high expectations for Gabriella's academic success. Mom and Dad work together at a local university. Dad works full time and Mom works part-time due to time conflicts related to taking care of Gabriella. Gabriella's parents are concerned about her academics. They reported that she had Ds and Fs after the first quarter of the 2017-2018 school year. Mom then stated that she purchased copies of the school's textbooks and had been doing a lot of repeated practice of the same skill, to help boost her grades.

In this chapter, I examined micro level discourses to learn about the acts of positioning by myself, as the researcher, and those present in transcripts obtained from three different observations: in the ESL classroom, general education classroom, and finally Gabriella's home environment. First, I will provide a brief reflection on my own positioning from a researcher perspective. Then, I will examine these acts in the ESL classroom. Next, I will perform a discourse analysis on a transcript from the general education classroom setting that highlights a conversation between Mrs. Kennedy and Gabriella. The final transcript used for analysis will be

representative of the home environment. Finally, I will make connections back to the larger data set, language ideologies, and other salient themes from chapter four.

Researcher Reflexivity

While researcher reflexivity is important to all sections of a dissertation, I feel it is especially salient at the onset of this chapter to exercise reflexivity in regards to my personal positioning of the participants. As I took a closer look at my study, I reflected on how I inserted my own thoughts, opinions, feelings, and beliefs into the analysis and the possible effects this had on the data. Therefore, I revisited and revised some initial conclusions I had drawn to further remove researcher bias from the claims. One such example is reporting on participants' thoughts and feelings. After conducting close reads and discussing my assertions with critical readers, it became apparent that there were times I made claims that eluded to the thoughts and feelings of the participants without having any data to support these assertions. Therefore, I have removed these claims from the text below. In addition, I also found myself using personal values as judgments against the participants such as traditional teacher/student roles. While researcher bias can never be fully removed from the analysis (Patton, 2002), I have made a clear and conscious effort to explain my positionality in chapter three, as well as my discoveries here, in order to increase transparency by exposing and critiquing some of my own implicit biases. This level of reflexivity is essential given the pervasiveness of dominant Discourses and countering them requires constant work (Patton, 2002).

ESL Classroom Observations

During the ESL classroom observations, Gabriella spoke with varying discourses. She often advocated for herself by asking clarifying questions such as "What do you mean?" She also ensured that others understood her point of view by making clarifying statements such as

“What I am trying to say...” This exhibited that she wanted to be understood and believed that what she had to say held value.

Although Gabriella advocated for herself, her discourse still reflected self-doubt. She often used words and phrases such as “might,” “I guess,” “I think,” and “I wonder.” Another example of uncertainty is the manner in which Gabriella uttered statements with rising end intonation which made her statements sound like questions. She also stated that she did not like to read and would often stay quiet when asked to infer from a text. Gabriella’s class participation rate increased when asked a question that possessed one correct answer; she tended to remain quiet when more elaborate and detailed inferences were involved in the discussion.

Although Gabriella spoke with conflicting discourses, she cared what others, especially her peers, thought of her responses, and she was pleased when students asked her thoughts to which she readily shared her opinions. She often positioned herself as a *knower* and winning was very important to her. In fact, her entire demeanor changed from negative and borderline rude to positive and cheerful when I positioned her as a winner at the end of a game (even though there was no true winner).

A final ESL observation was that Gabriella had conflicted relationships with her peers. She would often speak for other students, especially Alice, for whom she did so twice. Gabriella also put Daran down by saying, “Why is he so slow?” After her second time of commenting negatively about Daran, other students *picked up* this behavior and followed her lead. However, she also made claims for leadership and greeted students by explaining rules to them. Gabriella also tried to direct play by tapping her fingers, indicating she wanted her classmates to speed up and orally stating so to other group members and myself.

However, in this particular excerpt, the focus is on Gabriella's evolving discourse. I will narrate how she first entered discussions with a passive discourse, then took on more responsibility and displayed an increased degree of agency by speaking with an active discourse. Finally, Gabriella emerged with a confident discourse in the group discussions.

Contextual Background

The following microtranscript is from a twenty-eight-minute observation that took place on April 11, 2018. Gabriella was part of a group of four students receiving their daily ESL instruction. Appendix I contains a full copy of the microtranscript for this analysis. In the transcript, I refer to Gabriella as G, Aakash as A, Daran as D, Alice as AI, and myself as S. In this particular lesson, I set the stage to begin reading the book *Encounter* that I discussed in Aanya's ESL discourse analysis. Since the author wrote the book from the Native American's point-of-view and not that of Christopher Columbus, the lesson's focus was to apply the concept of perspective, and more specifically, the ability to see situations differently through the eyes of various individuals.

On the second day of this unit, I gave each student a question such as, "Should students be able to have cellphones in class?" but students were to answer the question through their anticipated perspective of a parent, principal, teacher, and student in addition to who would benefit from the situation. I selected the excerpt because it displayed actions noted throughout the small-group based ESL observations that contrasted behaviors I observed in large group settings. When in a small group setting, Gabriella acted agentically by advocating for herself and actively participating. However, in large group settings, her ability to act agentically was limited and she was often more passive in her discourse and behaviors.

Summary of the Interaction

I chose this four-minute excerpt because it followed my explanation of the perspective assignment to my students and Gabriella began asking clarifying questions. It is the back and forth question/answer turns between Gabriella and myself that represent the majority of this excerpt. When she shifted the topic of discussion to another topic, I bounded the microtranscript. I divided the excerpt into three distinct interactional units. The first laid the foundation for the problem and solution structure, which displayed the back and forth discussion and explanation of the problem between Gabriella and myself. In this interactional unit, Gabriella positioned herself using passive discourse; while she did ask questions, she did not assert her own thoughts.

The second interactional unit went from setting the stage for the problem to possible solutions. I also observed Gabriella's discourse transform from passive to active. She put forth solutions to the given problem instead of positioning herself as an idle bystander.

In the third interactional unit, Gabriella again positioned herself in a different manner. At this point, she shared her opinions, but also demonstrated a dedicated commitment to solving the problem. Gabriella continued shifting her discourse from passive to active, demonstrating increased confidence and assertiveness. She shifted from uttering self-verifying comments to making statements intended to stand on their own and enrich the discussion. Overall, this microtranscript presented a problem and solution structure that displayed Gabriella's shifts in discourse from passive to active. I will now elaborate on her language use that shifted from passive to active to confident.

Passive Discourse

As stated above, the excerpt began with an explanation of the activity the group was to complete. Previously, the students *pretended* to be various school stakeholders and discussed scenarios through different individuals' perspectives. In this second day of the activity, I asked students to reexamine the scenarios to see who might most benefit from the situation.

Throughout the first interactional unit, Gabriella asked questions with a discourse that I labeled as passive through the use of Gee's (2014) Big D Discourse Tool. As I explained the activity, Gabriella interjected with "so...would I just write the, like, teacher here and then explain why?" (lines 12-17). At first glance, it appeared Gabriella simply asked a clarifying question to ensure she understood the assignment. However, upon deeper analysis, I concluded that Gabriella used language to sustain and further build on the teacher/student identity roles that society assigned to her as well as myself (Thorstensson, 2013). By asking if her response was correct, she was further positioning me as the teacher and holder of knowledge that she, the student, was trying to get. Instead, these self-verification questions solidified Gabriella in her role as a traditional student, and me in my role as a traditional teacher. Examining the relationship between role and identity is essential for this study as Harwood (2004) claims, "examining themes of identity in discourse is essential to our understanding of people's self-concepts and relationships" (p. 300).

I noted further evidence of her passive discourse when she answered a question with rising intonation at the end of her response. In line 26, I asked the students, "Who benefits?" to which Gabriella replied, "The teacher." However, it was not just the words that held the meaning in this response; instead, it was the intonation and stress on the end word that painted a slightly different picture. By saying "the teacher↑" with a rising intonation at the end, it was as if

Gabriella answered a question with a question. By using her discourse to phrase her responses as questions, she positioned herself as one who needed verification from the teacher in order to feel confident with her responses.

This type of discourse continued until I detected a small shift in Gabriella's responses. In lines 40-42, she stated, "So then I would write teacher and principal.↑" This response was still verbalized as a statement with rising intonation at the end. However, it appeared to mark a slight change in Gabriella's discourse. It illustrated her increasing acceptance and responsibility for her own responses with less reliance on me, the teacher, to validate her answers. This shift led Gabriella to present herself with an active discourse.

Active Discourse

At the end of the first interactional unit, Gabriella began to take more responsibility for her learning. At the onset of the second interactional unit, Gabriella positively advocated for her learning by stating, "because sometimes I didn't know what that one meant" (lines 48-51). Instead of phrasing a statement as a question and seeking validation, Gabriella took more responsibility for her learning by admitting she did not know what the word *benefit* meant. By seeking clarification, it opened the door for her to move forward, producing an informed response instead of one which questioned validity.

Additionally, Gabriella was not the only student in the group that did not understand the word *benefit*. After a brief discussion of its meaning, Daran looked at his paper and erased a previous response. Perhaps, since other group members responded to Gabriella's move of advocacy with reassurance, she felt it was a valid concern, providing her a sense of accomplishment and an observable boost to her confidence. In the next set of speaking turns, Gabriella stated, "When I write how, I just, just write a sentence↑" (line 60). The first part of her

sentence, “When I write...” showed a change in the way she phrased her statements. Gabriella still phrased her sentences as questions, but it still marked another small shift in her evolving identity of smartness.

Gabriella uttered a similar type of response in line 78 when she stated, “What if I write...” This statement still demonstrated her desire to have her responses validated, but additionally, she was framing her response as a hypothetical response in case I negatively judged it, then it could be easily altered to meet what she believed I would deem as a more expected and appropriate response. Gabriella’s discourse continued increasing in confidence and finally positioned her as a confident participant.

Confident Discourse

Although the nature of her discourse was continuously changing, Gabriella continued positioning herself as uncertain for the remainder of the second and beginning of the third interactional unit. In line 104, she returned with the same type of self-validating statement when she led with, “I would write it will help students.” Gabriella still said it with a rising intonation; however, the tone sounded assertive and more confident.

I did not respond with praise or compliments; instead, I reiterated the expectation of the question previously posed to the students. In response, Gabriella’s discourse became more confident. She stated, “They are going to be helping the students” (lines 113-115). Gabriella uttered this statement in an assertive manner that lacked any intonation that would indicate she was questioning her response or seeking validation of its perceived correctness.

Gabriella’s discourse also demonstrated increased confidence by changing her use of pronouns. In the group discussion, Gabriella started with the use of the pronoun *you*. For example, when asked in lines 120-121, “What happens when you do homework?” Gabriella

responded, “you learn” (line 122), exhibiting that she was not emotionally tied to the response, nor that she was overly confident since she was placing the emphasis of the action on someone completely unrelated to her. By saying *you*, one is also saying *not me*.

However, as already confirmed above, Gabriella’s confidence increased. She evolved from using the pronoun *you* to using the pronoun *we* in her statements. While it would appear a small change, it did indicate an identity shift from one that was solely about other people to one that then became more of a group focus. Gabriella demonstrated this by answering the question “What happens after your teacher gives you a paper?” (lines 139-141) with “we do it” (line 149).

Finally, Gabriella started using the pronoun *I*, a sign of self-focus. In lines 196-197, I asked, “What happens when it gets home? [homework]” Gabriella responded with “I share it with my parents” (lines 198-199). It appeared Gabriella was trying to be independent in her thinking and was trying to work freely through the questions. She was willing to both make and share these personal connections. I believe these subtle changes in pronouns also showed increased agency and responsibility on Gabriella’s part. However, Gabriella flip-flopped throughout the remainder of the third interactional unit between the *we* and *I* identities. She started with a distancing identity of *you* that places the emphasis on someone unrelated to her, followed by a group identity that is encompassed by the pronoun *we*. Finally, a confident, self-focused discourse emerged through the use of the pronoun *I*. She led with this discourse until she was confident enough to stand on her own platform of ideas.

The Other Participant: Further Self-Reflection

The ESL setting was the most challenging to analyze. As a teacher-researcher in the study, it would be easy to overlook the full impact of my actions on the focal student as noted

above. Therefore, I felt it was important to devote a section of the analysis to my own actions in reference to the positioning of Gabriella.

In this excerpt, it was apparent that Gabriella was not the only student who subscribed to the traditional roles prescribed in the figured world of school (Thorstensson, 2013). While she followed the role of the student, I took up the traditional role of the teacher. I positioned students as recipients of knowledge through my use of leading questions that each possessed one expected answer as evidenced by my responses to the students. If student responses did not meet my expected response, I replied with phrases such as “*could be*” and “*ok.*” I would then either guide them towards the expected response or just provide it.

In interactional unit three, there was a long series of turns that went back and forth between Gabriella and myself. I kept probing her to answer with a deeper response. This back and forth went on for almost two and a half minutes. By not accepting the answer she provided, was I positioning Gabriella as knowing or not knowing? On one hand, it appeared that I enacted the social identity of the *good teacher* because that is what a good teacher does--challenge and advocate for students (Caldas, 2017). A good teacher makes sure that a student learns and a student can show they have learned by answering a question. Therefore, until she gave a response that I deemed as *good*, I kept the conversation going. Or, was I going against this ideology? Was I, by going back and forth, trying to position her as someone who possessed the knowledge to answer the question by herself, without a teacher having to give it to her? Either way, I still expected her to give me the *one* answer I had deemed acceptable.

This interaction also points to the insidious ways that dominant ideologies make their way into the discourses of those who consciously denounce them. Would I ever knowingly position a student in a negative way? No. However, through self-analysis and reflection, it

became clear that my role was that of a gatekeeper to smartness. This identification is important to my teaching practices, as it gives me the opportunity to grow as an educator from this experience. In fact, I will offer here what Crumpler, Handsfield, and Dean (2011) referred to as process drama (O'Neill & Lambert, 1982) as an effort to “render visible the construction of meaning and relationships of power and to deconstruct and renegotiate those relationships to realize alternative possibilities” (Crumpler et al., 2011, p. 74). Appendix I contains the full transcript of the back and forth discourse between myself and Gabriella. However, it started with me asking the question, “So who do you think benefits?” [regarding students having homework] (Observation, 4/11/18). Instead of continuing the initiation-response-evaluation (IRE) model of questioning (Mehan, 1979), and insisting Gabriella find the exact response that I had envisioned, I could have valued her response as a learner and knower and had her reflect and expound upon her response to engage in critical thinking.

Summary

In the ESL environment, Gabriella possessed an evolving discourse of smartness. At first, she was self-conscious about her participation and framed her statements with rising end intonations so they appeared to the listener as questions. Gabriella also used pronouns such as *you* to distance herself so that she did not have to take responsibility for the accuracy of her responses. However, as the observation continued, I identified a shift in the way she presented herself. She started taking a more active role in the conversation including using phrases such as “What if I...” to discuss her ideas. While she still sought verification and approval, she stated her ideas with increased confidence. She also started using pronouns such as *we* to form a group identity since she was not ready to move forward independently. However, her discourse

continued to evolve. In the end, she led the discussion with confidence and swapped the group identity for the individual pronoun *I*.

As a researcher, I also exercised reflexivity in order to discuss my positioning of Gabriella during the observation. In the next section, I will examine the *in the moment* discourse and positioning of Gabriella in the general education classroom setting.

General Education Classroom Observations

I conducted numerous classroom observations over the course of the study, witnessing Gabriella in whole group, small group, and one-on-one settings. In whole group lessons, Gabriella was often quiet and reserved. She did not readily volunteer; however, when she did, I observed nervous habits such as tapping a pencil or shuffling through papers. Gabriella often put her head down and avoided eye contact in an effort to prevent being called on.

During observations that exhibited a small group dynamic, Gabriella connected more with the teacher and voluntarily interacted with the other students. She had a visible presence in discussions and exuded a high degree of confidence with her responses.

I selected an excerpt for the classroom microanalysis that highlighted a one-on-one setting. In this type of environment, Gabriella remained relatively silent. She spoke only when asked a question. Even then, her responses were typically one or two-word utterances. This excerpt features a discussion of grammar between Gabriella and her classroom teacher.

Contextual Background

I selected the excerpt for microtranscription because it was multiply coded. It is from an observation that occurred on May 22, 2018. In the transcript, I referred to Gabriella as G and the classroom teacher, Mrs. Kennedy, as S. Appendix J contains a full copy of the microtranscript for this analysis. Mrs. Kennedy pulled Gabriella out of the classroom and into an office to

discuss a book report that she had written for a language arts assignment. In the excerpt, Mrs. Kennedy went line-by-line through Gabriella's assignment in order to offer suggestions for improvement in the area of grammar. Gabriella's agency and personal discourse were heavily limited in the correction process as she followed Mrs. Kennedy's recommendations.

Summary of the Interaction

In this four-minute microtranscript, I identified one interactional unit that followed a problem/solution format, which highlighted Mrs. Kennedy's concerns with Gabriella's grammar in her writing. Gabriella's ability to act agentically was restricted through the correction process and she was positioned as one who needed the teacher to validate the accuracy of her responses.

I marked the beginning boundary as a transition in the discussion by Mrs. Kennedy. She stated, "Ok, you got good sentences there. Now let's see..." (lines 1-5). At this point in the discussion, Mrs. Kennedy signaled to Gabriella that she wanted to shift focus from one aspect of the project to a different topic. The concluding boundary occurred approximately nine minutes into the observation. I determined this boundary because, again, there was a shift in the participants' discussion topic with Mrs. Kennedy signaling that she wanted to change the discussion from Gabriella's connection to her prediction.

Mrs. Kennedy's Use of Pronouns and Leading Questions

Prior to the onset of the excerpt, Mrs. Kennedy and Gabriella worked together to revise an essay she wrote about Ralph from *The Mouse and the Motorcycle*. After a lengthy correction sequence, Mrs. Kennedy paid Gabriella a compliment, stating, "You got some good sentences there" (lines 2-4). Mrs. Kennedy then moved past the first part of the essay to address the final section, stating, "Now let's see if the connection is strong" (lines 5-8). These two turns observed early in the excerpt displayed Mrs. Kennedy placing the person first in her discourse. For

example, in lines two through four shown above she stated, “You got some good sentences there,” instead of saying, “Those sentences are pretty good.” The focus is on the person rather than on the work itself. It also became apparent as the interaction progressed that she used this *person first* focus prior to offering feedback to Gabriella about changes she would like her to make to her writing (Halliday & Mattiessen, 2013).

Mrs. Kennedy also used language to build a connection and invite Gabriella to join her in a collaborative investigation. Her discourse included pronouns like *us* and *we* at the onset of the excerpt to show a connection to helping Gabriella correct her writing. For example, when she said, “Now let’s see if the connection is strong,” she informed Gabriella that she would not independently complete the task. Another example of Mrs. Kennedy using pronouns to establish a connection occurred in lines ten and eleven when she said, “We are talking about Ralph” (Halliday & Mattiessen, 2013). Although Mrs. Kennedy used pronouns to build a relationship, her subsequent correction sequences did not reflect a group thinking dynamic.

Gabriella then began reading her connection aloud to Mrs. Kennedy: “My connection is that when sometimes...” (lines 37-39). At this point, Mrs. Kennedy interjected, “I think this word ‘when’ doesn’t really serve a purpose” (lines 41-43) reflecting another pronoun use by Mrs. Kennedy. She used the pronoun *I* to insert her own personal feelings and thoughts on Gabriella’s writing. Mrs. Kennedy started by building a connection with Gabriella before inserting her own viewpoint. These lines also showed that Mrs. Kennedy used language to make the *sound* of Gabriella’s writing more significant than the overall message.

Gabriella then read her connection without the word *when*: “My connection is that sometimes in my house...” (lines 45-47). Mrs. Kennedy again interjected and asked Gabriella, “How does it sound better?” (line 48). Gabriella replied, “ummm” in line 49. With her

statement, Mrs. Kennedy made the assumption that what she recommended was better than what Gabriella had previously written and that Gabriella agreed. Also, the turn demonstrated Mrs. Kennedy using leading questions to guide Gabriella to the expected response. The use of leading questions occurred numerous times throughout the excerpt in an attempt to get Gabriella to revise something in her writing. Another example was in line 130, “Do you like that?” to which Gabriella told Mrs. Kennedy, “uh huh.” She also said in line 169, “Do you even think you need that?” to which Gabriella again followed the lead of the teacher and answered “no.” Gabriella demonstrated limited agency by speaking with a discourse that positioned her own chosen words as not good enough.

Mrs. Kennedy then stated in lines 62-65, “You got the word *when* that keeps popping up in places I don’t think it’s useful.” Again, Mrs. Kennedy focused on the sound of Gabriella’s writing instead of the actual message. An emerging conversational pattern between Gabriella and Mrs. Kennedy follows: 1) Mrs. Kennedy gave a directive, such as removing a word. 2) Gabriella did it. 3) The teacher asked how it was better. 4) Then Gabriella responded with a short utterance like “ummm” and the teacher shared her feelings about how it was better. This conversational structure curtailed Gabriella’s opportunity to act agentically and take pride in her own writing.

The back and forth correction sequence continued throughout the remainder of the excerpt. Mrs. Kennedy started with group pronouns such as *we* to build a relationship with Gabriella, and then switched to *I* to offer suggestions. However, later in the excerpt, she switched back to the *we* pronoun to reestablish the connection after many turns of corrections. In lines 176-177, Mrs. Kennedy stated, “We call that stating the obvious” when she told Gabriella that she did not need a sentence that she had written. Establishing an identity of connectivity and

helpfulness was important to Mrs. Kennedy as evidenced by her shifting pronoun use. I will now change focus to the analysis of Gabriella's in-the-moment discourses.

Rising End Intonation

Mrs. Kennedy then moved on to discuss the essence of Gabriella's writing piece. She asked, "What's the big idea for you here?" (line 22-23). Gabriella replied, "Trying to run away and not be se:en↑" (lines 29-30). Through reflection utilizing Gee's (2014) Intonation Tool, I recognized that when Mrs. Kennedy asked Gabriella a question throughout the observation, she often responded with rising end intonation that made her statements sound like questions (Tyler, 2014). She repeated this action again in lines 66-67 when she stated, "Don't want to be seen on weeknights.↑" The rising intonation in Gabriella's discourse displayed the uncertainty in her responses.

This uncertainty continued throughout the observation as Mrs. Kennedy closely examined Gabriella's writing, offering numerous suggestions for perceived grammatical errors. Mrs. Kennedy corrected Gabriella's writing to such an extent that Gabriella appeared confused about the actual purpose of the assignment. Mrs. Kennedy also asked leading questions that possessed one right answer; therefore, Gabriella responded with a question-like intonation to avoid committing to her response, allowing her to *save face* and preventing her from being wrong (Goffman, 1967). I observed other instances of rising intonation in line 118, when she stated, "So I won't ↑" and "Just an s ↑" in line 143.

Multiple times Gabriella used rising intonation to indicate an actual question. After Mrs. Kennedy recommended a correction, Gabriella would often say, "Like that?" This type of discourse showed that she was questioning if what she had just corrected had met the expected

response of the teacher (line 120). It also showed that Gabriella was uncertain of the expectation and relied on Mrs. Kennedy to verify the accuracy of her responses.

Unlike what I observed in the home environment, Gabriella was very passive as many of her short responses and rising intonation at the end of statements demonstrated. Mrs. Kennedy positioned Gabriella as being unable to draft sentences that *sounded* good, have opinions that mattered, or use valued stylistic writing choices. Gabriella positioned herself as a quiet and submissive student who agreed with everything the teacher said and she complied with all teacher given directives. Throughout the excerpt, she led with a limited capacity to act agentically and a discourse that lacked confidence. Only one time did she offer an idea, stating, “I could write...” showing the passive nature of the relationship and her reliance on Mrs. Kennedy for the expected response (line 167).

Overall, in order to be recognized as a good student, Gabriella told Mrs. Kennedy what she believed her teacher wanted to hear, this is what Bakhtin (1963/1994) referred to as double-voiced discourse. Double-voiced discourse is where a speaker takes into account an *other's* thoughts and feelings and changes their speech to meet a desired outcome (Bakhtin, 1963/1994). The concept of figured worlds (Holland et al., 1998) played a large role in the level and type of discourse the participants could take up; therefore, I will discuss it in more depth in the next section.

Traditional Student and Teacher Roles

The application of Gee's (2014) Figured World Tool, led to the reflection that the figured world present in Gabriella's excerpt is very similar to Aanya's. The figured world of the traditional student and teacher comes with prescribed roles that society values. For example, teachers have the ability to judge and evaluate student responses, which is the main focus of this

excerpt. Therefore, at the surface level, this excerpt displayed a teacher carrying out her duty to help a student do her best. However, at the micro level, deeper acts of positioning that held profound meaning became apparent.

Mrs. Kennedy felt it was her duty to be the holder of knowledge when it came to grammar, and her role was to uplift Gabriella by increasing her knowledge of Standard American English (SAE) and its use. She expressed in an interview that she finds value, as a teacher, in formal grammar instruction. Therefore, her discourse reflected her perceived role as a teacher being a dispenser of knowledge. Because of the power associated with the role and her discourse, it positioned Gabriella as subservient and Gabriella's discourse became more passive throughout the excerpt (Hatt, 2012). It was Mrs. Kennedy's job to put the knowledge out there, and the student's job to pick it up. To further illustrate Mrs. Kennedy's positioning of herself as a teacher and dispenser of knowledge, she further pushed the idea of Standard American English as a social good.

Standard American English as a Social Good

Standard American English is an interesting social construct, as the ability to determine what is deemed as *good* is out of the hands of most of the individuals that speak the language (Wolfram & Schilling-Estes, 2006). However, according to Wolfram and Schilling-Estes (2006), little to no individuals actually speak formal standard English; furthermore, they found that the very people who often push for it, violate the rules themselves in ordinary conversation. This is true for Mrs. Kennedy, as misuse is evident in her own discourse.

SAE is a social good, due to the fact that only those speakers that have social power have the ability to impose this variety of language onto others (Kövecses, 2000). Kövecses (2000) goes on to further explain how social power is desired by humans; therefore, the language of

those in power becomes sought by others, leading SAE to be a desired social good. By exercising Gee's (2014) Politics Tool, I recognized that Mrs. Kennedy demonstrated the importance of Standard American English as a social good. Therefore, through her ongoing corrective discourse, she demonstrated that she wanted everything in Gabriella's paper to be *just right*. The purpose of the assignment was to make a connection. However, Mrs. Kennedy only evaluated Gabrielle's grammar in the writing, making it appear as though the lesson was really measuring the accurate use of SAE.

It was clear through the consistent level of corrections and use of antiquated grammar books that Mrs. Kennedy believed in a formal grammatical sign system in regards to English. She spent the entire excerpt trying to take Gabriella's writing and make it fit into her valued system. By doing this, she showed that her way of knowing was better than Gabriella's. This built privilege for Mrs. Kennedy's language knowledge and use at the detriment of Gabriella's. Mrs. Kennedy corrective discourse positioned Gabriella as lacking a highly valued social good.

Summary

In the general education setting, Gabriella's discourse was similar to the passive discourse in the ESL setting. She did not offer new thoughts or ideas; instead, she simply uttered phrases such as "uh huh" to answer Mrs. Kennedy's questions. When Gabriella did express longer responses, they often ended with a rising intonation, making them appear question-like. Through this passive self-positioning, Gabriella was able to save face and not subject her oral responses to the same level of correction as her written words.

These series of corrections, initiated by Mrs. Kennedy, led Gabriella towards the teacher's expected response. Formal and proper grammar, or SAE, was a social good that Mrs.

Kennedy valued in the figured world of school. Mrs. Kennedy played the role of the traditional teacher and Gabriella the traditional student, setting the stage for Mrs. Kennedy's ideas to be of higher importance and value than Gabriella's, so it is not surprising that Gabriella acted and spoke with limited agency and instead accepted the positioning that placed Gabriella's grammar in her paper at a higher level of importance than the message itself.

While many acts of positioning occurred in the school environment, a number of those same acts of positioning occurred in the home environment as well, so in the final discourse analysis, I will examine the acts of positioning that took place in the home environment between Gabriella and her family.

Home Observations

As I will discuss below, Gabriella's parents have well-defined parameters in regards to what it means to be smart. Interestingly enough, these parameters have deep ties to language ideologies. Gabriella's parents equate language acquisition to high levels of intelligence. Since they have a perception of Gabriella that portrays her to suffer academically, the parents have changed their language goals for her. In their interview, they stated that they are no longer pursuing Gabriella learning Spanish because they do not feel she can learn academics and language at the same time (Interview, 5/29/18).

Numerous times during the home observations, Gabriella's parents projected their own abilities onto Gabriella. For example, Mom stated, "I got all A's as a student." During such projections, Gabriella usually remained quiet; however, she would advocate for herself if she felt it was something that was not her fault. One example was when she did poorly on a test, and Gabriella explained that it was because she missed the instruction when her parents took her out of school to go to a trip to Washington, D.C.

Her parents also questioned Gabriella's work ethic and effort. Numerous times her parents stated that she did not "try hard enough," showing that they believed "smartness" was a matter of effort, so if they pushed her harder, she would try harder, and if she tried harder, she would become smarter. Both parents made jokes in Gabriella's presence that hinted at her lack of work ethic being the reason for her undesirable academic performance.

Finally, Dad's discourse with Gabriella often involved him refuting something she had said or done and him providing what he perceived to be a more accurate response. At times, Dad pushed Gabriella to say aloud that she did not know what she was talking about which often led to a social-emotional response from Gabriella where she started to exercise agency and advocate for herself, but eventually, Dad ended the conversation having the last word.

Contextual Background

The microtranscript for this analysis was from the third and final observation that took place at Gabriella's home on May 29, 2018. Gabriella, her mom, and dad were present. In the transcript, I referred to Gabriella as G, Mom as M, and Dad as D. Like in the other transcripts, I referred to myself as S. Appendix K contains a full copy of the microtranscript for this analysis.

At the onset of the excerpt, Mom and Dad were in the dining room, and Gabriella was sitting on the couch in the living room. The family had just finished dinner and were talking. Mom asked Gabriella to start reading her book, *Judy Moody*. Since summer vacation had just started, this book would be for pleasure, not part of an assignment. Mom told Gabriella that she would like her to finish the book in five days. Gabriella agreed to read but wanted a calculator to figure out how many pages she needed to read in order to finish the book in the time allotted to her by her mother. This sparked the family discussion that I captured in this excerpt. I chose this specific excerpt due to the rich level of discussion among the focal student and her family,

providing accounts how Gabriella was positioned by both herself and her family. Examples of salient categories were self-verification and the positioning of Gabriella as a non-reader. I will discuss issues of smartness, advocacy, and the positioning of Gabriella as a non-reader.

Summary of the Interaction

In this specific microtranscript, I identified two distinct interactional units. The first started at the onset of the excerpt and detailed a problem/solution narrative structure. The parents outline the perceived problem that Gabriella does not read enough, so they requested that she start reading her book after dinner. Gabriella agreed to read the book but wanted to make sure that she read enough pages each day to finish it by the five-day deadline that her parents had set for her. Gabriella tried to solve the problem by asking for a calculator. However, instead of obtaining one, a discussion occurred amongst the family where Mom and Dad argued that Gabriella did not need to calculate the number of pages with Dad insisting that she just start reading. This struggle over reading continued to build throughout the first interactional unit.

About 45 minutes into the observation, Mom shifted the discussion of Gabriella's reading to a story about Bill Gates. This parallel narrative structure marked the beginning of interactional unit two. Throughout this interactional unit, Mom relayed the story of how Bill Gates read constantly as a child, which led her parents to point out that Gabriella was the opposite of Bill Gates, and they shared a laugh over the comparison. The narrative (and excerpt) concluded with the return of the discussion to the same problem/solution narrative structure present in the first interactional unit. The excerpt ended with Gabriella sitting down to start reading. The microanalysis of this interaction was marked by Gabriella's use of language for self-advocacy, which I will examine in-depth in the following section.

Displays of Self-Advocacy

Gabriella's language use throughout the narrative highlighted her desire to advocate for herself. In fact, in this excerpt, I identified through the use of Gee's (2014) Doing and Not Just Saying Tool that she acted agentially by advocating for her perceived needs from the onset. In chapter four, I defined advocacy as when either the self or an *other* voices the needs of the learner to ensure the necessary resources are available to be successful in the academic setting (Caldas, 2017). The excerpt began with Mom telling Gabriella to go and read her *Judy Moody* book. Gabriella immediately responded, "I have to use the calculator...because you said that how many pages divided by days" (lines 4-6, 8-11). The use of the word *have* made the division seem like a *need*, instead of just a *want*. She again used the word *have* to express the same need in line 25, "I have to do math." In these instances, Gabriella tried to express to her mother that the reason she was doing the math was due to the time limit her mother gave her to finish the book. If Mom had not imposed this time limit, Gabriella would have just started reading the book. Instead, she was trying to solve the problem on her own, but her parents quickly rejected her assertive discourse by positioning her as someone who avoids work.

Mom accepted that Gabriella wanted to do the math, but she wanted her to do it by hand instead of with a calculator. However, it was Dad that first tried to obstruct her bid for agency when he stated, "That's your reading, what are you talking about digits for?" (lines 23-24). Mom interjected and advocated for Gabriella by stating, "She want to divide so she knows how many pages she read a day" (lines 26-30). Dad then commanded Gabriella to "just read" (line 31). Dad reiterated this phrase multiple times. Each time the intonation told more of a story of authority and power on his part. The first time Dad said "just read," he said it with a lowered intonation.

At this point, Gabriella used Mandarin to call upon the relationship and bond that is unique between her and her mother. She asked her Mom, “Can I...” before switching over to an unknown speech act in Mandarin (line 36). Mom also responded in Mandarin in line 37. It is unknown what request she made of her mother, but it is significant to note that she thought it was important to exclude Dad from the conversation by use of a language that he did not know. Understanding what Gabriella and her mother discussed would provide more context as to whether Mom was supporting Gabriella or deciding to side with Dad. It was almost as if Gabriella used the language to make one final appeal to her Mom.

Dad then used the phrase “trying to give her a limit” to show that Mom was stifling Gabriella’s ability to “just read” by placing a limit on how many pages she could read at a given time (line 38). Gabriella twice stated that carrying out her plan would make things “easier” (lines 53 & 71). This highlighted the level of significance and importance Gabriella put on carrying out this task.

The first time that Dad said “just read,” he said so with a flat affect. However, the next time he said it in lines 41 and 42, he said to Mom, “I just want her to read” with an increasing intonation. This rising intonation could point to a growing frustration or a bid for power that indicated he wanted to be obeyed.

Gabriella discursively positioned herself as assertive. The ability to be heard and understood is a form of social capital (Bourdieu, 1986), but probing even deeper, what Goffman (1967) referred to as *a face need* was at stake for Gabriella. Goffman (1967) referenced the need for individuals to maintain face in order to sustain the identity created for others to experience. A face need is at stake, or a face threat is said to occur when “how we think we should be treated does not match with the reality of how the other person is actually treating us”

(Ting-Toomey, 2005, p. 73). Therefore, in defense of her request, Gabriella stated, “You just said I have to finish this book in five days” (lines 45-49). However, Dad still did not appear to respect her agentive actions or assertive discourse.

In line 65, Dad again stated, “just read.” However, this time it was said in a whisper. Dad changed his intonation to exercise power and control over Gabriella while trying to make a point in the three-way conversation between Gabriella, Mom, and himself. At this point, Mom accepted Dad’s bid for power and started using language to shift support to him. She reiterated his repeated phrase “just read” in line 66. Mom’s acknowledgment of Dad’s power bid pleased him and he again reiterated, “Just sit down and read” (line 67) with regular intonation; however, he placed a strong emphasis on the word *read*.

Positive face is threatened by criticism from another (Goffman, 1967); therefore, Gabriella continued using language to advocate for herself which she accomplished by countering Dad’s bid for immediate reading and positioning herself as someone who knew how to take control of her own learning. She said in lines 68-74, “I still have to finish this book in five days, so it’s easier if I calculate, so then I know how many pages.” Gabriella said this turn loudly and with great confidence, positioning herself as one who can take responsibility for her own learning.

Dad again returned to saying “just read” as a whisper in line 77. Gabriella tried to reach a compromise when she asked, “Can I just stop at this chapter?” However, Dad did not accept this compromise and again said, “Sit down over there and read” with rising end intonation in line 98.

His final statement on the issue, in line 147, “You are still not reading” had a lowering end intonation, which said he was done with the discussion. Repeatedly, Dad refused to take Gabriella’s viewpoint into consideration and denied her the face need to be heard and accepted.

It appeared to Dad that Gabriella should *just read* because it would be the most efficient way to complete the task of reading the book. However, with this assumption, he inferred that Gabriella understood and subscribed to time efficiency. Instead, Gabriella's attempt to manage her long term goal of reading a book in five days by breaking down a large amount of text into smaller, more manageable pieces revealed a glimpse of her self-image concerning reading and a focus on meaning-making, rather than efficiency of task completion. However, her tenacity in trying to explain her rationale to her parents despite their positions of power shows that she, too, was able to use discourse to advocate for herself. Dad, however, did not want any time to be wasted and persistently encouraged the immediate reading of the text. Her parents further thrust literacy into the spotlight by portraying it as a necessary social need for success which I will further analyze in the following section.

Literacy as a Social Need and Dad’s Power

Gabriella, as an only child, is used to speaking to intelligent, academic adults, so she is confident being assertive and inserting her opinion into conversations; however, like Aanya, she faced a limited capacity to act agentically and appeared to accept the positioning by the teacher as not knowing as was witnessed in the second interactional unit.

While being heard and understood could be considered a face need, another social good at play in this argument was being recognized as a literate, *good* reader which Society recognizes as an asset (Anderson, 2009). Gabriella’s parents likely subscribed to such a belief which

explains why they were so adamant about her reading, even though it was not for a school assignment.

Her parents also showed their fondness for literacy when, in the second interactional unit, Mom told a parallel story about Bill Gates. She assumed Gabriella would know who this man was and why he was famous. Mom used the phrase, “You don’t know?” in line 102 after Gabriella did not respond to her question, “Do you know who Bill Gates?” in line 100. Gabriella clearly did not know, so Mom told the story about how he was a voracious reader who would read all the time, so much so that he would get in trouble with his parents.

Mom used the story of Bill Gates being a good reader to position Gabriella as the opposite of him. Did Bill Gates actually hold importance in the story or rather, was it just that he was a voracious reader that was important? Could any other great reader have replaced him? I think Mom made the connection that *good* readers become successful so Gabriella needed to be a *good* reader, too; however, the story turned into one big joke about Gabriella and positioned her as a non-reader. Mom stated, “He’s very rich and very famous and he got in trouble when he was young. He likes to read when they are eating. He’s still reading. His parents get mad at him” (lines 114-121). To this statement, Dad replied, “We don’t have that problem...we have the other problem” (lines 122-123; 126-127). This negative positioning upset Gabriella, so in an effort to save face, she offered the reason for her perceived inadequacies when she said, “Because I don’t like to read” (lines 124-125).

That statement, “I don’t like to read,” raised many questions. Did Gabriella really not like to read or was she upset that her parents were positioning her as someone who was the

opposite of the rich and famous Bill Gates? Others have to recognize an identity in order for it to possess meaning (Fincher, 2011), so by making this statement, her parents limited the options for a reading identity available to her. In addition, this positioning pointed to either them equating non-readers with being unsuccessful and not valuable to society or they were telling her that she was unsuccessful and not valuable. Either way, this upset Gabriella as evidenced by her aggressive discourse and sullen body language, and she led with the statement about not liking to read. There is more power and agency in positioning yourself than there is in accepting a negative position.

Summary

In the first interactional unit, Dad led with a discourse of authority. He superseded Gabriella's bids for power and influenced her to "just read." Mom accepted Dad's bid for power by abandoning her original support for Gabriella. I observed this when she echoed her husband's statement of "just read."

In the second interactional unit, Gabriella's parents referenced her from a deficit perspective by telling a narrative of flawed performance. The parents' discourse positioned Gabriella as unable to meet their expectations. Gabriella accepted her parents' positioning for not meeting their expectations.

Macro Level Connections

For this final section of this paper, I will connect the micro level analyses to macro-level data. I will begin by reviewing the claims made regarding the theme of smartness throughout the microanalysis and then connect it to the larger data set. Afterward, I will revisit the Discourses discussed in chapter four and how they both produced and reinforced the discourses seen in the microanalyses.

Smartness

In the ESL excerpt utilized for microanalysis, Gabriella positioned herself as one with an evolving discourse related to smartness. She began with a passive discourse which I observed throughout the remaining ESL observations in addition to the whole group classroom space as well. In the one-on-one classroom setting, Gabriella spoke with a limited discourse related to the power of knowing and understanding as she remained silent unless summoned to speak, and when she did speak, she asked permission to write something or she made short utterances to verify a statement made by the teacher. Clearly, Gabriella accepted the teacher's positioning in this student grouping.

In the general education setting, Gabriella proceeded with limited agency and confidence in her work; instead, she accepted that Mrs. Kennedy was the teacher and thus possessed the correct answers. She was positioned as less, and the teacher as more. In addition, Mrs. Kennedy positioned some students as smarter than *others*. For example, when seeking volunteers, she stated, "I need a strong reader for this" before choosing a student. Not only did this position students, it called upon them to position themselves while also sending the message that only *good* readers should volunteer to read. Students had to place themselves in *one* category, therefore limiting the number of students who were even *eligible* to participate.

In the whole group setting, Gabriella never volunteered to read. She stated numerous times in numerous settings that she did not like to read and would often stay quiet when asked to infer from a text. Additionally, she rarely volunteered to answer questions unless it was an opinion or something that asked for a recall of a personal connection. I observed her putting her head down and avoiding eye contact in order to prevent participation.

The second type of discourse related to smartness that Gabriella spoke with was one that positioned her as an active participant. Across the settings, Gabriella became more involved when the teacher solicited one correct response. However, she made attempts at this level to discuss inferences. She tended to *back off* when more elaborate and detailed inferences were involved in the discussion.

When she did volunteer, there was often uncertainty in her responses. She often used words like “might,” “I guess,” “I think,” and “I wonder.” When speaking in both the ESL and classroom settings, her utterances had a rising end intonation, making them appear as questions.

In the home setting, Gabriella spoke with both a passive and confident discourse. Her parents attributed smartness to high performance in math and reading which supports Hatt’s (2012) findings that individuals enact an ideology of smartness and connect it to schooling practices. Gabriella’s mom asked if there were any summer camps for her to attend, so I recommended a local university as I was aware that it offered some classes for children. However, mom stated that Gabriella’s not gifted because she does not do well in math and reading so she probably could not attend. Gabriella then chimed in that she earned an A in social studies even though she did not like it. Mom replied, “that’s because it’s easy.” In other words, smartness appeared to be quantifiable to her parents (Hatt, 2012). I observed similar messaging when her parents stated that Gabriella did well on standardized tests, but that “anyone can do well on them if they are a good guesser.” Not only did they think Gabriella was a good guesser, but they also thought she could do a better job in school academically if she just “tried harder.” This push to “try harder” is indicative of Duckworth’s (2016) term “grit” which is often viewed as a needed ingredient for personal success, however, this view is also tied to forms of

meritocracy that hold back groups of people based on their perceived abilities (Daniels, 1978). Smartness was also a product of effort to her parents (Hatt, 2012). Gabriella was willing to accept some positioning by her parents as “lazy;” however, at times she disagreed and refuted their statements.

The final type of identity presented relative to smartness was one that exuded confidence. In many of the settings and during a majority of the observations, Gabriella did act with a degree of agency. She would ask clarifying questions and made clarifying statements such as “What do you mean?” and “What I am trying to say...” that showed she sought understanding and believed her discourse held value. Although she advocated for herself, she gave power to adults when she made statements like “kids will learn their lesson.” She also subscribed to the traditional roles of adults in her life and did not make attempts, especially with Mrs. Kennedy, to interrupt the status quo.

Gabriella did care about what others thought of her responses, especially when it came to her peers. She would often raise her hand to volunteer when her teacher’s back was turned but then lower it when the teacher turned to face her. In addition, she was only passively engaged in the lesson or activity but would then raise her hand when Mrs. Kennedy asked who got the problems they were discussing correct. The *appearance* of smartness was important to Gabriella.

As noted in the ESL introduction, Gabriella also spoke for other students who she perceived were not able to successfully communicate their message. She would take on *my* role as a teacher when she sensed a lull in the conversation which she accomplished by initiating a conversation with students, pushing a game along, or telling another student what to do. In a small group setting, Gabriella did not hesitate to volunteer. Her voice had a heavy

presence. She asked questions, responded to others, interjected, refuted, added her opinions, and offered inferences. Even when someone would interject, she would take back the conversation by finishing her statement when he/she stopped talking. In fact, by the end of one observation, students were turning to *her* for opinions and to validate her ideas. Gabriella's presence in a small group setting was similar to that in the ESL observations. In fact, her participation level was so high that Mrs. Kennedy started interjecting so that others could respond.

Language Ideologies

Throughout my observations and interviews, I witnessed the enactment of a large number of language ideologies. Unfortunately, the majority of the ideologies on display were those that support hegemonic practices. Shannon (2010) described language hegemony as “a form of dominance of one language over another” (p. 172). I was not surprised to observe hegemonic practices in a school system since according to Macedo et al. (2003), “Schools are not simply static institutions that mirror the social order or reproduce the dominant ideology. They are active agents in the very construction of the social order and the dominant ideology” (p.40). Since language ideologies are observable in social practices, I wanted to observe the participants in a variety of settings (Kroskrity, 2010) in order to capture the influence of the Discourses on the micro level, everyday discourses.

Gabriella's parents stated during their interview that they believed other students held discriminatory beliefs towards her because she was bilingual. However, the influence of difference depended upon where in the world she was. In Taiwan, Gabriella felt that being bilingual made her stand out and people thought of her bilingualism as an asset, so she stood out in a *positive* way. Her mom stated, “People there make her feel the same. They make her feel like you know the different language? You are the super kid!” In the United States, her parents

reported that she felt discriminated against because being bilingual set her apart from the rest of the students in a *negative* way. Her parents reported that people laughed at Gabriella and thought that her English was not good enough.

Gabriella's negative self-perception regarding her English relates to her lackluster participation in whole classroom discussions. According to Blommaert (1999), anytime two people are talking and the languages are different, one is seen as inferior to the other. Gabriella reported in her interview that she believed Mrs. Kennedy would rate her English as "medium." When asked to elaborate she stated, "Because sometimes it's hard for me to pronounce words. Because in Taiwan we don't really pronounce the S or like the R I think." As a result, Gabriella stopped participating in class because she feels that her English is not good enough, or at least she believed her teacher does not feel her English is adequate.

I asked Gabriella about her use of both languages. She stated, "Sometimes I speak English and Chinese in a mix. So like I will speak English for like a sentence and then Chinese." Such type of language use is what Reaser, Adger, Wolfram, and Christian (2017) described as code meshing. Code meshing is the "shifting and negotiated language choices that characterize successful communication in which a person's identity fluctuates" (Reaser et al., 2017 p. 153). Martínez (2013) found that students in his study who code meshed viewed the process through a deficit lens due to dominant language ideologies that portrayed it as a sign of linguistic deficiency. Gabriella does not feel comfortable using her native language in school and Mrs. Kennedy reported that she would not be comfortable with Gabriella using it in conversation at school either. Gabriella's discourse also depicted an ideology of subtractive assimilation in the classroom setting; therefore, Gabriella received the message that "she must assimilate, or fall silent" (Lippi-Green, 2012, p. 68).

Shannon (2010) stated that teachers often supported a monolingual agenda because there were few policies to guide them towards anything else. Handsfield and Crumpler (2013) and Razfar (2012) also examined teachers' beliefs regarding bilingual education and their studies produced similar findings which explain that many teachers still execute a monolingual ideology of English. Mrs. Kennedy in her interview stated that she does not differentiate instruction for her emergent bilinguals because she believed that "most of them are already fairly accomplished in English." The lack of differentiation could have led to the breakdown in communication between teacher and student. Perhaps Mrs. Kennedy did not make the input comprehensible to Gabriella and the end result was a final product that necessitated a large number of corrections. However, according to Lippi-Green (2012), individuals that subscribe to English only mentalities often place the burden of conversation and understanding on the other person which Reaser et al. (2017) referred to as linguistic profiling. Mrs. Kennedy linguistically profiled Gabriella because her language sounded like that of a native speaker, so she believed that Gabriella should be doing just as well academically as the other students. If she was not, then there must be another reason. Mrs. Kennedy stated that she believed that Gabriella's low academic performance was due to ADD tendencies or a possible disability such as dyslexia. According to Lippi-Green (2012), "Language is the last back door to discrimination and it's wide open" (p. 74). Gabriella faced discriminatory practices when her teacher made assumptions based on language alone.

When examining the teacher corrections, it was clear Mrs. Kennedy held Standard American English (SAE) in high regard and she was reproducing the dominant culture through her power as a teacher (Macedo et al., 2003) so the focus of the corrections was to increase Gabriella's ability to write with SAE. Lippi-Green (2012) found that "People are judged on the basis of language form rather than language content" (p. 333), and this appeared to be the case

with Gabriella. The quality of her message went undiscussed while Mrs. Kennedy revised the language to SAE perfection. The high level of push for SAE is a form of eradication (Lippi-Green, 2012) so Gabriella may see this as a threat to her already dwindling hold on her native language and could also be another reason she remained quiet throughout the correction process.

In the home, her parents have a very rich language background and deep-rooted opinions regarding ideologies. According to dad, there was a lot of Spanglish growing up (Blommaert, 1999) but he also stated that the whole culture of the neighborhood was to assimilate. Blommaert (1999) stated that “English is the mark of Americanness” (p. 20), which helped to understand the assimilation that dad experienced as a first-generation American. Dad grew up with the belief that “if you want to do better, you should uh, learn, learn English” (Interview, 05/29/18). Mom also stated that growing up in Taiwan, “In my culture, it is a little bit like everything from the foreign country is better.” Throughout time, society has built up English to be a language of power (Razfar, 2012) so Gabriella’s parents believed that it was important for her to learn English in addition to Chinese. However, they also partly attribute Gabriella’s academic issues to bilingualism, and they shifted their focus to academics at the expense of language goals.

In the ESL classroom, Gabriella felt more comfortable to utilize her native language to express herself and also lead with an identity of bilingualism. Perhaps it was the small group setting since she also exhibited these tendencies in the general education classroom when there were small groups. Thorstenson (2013) found that “The ESL classroom was a space in which students asserted and embodied what I call culturally relevant smartness” (p. 12). In the ESL

setting, Gabriella was amongst peers who also shared the trait of bilingualism so there was no perception of difference.

Conclusion

Gabriella exhibited different discourses in different environments. In the ESL classroom, there were times when she spoke with a passive discourse. In these instances, she positioned herself as a student unsure of her ability to obtain the expected response. As a teacher, I tried to provide an environment that helped Gabriella feel more comfortable with her bilingualism; however, I also positioned her as a student who needed to procure the expected response. The traditional teacher roles surrounding the figured world of school were present in their discourse. This was observed in the way that the teachers positioned themselves as having the knowledge and the student as the mere recipient of that knowledge.

However, Gabriella's discourse was evolving throughout the analyzed observation. She began participating in different ways and became more active in the group discussion. She still sought validation of her responses from me, but she also received validation from the students. This validation appeared to have boosted her confidence until finally, she presented herself with a confident discourse.

As a confident student, Gabriella spoke with an assertive tone and fewer statements with rising end intonation. She also went through a series of pronoun use changes. She started with using the word *you*, then *we*, and finally made personal stances with the pronoun *I*.

In the general education classroom setting, Mrs. Kennedy used pronouns to bond with Gabriella and let her know that she would not be alone in the correction process. However, the degree of correction positioned Gabriella as one who did not possess the social good of Standard

American English. Through this positioning, Mrs. Kennedy sent the message that Gabriella's grammar use was more important than the message conveyed through her written words.

Gabriella resumed speaking with a passive discourse and did not offer her own ideas in the one-on-one discussion with Mrs. Kennedy; I identified this identity shift due to the rising end intonation Gabriella used demonstrating the uncertainty in her responses.

Finally, in the home environment, Gabriella enacted agency and advocated for herself in conversations with her Mom and Dad. However, Dad possessed the power in the home and would quickly reject Gabriella's bids. At first mom supported Gabriella; however, she eventually changed to promoting Dad's message. Eventually, the two shared discourse that positioned Gabriella as a non-reader. Gabriella reluctantly accepted this position and self-identified as hating reading.

In the final chapter of this dissertation, I will summarize the findings and connect them to the research questions. In addition, I will also discuss the implications for practice as well as the limitations of the study. I will conclude with recommendations for future research in the areas of positioning and identity work with the emergent bilingual student.

CHAPTER VII: DISCUSSION

The purpose of my study was to investigate the intersection of identity and positioning for emergent bilinguals while including the larger concept and role that language ideologies play in these acts. With emergent bilinguals being the largest growing population in the American school system, more specifically rising to over ten percent of the student population in Illinois (Snyder et al., 2016), I found it imperative to examine how such students position themselves and are likewise positioned by others as influenced by macro-level language ideologies--beliefs that fuel the hegemonic practices seen in schools today (Lippi-Green, 2012).

Guided by positioning (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999) and critical sociocultural (Lewis et al., 2007) theories, I looked at how intermediate-aged, emergent bilingual students (re)negotiated their cultural and linguistic identities based on the discursive positioning that occurred within various settings; specifically, I wondered how emergent bilingual students, their families, and ESL/general education teachers discursively positioned one another. Likewise, I aimed to understand how the emergent bilingual, in connection with others, co-constructed their linguistic identities. I was particularly interested in the specific language ideologies the participants articulated and embodied in their discourse across different settings. There is still little research that examines the discursive positioning of intermediate emergent bilinguals across the home, school, and community settings while underpinning the language ideologies that influence these acts of positioning.

To answer my research questions, I conducted a study during the Spring and Summer of 2018, utilizing qualitative methods such as observation and interview to collect the necessary data for analysis using a two-cycle coding process. Next, I carried out small story analysis applying Gee's (2014) discourse analysis tools that, most importantly, allowed me to connect the

macro concepts that emerged during the coding process to the micro level acts of discursive positioning.

Throughout the study, participants enacted two hegemonic language ideologies through their discourse: language subordination and English as a superior language. This finding was important because I learned that across all three main settings, participants performed hegemonic ideologies at the micro level thereby reproducing and reinforcing them at the macro level. However, as I further analyzed the data, I discovered that the participants enacted a counter-hegemonic language ideology of language maintenance, leading to not only the maintenance but cultivation of the participants' native language.

On a more micro level, I came to understand that I, as a teacher, was authoring a discourse of loss for Aanya, an important understanding because it allowed me to reflect on ways that I am positioning my students on a daily basis and the influence this may have on their linguistic identities. Some other major discourses found in Aanya's analysis included rejection, dominance, and smartness. As I went through Gabriella's discourse analysis, I discovered that her discourse was different across the three main environments; in fact, her confidence in her own responses evolved. Often, what I found for both participants was that they presented a discourse of confidence and were more assertive in small group settings as opposed to the more restrictive discourse in whole group and one-on-one teacher settings. A more in-depth discussion of my analyses based on the research questions will be presented below.

After explicating the research questions and summarizing the main findings, I will then situate those findings into the larger body of research regarding emergent bilinguals and positioning. Next, I will discuss the limitations of the study as well as the implications of the results for theory and practice. I will then discuss recommendations for future research related to

the current study and conclude with my reflections of what I learned about the positioning of emergent bilinguals and the implications of these acts on their linguistic/cultural identity.

Summary of the Findings

The following research questions guided the data collection and analysis for my study with the goal of achieving a better understanding of positioning and identity work with intermediate-aged emergent bilinguals:

1. What ideologies do students, teachers, and parents articulate and embody within the school, home, and community settings?
2. How do emergent bilingual students, their families, and ESL/general education teachers discursively position one another and co-construct their linguistic identities in relation to these ideologies?

In order to answer these questions, I collected data over the course of the spring and summer semesters of 2018 in the ESL, general education, home, and community environments with two focal fourth-grade emergent bilingual participants. I then analyzed the data in the fall 2018 semester. A brief summary of the findings that were explained in detail in chapters four through six in relation to the research questions follows.

Research Question 1

My primary research question was “What ideologies do students, teachers, and parents articulate and embody within the school, home, and community settings?” Two key findings emerged from the data and were thoroughly elucidated in chapter four: the enactment of ideologies of language and smartness in the participants’ discourse.

Language Ideologies. In reference to ideologies of language, I identified two prevalent themes, including the hegemonic ideologies of language subordination and English as a superior

language. As previously illustrated through my analysis of the participants' discursive acts, both hegemonic ideologies fueled the cycle of deficit thinking between participants across the various settings.

In particular, participants embodied hegemonic ideologies as displayed by discourses of loss and hierarchy. Each focal student participant shared a narrative of loss. Moreover, their narratives were co-constructed in the sense that each story contained the influence from the positioning of an *other* in relation to the hegemonic language ideology. I, myself, came to understand the ways in which I positioned the focal participants around this discourse of loss and inadvertently co-authored Aanya's narrative of loss. Likewise, power relations circulating from the macro to micro levels as documented in Aanya's dad's conversation regarding current political policies and past effects of British colonization on his native language influenced and co-constructed his narrative of loss. Similarly, Gabriella's father also shared a narrative of loss initiated by his own father who led him to believe that better economic opportunities emerge if he rid himself of Spanish and became a fluent English speaker.

For both focal student participants, their general education classroom teachers unknowingly reproduced the dominant language ideologies, perpetuating the cycle of loss of the participants' native languages. Gabriella expressed that she did not enjoy speaking her native language unless it involved an exchange with another native speaker due to the perceived discrimination that she faced. Through these hegemonic practices, she began to identify English as the language for instruction and learning, and Mandarin as a language for home. Likewise, Aanya believed English should be the dominant language spoken everywhere, leading to the slow erasure of her native language.

These findings on hegemonic language ideologies present in the school setting support and extend other research on the influence of hegemonic practices in the U.S. school system where the message sent to emergent bilingual students is that English equals success so their native heritage, language, and knowledge are not legitimate, leading them to renegotiate their linguistic and cultural identity (Flores et al., 2015; Ghiso & Low, 2013; Kim & Viesca, 2016; Turkan & Iddings, 2012; Yoon, 2015). I extended this line of research by analyzing discourse across multiple settings to include environments other than school. My findings support that hegemonic discourses were present in the home setting in addition to the school setting. Also, the aforementioned studies only investigated the influence of the ideologies from the outside in, meaning, that they focused on the positioning of the dominant ideologies on emergent bilinguals. My findings revealed that emergent bilinguals were also positioning themselves in ways that both reinforced and negated the dominant beliefs found in the U.S. school system.

Furthermore, as my analysis has also shown, participants resisted these dominant ideologies in favor of counter-hegemonic ideologies by utilizing discourse that challenged a culture symbolic of monolingualism as demonstrated through using bilingual discourses that promoted language maintenance. For instance, Aanya and Gabriella described a translanguaging identity (Man Chu Lau, 2019); Aanya used both languages to make her message clearer, and likewise, Gabriella referenced the back and forth switching of languages for no reason other than it just sounded and felt right.

While the focal participants led with conflicting discourses of language, discourse in the school setting most predominantly depicted a monolingual ideology as referenced by Blommaert (1999). Both focal teachers made connections to counter-hegemonic discourses; however, as my observation data and analysis showed, the hegemonic ideologies ultimately prevailed.

My findings further support and extend Bloome et al. (2010) and Martínez (2013) who reported on how marked or non-dominant discourses such as *Spanglish* led to the negative positioning of students in the general education setting such as the way that the focal teachers positioned Gabriella and Aanya as not capable of obtaining the teachers' expected response. However, my study also supported Achugar (2008) that examined how students contested dominant language ideologies while at the same time countering Shibata' (2004) claims that parents of bilinguals often do not push for maintenance of the native language because they believe it will slow down English acquisition. For instance, Gabriella's family frequently takes her to Taiwan in order to maintain and enrich her cultural heritage and native language. Likewise, Aanya's mother decided to begin lessons in her native language so that Aanya could continue to deepen her bond with her Telugu speaking relatives in India.

While my research supports a number of studies regarding emergent bilinguals, it also adds to the literature in the use of both macro and micro discourse analysis. A limited number of studies have been conducted focusing on microanalysis of discourses of emergent bilinguals in the school setting relating to positioning and linguistic identity (Andrews, 2010; Collett, 2018; Nuñez & Palmer, 2017). I was unable to uncover any studies that included micro level discourse analysis of emergent bilinguals across multiple settings; therefore, my study fills a gap that exists in the literature regarding the intersection of language ideologies, emergent bilinguals, positioning, and Discourses. This is valuable, because it showcased how individuals put forward a different dimension of identity based upon the individuals present as well as the location of the interaction.

Ideology of Smartness. I also identified participants enacting the ideology of smartness in their discourse. Researchers have previously defined smartness from an intellectual standpoint without acknowledging external influences; therefore, my study followed Hatt (2012) who defined smartness as a cultural construct that affects the ways in which people determine what knowledge is important to know. I identified the discourses of limitation and assertiveness as the two main discourses within this theme.

In the home environment, my findings suggested that Gabriella's parents assumed a direct correlation between effort and smartness, so in referencing their daughter's lack of effort, they positioned her as lacking smartness. As a result, Gabriella's ability to act agentially and produce artifacts of intelligence her parents valued, such as high grades and learning Spanish, were similarly limited. Therefore, since the parents referenced her lack of effort; they thereby positioned her as lacking smartness. More so, this limited her ability to act agentially and produce artifacts of intelligence that the parents valued, such as grades and learning Spanish.

In the school environment, the focal teachers positioned the participants as recipients instead of capable producers of knowledge. My findings further support and extend Palmer and Henderson (2016) and explain how teachers in the study interacted differently with students based on the "track" they were members of. Both focal teachers positioned the emergent bilinguals' ideas as *not enough*, evidenced through the teachers' corrections of the participants' otherwise acceptable responses. Therefore, the focal students were often unable to enact their own concepts of legitimized smartness. Even in the ESL classroom, the theme of smartness through a discourse of limitation was observed. Like the other focal teachers, I positioned the students as recipients of knowledge by framing smartness as articulating the teacher's expected response.

Although my findings supported an ideology of smartness that limited participant agency and advocacy, my research also highlighted numerous ways in which the participants refuted such positioning and enacted their own constructs of smartness through a discourse of assertiveness. In the home environment during conversations with her parents, Gabriella often spoke with an assertive discourse to stand up for what she believed to be true and correct. Likewise, both focal student participants utilized an assertive discourse to refute ideas they did not agree with while advocating for their own learning. My findings suggested that the ESL classroom was the space in which the participants exercised the highest degree of agency because the environment allowed them to enact what Thorstenson (2013) referred to as “culturally relevant smartness” (p. 12). These findings on smartness as a cultural construct further support and extend Hatt (2012), Palmer & Henderson (2016), and Thorstenson (2013) by examining constructs of smartness across different environments with the same participants.

Research Question 2

A secondary research question was “How do emergent bilingual students, their families, and ESL/general education teachers discursively position one another and co-construct their linguistic identities in relation to these ideologies?” As I described in the key findings of chapters five and six, the focal participants, teachers, and family members discursively positioned one another in regards to language ideologies in rather complex ways. Moreover, the focal participants discursively positioned themselves in ways that were both consistent with and countering the hegemonic language ideologies and dominant Discourses. I will now review the dominant Discourses the participants demonstrated to position themselves and others throughout the course of the study.

Aanya. Aanya both discursively positioned herself and was positioned corresponding to hegemonic ideologies of language. With her family, Aanya was more assertive and dominant with her discourse than compared to the general education classroom. Moreover, she used language to exercise a hierarchy of power and influence over her brother and father. Aanya also subscribed to the ideology that English should be everywhere, furthering Morales's (2016) findings; however, she also countered this sentiment by "bragging" about her native country and language. Overall though, Aanya positioned English as the more valued language through her discourse reflective of hegemonic ideologies.

As the ESL teacher, I discovered that I, too, co-authored Aanya's discourse of loss, thereby positioning her as being less agentic in positively shaping her linguistic identity. This finding supports Hurie and Degollado's (2017) summary of the research that posited that overall, the American school system promotes the belief that when in the United States one should speak English. One group member Abjit resisted the discursive positioning of language loss by sharing all of the languages that he *did* know. Despite Abjit's claim to language maintenance, the other students formed a group identity of loss by sharing their own personal narratives.

Aanya's classroom teacher positioned her as one who lacked the ability to articulate the teacher's expected response. In this relationship, Aanya relinquished some of her rights of power to her teacher by seeking her approval in order to be deemed as smart. This finding supports and extends other research on students' self-perceptions of smartness (Hatt, 2012). Furthermore, Mrs. Cooper's dismissive discourses positioned Aanya as lacking smartness, so her eventual refusal to answer Mrs. Cooper's questions became evidence of Aanya's identity of rejection.

Gabriella. Gabriella's discourse was ever-changing throughout the different observations and across each environment. First, she made connections to her bilingual identity by bonding with her mother over the sharing of their native language. This finding supports Reaser et al.'s (2017) theory of code meshing by the way that both Gabriella and her mother would use both the native language and English in ways that best served the purpose of their discourse. In addition to this positive relationship to language, Gabriella also enacted a high level of agency and advocated for herself when with her family. Dad tried to obstruct Gabriella's bid for agency by establishing the power in their relationship and positioning her as one that needs to abide by his directives; however, through discourse Gabriella continued to position herself as assertive. This was possibly due in part to her desire to have her face need of being "heard" met; moreover, when her positive face was threatened she continued advocating for herself. Therefore, in an effort to save face, she offered the reason of hating reading for the perceived deficiency; however, it also established the moment that Gabriella accepted the negative positioning as a non-reader by her parents.

As the ESL teacher, I positioned Gabriella as a student who needed to get the expected response to be deemed as smart. She often positioned herself as not knowing by speaking with a passive discourse, further exemplifying the uncertainty in her ability to meet the teacher's expected response. However, Gabriella began participating in different ways, becoming progressively active in the group discussion and shifting her pronoun use to be less dependent on the teacher. In fact, she started with a passive discourse, shifted to active, and eventually presented a discourse of confidence. The positive responses she received from her classmates likely fueled her confidence and validated her bid for power and agency; allowing her to position herself and one who could stand on her own ideas. This finding supports other research on

language and smartness in the ESL classroom such as that by Thorstensson (2013) who found the ESL room to be a place of culturally relevant smartness. Also, Gabriella was amongst peers who also shared the trait of bilingualism so they positioned themselves as equals since there was less of a perceived difference than in the general education classroom.

Finally, Mrs. Kennedy positioned herself as the teacher and dispenser of knowledge; leading Gabriella to strive to meet her teacher's expectations. When Gabriella was unable to meet these expectations, Mrs. Kennedy, through her corrective style of discourse, positioned her as lacking the social good of Standard American English. These findings both support and extend other research on subtractive assimilation in the classroom (Lippi-Green, 2012; Razfar, 2012) by the inclusion of SAE. In return, Gabriella positioned herself as a quiet and submissive student who sought to please her teacher; and therefore, presented a limited capacity to act agentically or present a discourse of confidence and instead retreating to a passive discourse where she stopped offering her own ideas in one-on-one discussions with Mrs. Kennedy. The findings above provide valuable insight into the ideologies the participants articulated and embodied in addition to the discursive positioning that may occur across various settings in light of these ideologies; however, in the next section, I will present possible limitations of the study.

Limitations

While I presented many significant findings from my research, my study's contributions are also limited in a number of ways. Therefore, while measures were taken to reduce bias and increase study trustworthiness, such as exercising researcher reflexivity, data triangulation, peer-debriefing, and memoing (Miles et al., 2014), the study was qualitative in nature and relied on my own personal interpretations of the data based on my specific background knowledge and life experiences. Likewise, since I employed a case study design that focused on two student

participants, the findings are not generalizable or meant to be representational of all acts of positioning that occur between teachers, parents, and emergent bilinguals (Corbin & Strauss, 2015). My findings may be applicable or similar to other emergent bilinguals' experiences but represent only my two specific students' experiences, so even though there were consistencies between the two participants in regards to the types of discourses taken up in the different settings making the findings come across as similar, they are not meant to be replicable in future studies (Corbin & Strauss, 2015). In addition, the reduced time frame of the study is a limitation; I acknowledge that the portion of the overall time the participants, teachers, and family members spent together over the course of the school year versus the time I spent observing (and thus what I have presented in this dissertation) is only a small part of the participants' ongoing and ever-evolving linguistic narrative.

Moreover, I acknowledge that my dual role as principal investigator and immersed participant may be biased since I collected data in my place of employment and selected participants from my own classroom indicating convenience sampling. According to Patton (1990), convenience sampling may not lead to the most information-rich cases, and since I already knew all of the focal participants, may have led them to change their behaviors in order to showcase what they believed I wanted to see (Patton, 2002). Additionally, my own classroom responsibilities did not allow me to personally observe the focal teacher participants; as a result, they operated the video camera in their general education classroom and chose what they believed to be the best lessons for observation. As Guest, Namey, and Mitchell (2011) posited, it is possible that people change their behaviors when outsiders are present; therefore, if the focal teachers were uncomfortable recording their own instruction for another to view, they may have chosen to record what they believed to be their "best" acts of teaching emergent bilinguals. If

this is true, as my findings indicate, it is likely that participants performed many acts of positioning and hegemonic language ideologies that were not caught on video for observational data.

Finally, my study is limited in that translation of participants' use of their native language did not occur. Temple and Young (2004) reported that to ignore the native language in a research study is to do a disservice to the participants and overall research study. While having such translations in my study would be desirable, Temple and Young (2004) also acknowledge that translating languages adds another layer of bias to the analysis since personal interpretation goes into any translation process. There were times, especially during home environment observations, that the participants spoke in their native language which I deemed desirable as I wanted the observations to reflect their natural language use. However, in order to delineate all non-English discourse from the hundreds of hours of recorded data and the cost to accurately translate was outside the scope of available time and monetary resources for this project. This information though would prove to be valuable during discourse analysis and may be carried out if the data is utilized for future publications.

While my study was limited, it did provide insight into the types of positioning that may occur with emergent bilinguals across various settings and in relation to language ideologies. It is my hope that my study can serve as a starting point for future research that investigates the intersection of positioning and identity for intermediate-aged emergent bilinguals; as such, I will articulate possible practical and theoretical implications of my study in the following section.

Implications for Practice

As mentioned in the introduction, one goal of my study was to investigate the intersection of identity and positioning for emergent bilinguals in the context of larger scale ideologies of

language. I employed both macro and micro level discourse analysis of focal participants' discursive acts across multiple settings that provided robust interpretations of the discourse and its influence on participants' linguistic identities. While the results cannot be replicated, my study has implications for teaching practices in classrooms with emergent bilinguals. In the following section, I will address three key implications of the study and their influence in the educational setting for the participants and other emergent bilinguals.

Reconfiguring the Figured World of School

First, the study's findings contribute to the body of literature surrounding schools as figured worlds. Researchers such as Holland et al. (1998) have shown the important role that schools as figured worlds play in the day-to-day (re)formation of student identities. Each "actor" in a figured world takes on a specific role in the eyes of those who are a part of that world. Actors then position and reposition themselves, and each other, based on the dominant power structure present in the figured world.

My study documented that teachers wielded the power in the classroom in regards to knowledge and keepers of smartness. Furthermore, the focal teachers and student participants often demonstrated a disconnect between the type of knowledge that they each identified as valuable to possess. The focal teachers' discursive practices revealed their strong desire for students to obtain the expected responses that they held as being the most correct answer. However, as Moll et al. (1992) argued, schools need to move beyond the rote memorization and reliance on textbook answers that typically occur in classrooms and begin to capitalize on other funds of knowledge possessed by bilingual students. However, as my study showed, classroom teachers at times felt their ability to act agentically in their own classroom was out of their control; for example, one focal teacher expressed that her IEP students' needs were "more

important” than her emergent bilinguals, citing the mandated policies of implementing IEP students’ learning goals as set forth in the IEP versus the emergent bilinguals who did not appear to have anyone advocating for them.

My study further supports Shannon (2010) who posited that teachers are often influenced by hegemonic policies because few policies exist that guide them towards anything else. Likewise, Colón and Heineke (2015) found that federal and state level mandates created an environment that forced teachers to focus on academic content at the expense of emergent bilingual’s language needs. Such macro level policies dominated the practices of the teachers, even if they knew their emergent bilinguals might require more to find academic and language success. Therefore, I argue that classroom teachers should take a more student-centered approach with emergent bilinguals instead of focusing so heavily on macro level policies; this would orient teachers to the funds of knowledge their students possess and how to better incorporate them in the classroom setting.

Furthermore, school curriculums are often based on the mainstream norms, so if teachers integrated different ways of knowing and doing for their students, perhaps students would better connect the content to their personal lives and form a deeper level of understanding. Therefore, I argue that educators need a better understanding of the funds of knowledge their emergent bilinguals bring to the classroom in order to find a way to incorporate them in a more meaningful way and enhance learning beyond rote memorization. In addition, school systems, starting at the administrative level, may benefit from more exposure and a deeper knowledge base regarding emergent bilinguals. A first step may be to establish partnerships between universities and local school systems in order for classroom teachers to develop a more complex and complete understanding of their role in the figured world of school relative to emergent

bilinguals. Riojas-Cortez and Flores (2009) articulated that “understanding children’s background enhances educators’ facility for including children’s funds of knowledge and families’ cultural knowledge in their classrooms” (p. 238).

Utilizing students’ funds of knowledge would support Wiggins and Monobe’s (2017) claim that emergent bilinguals need to be positioned as insiders in the school setting in order to positively negotiate their identity in relation to their funds of knowledge. Overall, my study’s findings contribute to understanding the important role teachers play in positioning their students in the figured world of school. The findings also demonstrate the importance of educator awareness about how students interpret this role in the context of power relationships; in addition to the influence their positioning has on students’ linguistic identity and their ability to act agentially in the classroom.

Practitioner Reflexivity

In order to redefine what knowledge a teacher holds relevant, he/she would first need to identify what ideologies they enact through their own teaching practices. As discussed throughout this dissertation, the focal teachers in the study, including myself, were not always aware of their discursive positioning of the focal students and how this positioning is traced back to the dominant ideologies that influence them. Therefore, all teachers working with emergent bilinguals would benefit from self-reflective exercises; moreover, such explorations of one’s own practices may influence awareness of significant dominant ideologies.

Studies have shown the importance of critical reflection on teaching practices in action (Haneda, Teemant, & Sherman, 2017; Lindahl & Henderson, 2019; Schutz & Hoffman, 2017). The relevance of reflexivity became apparent to me during the analysis of the data for my study. There were several times I either recognized, or it was brought to my attention, that I had

either inserted or imposed my own thoughts, opinions, feelings, and beliefs into the analysis or onto the participants. One such example is my projection of a narrative of loss onto Aanya. Similarly, from the analysis of the other focal teachers' language use, teaching practices influenced by the embodiment of hegemonic ideologies of language and smartness were apparent.

As argued by Lindahl and Henderson (2019), "a teacher's pluralist stance towards bilingual language practices has been identified as a central component for successful ELL instruction" (p. 62). Therefore, I encourage school districts to engage teachers in reflective practices such as those outlined in Haneda et al. (2017) who argued that reflective coaching sessions with teachers of emergent bilinguals "cultivated a dialogic space in which the teacher was invited to challenge, explore, appropriate, and eventually enact Critical Stance as a pedagogical principle in her teaching" (p. 47). Such dialogic spaces could assist teachers of emergent bilinguals in what Schutz and Hoffman (2017) discussed as the process of critical reflection that "examines the ways to challenge the controlling conditions and work around them to resolve roadblocks to practice" (p. 10).

I argue that encouraging teachers to identify and break down the dominant ideologies performed in their teaching practices would then allow them to continue to grow as professionals and build their teaching practices from a perspective that reflects awareness of deficit views, in order to positively influence emergent bilinguals socioemotional, academic, and linguistic classroom experiences (Lindahl & Henderson, 2019).

One such way to accomplish this degree of teacher reflexivity is through the application of critical discourse analysis (CDA). Gee (2014) defined discourse analysis as "the study of language at use in the world, not just to say things, but also to do things" (p. 1). However, when

implementing *critical* discourse analysis, issues of dominance and power are examined within a socio-political context relative to the construction, maintenance, and legitimization of social inequities (Mullet, 2018). Warburton (2016) proposed that CDA be utilized as a means of “truth telling.” Through CDA, teachers can examine both the students, and their own discourses, in order to dispel the notion that teachers *always* lead with students’ best interests in mind (Warburton, 2016). While the vast majority of teachers would never purposefully obscure the truth in teaching and learning, their own contributions *to* and performances *of* dominant language ideologies can be explored through the implementation of CDA. This increased focus on teachers’ roles in perpetuating, but moving beyond, the status quo will better equip teachers to teach with a social justice mindset (Warburton, 2016).

Accordingly, I feel it is my duty to be a change agent, and share my findings with the participants. Through the sharing and discussing of CDA results, the participants can further explore their own personal journeys and roles played in the suppressing and/or uplifting of others. Therefore, possible implications for the participants include a better understanding of the ideologies that drive their discourses as well as learning the role they play in the reinforcement of dominant ideologies that hinder their own or others’ learning and what constitutes as legitimate knowledge in and outside of the school setting.

Culturally Relevant Teaching

Too often emergent bilingual students are placed in a classroom with a teacher who embodies monolingual ideologies as a foundation for instructional practices. In the previous two sections, I discussed the study’s implications for reconfiguring the figured world of school in addition to my recommendation for increased practitioner reflexivity. In this final section, I will

discuss how findings from my study support culturally relevant teaching practices in all classrooms.

From my analysis of the focal teachers' language use, my study shows that the classroom teachers often utilized an initiation-response-evaluation (IRE) model of questioning (Mehan, 1979). While IRE can be an effective method of questioning to measure students' ability to recall factual information, my study supports Cazden (2001) who claims this method fails to promote higher order thinking. My discourse analysis revealed that the teachers did the majority of the speaking, making the conversations particularly teacher-centered. Furthermore, my study showed that due to the use of the IRE model, teachers' questions often contained only one right answer, prohibiting a deeper level of engagement as showcased by a lack of discussion on the students' part. Therefore, a shift away from IRE as the primary method of instruction is implicated by the findings in my study. Instead, as Cazden (2001) suggests, student engagement and thus learning is likely to be more effective when students are co-constructors of meaning. Therefore, I argue that teachers should participate in professional development respecting culturally relevant teaching practices (Gay, 2012; Ladson-Billings, 1995) in order to promote higher order thinking, increased student engagement and dialogue, and to promote emergent bilinguals' ability to act agentically in their classroom environment. Researchers such as Gay (2012) and Ladson-Billings (1995) have shown the importance of teachers being culturally competent, refining their curriculum to be culturally responsive, supportive of the learning environment, establishing cultural congruence in the classroom, and engaging in effective classroom instructional techniques.

It is my hope that my study has provided numerous practical implications for practice; in addition, I will now articulate possible research implications in the final section.

Implications for Research

While the practical implications of my study were considered above, particularly the reconfiguring of the figured world of school, practitioner reflexivity, and culturally relevant teaching, opportunities for further research exist; therefore, in this section I will outline the contributions my study makes for research in the field of identity, position, and the emergent bilingual.

First, Bomer and Laman (2004) addressed how individuals may believe they have free choice in positioning themselves, but “they are actually always subjected to the workings of state apparatuses that make them desire and intent to inhabit the roles that ideology has already prepared for them” (p. 426). My study outlines the type of hegemonic ideologies that influence teacher perceptions of language and shape their interactions with students; however, where, when, and how did teachers learn these ideologies? Blommaert (1999) stated that oftentimes, teachers’ opinions of monolingualism exist because there are few policies to guide them towards anything different. Therefore, it may be valuable to investigate the types of language ideologies embedded within current educational policy. Recent work by Ascenzi-Moreno, Hesson, and Menken (2016) offer promising leads into this line of discovery through the reformation of school policy and restructuring of school leadership to reflect a more collaborative approach to ensuring multilingualism within their local school system.

Next, as highlighted in the review of the literature, a growing body of research (Handsfield & Crumpler, 2013; Martin, 2012; Martin-Beltran, 2010; Moses & Kelly, 2017; Pinnow & Chval, 2015; Reeves, 2009; Turkan & Iddings, 2012; Yoon, 2008; Yoon, 2012; Yoon, 2015) exists that investigated teacher positioning of emergent bilinguals in the classroom setting; however, few studies (Martin, 2012; Martin-Beltran, 2010; McHatton et al., 2007) have

considered student perceptions relative to teacher positioning. My study suggests that students do understand how teachers are positioning them, which is supported by Martin (2012) who suggested that older students had a more negative perception of their teacher's beliefs regarding their linguistic identity. In Martin's (2012) study, first grade students had a positive outlook regarding their beliefs about their teachers' perceptions regarding their language; however, by fourth grade this had changed. Therefore, additional longitudinal research would be beneficial in order to identify possible changes in student perceptions over time.

Also, in a similar vein as student perceptions, findings from my study support and extend Lapayese's (2016) notion of "los intersticios" or the space between identities, where emergent bilinguals often find themselves as a result of positioning in the school setting. Numerous researchers (Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2001; Cone et al., 2014; Ghiso & Low, 2013; Lapayese, 2016; McHatton et al., 2007; Norén, 2015) have investigated conflicted identities relative to emergent bilinguals; however, this "space between identities" has been relatively underexplored. Therefore, it may be valuable to explore, from students' perspectives, how they negotiate these different "spaces" and achieve agency in reference to their linguistic identity in the general education classroom setting.

Finally, many promising studies have emerged regarding the positioning of emergent bilinguals in the general education setting; however, when reviewing the theoretical frameworks, only a few referenced power structures and student agency (Handsfield & Crumpler, 2013; Yoon, 2015). Acts of positioning, influenced by language ideologies, are rooted in structures of power (Lewis et al., 2007) so further research incorporating a critical approach would lend the potential to bring these structures of power and agency to the forefront for discussion.

Conclusion

A growing body of literature supports the need for further research into evolving identities of emergent bilinguals in the educational setting. While the results from my study showcased numerous acts of positioning and Discourses that led to the renegotiating of linguistic identities towards a more monolingual identity, a number of constructive acts of agency, advocacy, and self-positioning also occurred. I remain hopeful that monolingual policies in schools will soon come to an end and that students from all cultures, who speak one, two, three, or even four or more languages will not only find tolerance for their native language, but also experience a time where their bilingualism is embraced and approached from an additive and enriching standpoint.

Moreover, my study has demonstrated the need for students' funds of knowledge to be incorporated into the classroom environment so that the focus shifts from students seeking to find that one right answer--that expected response--to embracing multiple ways of knowing. When everyone interprets the world based on their past experiences, can there ever be just *one* right answer? I challenge educators to travel the world, to learn another language, to embrace the diversity around them, or if diversity does not exist, seek opportunities to experience it. Henry David Thoreau stated, "It is never too late to give up your prejudices." Therefore, I further challenge educators to engage in self-reflection. What ideologies fuel your practice? Where did these come from? Are there any you wish were not present? If so, what can you do about it?

To conclude, my study focused on the identities of emergent bilinguals across more than just the school setting, extending into the home and community environments to highlight the importance of positioning and identity work at all times and across all domains. Our culture,

traditions, and language are the foundations upon which we build our identity. Thus, it is time that society, macro-level policies, school systems, teachers, and family members exercise due diligence to ensure our children are growing up in a world that embraces knowledge and language diversity to promote transformational and sustainable change.

REFERENCES

- Achugar, (2008). Counter-hegemonic language practices and ideologies: Creating a new space and value for Spanish in Southwest Texas. *Spanish in Context*, 5(1), 1-19.
- Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (1994). Observational techniques. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 377-392). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Alegria, A. (2014). Supporting English language learners in the science classroom through critical pedagogy. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 12(1), 99-121.
- Alvarez (2017). *Brokering tareas: Mexican immigrant families translanguaging homework literacies*. Albany, NY: Suny Press.
- Anderson, K. (2009). Applying positioning theory to the analysis of classroom interactions: Mediating micro-identity, macro-kinds, and ideologies of knowing. *Linguistics and Education*, 20, 291-310.
- Andreouli, E. (2010). Identity, positioning, and self-other relations. *Papers on Social Representations*, 19, 14.1-14.13.
- Andrews, M. (2010). What about linguistic identity? *Journal of Language and Literacy Education*, 6(2), 85-102.
- Angrosino, M. V., & Mays de Perez, K. A. (2000). Rethinking observation from method to context. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of quality research* (2nd ed.)(pp. 673-702). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Apple, M. (2004). *Ideology and Curriculum*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Ascenzi-Moreno, L., Hesson, S., & Menken, K. (2016). School leadership along the trajectory from monolingual to multilingual. *Language and Education, 30*(3), 197-218.
- Bakhtin, M. (1994). Double-voiced discourse in Dostoevsky. In Morris P (Ed.), *The Bakhtin reader: Selected writings* (pp. 102-111). London, England: Edward Arnold. (Original work published 1963)
- Bamberg, M. (1997). Positioning between structure and performance. *Journal of Narrative and Life History, 7*(1), 335-342.
- Bamberg, M. (2012). Why narrative? *Narrative Inquiry, 22*(1), 202-210.
- Bamberg, M. (2016). Narrative. In K. B. Jensen & R. T. Craig (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of communication theory and philosophy* (pp. 1287-1295). Boston, MA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Bamberg, M., & Demuth, C. (2016). Narrative inquiry: An interview with Michael Bamberg. *European Journal of Psychology, 12*(1), 14-28.
- Bamberg, M., & Georgakopoulou, A. (2008). Small stories as a new perspective in narrative and identity analysis. *Text and Talk, 28*, 377–396.
- Bialystok, E. (2001). *Bilingualism in development: Language, literacy, and cognition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Black, R. W. (2006). Language, culture, and identity in online fanfiction. *E-Learning, 3*(2), 170-184.
- Blackledge, A., & Pavlenko, A. (2001). Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 5*(3), 243-257.
- Block, D. (2012). Class and SLA: Making connections. *Language Teaching Research, 16*(2), 188-205.

- Block, D. (2014). *Second language identities*. London, UK: Bloomsbury.
- Blommaert, J. (1999). The debate is open. In J. Blommaert (Ed.), *Language ideological debates* (pp. 1-38). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- 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.
- Bloome, D., Katz, L., & Champion, T. (2010). Young children's narratives and ideologies of language in classrooms. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 19(3), 205-223.
- Bomer, R., & Laman, T. (2004). Positioning in a primary writing workshop: Joint action in the discursive production of writing subjects. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 38(4), 420-466.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (241-258). Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Bourdieu, P. (1989). Social space and symbolic power. *Sociological Theory*, 7(1), 14-25.
- Cain, A. (2017). Seven tips for newcomer emergent bilingual students. *The Reading Teacher*, 71(4), 485-490.
- Caldas, B. (2017). Shifting discourses in teacher education: Performing the advocate bilingual teacher. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 118, 190-201.

- Castro, D. C., Ayankoya, B., & Kasprzak, C. (2011). *The new voices—nuevas voces: Facilitator's guide to cultural and linguistic diversity in early childhood*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.
- Cavazos, A. G. (2019). Encouraging language other than English in first-year writing courses: Experiences from linguistically diverse writers. *Composition Studies*, 47(1), 38-56.
- Cazden, C. B. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2017). Minority languages and sustainable translanguaging: Threat or opportunity? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(10), 901-912.
- Chang, A. (2017). Resisting the orthodox smart label: High school Latinas and the redefinition of smartness on the western frontier. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 16(1), 30-40.
- Chen, T., Kyle, D. W., & McIntyre, E. (2008). Helping teachers work effectively with English language learners and their families. *The School Community Journal*, 18(1), 7-20.
- Chaing, Y., & Schmida, M. (2002). Language identity and language ownership: Linguistic conflicts of first-year university writing students. In V. Zamel & R. Spack (Eds.), *Enriching Esol pedagogy* (393-409). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Chiseri-Strater, E. (1996). Turning in upon ourselves: positionality, subjectivity, and reflexivity in case study and ethnographic research. In P. Mortensen, & G. E. Kirsch (Eds.), *Ethics and representation in qualitative studies in literacy* (pp. 115-133). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Coady, M. R., Harper, C., & de Jong, E. J. (2015). Aiming for equity: Preparing mainstream teachers for inclusion or inclusive classrooms? *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(2), 340-368.

- Collett, J. (2018). Constructing identities: How two emergent bilinguals create linguistic agency in elementary school. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41(2), 133-149.
- Colón, I., & Heineke, A. J. (2015). Bilingual education in English-only: A qualitative case study of language policy in practice at Lincoln Elementary School. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, 27(4), 271-295.
- Cone, N., Buxton, C., Lee, O., & Mahotiere, M. (2014). Negotiating a sense of identity in a foreign land: Navigating public school structures and practices that often conflict with Haitian culture and values. *Urban Education*, 49(3), 263-296.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2015). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Crawford, J. (1996). Seven hypotheses on language loss causes and cures. In G. Cantoni (Ed.), *Stabilizing indigenous languages* (pp. 45-60). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University, Center for Excellence in Education.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2017). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Crumpler, T. P., Handsfield, L. J., & Dean, T. R. (2011). Constructing difference differently in language and literacy professional development. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 46(1), 55-91.
- Daniels, N. (1978). Merit and meritocracy. *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 7(3), 206-223.

- Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2014). Social class, identity, and migrant students. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 13*, 111-117.
- Davies, B. (2000). *A body of writing, 1990-1999*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira.
- Davies, B., & Harré, D. (2007). Positioning: The discursive positioning of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 20*(1), 43-63.
- Denzin, N. K. (1978). *Sociological methods*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Dexter, L. A. (1970). *Elite and specialized interviewing*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Díaz-Rico, L. T. (2013). *Strategies for teaching English learners* (3rd ed.). London, England: Pearson.
- Dressler, R. (2014). Exploring linguistic identity in young multilingual learners. *TESL Canada Journal, 32*(1), 42-52.
- Dressler, R., & Dressler, A. (2016). Linguistic identity positioning in Facebook posts during second language study abroad: One teen's language user, experience, and awareness. *The Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 19*(2), 22-43.
- Dressler, R., & Dressler, A. (2019). The methodological affordances and challenges of using Facebook to research study abroad. *Study Abroad Research in Second Language Acquisition and International Education, 4*(1), 126-144.
- Duckworth, A. (2016). *Grit: The power of passion and perseverance*. New York, NY: Scribner/Simon & Schuster.
- Dwyer, S. C., & Buckle, J. L. (2009). The space between: On being an insider-outsider in qualitative research. *Internal Journal of Qualitative Methods, 8*(1), 54-63.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968) *Youth and crisis*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton Company.

- Farmer, L. (2017). How to beat teacher burnout: With more education. *Governing*. Retrieved from <http://www.governing.com/topics/education/gov-stem-teachers-education.html>
- Fincher, R. (2011). Cosmopolitan or ethnically identified selves? Institutional expectations and the negotiated identity of international students. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 12(8), 905-927.
- Fleischer, A. (2012). What is our current understanding of one-to-one computer projects: A systematic narrative research review. *Educational Research Review*, 7, 107-122.
- Flores, N., Kleyn, T., & Menken, K. (2015). Looking holistically in a climate of partiality: Identities of students labeled long-term English language learners. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 14, 113-132.
- Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (1998). Interviewing: The art of science. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (pp. 47-78). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Foote, M. Q., & Bartell, T. G. (2011). Pathways to equity in mathematics education: How life experiences impact researcher positionality. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 78(1), 45-68.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972– 1977*. New York, NY: Pantheon.
- French, S. E., Allen, L., Aber, J. L., & Seidman, E. (2006). The development of ethnic identity during adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, 42(1), 1-10.

- Gal, S. (1998). Multiplicity and contestation among linguistic ideologies. In K. Woolward & B. Schieffeli (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 317-331). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Gándara, P., Maxwell-Jolly, J., & Driscoll, A. (2005). *Listening to teachers of English language learners: A survey of California teachers' challenges, experiences, and professional development needs*, The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning.
http://www.cftl.org/publications_latest.php.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- García-Mateus, S., & Palmer, D. K. (2017). Translanguaging pedagogies for positive identities in two-way dual language bilingual education. *Journal of Language Identity & Education*, 16(4), 245-255.
- Gay, G. (2012). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(2), 106-116.
- Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (2nd ed.). London, England: Taylor & Francis.
- Gee, J. P. (2000). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. *Review of Research in Education*, 25, 99-125.
- Gee, J. P. (2001). Reading as situated language: A sociocognitive perspective. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 44, 714-725.

- Gee, J. P. (2014). *How to do discourse analysis: A toolkit* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gee, J. P. (2015). *Unified discourse analysis: Language, reality, virtual worlds and video games*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Georgakopoulou, A. (2006). Thinking big with small stories in narrative and identity analysis. *Narrative Inquiry*, 16(1), 122-130.
- Ghisso, M. P., & Low, D. E. (2013). Students using multimodal literacies to surface micronarratives of United States immigration. *Literacy*, 47(1), 26-34.
- Ginsberg, R. (2017). Finding comfort in the discomfort of being multiracial: Lessons from my schooling. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 19(2), 103-108.
- Glesne, C. (2016). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: essays on face-to-face interaction*. New York, NY: Doubleday Anchor.
- Graves, D. (1983). *Writing: Teachers and children at work*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Green, J. L., & Wallat, C. (1981). Mapping instructional conversations. In J. L. Green & C. Wallat (Eds.), *Ethnography and language in educational settings* (pp. 161– 195). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday, M. A., & Mattiessen, C. (2013). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Handsfield, L. (2016). *Literacy theory as practice: Connecting theory and practice in k-12 classrooms*. New York, NY: Teacher's College.
- Handsfield, L., & Crumpler, T. (2013). "Dude, it's not a appropriate word": Negotiating word meanings, language ideologies, and identities in a literate discussion group. *Linguistics and Education, 24*, 112-130.
- Haneda, M., & Alexander, M. (2015). ESL teacher advocacy beyond the classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 49*, 149-158.
- Haneda, M., Teemant, A., & Sherman, B. (2017). Instructional coaching through dialogic interaction: Helping a teacher to become agentive in her practice. *Language and Education, 31*(1), 46-64.
- Hagood, M. C. (2002). Critical literacy for whom? *Reading Research and Instruction, 41*(3), 247-266.
- Harré, R., & van Langenhove, L. (1991). Varieties of positioning. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 21*(4), 393-407.
- Harré, R., & van Langenhove, L. (1994). Cultural stereotypes and positioning theory. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 24*(4), 359-372.
- Harré, R., & van Langenhove, L. (1999). The dynamics of social episodes. In R. Harré & L. van Langenhove (Eds.), *Positioning theory: Moral contexts of intentional actions* (pp. 1-12). Malden, MA: Blackwell Hoffman.
- Harwood, J. (2004). Social identity as expressed in grandparents' personal web sites. *Communication Studies, 5*(2), 300-318.
- Hatch, J. A. (1990). Young children as informants in classroom studies. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 52*(2), 251-264.

- Hatt, B. (2007). Street smarts vs. book smarts: The figured world of smartness in the lives of marginalized, urban youth. *The Urban Review*, 39(2), 145-162.
- Hatt, B. (2012). Smartness as a cultural practice. *American Educational Research Journal*, 49(3), 438-460.
- Hébert, T. P., & Beardsley, T. M. (2002). Jermaine: A critical case study of a gifted Black child living in rural poverty. In S. B. Merriam (Ed.), *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis* (pp. 201-232). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hickey, P. J. (2016). “They always keep us in line”: Neoliberalism and elementary emergent bilinguals. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 14(2), 14-40.
- Holland, D., Lachicotte, W., Jr., Skinner, D., & Cain, C. (1998). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Holland, D., & Lave, J. (2001). *History in person*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Holland, D., & Leander, K. (2004). Ethnographic studies of positioning and subjectivity: An Introduction. *Journal for the Society of Psychological Anthropology*, 32(2), 127-139.
- Hurie, A. H., & Degollado, E. D. (2017). An overview of language ideologies in bilingual education. *Texas Education Review*, 5(1), 57-66.
- Illinois State Board of Education. (2017, July 31). *Illinois licensure, endorsement, and approval requirements*. Springfield, IL: ISBE Retrieved from https://www.isbe.net/Documents/endsmt_struct.pdf
- Janesick, V. (2000). The choreography of qualitative research design: Minuets, improvisations, and crystallization. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of quality research* (2nd ed.)(pp. 379-400). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Jones, S. R., & McEwen, M. K. (2000). A conceptual model of multiple dimensions of identity. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(4), 405-414.
- Kareva, K., & Echevarria, J. (2013). Using the SIOP model for effective content teaching with second and foreign language learners. *Journal of Education and Training Studies, 1*(2), 239-248.
- Kayi-Aydar, H. (2014). Social positioning, participation, and second language learning: Talkative students in academic ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 48*(4), 686-714.
- Kibler, A. K., Palacios, N., Simpson-Baird, A., Bergey, R., & Yoder, M. (2016). Bilingual Latina children's exposure to language and literacy practices through older siblings in immigrant families. *Linguistics and Education, 35*, 63-77.
- Kidder, L. H. (1981). *Research methods in social relations* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Kim, L. S. (2003). Multiple identity in a multicultural world: A Malaysian perspective. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 2*, 137-158.
- Kim, J., & Viesca, K. M. (2016). Three reading-intervention teachers' identity positioning and practices to motivate and engage emergent bilinguals in an urban middle school. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 55*, 122-132.
- Kövecses, Z. (2000). *Metaphor and emotion*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Kroskrity, P. K. (2004). Language ideologies. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *Companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 496-517). Malden, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Kroskrity, P. K. (2010). Language ideologies. *Handbook of Pragmatics, 14*, 1-24.

- Kubota, R., & Lin, A. (2009). Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice. In R. Kubota & A. Lin (Eds.), *Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice* (pp. 1-24). New York, NY: Routledge.
- LaBelle, S. (2011). Language and identity. In A. Mooney, J.S. Peccei, S. LaBelle, B. E. Henriksen, E. Eppler, A. Irwin... S. Soden (Eds.), *Language society and power: An introduction* (3rd ed.) (pp. 173-188). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465-491.
- Lapayese, Y. V. (2016). Identify the cracks: That's where the light slips in: The narratives of Latina/o bilingual middle-class youth. *The CATESOL Journal*, 28(1), 161-174.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Lawler, S. (2003). Narrative in social research. In T. May (Ed.), *Qualitative research in action* (pp. 242-258). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Lee, S. (2015). Implementing the sociocultural theory while teaching ESL. *SPACE: Student Perspectives About Civic Engagement*, 1(1), 28-35.
- Lewis, C., Encisco, P., & Moje, E.B. (2007). *Reframing sociocultural research on literacy: Identity agency, and power*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lewis, C., & Moje, E. B. (2003). Sociocultural perspectives meet critical theories: Producing knowledge through multiple frameworks. *International Journal of Learning*, 10, 1979-1985.

- Lindahl, K., & Henderson, K. (2019). The intersection of language ideologies and language awareness among in-service teachers of emergent bilinguals. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 7(1), 61-87.
- Linehan, C., & McCarthy, J. (2001). Reviewing the “community of practice” metaphor: An analysis of control relations in a primary school classroom. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 8(2), 129–147
- Linville, H. A. (2016). ESOL teachers as advocates: An important role? *TESOL Journal*, 7(1), 98-131.
- Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lyotard, J. F. (1979). *The postmodern condition*. Manchester, England. Manchester University Press.
- Macedo, D., Dendrinos, B., & Gounari, P. (2003). *The hegemony of English*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Macias, R. (2014). Benefits of bilingualism: In the eye of the beholder? In R. M. Callahan & P. C. Gándara (Eds.), *The bilingual advantage: Language, literacy and the U.S. labor market* (pp. 16-44). Bristol, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.
- Man Chu Lau, S. (2019). Convergences and alignments between translanguaging and critical literacies work in bilingual classrooms: Translanguaging and critical theories in education. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*, 5(1), 67-85).
- Martin, B. (2012). Coloured language: Identity perception of children in bilingual programmes. *Language Awareness*, 21(1-2), 33-56.

- Martin-Beltrán, M. (2010). Positioning proficiency: How students and teachers (de)construct language proficiency at school. *Linguistics and Education*, 21(4), 257-281.
- 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.
- Marx, S. (2009). "It's not them; It's not their fault": Manifestations of racism in the schooling of Latinas/os and ELLs. In R. Kubota & A. Lin (Eds.), *Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice* (pp. 81-98). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Matthews, J. S., Banerjee, M., & Lauermann, F. (2014). Academic identity formation and motivation among ethnic minority adolescents: The role of the "self" between internal and external perceptions of identity. *Child Development*, 85(6), 2355-2373.
- Maxwell, J.A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach (applied social research methods)* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- McAlpine, L. (2016). Why might you use narrative methodology? A story about narrative. *Eesti Haridusteaduste Ajakiri*, nr 4(1), 32–57.
- McCarthey, S. J., & Moje, E. B. (2002). Identity matters. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 37(2), 228-238.
- McConnochie, M., & Figueroa, A. M. (2017). "Dice que es bajo" ("She says he's low"): Negotiating breaches of learner identity in two Mexican families. *Linguistics and Education*, 38, 68-78.

- McHatton, P. A., Shaunessy, E., Hughes, C., Brice, A., & Ratliff, M. A. (2007). You gotta represent! Ethnic identity development among Hispanic adolescents. *Multicultural Perspectives, 9*(3), 12-20.
- McVee, M. B. (2011). Positioning theory and sociocultural perspectives: Affordances for educational researchers. In M. B. McVee, C. H. Brock, & J. A. Glazier (Eds.), *Sociocultural positioning in literacy: Exploring culture, discourse, narrative, and power in diverse educational contexts* (pp. 1-21). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Menken, K., Rosario, V. P., & Guzmán Valerio, L. A. (2018). Increasing multilingualism in schools. *Linguistic Landscape, 4*(2), 101-127.
- Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education: Revised and expanded from case study research in education* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S., & Muhamad, M. (2000). How cultural values shape learning in older adulthood: The case of Malaysia. *Adult Education Quarterly, 51*(1), 45-63.
- Merriam, S. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing, Inc.

- Mishler, E. G. (1999). *Storylines: Craftartists' narratives of identity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mishler, E. G. (2004). Historians of the self: Restorying lives, revising identity. *Research in Human Development, 1*(1-2), 101-121.
- 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.
- Moje, E. B., & Lewis, C. (2007). Examining opportunities to learn literacy: The role of critical sociocultural literacy research. In C. Lewis, P. Enciso, & E. B. Moje (Eds.), *Reframing sociocultural research on literacy* (pp. 15-48). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Moje, E. B., & Luke, A. (2009). Literacy and identity: Examining the metaphors in history and contemporary research. *Reading Research Quarterly, 44*(4), 415-437.
- Moll, L.C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzales, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 31*(2), 132-141.
- Moll, L., & Rubenstein-Avila, E. (2007). Commentary. In C. Lewis, P. Enciso, & E. B. Moje (Eds.), *Reframing sociocultural research on literacy* (pp. 189-194). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Montanaro, D, Kurtzleben, D., Horsley, S., McCammon, S., & Gonzales, R. (August 31, 2016). Fact check: Donald Trump's speech on immigration. Retrieved from <https://www.mprnews.org/story/2016/09/01/npr-fact-check-trump-immigration-speech>

- Mooney, A. (2011). What is language? In A. Mooney, J.S. Peccei, S. LaBelle, B. E. Henriksen, E. Eppler, A. Irwin... S. Soden (Eds.), *Language society and power: An introduction* (3rd ed.) (pp. 1-23). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Morales, P. Z. (2016). Transnational practices and language maintenance: Spanish and Zapoteco in California. *Children's Geographies*, 14(4), 375-389.
- Moses, L., & Kelly, L. B. (2017). The development of positive literate identities among emerging bilingual and monolingual first graders. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 49(3), 393-423.
- Mullet, D. R. (2018). A general critical discourse analysis framework for educational research. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 29(2), 116-142.
- Nicolaides, C., & Archanjo, R. (2019). Reframing identities in the move: A tale of empowerment, agency and autonomy. *Trabalhos em Linguística Aplicada*, 58(1), 96-117.
- Nieto, S. (2010). *Language, culture, and teaching: Critical perspectives* (3rd ed.). London, England: Routledge.
- Norén, E. (2015). Agency and positioning in a multilingual mathematics classroom. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 89, 167-184.
- Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2002). Identity, language learning, and social change. *Language Teacher*, 44(4), 412-446.
- Núñez, I., & Palmer, D. (2017). Who will be bilingual? A critical discourse analysis of a Spanish-English bilingual pair. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 14(4), 294-319.
- O'Neill, C. & Lambert, A. (1982). *Drama structures: A practical handbook for teachers*. Exeter, N. H.: Heinemann Educational Books.

- Ortmeier-Hooper, C. "English may be my second language, but I'm not 'ESL.'" *National Council of Teachers of English*, 59(3), 389-419.
- Oyserman, D., Bybee, D., & Terry, K. (2003). Possible selves and academic outcomes: How and when possible selves impel action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 91(1), 188–204.
- Pacheco, M. B., & Miller, M. E. (2015). Making meaning through translanguaging in the literacy classroom. *The Reading Teacher*, 69(5), 533-537.
- Palmer, D. K. (2009). Code-switching and symbolic power in a second-grade two-way classroom: A teacher's motivation system gone awry. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 32(1), 42-59.
- Palmer, D., & Henderson, K. (2016). Dual language tracking and teacher discourses on emergent bilingual students. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 10(1), 17-30
- Pandey, A. (2014). Using mother tongues as building blocks in childhood education. *Childhood Education*, 90, 61-67.
- Patton, M. Q. (1985). *Quality in qualitative research: Methodological principles and recent developments*. Proceedings from the American Educational Research Association. Chicago, IL.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation methods*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Pavlenko, A. (2002). 'We have room but for one language here:' Language and national identity in the U.S. at the turn of the 20th century. *Multilingua*, 21, 163-196.

- Peshkin, A. (1988). In search of subjectivity--One's own. *Educational Researcher*, 17(7), 17-21.
- Pinnow, R. J., & Chval, K. B. (2015). "How much You wanna bet?": Examining the role of positioning in the development of L2 learner interactional competencies in the content classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, 30, 1-11.
- Proctor, C. P., August, D., Carlo, M., & Barr, C. (2010). Language maintenance versus language of instruction: Spanish reading development among Latino and Latina bilingual learners. *Journal of Social Issues*, 66(1), 79-94.
- Public Law 107-110. (2002). Title IX, Part A, Sec. 9101, (25).
- Raggatt, P.T.F. (2007). Forms of position in the dialogical self. *Theory & Psychology*, 17(3), 355-382.
- Razfar, A. (2010). Repair with confianza: Rethinking the context of corrective feedback for English learners (ELs). *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 9(2), 11-31.
- Razfar, A. (2012). Narrating beliefs: A language ideologies approach to teacher beliefs. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 43(1), 61-81.
- Razfar, A., & Rumenapp, J. C. (2012). Language ideologies in English learner classrooms: Critical reflections and the role of explicit awareness. *Language Awareness*, 21(4), 1-22.
- Reaser, J., Adger, C. T., Wolfram, W., Christian, D. (2017). *Dialects at School: Educating linguistically diverse students*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Reeves, J. (2009). Teacher investment in learner identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25, 34-41.

- Reyes, G. T., & Zermeño, B. P. (2018). Of course she will learn: A cultural pedagogy in bilingual transitional kindergarten with newcomer students. *Multicultural Education*, 25(3-4), 18-22.
- Riojas-Cortez, M., & Flores, B. (2009). Sin olvidar a los padres: Families collaborating within school and university partnerships. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 8(3), 231-239.
- Roeser, R. W., Peck, S. C., & Nasir, N. S. (2006). Self and identity processes in school motivation and achievement. In P. A. Alexander & P. H. Winne (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (2nd ed.) (pp. 391-424). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rose, P. (1985). *Writing on women: Essays in a renaissance*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Rose, J., & Paisley, K. (2012). White privilege in experiential education: A critical reflection. *Leisure Sciences: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 34(2), 136-154.
- Rowley, S. J., Chavous, T. M., & Cook, D. Y. (2003). A person-centered approach to African-American gender differences in racial ideology, self and identity, *Self & Identity*, 2(4), 287-306.
- Rubin, B. C. (2007). Learner identity amid figured worlds: Constructing (in)competence at an urban high school. *The Urban Review*, 39(2), 217-249.
- Schutz, K. M., & Hoffman, J. V. (2017). I practice teaching: Transforming our professional identities as literacy teachers through action research. *The Reading Teacher*, 71(1), 7-12.
- Sfard, A., & Prusak, A. (2005). Telling identity: In search of an analytic tool for investigating learning as a culturally shaped activity. *Educational Researcher*, 34(4), 14-22.

- Shannon, S. M. (2010). The debate on bilingual education in the U.S.: Language ideology as reflected in the practice of bilingual teachers. In J. Blommaert (Ed.), *Ideological debates* (pp. 171-199). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Shibata, S. (2004). The effects of Japanese heritage language maintenance on scholastic verbal and academic achievement in English. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37(2), 224-231.
- Silverstein, M. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In R. Clyne, W. Hanks, & C. Hofbauer (Eds.), *The Elements: A parasession on linguistic units and levels* (193-247). Chicago, IL: Linguistic Society.
- Snyder, T.D., de Brey, C., and Dillow, S.A. (2016). *Digest of Education Statistics 2015* (NCES 2016-014). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC.
- Stake, R. E. (2000). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of quality research* (pp. 435-453). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Stake, R. E. (2003). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry* (2nd ed.) (pp. 134-164). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Suarez, D. (2002). The paradox of linguistic hegemony and the maintenance of Spanish as a heritage language in the United States. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 23(6), 512-530.
- Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2003). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Temple, B., & Young, A. (2004). Qualitative research and translation dilemmas. *Qualitative Research*, 4(2), 161-178.

- Thorstensson, L. (2013). Learning English and “smartness”: Refugee students negotiate language, reception, and ability in school. *Journal of Southeast Asian American Education and Advancement*, 8(1), Article 1.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (2005). Identity negotiation theory: Crossing cultural boundaries. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 211-233). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Tirado, F., & Galvez, A. (2008). Positioning theory and discourse analysis: Some tools for social interaction analysis. *Historical Social Research*, 33(1), 224-251.
- Tracey, D. H., & Morrow, L. M. (2017). *Lenses on reading: An introduction to theories and models* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Turkan, S., & Iddings, A. C. D. (2012). That child is a yellow: New immigrant children’s conceptions of English language, literacy, and learners’ identities in the NCLB era. *Theory Into practice*, 51, 273-280.
- Tyler, J. (2014). Rising pitch, continuation, and the hierarchical structure of discourse. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*, 20(1), Article 36.
- Urrieta, L., Jr. (2007). Identity production in figured worlds: How some Mexican Americans become Chicana/o activist educators. *The Urban Review*, 39(2), 117-144.
- Valencia, R. R. (2012). *The evolution of deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice (e-book)*. London, England: Routledge.
- Vonderlack-Navarro, R. (2013). *The Illinois English learner student population: A demographic overview* [PDF document]. Retrieved from Latino Policy Forum Web site: http://www.latinopolicyforum.org/resource/webinars/document/Website_ELL-Demographic-Overview-6/25-13.pdf.

- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. In M. Gauvain & M. Cole (Eds.), *Readings on the development of children* (pp. 34-40). New York, NY: Scientific American Books.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1981). The genesis of higher mental functions. In J. V. Wertsch (Ed.), *The concept of activity in Soviet psychology* (pp. 144-188). Armonk, NY: Sharpe.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MS: The Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Warburton, T. (2016). Turning the lens: Reflexivity in research & teaching with critical discourse analysis. *Critical Question in Education*, 7(3), 249-267.
- Wells, A. S., Fox, L. & Cordova-Coba, D. (2016, February 9). *How racially diverse schools and classrooms can benefit all students*. The Century Foundation. Retrieved from https://s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/production.tcf.org/app/uploads/2016/02/09142501/HowRaciallyDiverse_AmyStuartWells-11.pdf
- Wiggins, J. L., & Monobe, G. (2017) Positioning self in “figured worlds”: Using poetic inquiry to theorize transnational experiences in education. *Urban Review*, 49, 153-168.
- Wolfram, W., & Schilling-Estes, N. (2006). *American English: Dialects and variation* (2nd ed.), Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Woolard, K. A. (1992). Language ideology: Issues and approaches. *Pragmatics*, 2(3), 235-249.
- Woolard, K. A., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1994). Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 23, 55-82.
- Yolen, J. (1989). *Encounter*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt.

- Yoon, B. (2008). Uninvited guests: The influence of teachers' roles and pedagogies on the positioning of English language learners in the regular classroom. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(2), 495-522).
- Yoon, B. (2012). Junsuk and Junhyuck: Adolescent immigrants' educational journey to success and identity negotiation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 49(5), 971-1002.
- Yoon, B. (2015). Cultural capital, agency, and voice: Literacy practices of middle school English language learners. *Middle Grades Review*, 1(2), 1-13.
- Yoon, B., & Haag, C. (2010). Visible or invisible? Korean high school students' current schooling experiences in the United States. *Current Issues in Education*, 13(2). Retrieved from <http://cie.asu.edu/>
- York, S. (1991). *Roots and wings: Affirming culture in early childhood program*. St. Paul, MN: Redleaf Press.
- Zelasko, N., & Antunez, B. (2000). *If your child learns in two languages: A parent's guide for improving educational opportunities for children acquiring English as a second language*, Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse of Bilingual Education.
- Zhang-Wu, Q. (2017). Culturally and linguistically responsive teaching in practice: A case study of a fourth-grade mainstream classroom teacher. *Journal of Education*, 197(1), 33-40.

APPENDIX A: REFLECTIVE MEMO

April 25 Gabriella Classroom Memo 21:29

This 21 minute and 29 second classroom observation of Gabriella took place on April 25, 2018. It is a group of students reading and discussing the Mouse and the Motorcycle.

Each student in the group had read portions of the book independently. It was difficult to have a discussion because the kids were at different parts of the book. Therefore, there was a lot of recalling and retelling to catch other kids up to speed so that the entire group could discuss. It was interesting, because as “involved” as the teacher usually is, she pretended to not have read the book before making it seem all new to her. Students were making inferences while reading. Focal student said “So he went back to be protected.” She did not hesitate with her inferences and they were mostly “EXPECTED RESPONSES.”

The biggest thing in this transcript was the “CORRECTING” that occurred throughout the entire observation. The focal teacher again was wanting exact words. Students would give an adequate response and she would prompt them towards an “EXACT RESPONSE.” For example, the focal student stated, “Maybe he was *inaudible*.” The teacher then stated “What’s another word for that?” and “LEADING” student until she got the exact word. The correcting continued when the student gave a correct response. On page 11, the focal student says, “That means that she is so, so good.” The teacher then corrects her to state, “it means extremely, intensely.” This could either be looked at as a means of “OVERCORRECTING” or it could be that she wanted to simply teach synonymous vocabulary words. However, in the moment while someone is reading, it seems like the overcorrecting is at the expense of comprehension.

The focal teacher would correct both intonation and words/phrases. One example of intonation correction occurred on page 5 with student “K” when a student reads a sentence and the focal teacher “INTERJECTS” and states, “Read that like a question. It’s a question.” It took 4 turns for the student to get it correct and then they read 2 ½ more sentences and a long correction series occurred again on word pronunciation. In the ~20 minute observation, there were 14 different correction series occurring...many of them continuing for many lines of transcript.

A pattern of correcting may be appearing. The first step is that the student makes a miscue. The teacher then works with him/her to “get it right.” Then the teacher tells a personal story/connection associated with that word or concept.

However, throughout all of these connections, the teacher does appear to try “CONNECT” with the students and want to “lessen the blow” of a correction. It’s kind of like what has been observed in other transcripts/observations. She does not want to hold all of the power. She does seem to want to open the door to other responses. She accomplishes this by using the initial sentence starter “I think” when offering an “ALTERNATIVE RESPONSE.” The focal student and teacher are talking about where the crook of the elbow is. The focal student points to an incorrect place. The teacher states, “I think it’s more on the inside.” She could have been more direct and just pointed, but she used that phrase “I think.” She did it again on page 10. A student “J” read the word “chastened.” She corrected the student by saying “I think it’s chastened. When it seems like the miscue was of an “easy” word or phrase, she doesn’t seem to have a problem correcting. However, when it involves high level vocabulary, she prefers it with “I think.”

APPENDIX B: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Student:

- What languages do you speak?
- What language(s) do you use at home? In the community?
- How do you feel about the languages you speak?
 - Tell me a story about whenever you felt ____ when using that language
- Tell me about a moment when you felt proud to be bilingual?
- How do you think your teacher feels about you speaking ____?
- How do you think your teacher feels about your English?
- Which language do you prefer? Why?
- What type of learner are you?
- What language do you think in? Do you dream in? Has that always been the case?
 - Can you recall any stories where this switch occurred?
- Do you have any extra responsibilities because you can speak more than one language? What are they? How do you feel about it?
- What can you tell me about your family's linguistic history?

Parents:

- Tell me about your language background.
- Tell me a story about ____'s typical language use in the home? Community?
- How do you or how would you feel about ____ using only English in the home?
- What are your language goals for your child?

Teachers:

- Tell me a story about ____'s typical language use in the classroom.
- How do you feel about his/her use of the home language and English at school?
- How do you or how would you handle ____ using the native language in the classroom? What type of language use do you encourage in the classroom?
- What native language influences do you feel are observable in ____'s speaking and writing in English?
- What do you feel your role is related to ____ language development?

APPENDIX C: SYNTHESIS JOURNAL ENTRY

Journal Entry 9

August 1, 2018

Classroom Observation Summary

When summarizing my classroom observations of participant 2, it is important to note the structure of the group size as this appears to have an effect on her level of participation as well as how she positions herself.

Whole Class Math

In whole class math lessons, the focal student's "opinion" voice is relatively silent. However, it would appear at first that Aanya is a good advocate for herself. She tells the teacher when she doesn't understand and asks for help. While this does point to advocacy, what I noticed is that she only seems to advocate for help...help that she possibly doesn't need. It appears that she may ask for help that she doesn't really need, because she is uncertain of her own mathematical abilities...or uncertain that she will obtain the expected response of the classroom teacher.

From the observations I analyzed, it appears that the teacher "quantifies" her speech acts. For the purpose of this study, quantifies means that she uses words such as tricky, difficult, easy, etc... to position certain concepts or problems as either being easy or hard. She then positions certain students as knowers of these concepts and repeatedly asks the same students to demonstrate their understanding and explain to the rest of the class steps they took to solve the problem. The focal student was not one of those students.

Instead, the focal student seemed to be positioned by both the teacher and herself as someone who needs "tricks" and extra help in order to apply her knowledge to the "tricky" problems. Her knowledge bases were insufficient to achieve the expected response that was put forth not just by the teacher but by "they."

"They" is one of the various interesting choices of pronouns that the classroom teacher utilized during her turns. The would give power to "they" stating that we will have to see what "they" say. One can assume through context clues that they are referring to the authors of the textbook or just the textbook as an entity itself. This reliance on the textbook as the holder of the knowledge and power seems to diminish the teacher as the "knower" and the one of ultimate power in the classroom. However, she does maintain a power status when telling students that the problem is difficult but when she teaches them the trick they will be able to get it. However, in the hierarchy of the classroom, it appears that it is the textbook, teacher, and then students who possess the knowledge.

The teacher also shares the responsibility of NOT knowing with students as well through the use of pronouns. She incorrectly taught a concept and when two students refuted her statements, the teacher then responded with, "we were wrong." This use of we may show that the teacher wants to maintain her power status in the classroom and if she took full responsibility for the mistake, it may place her lower on the hierarchy so instead she shares the blame with the students.

Small Group Math

During small group math lessons, Aanya again appears to lack confidence in her own abilities. She appears to have limited agency, mainly speaking to seek the teacher's approval. This is done through the use of "right?" at the end of each of her statements. However, there was

an instance of her challenging the views of those in the small group. However, she wasn't challenging the validity of their actual statement...like the answer to the problem, instead she was nitpicking at a detail of the person's response. Was this her way to assert herself into a group that she does not feel comfortable about?

In a small group setting, the classroom teacher was still quantifying things, positioning Aanya as an outsider to knowledge. There were times when the teacher would ignore Aanya's hand being raised. However, the act of positioning that I chose to focus on was the fact that she would not lead Aanya to finding/understanding the expected response. Instead, she would give Aanya the answer, and then say, "right?"

Is Aanya picking up on the sentence structure of the teacher? Does she believe that even those in positions of power have to have their statements validated by another in power for them to be "accurate?" There are other instances where she has picked up the statement cues by the teacher and replicated them. This could also be why she does not position herself as one that is in power over her own knowing. The teacher continues to use the pronoun "they" to refer to the textbook as the one with the correct answers. If the teacher is doing this, it could be that Aanya is picking up on these cues and incorporating them into her own mindset.

One-On-One

When the focal student is alone with just the teacher, there is a lot of negative talk occurring. She uses negative phrases to describe her feelings of the content. She often said, "I don't like... I don't think I am going to like..." The only act of advocacy shown here is that she asks the teacher to take turns reading. However, it is not apparent if this is advocacy (asking for help from a fluent native speaker/reader) or if it a negative self-image that she needs another to help fulfill the assignment.

Aanya is again showing that the focal student believes that the teacher is the holder of the knowledge. She will often ask permission to write something after sharing it with her teacher. "Could I say..." After she presents her statement, the teacher often responds with the expected response that she had in mind. Aanya then worked diligently to erase her answer (even if it was--in my eyes--an acceptable alternative response) and attempts to write verbatim what the teacher recommended. Self-talk is evidenced as she is repeating over and over to herself what the teacher said so that she will not forget it. It appears that learning to her is a guessing game to get the expected response of the teacher.

APPENDIX D: MICROTRANSCRIPTION KEY

Transcription Key	
<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Meaning</i>
_____	Emphasis
	Short pause
	Long pause
*	Voice, pitch, or style change
↑	Rising intonation
↓	Falling intonation
:	Elongated vowel
[Start overlapping talk
]	End overlapping talk
XXXX	Undecipherable

APPENDIX E: DISCOURSE ANALYSIS TOOLS

<u>Name of Tool</u>	<u>Summary of Tool</u>	<u>Am I going to use it?</u>	<u>Justification</u>	<u>Question(s) to ask</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Linguistic and Contextual Tools (physical setting and everything in it--gaze, gestures, movements, both present & past)					
#1: The Diexis Tool	How pronouns and adverbials tie speech and writing to context	Yes	Pronoun use can be a window through which cultural practices can be investigated. When a participant uses a particular pronoun or adverbial it both situates themselves and the listener as being a certain person--identity work or assumptions of identity can be made using the Diexis tool	* What aspects of the specific meaning need to be filled in from context	*Cross with Situated Meaning Tool *Adverbials: then, this, that, the former/latter, as, we, you, here, there, now *Meaning determined through context
#2: The Fill in Tool	Knowledge, assumptions, and inferences that readers have to bring to communication	Yes	The Fill in Tool will help to reveal what, if any, contexts/communications are not available to the focal students due to their lack of background knowledge (context). It will also reveal whether the focal student is positioned as an insider or outsider of various settings by various people	*Based on what was said and the context, what needs to be filled in to understand? *What is not being said, but assumed to be inferable?	How will it influence how language is used?

#3: The Making Strange Tool	Pretending to be an outsider to see what information has to be inferred	Yes	Same reasoning as above. When the researcher takes a step back from their own world of knowing and is an outsider, they can see the assumptions that have to be made by others to understand the context. Again, this seems like it would help to use tool number two that could help to answer questions about positioning.	*What would an outsider find strange or unclear if information was not shared by an insider?	Helps us use The Fill in Tool “What knowledge is taken for granted by outsiders?”
#4: The Subject Tool	How subjects are chosen and what speakers choose to say about them	Yes	This tool will allow me to examine the importance that the focal participants put on certain subjects. This could show acts of positioning by what they value and could also be linked to various ideologies	*Why did the speaker organize their speech in the way they did (subjects/predicates)?	
#5: The Intonation Tool	How the speaker’s pitch contributes to the meaning of an utterance	Yes	Studying intonation contours might show why the focal student is being positioned in a certain way by teachers if their intonations do not follow typical mainstream structures (rise/fall)	*How does intonation contribute to the meaning of an utterance?	So what is the intonation structure and what were the responses?
#6: The Frame Tool	Making sure all aspects of context are accounted for	Yes	Since we can always learn more about contexts, the frame tool will help to further prevent premature	*Is there anything else about the context in which the data occurred that I can figure out?	Going back to participants to ask for translation of Mandarin/Telugu

			assumptions. It can help to push beyond the limits that the participant may be attempting to set.		
Saying, Doing, & Designing Tools (Language can perform different functions--using grammar and words to design and build language structures with meaning)					
#7: The Doing and Not Just Saying Tool	Making sure to pay attention to what speakers are trying <i>to do</i> with their communication	Yes	This tool helps to study the relationship between language and action. Therefore it is a perfect tool to examine positioning and small story analysis.	*What is the speaker trying to DO with their communication?	Positioning and small story analysis
#8: The Vocabulary Tool	Examining the different types of language use (i.e. formal v. informal)	Yes	There are 3 main tiers of word. The first is everyday vocabulary. The second tier has more formal words and tier three has specialist technical terms. Since schools focus on mostly tier two it would be good to see what levels are used with English learners as the higher levels could be a barrier to learning/communication if not made comprehensible.	*How does the type of language use contribute to the purpose for the communication?	
#9: The Why This Way and	Why speakers build their messages in a	Yes	This tool should be used in conjunction with the Doing and Not Saying Tool & the	*How else could the sentences be framed and what does the speaker	Connected to the Doing Not Saying

Not that Way Tool	certain way and not in some other way		Fill in Tool in order to triangulate analysis. Each one give slightly different information, but support each other	mean by doing it this particular way?	Tool & the Fill In Tool
#10: The Integration Tool	How clauses are integrated into utterances/sentences	Yes	The Integration Tool looks at whose perspectives are being communicated based on how the clauses were used. Therefore there could be ties to language ideologies based on what perspective is linked to and why.	*What was left out and what was included when clauses were turned into phrases?	
#11: The Topic and Theme Tool	What the topic and theme is in a sentence	Yes	The subjects that are being chosen in sentences helps the listener make assertions about meaning and importance. Themes in subjects also create perspectives in which everything else is viewed. Could be tied to positioning since the assertions being made connect to how the speaker positions the self or others.	*Why were the choices made for to include a particular theme in a clause or deviate from the theme if there is one main theme?	
#12: The Stanza Tool	Look for groups of idea units and how they cluster into larger chunks of information	Yes	This tool was already employed by breaking the micro transcript into interaction units. Interaction	*Can/How you group communication into stanzas to help you interpret the data?	Interaction Units

units allow you to see how groups of speech go together to showcase ideas about one important “event”

Reality Building Tools (Shaping language, but also being shaped by it) (worlds are (re)built on language and other actions, interactions, non-linguistic symbols, objects, tools, technologies, ways of thinking, valuing, feeling, and believing)

<p>#13: The Context is Reflexive Tool</p>	<p>What speakers say and how they replicate, transform, or change context either consciously or unconsciously</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>This tool addresses power, historical, and cultural issues surrounding context. Speakers have the power to shape how listeners view context and how listeners view context shapes how the communication is received. Since speakers fit their language to a context it speaks to language ideologies and would be good for small story/positioning analysis. Context is reflexive. Speaking reflects context and context is shaped and reshaped by speaking.</p>	<p>*How is what the speaker saying (and how they say it)... -changing what is the relevant context? -reproduce contexts that continue through time and space? -Are they replicating contexts, transforming, or changing them in any respect? *Is the speaker reproducing contexts unaware of aspects that they wouldn't want to be reproducing if they knew they were?</p>	<p>In line with Fill in, Doing and not saying, Frame Problem, Why this way and not that way (context)</p>
<p>#14: The Significance Building Tool</p>	<p>What is chosen to be either strengthened or lessened through the choice of specific words or grammatical structures</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>This tool seems to go with the Topic and Theme Tool. What is in the main clause is foregrounded information and the subordinate clause contains backgrounded</p>	<p>*How are words and/or grammar structures used to strengthen or lessen significance</p>	

			information. Therefore, this tool allows the reader to see where significance lies for the focal participant in the language that they use.		
#15: The Activities Building Tool	What activities are built or enacted by communication, what social groups, institutions, or cultures support and set norms for the activities	Yes	Since this tool can be used in conjunction with The Doing and Not Just Saying Tool, it can be used for small story analysis and positioning. Further justification comes from the fact that it focuses on activities--actions that carry out a socially recognizable and institutionally or culturally normed endeavor (practice)	*What "groups" support and norm the actions being observed? *What activity is the communication seeking to get others to recognize as being accomplished?	Goes with the Doing and Not Saying Tool (actions) versus this tool (practices) Example: Action (playing a video game); Activity/practice (gaming) Action: here and now Activity: meaning and social significance
#16: The Identities Building Tool	What socially recognizable identity the speaker tries to enact or get others to recognize; how the speaker positions others and what identities he invites them to take up	Yes!	The identities building tool helps to make visible how people expressing their sense of who they are and their multiple other identities through language. Not only does this tie to identity work which is part of my research questions, but it also ties to language ideologies and	*What identity is the speaker trying to enact or get others to recognize? *How does the speaker's language treat other's identities *How is the speaker positioning others?	

			positioning due to the nature of how people take on or ascribe identities.		
#17: The Relationships Building Tool	How lexical and grammatical nuances build and sustain relationships among the speaker, other people, social groups, cultures, and institutions	Yes	The identity we construct for ourselves in any context is often defined (in part) by how we see and construe our relationships with other people, social groups, cultures, or institutions. We relate to other people in terms of different identities we take them to have.	*How do the words used are building/sustaining or changing various relationships among speaker, others, social groups, cultures, institutions?	Related to Identities Building Tool. Identities set up parameters for relationships
#18: The Politics Building Tool	How words are employed to build social goods and a viewpoint on how social goods are or should be distributed in society	Yes	Could social goods be tied to language ideologies? I could maybe see this showing contradiction between what some participants say about language and how it's being used.	*How are words being used to build what counts as a social good and to distribute this good or withhold it from listeners *How are words being used to build a viewpoint on how social goods are/should be distributed in society?	This seems like a pretty macro topic to be using as a micro tool
#19: The Connections Building Tool	How words are used to connect or disconnect things or ignore connections between things. Such	Yes	Yes, the ways that participants are using language to connect "things" together can position themselves and others in certain ways	*How are the words (dis)connecting or ignore connections between things?	Seems to connect with Diexis Tool. Could also go with Fill in Tool if assumptions are left

	connections are fashioned by means of pronouns, determiners and quantifiers, substitution, ellipsis, adjunctive, conjunction, adverbs.			*How do the words being used make things (ir)relevant or ignores their relevance to each other	to be made by the listener about the nature of the connection.
#20: The Cohesion Tool	How cohesion works in texts to connect pieces of information and in what ways	Yes	Is the cohesion tool examining message units and how they work together to create cohesive themes?	How does cohesion work to connect information? What is the speaker trying to communicate by using cohesion in that way?	
#21: The Sign Systems and Knowledge Building Tool	The ways in which words and grammar privilege or denigrate specific sign systems	Yes	Dominant language ideologies can influence the value placed on various sign systems. Therefore, if one way of speaking or knowing is valued over the other, positioning is occurring. This aligns with the research questions since sign systems partly define identities.	How are the words and grammar being used privileging or devaluing or different ways of knowing and believing?	Related to Politics Tool. Politics tool seems to be macro and this tool seems to be funneled in from the macro
#22: The Topic Flow or Topic Chaining Tool	The topics of main clauses, the ways they are linked to each other to create (or not) a chain; how speakers switch topics	No	I see the focus of this tool more on the grammar and just switching of topics and not so much on what the speaker is trying to do with their speech acts which is more what I am	How are speakers switching topics? Are they linking them back? How are topic shifted structures being used?	

trying to accomplish with studying positioning.

Theoretical Tools for Discourse Analysis

<p>#23: The Situated Meaning Tool</p>	<p>Specific meanings that listeners attribute to words given the context and how the context is constructed</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Is this tool really needed? It seems what it does is covered by the context tools. Plus, it seems like the focus is on the structure of the language and not the actual words or what the speaker is trying to do with the words. Or is it important because of the assumptions that the speaker makes about the listener and their way of knowing/understanding?</p>	<p>What meanings do listeners have to attribute words given the context and how is the context construed?</p>	<p>Shared experiences and background knowledge are seen as a prerequisite Related to Filling In Tool</p>
<p>#24: Social Languages Tool</p>	<p>How words and grammatical structures can signal and enact a given social language</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>This tool addresses issues of identity and the importance that “doing identities” has on knowing a particular social language. Therefore, there are direct ties to language ideologies and the impact that these have on the social identities that participants relate to and identities they act out and what they are trying to do with the language</p>	<p>How are words/grammatical structures used to signal and enact a given social language?</p>	<p>Language Ideologies Styles of a language that are associated with a particular social identity May blend or switch between languages</p>

#25: The Intertextuality Tool	How lexical and grammatical items can be used to quote, refer to or allude to other “texts” or styles of language	Yes	This tool refers to looking at how texts are used, but not what they are trying to say or do by using such styles of language.	How are words used to refer to what others have said or other styles of language?	
#26: Figured World Tool	What figured worlds the words and phrases of the communication assume and in turn invite listeners to assume	Yes	The typical stories valued in figured worlds can marginalize people and things that are not “normal” within the context of the figured world. What counts as a typical story differs by their social and cultural group(s). Therefore, this tool may help to analyze positioning based on insider/outsider status in these figured worlds and therefore identity work.	What participants, ways of interacting, forms of language, people, objects, environments, and institutions, as well as values are in these figured worlds?	<p>Figured Worlds: Think about a classroom. The story I have for a classroom in the U.S. might be different than in China (culture matters!)</p> <p>Schema comes to mind</p>
#27: The Big “D” Discourse Tool	How the speaker/listener manipulates language and ways of acting, interacting, thinking, believing, feeling, etc... and using various objects, tools, etc...to enact a particular social identity	Yes	This tool helps to pinpoint the identities that speakers are putting out there trying to get recognized through their use of language as well as how language ideologies come in to play to influence the identities that are available to speakers in addition to those that they prescribe to others. Therefore with the tie to discourse, language, identities, and	<p>*How is a person using language (and other ways of being) to enact a socially recognizable identity to engage in a social activity</p> <p>*What Discourse is this language part of...what identity is this speaker seeking...what kinds of actions, values, etc...are associated with this sort</p>	<p>Language Ideologies</p> <p>d discourse: - language in use</p> <p>D discourse: - language plus other stuff (beliefs, ideas, emotions, means, places)</p> <p>-language through time and history</p>

			language ideologies, this tool is a great fit for my study.	of language with this Discourse?	-distinctive ways of reading, writing, speaking, listening and acting/being.... all done to enact identities -About being kinds of people
#28: The Big C Conversation Tool	The issues, sides, debates, and claims the communication assumes hearers know in a historical context.	Yes	I believe this tool would be useful to my study because it looks at the conversations that are embedded in Discourses are tied historically to wider scaled beliefs that can be linked to dominant language ideologies.	What historically known debate is carried out between Discourses? Which Discourses?	Big C Conversations are those conversations that are embedded in culture and big D Discourses

APPENDIX F: AANYA ESL MICROTRANSCRIPT

A.V. ESL Observation

The following excerpt is taken from an ESL observation of A.V. conducted by the researcher on April 18, 2018. The context of the observation was an ESL lesson conducted from 8:00-8:30 in the ESL classroom. There were four students present. The students will be referred to as A, Ab, Ay, and H. The teacher researcher will be referred to as S. The observed lesson was a group discussion about a book entitled *Encounter* by Jane Yolen. This fictional (but based on real facts) book is about the explorations and discoveries of Christopher Columbus told from the perspectives of a Native American tribe. At the point of the excerpt, we had just finished reading the book and the main character (who had been a young Native American boy) was grown up and telling a story about the loss of his land, heritage, language, religion, etc... This sparked a discussion about loss amongst the students.

This excerpt, that starts at 13 minutes and 1 second into the 24 minute and 55 second observation and concludes at 15 minutes and 52, provides a rich discussion of loss from a young child's perspective for analysis and will aid in the answering of research questions one and three that are: How do emergent bilingual students, their families and ESL/general education teachers discursively position one another? And How do emergent bilinguals co-construct their linguistic identities in relation to these language ideologies?

This specific excerpt was chosen due to the rich level of discussion that was present amongst the young students. The beginning boundary was identified as a shift in group discussion. I had just finished reading a portion of the book and was shifting the group to a discussion instead of just active listening. The same type of boundary exists at the end of the excerpt. There is another shift from group discussion back to the teacher reading of the text. The excerpt starts on the ninth turn of page 9 of the transcript and ends after the twenty-first turn of page 10. Within those two pages, there were 12 different speech acts coded leading to a total of 8 different categories (connecting, deflecting, identity, language, loss, positioning other, self-preservation, and smartness). You can see the renaming and category columns below for the 12 turns of codes.

Finally, the excerpt was broken into interactional units. Green and Wallat (1981) describe interactional units as "a series of conversationally tied message units" (p. 200). In small story analysis, the researcher examines "small stories" in everyday activities that the participants use to "construct a sense of who they are" (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008, p. 382). Bamberg and Georgakopoulou (2008) believe small stories are people *doing* identities. Small story analysis is a form of narrative analysis; therefore, the interactional units are groups of message units that represent the structure of the "narrative" and what the participants are doing with/within that structure. In this specific excerpt, there were three different identifiable interactional units present in the text. The first interactional unit was bounded by its setting of the scene. There are three turns that take place at the beginning of the excerpt that set the scene for the later discussion of loss. Therefore, the second interactional unit begins with a solicitation of a personal narrative from the students. There is some general discussion, but the third interactional unit really marks the beginning of an identification of a problem--loss of language--and a description of that problem. Unfortunately, there is no real discussion to the solution to the problem as the student does not seem to have worked through that yet. The third interactional unit and excerpt ends when there is a transition back to reading the text.

Renaming	Category 1	Category 2	Category 3
Uptake (AV of AB)	Assertive	Defending	Smartness
Interjection (AV over ?)	Assertive	Positioning Self (as leader)	Dominance
Uptake (AV of AY)	Assertive	Defending	Smartness
Social Emotional Loss	Connecting		
Interjection (AV over AB)	Assertive	Positioning Self (as leader)	Dominance
Personal Opinion (uncertain)	Positioning Self (as leader)	Assertive	Smartness
Probing	Positioning Other	Connecting	
Uncertainty	Connection		Loss
Uptake (AV of AY)	Connecting (to group)	Loss	
Uptake (AY & AV of HT)	Connecting (to group)	Loss	language
Uptake (AV of HT)	Connecting (to group)	Loss	language
Language	Loss	language	
Language	Loss	language	
Connection	Loss	language	
Probing	Positioning Other	Connecting	
Neutral Response	Self Preservation	Deflecting	Smartness
Loss	Identity	language	
Loss	Identity	language	
Loss	Identity	language	
Opinion Solicitation	Positioning Other	Connecting	
Personal Opinion	Positioning Self (as leader)	Assertive	Smartness
Clarification (question)	Self Verification	Advocacy	Smartness
Word Choice (there)	Separating		

The below symbols and their corresponding meanings will be utilized throughout the microtranscription process in order to paint a more complete picture. This will allow a deeper analysis of spoken language in addition to the contextualization cues from each participant.

Transcription Key	
<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Meaning</i>
_____	Emphasis
	Short pause
	Long pause
*	Voice, pitch, or style change
↑	Rising intonation
↓	Falling intonation
:	Elongated vowel
[Start overlapping talk
]	End overlapping talk
XXXX	Undecipherable

Time	Line #	Speaker/ Hearer	Message Unit	Additional Contextualization
Begin Interaction Unit 1: Discussion focusing on the text and characters (setting the scene)				
13:01	001	S →	Yes ↑	A smiles
	002	Group	So they are no	
	003		longer	
	004		believing	
	005		in their <u>own</u>	
	006		beliefs and	*Reads slowly and enunciates each word. Uses
	007		gods	hand gestures for further emphasis. At this line
	008		Now they are	A raises her hand and shakes it to show she
	009		going	“really” wants to answer and makes an “o” with
	010		with somebody	her mouth.
	011		<u>else’s</u> beliefs	
	012		<u>Then</u> it says	
13:23	013	A →	listen to this	
	014	Group	one	
	015		*We took <u>their</u>	
	016		speech	
	017		into our mouths	
	018		forgetting our	
	019		o:wn	
	020		Yeah*	
13:36	021	S →	So that	
	022	Group	like	
	023		they took	
	024		like you know	
	025		what they are	
	026		speaking like	
			the Europeans	
			are speaking	
			English	
			so we also	
			started speaking	
			<u>English</u>	
			but not our own	
			language	
			So they	
			gave up	

			their own native languages and <u>now</u> took on the Europeans' language ↓	
Begin Interaction Unit 2: Solicitation of personal stories				
	027		Has that happened	S scrunched eyes while asking the question
	028		to anyone	A makes a long face and shifts eyes back and forth like to indicate no or to check out what others are saying. Then looks to Ay
	029		here ↑	
	030		Do you feel like you have lost	Ay & H half raise their hands
13:51	031	Ay → Group	some of your language ↓	Ay speaks very quietly
13:52	032	H → Group	I think I sort of	H speaks very quietly at the same time as Ay
13:53	033		I feel like a little bit	A has her elbow on the table and flips her hand over and over indicating some level of agreement
	034	S → Ay	That's kind of what your sister said	A quick waves hand in the air to indicate she wants to speak
	035		too	A overlapping talk with H
13:58	036	H → Group	She said sometimes I	H doesn't make eye contact during this turn
13:58	037	A → Group	forget	
	038	A → Group	some of the Spanish words	
13:59	039	H → Group	I	Waves arms when saying *same same*
	040	H → Group	[yeah	
	041	H → Group	me too	
14:03	042	H → Group	sometimes	
	043	H → Group	I for]	
	044		I forge	A stops talking to give Ay the turn
14:04	045		I forget	
	046		like a lot	*Ay speaks quickly*
	047		like a little bit	
	048		of Tamil	

14:07	054		Yeah	Overlapping talk with A and AB Ab looks directly at the camera when speaking. S does not acknowledge that Ab is speaking and continues with her turn
	055	A →	same same	
	056	Group		
14:07	057		*And my mom	
	058		thinks	
	059		I should go to	
14:08	060	Ay →	Mexico	
	061	Group	so I can learn more words↓ *	
		A →	I	
		Group	[forgot	
		AB →	I know	
		Camera	a lot of	
			languages	
			it's easy	
			forgot	
			all of my	
		A →	Telugu letters]	
		Group		

Begin Interaction Unit 3:

14:11	062	S → A	So yeah	H turns away from Ab (towards the camera) and counts after his comment about knowing 9 languages
	063		tell me a story	
	064		About	
14:13	065		[<u>loss</u>	
	066	H → Self	1	
	067		2	
	068		3	
	069		4	
	070		5	
	071		6	
	072		7	
	073		8	
	074		9	
14:14	075		10	
	076	S → A	of language	
	077		so you been	
14:17	078		here	
	079	S → A	about what]	
			2 years now ↑	

14:18	080	A → S		Undecipherable overlapping talk between H & Ab at the same time A is talking to S.
	081	Ab → H	2 years and I	
14:19	082	S → Ab &	forget	
	083	H	[XXXX	
14:21	084		Hey guys	
	085	S → Ab &	hey guys]	S Points to A when saying “her story”
	086	H	I want to hear	Ab turns to A & puts hand on mouth
	087		her story	
	088		She is telling us	
14:28	089		the <u>story</u>	
	090		of the loss	A plays with her shirt while talking
	091	A →	of her language	
	092	Group	↓	
	093		So	
	094		I came here	
	095		for 2 years	
	096		and after that	
	097		I forgot all of	
	098		my Telugu ↓	
	099		like words in	
	100		from India	
	101		I used to speak	A smiles
	102		like when I	
14:48	103		went	
			somewhere	
14:50	104		like somewhere	A smiles
	105	S → A	I used to speak	A scrunches her nose in thought
	106		it ↑	
	107	A → S	or I used to like	
	108		use Telugu	*The entire word “more” is drawn out and said like a question and said with an exhale
14:56	109		now I have	
	110		forgot	
			how to read	
			Telug:u	
15:00	111	S → A	and write ↓	4 second pause. Shakes hand, smirks, then smiles when talking.
15:02	112	A → S	And why do	
			you think that’s	
15:03	113		happened ↑	Repeated back to her. Said quietly.
	114	S → A	I don’t <u>know</u> ↓	Hand half raised
	115		Maybe	Overlapping group talk
15:04	116	H →	because I	
15:06	117	Group	change it	
			with English	Overlapping talk of Ab and A

15:07	118 119	Group Talk	*more* ↑	Uses his hands to show that he is counting
15:07	120 121 122	Ab → Camera & H	Ok And how do you feel about that ↑	*Each language is said with stress on the first syllable.*
15:13	123 124 125 126	A → Group	I don't know	
	127 128		*You don't know*	Overlapping talk H & Ab
15:14	129 130	Ab → Camera & H	I say	
15:14	131 132		I don't like [that ↓	
	133 134	S → Group	XXXX]	
15:14	135 136 137		I [know I am trying to fix that]	Large amount of overlapping talk between Ay, Ab, and H.
	138 139	Ab → Camera	9 languages ↑ [*Japanese	
15:15	140 141 142		She said she kind of feels sad by that	Raises his hand and then interjects to speak. However, he stops talking when Ay interjects.
	143 144		↓	
15:18	145 146 147	Ab → Camera H → S	Does anybody else feel <u>sad</u> about losing some of their language ↑]	H is putting his hand out to Ab trying to get him to stop talking. Ab pushes H's hand away.
15:22	148	Ay → Group	Indian	*Barely audible
15:23	149 150 151		Ordiya English XXXX XXXX	
	152 153		[HTML Yeah	A smiles
	154 155	Ab → Camera	Like sometimes Like]	
15:31	156		[You lost some of your language	
15:32	157 158 159	H → Ab	and then the language you speak	Ay shakes head "yes"

	160		is sometimes just lost ↓	
	161		MCSS	
15:36	162	Ab → H	ESS*	
	163		I know	
	164	S → Group	9 languages Stop ↑	
	165		Stop ↑	
15:41	166		Stop ↑]	
	167		*What are you	Ab laughs and looks at the camera while talking
15:43	168		doing?	
	169			
	170		Yeah ↑	
	171	A →	because yeah ↑	
15:46	172	Group	what Ay was saying	
	173	S → Group	she was kind of saying	*Said in a “silly” voice
15:48	174		your language is kind of a part of who you are	
15:48	175		↑	
15:50	176	H → Group	Yeah	
			And if you forget some of it	
		S → H	it’s like you kind of lost a little bit of yourself ↑	
		Ab → Group	Isn’t it ↓	
			It’s like kind of you’re lost your like your lost of your stuff	
		S → Group	You <u>lost</u> something ↓	
		S → Group	Yeah	
			Yeah	

		<p>Ab → Group</p> <p>S → Group</p>	<p>you lose something Yeah I lost my shirt</p> <p>Huh that's really interesting</p> <p>So guys </p> <p>*I lost my bey blade</p> <p>Wait a minute there is just a little bit left ↓</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

APPENDIX G: AANYA CLASSROOM MICROTRANSCRIPT

Aanya Microtranscription (Classroom)

The following microtranscription is from an observation of participant Aanya that took place on April 11, 2018. Aanya has been pulled aside by her classroom teacher to discuss a new book, *Tracker* by Gary Paulsen, that the class is going to begin reading. The entire transcript/observation is 6 minutes and 34 seconds.

The observation/excerpt was selected because of the fact that it is multiply coded. There are 17 different lines of coded text that were collapsed into 14 different categories. The categories are: advocacy, assertive, connecting, deflecting, explanation, language, low level questioning, motivation, positioning other, positioning self as leader, projection, self-positioning, self-preservation, self-verification. For more information regarding the codes, renaming, and categories see the table below.

Code	Renaming	Primary Category	Secondary	Tertiary
Do you know?	Probing for Expected Response	Low Level Questioning		
On the right track	Encouragement	Motivation		
I don't like	Personal Opinion	Deflecting	Self-Preservation	
I don't like	Personal Opinion	Deflecting	Self-Preservation	
I don't like	Personal Opinion	Deflecting	Self-Preservation	
Can we?	Advocacy	Advocacy	Assertive	Positioning Self (as leader)
Shakes head no	Action (movement-AV to teacher)	Deflecting		
What does that mean?	Expected Response	Low Level Questioning	Language	
I don't think	Personal Opinion	Deflecting	Self-Preservation	
Right?	Leading	Low Level Questioning		

Could I say?	Permission	Self-Verification	Self-Positioning	
What are you wanting to ask?	Opinion Solicitation	Positioning Other	Deflecting	
You could even...Right?	Leading	Positioning Other	Projection	language
Connection	Connection	Connecting		
You know?	Refuting	Positioning Other		
I mean	Refuting	Self-Preservation	Explanation	
I know someone	Connection	Connecting		

This excerpt starts at the onset of the video (0:00) and concludes at 5:41; however, the entire five minutes and forty-one seconds is not being used for micro transcription. There are parts of the transcript where the teacher (E) and the focal participant (A) are simply reading from the new book without discussion. While these parts of the transcript are not being used in the micro transcription process for discourse analysis, they are listed in a separate table following the micro transcript to provide a frame of reference for other discussion between the two participants.

With the brevity of the entire video, the start and 5:41 provided a natural boundary for section of the excerpt. The beginning explains itself; however, 5:41 was selected because that is the point where Aanya starts writing and E starts talking to other students about unrelated content until the end of the video. The only other boundaries that were decided upon were to omit the verbatim reading of text from the micro transcript and therefore discourse analysis. With those removed from the excerpt the actual amount of video utilized for discourse analysis is 3 minutes and 42 seconds. Once the boundaries were determined, the transcript, that had originally been transcribed verbatim was broken into message units. After the original transcript was broken into message units, they were typed into a new document following directions of the micro transcription process. Times, speakers/hearers, actual words, and contextual cues were all noted. The transcription key utilized in the process is shown below.

Transcription Key	
<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Meaning</i>
_____	Emphasis

	Short pause
	Long pause
*	Voice, pitch, or style change
↑	Rising intonation
↓	Falling intonation
:	Elongated vowel
[Start overlapping talk
]	End overlapping talk
XXXX	Undecipherable

Finally, the entire micro transcript was broken into interactional units. There were three interaction units present in the text. The first began at the onset of the transcript. These turns set the stage for reading. The teacher was soliciting predictions from the participant and she was also attempting to build interest in the text. The second interactional unit begins with the reading of the text and the shift from prediction type responses to discussion of actual text, comprehension questions, and vocabulary. The final interactional unit signifies another shift in the discussion. It is marked when the discussion shifts from revolving around the text itself to personal discussion of people the focal student and teacher know with cancer.

Time	Line #	Speaker/Hearer	Message Unit	Additional Contextualization
Begin Interaction Unit 1: Setting the stage for reading. Making prediction, attempts to build interest in text				
0:00	001 002 003 004	E → A	Ok So this new book That we're going to be reading	E takes off her classroom microphone
0:03	005	E → A	A___ ↓	E pulls the book out and places it in front of A
0:04	006 007 008 009	A → E	[Uh huh Is called <i>Tracker</i>] any predictions based on the cover	E puts her hand on her chin

			what this is going to be about ↑	
0:10	010	A → E	A deer ↑	A purses her lips and shakes her head slowly side to side when answering
0:11	011 012 013 014 015	E → A	Maybe about a deer ↑ Um Do you know What it means To track something ↑	E turns the book over to look at the back cover
0:17	016 017	A → E	*Mmmmm To go after it ↑	E looks away while thinking *A says this as a question
0:20	018 019 020 021 022 023 024 025	E → A	Uh Ye:ah ↑ *You on the right <u>track</u> With that To go after it ↑ Um It's also ↓ Is like following the <u>trail</u> ↓	Looks at A and pauses when she says "track" and then smiles because it's like a joke since the book title is <i>Tracker</i> A smiles in return and looks at E E looks at A when she says "trail"
0:29	026	A → E	Ok	
0:29	027 028 029 030	E → A	So I think You might be following The trail of	A starts shaking her head side to side and has a frown on her face
0:34	031 032 033	A → E	I don't think That I am going to like This book	Looks at E when she says this
0:37	034 035	E → A	*Well	* E laughs at A's previous turn and looks to her

	036 037 038		This story is written By Gary Paulsen He wrote <i>Hatchet</i> ↑ Did you like <i>Hatchet</i> ↑	
0:42	039	A → E	Unh uh ↓	A shakes her head quickly side to side
0:44	040 041	Unknown Student	Uh huh I didn't think so	A smiles widely and then look at E
0:44	042 043	E → A	*Ok Well this is a survival story	E is laughing again at what A and the unknown student has said in the previous two turns
0:48	044	A → E	I don't like survival stories	A looks up to E when she says "like survival stories" with a smile on her face
0:49	045 046	Ab → A	It's ↓ it's actually darker Than um <i>Hatchet</i>	E looks at A with a "smirk" on her face
0:53	047	A → E	I don't like dark books ↓	A looks down when she says this then looks away
0:55	048 049 050 051 052 053 054 055 056 057 058 059	E → A	*So I am going to have you read The first 19 pages ↓ It is a smaller book So the first 19 pages *And your first job Is to start Right here Ok ↑ Do you want to start reading It to me	*E is talking through a "snicker" *Tone is now very quiet

1:10	060 061 062 063	A → E	*Uh huh Can we take turns Like first I can read Then you can	*Tone is very quiet A looks at E and points to herself to read
1:15	064 065 066 067	E → A	*Sure You can begin first Can you scoot this way Just a little bit	*Entire turn is said very quietly
Begin Interaction Unit 2: Reading text and discussion of comprehension concepts and vocabulary				
1:18 1:23	068 069	A → E	Uh huh *R1*	Starts reading. See text below. *R1* A is holding the book with one hand reading
1:46 1:47 1:47	070 071 072 073 074	E → A A → E E → A	That word is ruddy ↓ [Ruddy oh Do you know] What that means Ruddy means like thick	A shakes her head side to side indicating a negative response
1:50	075 076	A → E	Oh ↓ *R2*	Starts reading. See text below. *R2*
2:19 2:22 2:22	077 078 079 080 081 082 083 084	E → A A → E E → A	What does that mean If you have <u>humor</u> ↓ [Oh humor Humor] In the corner Of your eye ↓ What do you think That means ↓	E points to something in the book then looks at A with her hand on her chin and smiles
2:26	085	A → E	*Ga:s ↑	*Said as a question. A points to her eye when responding

2:27 2:33 2:34	086 087 088 089 090 091 092 093 094 095	E → A	N:o <u>Humor</u> means Like if you had If something's humorous It's funny [Oh So] It means That he has a sense of humor In his eyes ↓	E touches her eye and strokes it multiple times when talking about eyes
2:36	096 097	A → E	Oh yeah ↑ humor	
2:37	098 099 100	E → A	So it's like His eyes smile ↑ Right ↑	Starts reading. See text below. *R3*
3:19	101 102 103 104 105 106	E → A	Do you know What that means If you sag Droop Grandmother's sad Right ↓	A shakes head side to side to indicate "no" E makes a motion to show drooping with her head and shoulders
3:25	107 108 109	A → E	I don't think I am going To finish this	A looks away and then to E when she speaks with a small smile on her face Starts reading. See text below. *R4*
3:58	110 111 112	E → A	So Do you get That he's sick ↓	
4:00	113	A → E	Uh huh	
4:01	114 115 116	E → A	Yeah And he's not getting better ↓ right	
4:02	117 118 119	A → E	Could we Could I sa:y *Who was sick ↑	Looks away and picks up a pencil then grabs the book

				*Said as a question and looks to E for reassurance
4:07	120 121	E → A	Oh ↑ For your discussion question ↑	
4:08	122	A → E	Uh huh	
4:09	123 124	E → A	Sure ↑ So what are you wanting to ask ↑	
4:10	125	A → E	Who was sick ↑	Looks at E
4:11	126 127	E → A	Who was sick Ok	
4:18	128 129	A → E	And then I need another one 	A looks through book with pencil on face 6 second pause
4:26	130 131 132 133 134	E → A	You could even ask What is he sick with ↑ Right Do you remember What he is sick with ↑	A is looking through the books
4:32	135 136 137	A → E	Uh huh Um Chemicals and knives ↓	
4:38	138 139	E → A	Hmmm *He's sick with that ↑	*Said as a question
4:39	140	A → E	Hmmm	
4:42	141 142	E → A	Hmmm	E points to a paragraph in the book 6 second pause while A reads

			Read this paragraph	
4:49	143 144	A → E	Oh From ca:ncer	
4:51	145 146 147	E → A	Uh huh Yeah He has cancer	E looks at other students not in camera frame and smiles 16 second pause
Begin Interaction Unit 3: Move to personal discussion about people they know with cancer				
5:09	148 149 150 151	A → E	Oh For a connection ↓ I said Many people having *cancer ↓	A looks to E when speaking *Said as a question
5:13	152 153	E → A	Mmmm hmmm You know many people ↑	E shakes head affirmatively
5:17	154	A → E	Yeah	
5:18	155 156 157	E → A	Mmmm hmmm Who is somebody That you know ↓	E shakes head affirmatively
5:19	158 159 160 161 162	A → E	Like on I mean On TV I saw people With cancer ↓	E shakes head affirmatively
5:24	163 164 165 166 167	E → A	Mmmm hmmm There is someone You know at our <u>school</u> That had cancer Remember ↑	
5:27	168	A → E	Ummm	A looks up and then to E
5:28	169	E → A	Remember	

5:29	170	A → E	*Mrs. H___ ↑	*Said as a question and then brushes some hair off her face
5:29	171 172	E → A	N:o Mrs. D___	
5:32	173 174	A → E	Oh yeah ↑ I remember	Hand starts covering her mouth. She removes it to speak
5:34	175 176	E → A	She had breast cancer ↓ She is better now though	
5:38	177 178	A → E	I know someone *Who has cancer ↑	Said as a question and then she starts writing
5:41	179	E → A	Ok ↑	*A mumbles to self as she write her sentence down

Text that is being read aloud by both participants				
Time	Line #	Speaker/Hearer	Actual Text	Contextualization Cues
1:23 -1:45	R1	A → E	“John Born sat at the breakfast table and tried to see the look of death on his grandfather. He could not. If a change were there, he could not see it. Clay Born had *ruddy* cheeks	Reading is fairly choppy. A reads with the book fairly close to her face *AV read “really” it should have been ruddy E interjects while A is in between words to make a correction. She tells her that ruddy means thick, but it actually means red, like the color
1:51 -2:18	R2	A → E	“Ruddy cheeks. A head of white hair. Clear eyes and steady hands as the as I mean as he	Reading was choppy.

			<p>buttered a giant slab of fresh bread. Hot from the bread. St...still had *humor in the close of his eyes just as he always has.”</p>	<p>E looks at book while A is reading</p> <p>*A mispronounced humor (with a short u sound)</p>
2:42 - 3:19	R3	E → A	<p>“He is like John, but not dead. He will never be dead. Whenever I turn around and meet him, grandpa will be there. But that is not what the doctors said. Two weeks ago at the hospital in Grand Forks the doctors had asked them to come into a small green room or had asked his grandparents and John had gone with them, because nobody said he couldn’t. There is nothing more to do the doctor said. They look sad, but it was a sadness that would go away. We can’t stop the cancer and John had watched his grandmother sag.”</p>	<p>E read slowly and quietly and pauses to ask A a question about a word in the text “sag”</p>
3:26 - 3:57	R4	E → A	<p>“She made no sound, but just sagged. A part of her went out at the words and she started down and John caught her on one side and his grandfather on the other and they put her in a chair. It will be alright Clay told her gently. It will be alright. But how could it be, the doctors had done tests and more tests and worked with chemicals and knives and finally they sent John Born’s grandfather home to die in peace on a small farm at the edge of the woods”</p>	<p>E read smoothly and slowly. She stopped for discussion.</p>

APPENDIX H: AANYA HOME MICROTRANSCRIPT

Aanya Home Observation

The following excerpt is taken from the second of three home observations of Aanya conducted by the researcher on May 10, 2018, from 6:00 PM until 6:53 PM. The visit took place at their home and was a split observation. This means that the first half of the recorded observation (46 minutes and 33 seconds) was considered a home observation. The second half of the observation was considered a community observation and went from 6:53-8:55 PM. Mom, dad, brother, focal student and researcher were present. The participants will be referred to as mom, dad, P (brother), and A (focal student). The researcher will be referred to as S. During the observation, A is working on a class reading assignment while brother is working on his work from Kumon. There is a good deal of interaction between mom/dad and A; however, there is an interactional unit where there is dialogue between A and P.

This excerpt, that starts at 16 minutes and 25 seconds into the 46 minute and 33 second observation and concludes at 20 minutes and 42, provides an account of positioning both by the self and by the family for analysis and will aid in the answering of research questions one and three that are: How do emergent bilingual students, their families and ESL/general education teachers discursively position one another? And how do emergent bilinguals co-construct their linguistic identities in relation to these language ideologies?

This specific excerpt was chosen due to the rich level of discussion that was present amongst the focal student and her family. The beginning boundary was identified as a shift in group discussion. I was talking to the family about plans my family had and at 16:25, the conversation shifted to A working on a class reading assignment. This provided a natural break from one topic of discussion to another and therefore is the beginning boundary. The end of the excerpt was also bounded by a shift in discussion from talk of their homework assignment to that of general conversation about violin lessons.

The home observations did not provide as much rich data for analysis as the students were in their natural setting and would often leave the room of the observer. This led to long pauses in recordings as well as long discussions on general and random topics. School observations (both ESL and classroom) were more academically focused and information dense, therefore providing a richer observation for coding to take place. Nonetheless, there were still parts of this observation that supported findings from the other settings and this is another reason this excerpt was selected. For more information regarding this, see the memo for the second observation. During the excerpt that was selected for microtranscription and data analysis, there were four lines that were highlighted during initial coding. These codes resulted in three categories: advocacy (self-awareness), positioning other, and self-verification. You can see the codes, renaming, and primary category columns below for the four turns of coded text.

Code	Renaming	Primary Category
Where/how to write it?	Uncertainty/Seeking Confirmation	Self Verification
I don't get it	Uncertainty	Advocacy (self awareness)
Am I correct?	Uncertainty/Seeking Confirmation	Self Verification
It's up to you	Encouragement/Confirmation	Positioning Other

Finally, the excerpt was broken into interactional units. While there are three distinct sections, they are being labeled as 1a, 2, and 1b. 1a & 1b are carrying out the same function. They are both A attempting to get her last problem on her reading homework assignment complete. What we see in 1a is a problem/solution structure. The participants are either working together (or against each other) to complete a task. We see in 1a A trying to get her assignment completed. Dad is there for support and guidance, but P seems to come in and out of the seen as a distraction. In interaction unit 2 we see this complete break from the problem and any possible solution to entertain the distraction. A engages P in a discussion about Six Flags tickets. While it first appears that P is “annoying” A, it almost seems like A draws P in as a welcomed distraction. She then calls for assistance from the adults when she is “done with the distraction.” With that being said, once the Six Flags discussion comes to an end, we see interaction unit 1b, that is being called “da capo.” In music, a da capo is a return to the top. This is why it is labeled interaction unit 1b instead of 3. We see that 2 was really just a distraction from the problem/solution structure and in 1b we return to basically the same conversation that was in 1a. The interaction unit ends when A solves her final problem and the conversation transitions to something outside of the scope of the original conversation.

Time	Line #	Speaker/Hearer	Message Unit	Additional Contextualization
Begin Interaction Unit 1a: Problem/solution (setting the stage)				
16:25	001 002 003	A → D	What did Chester do to prepare for the party ↓	A is reading from her worksheet
16:29	004	D → A	XXXX	*Telugu
16:30	005 006 007 008 009	A → D	Unh uh ↓ in like <u>two</u> pages in night I mean first I want to answer it	
16:35	010	D → A	The dinner party	
16:35	011 012 013	A → D	I am su:re ↑ that it is in the first and the second pages ↑	

16:39	014	D → A	Chapter 10	
16:40	015 016	A → D	*First and second page I am sure ↓	Said in a confident tone
16:42 16:44 16:45	017 018 019 020	D → A A → D D → A	Then if you know that ↓ why *[but I don't know What the problem ↓	Said in a whining voice
16:46	021	D → A	Why you don't know ↓	
16:47 16:50 16:52 16:53	022 023 024 025 026	A → D D → P A → D D → P	I don't <u>ge:t</u> it Look I [P__ did you complete your Kumon ↑ don't it's so I don't know Huh ↑]	*Dad is yelling at P I wrote in my field notes that P gets the blame for A's lack of task completion
16:53	027	P → D	Yeah	
16:54	028	D → P	XXXX	
16:55	029	P → D	* I did my Kumon ↑	*Said in a whining voice
16:57	030 031 032	D → P	You still have one more book it seems ↑	
16:59	033 034 035	P → D	*I want to do it when XXXX do it	* Said in a whining voice
17:01	036 037	D → P	What this is the only *	* laughs

17:03	038 039	P → D	*No it's n:ot ↑	*Said in a whining voice. The word not was stretched out and a pitch changed occurred at the vowel
17:04	040	D → P	Now complete it XXXX	
17:06	041 042 043 044	P → D	I need to read If we can read Alexa Make me ↓	
17:12 17:12 17:12	045 046 047 048 049	D → P A → P D → P	[No ↑ What] ↑ You have tomorrow ↑ you have to do that ↓ come come	Overlapping talk between A & Dad. Dad is yelling at P who is in another room to finish his work
17:14	050	A → D	I am done with mine	
17:15	051 052	D → P	Yeah very good ↓ see DD has completed ↓	
17:18	053 054 055	P → D	Make sure she DD has one more book	
17:21	056	D → P	<u>N:o</u> come P____ ↓	
17:23	057	P → D	Yes she do ↑	
17:24 17:24 17:27	058 059 060 061 062	D → A P → D D → A	It's [ok I say the] *what did Chester do to prepare for the party ↓	Overlapping talk between Dad and P. Dad is trying to get A to finish her last homework question, but P keeps chiming in from another room. *Dad reads question off of paper

17:31	063 064 065 066	A → D	It's a really big one but I don't know how to sharpen it XXXX	
17:39	067	P → A	Then let me see DD ↓	
17:42	068	A → P	*P___ st:op it ↑	*Said in a whining voice
17:44	069 070	M → P	P___ XXXX	Mom yells at P in Telugu from another room and he goes to his bedroom and shuts the door
17:52	071 072	D → A	*You use this pen or no	Said very quietly
17:56	073 074 075 076	D → S	Mrs. ____ Do you want to have some tea ↑ Coffee ↑	
17:59	077	S → D	No I am perfect	
17:59	078	D → S	Sure ↑	
18:00	079	S → D	Yeah	
18:00	080	D → S	Ok	32 second pause after this turn
18:32	081 082 083	A → M	*I'm hungry Am I correct ↑ I mean	First line said in a whiny voice

18:41	084 085	P → D	*I don't want to do it	*Said in a whiny voice
18:45	086	A → D	[Still	
18:45	087		daddy	
	088 089		should I go to book ↓]	
18:46	090 091	D → A	Yeah one second	
Begin Interaction Unit 2: Break from the structure (Un) welcomed distraction				
18:49	092 093 094	P → D	I'm going to Six Flags <u>too</u>	
18:51	095 096 097	A → P	No this is only one ticket and it's for <u>me</u>	
18:55	098 099 100	P → A	*I want to go to Six Flags too	Said in a whining voice
18:57	101 102 103	A → P	No ↑ this is only one ticket <u>P_____</u>	
19:00	104	P → A	*I am going	Almost in tears said in a whining voice
19:01	105	A → P	<u>*It's only for me</u>	Slowly enunciates each word separately
19:03	106	D → A	XXXX	* Telugu
19:05	107 108 109	A → P	It's only <u>one</u> ticket <u>P_____</u> and it's for <u>me</u> ↑	
19:09	110	P → A	Then who will go with you ↓	

19:12	111	A → P	<u>Da:d</u> dy	4 second pause
19:16	112	P → A	*Daddy will be in office ↑	Whining voice
19:21	113 114 115 116	A → P	Well it's on summer vacation ↓ P ____ <u>summer</u> vacation	
19:26	117 118	P → A	*He will still be in office	Whining voice
19:30	119 120 121	A → P	On <u>we:ekends</u> ↓ he won't be on the office in <u>we:ekends</u> ↓	
19:39	122	P → A	Eh eh uh*	* Taunting
19:40	123	A → P	Eh eh uh*	* Taunting (From field notes: A puts her hand in P's face)
19:41	124	P → A	Eh eh uh*	* Taunting. Then 9 second pause before next turn
19:50 19:55	125 126	P	*Laughs Oww	*Laughs. Then 5 second pause.
19:56	127	A → D	XXXX	* Telugu
Begin Interaction Unit 1b: Problem/Solution Da Capo (return to the beginning with a final solution)				
19:58 20:02	128 129 130 131	D → A D & A → each other	Ung So what did Chester do [to prepare for the party]* come on ↑	Dad starts reading from paper *Line was said in unison
20:03	132 133	A → D	*There's a big word	Says this turn very loud

			daddy	
20:04	134 135	D → A	Heh ↑ XXXX	* Telugu
20:07	136	A → D	XXXX	* Telugu
20:09	137 138 139 140	A → D	Chester wanted everything to be perfect on the particular evening	A is reading from the book
20:13	141 142 143	D → A	Unh So Chester wanted to be ↑	
20:17 20:19 20:20	144 145 146 147	A → D	<u>No</u> it said what did Chester <u>do</u> [<u>do</u> to to prepare]	
20:20	148 149 150 151	D → A	Yeah so she she wanted to be perfect on that	
20:23 20:23 20:23 20:24	152 153 154 155 156 157	A → D D → A A → D D → A	<u>It</u> is [Uh It is <u>he</u> Sorry ↑ it Sorry ↑]	A corrects her father on the gender of the main character (Chester--a mouse)
20:26	158 159	D → A	It wanted to be prefect on that particular thing right ↑	
20:30	160 161	A → D	<u>Evening</u> ↑ <u>Evening</u> ↑	Both times the word “evening” were said with emphasis. However the first time

				was an elevated tone and the second time was even louder
20:30 20:31 20:31	162 163 164 165 166 167	D → A A → D D → A	Evening ↑ [evening↑ Evening] So but you cannot write all <u>this</u> story it it wanted to be perfect	
20:38	168 169	A → D	Yeah so how to shorten ↓	
20:40	170 171 172	D → A	<u>You</u> write it I told <u>you</u> it's up to <u>you</u> (20:42)	

APPENDIX I: GABRIELLA ESL MICROTRANSCRIPT

Gabriella Microtranscription (ESL)

The following microtranscription is from an observation of participant Gabriella that took place on April 11, 2018. Gabriella is part of a group of four students who are taking part in their daily ESL lessons. The group lesson for the day is on perspective--seeing situations through the eyes of different people. The students have each been given a question and they have been asked to answer that question through the eyes of either a parent, principal, teacher, or student. The entire observation that the excerpt was selected from was 28 minutes and 27 seconds.

The observation/excerpt was selected because of the fact that it showcases something specific about Gabriella that was noted throughout the ESL observations that is in contrast when compared to the large group settings. When in a small group setting, Gabriella will advocate for herself and is very vocal in small group discussions. In large group settings he is often more passive and will not participate nor advocate for herself. This excerpt showcases a problem and solution frame that shows the shifting of Gabriella from passive participant to active advocate. In addition, this selection is multiply coded. There are 11 different lines of coded text that were collapsed into 9 different categories. The categories are: advocacy, connecting, explanation, positioning other, positioning self, projection, self-preservation, self-verification, and smartness. For more information regarding the codes, renaming, and categories see the table below.

Code	Renaming	Primary Category	Secondary	Tertiary
So I?	Clarification (question)/Uncertainty	Self-Verification	Advocacy	
The teacher benefits?	Alternative Response/Intonation	Positioning Other	Projection	
So then I	Clarification (question)/Uncertainty	Self-Verification	Advocacy	
Make you think	Thinking	Positioning Other	Smartness	
Sometimes I didn't know	Negative (self)	Positioning (self)	Smartness	Explanation
I just?	Clarification (question)/Uncertainty	Self-Verification	Advocacy	
I want to	Personal Opinion/Word Choice (want)	Self-Verification	Self-Preservation	Smartness

So then I	Clarification (question)/Uncertainty	Self-Verification	Advocacy	
Tell me	Probing	Positioning Other	Connecting	
And then	Probing	Positioning Other	Connecting	
You could	Refuting	Positioning Other	Smartness	Projection

This excerpt starts at 7 minutes and 14 seconds into the recording and concludes at 11 minutes and 37 seconds. 7:14 was selected as a beginning boundary because it is right after I explain an assignment to the students and where the focal participant begins asking clarifying questions. It is the back and forth question/answer turns between S and the focal participant that are the majority of this excerpt. The end boundary was marked when a shift in topics occurred. S and Gabriella have finished their discussion on one part of the assignment and Gabriella then shifts the discussion to another part of the paper. It is also bounded by the type of her responses. This will be discussed more in the breaks for interaction units. Below is the bullet point, step by step, process that was taken to conduct the full micro transcription process.

Micro transcription Steps

1. Pick transcript to find an excerpt
2. Read full transcript for parts that are highly coded
3. Read transcript and watch video to select excerpt for micro transcription and identify the start and end boundaries
4. Break excerpt into message units on original transcript
5. Review video and transcript to type message units into new document including the speaker and hearer
6. Review video to add in time stamps for the start of each new message unit starting with a new speaker
7. Review excerpt in transcription software to slow down and add in micro transcription symbols to indicate further meaning and add contextualization (*transcription key is shown below)
8. Review video to add nonverbal contextualization cues
9. Break excerpt into interaction units
10. Add in number lines
11. Memo explanations of excerpt selections, message units, contextualization cues, and interaction units.

*Transcription Key	
<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Meaning</i>

_____	Emphasis
	Short pause
	Long pause
*	Voice, pitch, or style change
↑	Rising intonation
↓	Falling intonation
:	Elongated vowel
[Start overlapping talk
]	End overlapping talk
XXXX	Undecipherable

Finally, the entire micro transcript was broken into interactional units. There were three interaction units present in the text. The first began at the onset of the excerpt. This first interaction unit sets up the narrative structure as a problem and solution. It showcases the back and forth discussion and explanation of the problem with participants S and Gabriella. The interaction units in this excerpt are doing more than marking the narrative structure, they are also highlighting Gabriella as a participant. In this first interaction unit, Gabriella is a passive participant. She is taking in what is being said. While she does ask questions, she does not assert her own personal thoughts, rather she puts things out there as questions instead of personal statements. The boundary of the second interaction unit is marked by the shift in discussion from the setting up of the problem to possible solutions. We also see Gabriella as transforming into a more active participant. She is putting forth solutions to the given problem instead of idly sitting back. Finally, we see the final shift at the onset of the third interaction unit. Solutions to the problem are still being shared, but there is a more dedicated commitment to the answers solving the problems. Also, in terms of Gabriella, her responses have shifted from passive to active and confident and more assertive. She shifts from making statements that are really questions to making statements that are meant to stand on their own.

Time	Line #	Speaker/ Hearer	Message Unit	Additional Contextualization
Begin Interaction Unit 1: Explanation and discussion of the problem (G as passive participant)				

7:14	001 002 003 004 005 006 007 008	S → Group	You are <u>not</u> pretending ↑ To be One of the Uh You are not <u>looking</u> At it	Students are looking at the paper that was just handed out to them and holding pencils
7:21	009 010 011	G → S	<u>Through</u> the eyes Of one of those people ↑ Anymore [so You are looking At the <u>overall</u> situation]	G looks up to me and interjects and looks down again when I don't pause
7:23	012 013 014 015 016 017	G → S	So Would I just write The like Teacher here And then explain why ↓	G makes eye contact with S when asking her question and uses her pencil as a pointer on her paper
7:29	018 019 020 021 022 023 024 025 026	S → G	So Who do you think Benefits in yours ↓ So Should students Have homework So If they do ↑ Who benefits ↓	S points to the question on G's paper G forms her mouth like she wants to speak but S keeps talking
7:40	027	G → S	The teacher ↑ *	* Said quietly and as a question but maintains eye contact with S
7:41	028 029 030 031	S → G	Ok The teacher Benefits Anybody else ↑	
7:43	032	G → S	The principal ↓	G makes eye contact with S when answering but then looks away
7:44	033 034	S → G	Anybody else ↓ So you can	

	035 036 037 038 039		*Sometimes <u>All</u> of them Might benefit* Sometimes Only one ↑	*Said louder than the rest of the words in the turn
7:49	040 041 042	G → S	So then I would write *Teacher and principal ↑	Looks down for “so then I would write” and then makes eye contact for “teacher and principal” *said as a question
7:53	043 044 045 046 047	S → G	Ok ↑ And then <u>How</u> do they benefit This was meant To make you think 	4 second pause 11 second pause before next speaker Other students are writing on their papers
Begin Interaction Unit 2: Exploration and discussion of solutions (G as active participant)				
8:11	048 049 050 051	G → S	Because Sometimes I didn't know What that <u>one</u> meant ↓	Points to the word benefit on the paper and keeps eyes on paper the whole turn
8:14 8:21	052 053 054 055 056 057	S → G D → S	Benefit Yeah If someone <u>benefits</u> ↑ They rece:ive Something <u>go:od</u> [oh From it]	S uses hand gestures to show incoming when saying “receive” “Good” is really stretched out and emphasized D starts erasing on his paper
8:22 8:22 8:24	058 059 060 061 062 063	G → S S → D	And then [yeah When I write how] I just Just write a sentence ↑	
8:25	064	S → G	Sure ↑	

8:27	065 066 067	D → S	*I think I need an eraser	Said very quietly in the background. Barely audible
8:29	068 069	S → D	You need An eraser	5 second pause before the next speaker G looks over at D's paper
8:34	070 071 072	AI → S	Wait ↓ What if no one Has a benefit ↓	Looks down at paper until she says "has a benefit"
8:36	073 074 075	S → AI	A:h h h ↑ You could say That as well ↑	Ahhh said stretched out and like it was a "discovery" G looks over at AI's paper
8:40	076 077	D → S	A:h h h ok	
8:43	078 079 080 081 082 083	G → S	Bec what if I write That it would help The students Get better Like *Down here	Stammering at the beginning to get her first words out *Said as a question and points on her paper
8:52 9:12	084 085 086 087 088 089 090 091 092 093 094 095 096 097 098 099 100	S → G G → S	So Who is benefitting Who is receiving Something <u>good</u> ↑ From doing This question ↓ Ok That's number one ↓ Number two Who is <u>impacted</u> ↑ If somebody is <u>impacted</u> ↑ That means That like Who has to <u>d:o</u> [I would say The work] Who has to carry out This task	S points to G's paper. Then uses her hands to show receiving (hand sweeping motions outward and then inward) G keeps steady eye contact with S Hand gestures again from S when saying "do the work"

Begin Interaction Unit 3: Commitment to solution (G as assertive and confident participant)				
9:13	101 102 103 104 105 106	G → S	So Then right here I I would write It will help The students* ↑	* Said as a question but with a somewhat assertive tone
9:17	107 108 109 110 111 112	S → G	So You are saying Who benefits ↑ How Are they benefitting ↓ ok	
9:22	113 114 115	G → S	They are going to be helping the students *	Said in an assertive manner instead of a question
9:23 9:27	116 117 118 119 120 121	S → G G → S	Ok ↑ And then who Is most <u>impacted</u> Who has to do the work [the students What happens] When you do homework ↑	G tries to interject but S keeps talking
9:30	122	G → S	You le:arn*	* Drawn out and said like a question
9:31	123 124 125 126 127	S → G	Ok Think about The process So what happens Tell me steps	S uses her hands to show “steps”
9:35	128 129 130 131 132 133	G → S	It takes sometimes It takes um sometimes a long ti:me Or like fifteen minutes	G says with a small smirk on face

9:44	134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141	S → G	Ok So your <u>teacher</u> ↑ Gives you like a paper Right ↑ And then What happens After your teacher Gives you a paper ↓	
9:52	142 143 144 145	G → S	*If we don't finish In the morning It's homework For when we go home	*Entire turn said quietly and in a manner that is like, why is she asking me this G does not make eye contact at all
9:56	146 147 148	S → G	So You take it home ↓ a:nd	
9:59	149	G → S	And we do it ↓	Good eye contact
10:00	150 151	S → G	And you do it ↑ And then what happens ↑	
10:03	152 153 154 155	G → S	When I am done with it and then I bring it back to school	Good eye contact
10:05	156	S → G	And then what happens	
10:07	157	G → S	*I turn it in ↑	*Entire turn is said in a higher pitch and with a smile on her face
10:07	158 159 160 161	S → G	And ↑ <u>then</u> what happens What happens After You turn it in	6 second pause Up until this point An had been the only one writing. D and Al had been paying attention to G & S's conversation

10:16	162 163	G → S	We do Our other morning work	No eye contact from G
10:19	164 165 166	S → G	What happens To your <u>homework</u> though	
10:21	167 168	G → S	Oh She checks it	Eye contact again. G is playing with her pencil during the turn
10:22	169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176	S → G	Oh ↑ So The teacher Takes time To look over it ↑ And check it ↑ And then What happens ↑	
10:28	177 178	G → S	I don't know What Mrs. ____ does*	*S laughs. G says this with a smile on her face
10:31	179 180 181 182 183	S → G	So She checks it ↑ She does something to it ↑ And gives it back to you Right ↓	Now all other group members are interested in "watching" the back and forth conversation between G & S
10:35	184	G → S	yeah	
10:35	185 186 187 188	S → G	And then What do <u>you</u> do With it When you get it back	
10:38	189 190 191	G → S	I put it In my data file *well I mean my mailbox	*Said like she changed her mind (shakes her head)

10:41	192 193 194	S → G	You put it In your mailbox *And then what happens	This was repeating what G had said as confirmation *Said very high pitched
10:44	195	G → S	*I take it out*	*G mimics my high pitched tone and smiles *A laughs
10:50	196 197	S → G	What happens When it gets home ↑	
10:52	198 199	G → S	I share it *With my parents ↑	*Said as a question and no smile on face. Playing with pencil.
10:54	200 201	S → G	And what Do they do ↑*	*Group laughs
10:56	202	G → S	*I don't know	Indifferent tone and facial expression
10:59	203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210	S → G	Do they ever talk To you About it ↑ Like If you miss a problem Do they talk To you About it ↑	G is rubbing pencil and puts hands in an "I don't know" manner 4 second pause
11:07	211 212 213 214 215	G → S	Uh My mom Looks over it With me again	G makes eye contact and is wrapping a hair tie onto the end of her pencil
11:10	216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223	S → G	Ok ↑ So when We say <u>Homework</u> There is actually A lot of people ↑ Involved in homework	S shakes head and using hands to show "lot"
11:19	224	G → Group		Al looks at G and smiles

	225 226		You might not have thought About it [o:h hh But it does say] Who was <u>most</u> impacted ↓	
11:23	227	D → S	Most	
11:24	228	S → Group	<u>Most</u>	S is mimicking D's response back to him
11:25	229	A → Group	Most	4 second pause before next turn
11:29	230 231 232 233 234	G → S	So then Right here Would I write Students That helps them learn	The turn is structured like a question, but it is actually said more like a statement than a question. More assertive tone.
11:34	235	S → G	You could ↓	
11:35	236 237 238	G → S	And then I don't write anything Down here then	

APPENDIX J: GABRIELLA CLASSROOM MICROTRANSCRIPT

Gabriella Microtranscription (Classroom)

The following microtranscription is from an observation of participant Gabriella that took place on May 22, 2018. Gabriella has been pulled aside by her classroom teacher to discuss a book report that she has written for a class reading assignment. The entire transcript/observation is 21 minutes and 29 seconds. However, this excerpt starts 4:17 into the video and concludes at 8:58.

According to Bloome et al (2010), boundaries are socially constructed and allow those participating in the discussion to “signal to each other what is going on” (p. 14). After the two-minute mark in the recording, the teacher makes a statement “Ok, you got good sentences there. Now let’s see...” This is a point in the discussion where the teacher signals to the participant that she would like to shift focus from one aspect of the student’s project to a different topic.

The concluding boundary occurs at 8:58 into the observation. While discourse is not the only aspect that should be taken into consideration when determining boundaries, it can be used in connection with contextualization cues from the participants (Bloome et al., 2010). This concluding boundary was determined, because again, there was a shift in the topic of discussion between the participants. The teacher signals that she wants to change what they are talking about from her connection to her prediction. In addition to this natural break in the conversation, contextual cues were also analyzed to make a determination of the boundaries. An example of an observed cue is a changing in the tone of voice by the teacher when she suggests a change in topic discussion.

The excerpt was also selected because of the fact that it is multiply coded. There are fourteen different lines of coded text that were collapsed into six different categories. The categories are: dominance, language, positioning other, projection, self-verification, and smartness.

Code	Renaming	Primary Category	Secondary Category	Tertiary Category
Good sentences	Encouragement	Positioning Other	Smartness	
I think	Correction	Dominance	Language	Smartness
How does it sound	Prompting/Leading	Dominance	Language	Smartness
I don't think	Correction	Dominance	Language	Smartness
I don't think	Correction	Dominance	Language	Smartness

I would?	Approval	Self-Verification	Dominance	
If you change	Correction	Dominance	Language	Smartness
Like that?	Approval	Self-Verification		
If you think	Leading	Positioning Other		
Like that?	Approval	Self-Verification		
What do you think?	Opinion Solicitation/Leading	Projection		
I could	Approval	Self-Verification	Dominance	Smartness
Do you think	Correction	Dominance	Language	Smartness
Smooth and nice	Leading	Positioning Other	Language	

Once the boundaries for the microtranscription were identified, the transcript that had been previously produced for phase one analysis was re-examined. The video was reviewed, first comparing the audio to the transcription. Once all corrections and small nuances had been made and captured, the video was reviewed again in order to break the current transcript into contextualization cues and message units.

Contextualization cues are what Gumperz (1986) refers to as “a feature of linguistic form that contributes to the signaling of contextual presupposition” (p. 131). Contextualization cues are those “verbal, nonverbal, and prosodic signals, and manipulation of artifacts” that provide deeper understanding into the intent of the participant’s discourse acts (Bloome et al., 2010). A non-exhaustive list of examples includes shifts in tone, volume, rhythm, stress patterns, velocity in addition to pauses, facial/body expressions, and register/syntactical shifts (Bloome et al., 2010). Examples of the symbols used in this microtranscription are listed below:

Transcription Key	
<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Meaning</i>
_____	Emphasis

	Short pause
	Long pause
*	Voice, pitch, or style change
↑	Rising intonation
↓	Falling intonation
:	Elongated vowel
[Start overlapping talk
]	End overlapping talk
XXXX	Undecipherable

According to Green and Wallat (1981) message units are the smallest unit of conversational meaning. The transcript from phase one was re-examined to identify these small units of meaning. Once the message units were determined through the analysis of contextualization cues, interaction units were identified. Interactional units are “a series of conversationally tied together message units” (Green & Wallat, 1981, p. 200). There was only one identified interaction unit in the transcript excerpt. The boundaries of were determined at the onset by the switching in conversational patterns to those that discussed the focal student’s reflection to those that specifically addressed the participant’s connection to the text. It was determined that the interactional unit had ended when the conversation again shifts from talk of the connection to a separate part of her assignment that addressed a prediction she had made. With the contextualization cues, message units, and interaction units clearly identified, further discourse analysis could take place.

Time	Line #	Speaker/Hearer	Message Unit	Additional Contextualization
Begin Interaction Unit 1: Problem and solution through correcting sequences				

4:17	001 002 003 004 005 006 007 008 009 010 011 012 013 014 015 016 017 018 019	K → G	Ok ↑ You got some good sentences there Now let's see if the connection is strong ↓ Ok We are talking about Ralph being on the motorcycle He gets seen by a dog The dog barks at him Ralph is trying to run away so he won't get <u>eaten</u>	K's face is not visible in the video, but her hand is pointing to G's writing. G is looking at her writing.
4:29	020	G → K	Uh huh	G shakes head affirmatively
4:29	021 022 023 024 025 026 027 028	K → G	Alright So what's the big idea for you here about this Thinking about how it connects to you The whole big idea Is that Ralph is	K underlines something on G's paper
4:37	029 030	G → K	Trying to run away and not be se:en ↑	G said as a question and looks at K
4:39	031 032 033 034	K → G	Ok ↑ So that's what you are going to connect with right	
4:41	035	G → K	Mmm hmmm	

4:43	036	$K \rightarrow G$	Alright so what do you have next	
4:44	037 038 039	$G \rightarrow K$	My connection is that when sometimes	G is reading from her paper
4:47	040 041 042 043 044	$K \rightarrow G$	Ok I think this word “when” doesn’t really serve a purpose read how it sounds without it ↓	K points to G’s paper
4:52	045 046 047	$G \rightarrow K$	My connection is that sometimes in my house ↑	
4:55	048	$K \rightarrow G$	How does it sound better	
4:57	049	$G \rightarrow K$	Ummm	
4:58	050 051 052	$K \rightarrow G$	Is that “when” sometimes or is it just sometimes in my house	G looks at K
5:02	053	$G \rightarrow K$	So:metimes	
5:02	054 055 056	$K \rightarrow G$	Uh huh I don’t think you need that word ↓	G erases the word “when”
5:06	057 058 059 060	$G \rightarrow K$	Sometimes in my house I don’t want to be se:en when I	G is reading from her paper

5:11	061 062 063	K → G	Ok You got that word “when”	K makes circle movement with her hand
5:13	064	G → K	that keeps popping in	
5:13	065	K → G	[so I can in places when I don’t think it’s useful]	
5:16	066 067	G → K	Don’t want to be see on weeknights ↑	G says this as a question
5:18	068 069 070	K → G	Sure ↑ that word doesn’t have a purpose there	G is erasing something on her paper
5:21	071	G → K	On weeknights ↓	
5:22	072 073 074	K → G	Now Start at the beginning And see how it sounds	K points to something on G’s paper
5:24	075	G → K	In my house	
5:25	076 077	K → G	No My connection is	K interjects when G is in between words and points to something on G’s paper
5:26	078 079 080 081 082 083	G → K	Oh My connection is that sometimes in my house I don’t want to be se:en ↑ on weeknights and then that’s a period	K points to something on G’s paper G adds a period where K pointed
5:37	084 085 086 087 088	K → G	Uh huh Is weeknights singular ↑ One week night Or	Said as a question G looks up in thought

			All weeknights	
5:43	089 090	G → K	Only <u>some</u> of them So that I would put an “s” ↑	G looks at K K points at G’s paper; G says this as question
5:47	091 092 093	K → G	Sure I don’t want to be seen on weeknights	K flips hand over indicating an affirmative response
5:53	094 095 096 097 098 099 100	G → K	I go downstairs To do something ↓ Like get something to e:at ↑ I don’t want to be seen ↑ By mom and d:ad ↓ So I don’t get in trouble at all	G is reading off of her paper
6:08	101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114	K → G	Ok ↑ Let’s read that ↓ I don’t want to be seen by mom or dad I don’t know about that so I don’t want to be seen by mom or dad so I don’t get in trouble or How about <u>won’t</u> so I <u>won’t</u> get in trouble Don’t means kind of like it already happened and you didn’t but you are hoping	K is reading G’s writing and using her hand to track as she goes G starts erasing on her paper

6:29	115	G → K	Oh ↑	
6:30	116 117	K → G	I think the so is ok if you change it to won't	
6:34	118	G → K	S:o I won't ↑	G says this as a question
6:37	119	K → G	Ye:ah ↑	7 second pause while G is writing
6:44	120	G → K	Like that ↑	G looks to K and says this as a question
6:44	121 122 123 124	K → G	Let's see Read it and see if you think it sounds smooth	K points to G's writing
6:47	125 126 127 128 129	G → K	I don't want to be seen by mom ↑ and dad so I won't get in <u>trouble</u> ↑ at all ↓	G is reading from her paper
6:54	130	K → G	Do you like that ↑	
6:54	131	G → K	Uh huh ↑	
6:55	132 133 134 135	K → G	Do you realize that "won't" There's one of those letters That you don't need Spell won't	K points to something on G's paper
6:59	136	G → K	"U"	G erases the misspelled word from her paper
6:59	137 138 139	K → G	Right <u>won't</u> and <u>don't</u> are spelled the same way but you do need that apostrophe	G is writing on her paper

7:06	140	G → K	Like th:at ↑	G looks at K and says this as a question
7:08	141 142	K → G	Now you got wons What would won't be 	3 sec pause while G is erasing on her paper
7:14	143	G → K	Just an s ↑	Said as a question
7:16	144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152	K → G	Won't is one of those Well there's It's not won'ts So there's no "s" needed Won't comes from will not ↓ So it's a contraction ↑ What do you do For a contraction You use an apostrophe	5 second pause G coughs
7:31	153	G → K	So apostrophe "ṭ"	
7:32	154 155 156 157 158 159	K → G	I think so ↑ Let's see Yeah Because that's where the letters If you spelled will not part of the letters aren't there	G coughs
7:39	160	G → K	Mmmm hmmm	
7:39	161 162 163 164 165 166	K → G	Ok ↑ Now let's look at one other thing what I see here is "my connection <u>is</u> " and then "My connection <u>is</u> "	K points at something on G's paper

			and then “so that is my connection ↓ what do you think about that	
7:52	167 168	$G \rightarrow K$	I could write So that is what I think ↑	G says this as a question and looks at K
7:54	169	$K \rightarrow G$	Do <u>you</u> even think you need that ↓	K says this as a question
7:57	170	$G \rightarrow K$	N:o ↓	G shakes her head side to side and looks at K
7:57 8:13 8:13	171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186	$K \rightarrow G$ $G \rightarrow K$ $K \rightarrow G$	Not really You’ve already kind of already got it Sometimes What you don’t need to We call that <u>Stating the obvious</u> It’s kind of obvious ↑ It’s your connection Because You already told us so At the end You don’t need to Say it again [Ok So that is my connection]	G is erasing
8:14	187	$G \rightarrow K$	Ok	
8:15	188 189 190 191	$K \rightarrow G$	Alright Read it all through and see if each sentence sounds smooth and nice	

8:17	192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200 201 202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211 212 213 214 215 216	G → K	<p>My connection is from when Ralph is on the boys <u>motorcycle</u> toy in the hotel ↓ Ralph is in the <u>hallway</u> and he gets seen by a dog ↓ and it barks at him ↓ Ralph is trying to run away So he won't get <u>eaten</u> by the dog ↓ My connection is that sometimes in <u>my</u> house I don't want to be seen on weeknights I go <u>downstairs</u> to do something like get something to eat ↓ I don't want to be seen by mom and dad so I won't get in trouble at all ↓</p>	G interjects when K pauses and begins reading from her paper
------	---	-------	--	--

APPENDIX K: GABRIELLA HOME MICROTRANSCRIPT

Gabriella Home Observation

The following excerpt is taken from the third of three home observations of Gabriella conducted by the researcher on May 29, 2018 from 6:00 PM until 7:15 PM. The visit took place at G. D.'s home and the parent interview followed the observation. Mom, dad, focal student and researcher were present. The participants will be referred to as Mom (M), Dad (D), and G (focal student). The researcher will be referred to as S. The observation takes place in the dining and living room where the family has just finished their dinner and are talking. Dad is wanting G to start reading her book (for please, not for an assignment, we were a few days into summer vacation). G agrees to read but wanted a calculator to figure out how many pages she should read in order to finish the book in five days like her mom asked her to. This sparked a family discussion, which is captured here in this excerpt.

The excerpt, that starts at 42 minutes and 45 seconds into the 1 hour and 15 observation and concludes at 46 minutes and 41 seconds, provides an account of positioning both by the self and by the family for analysis and will aid in the answering of research questions one and three that are: How do emergent bilingual students, their families and ESL/general education teachers discursively position one another? And how do emergent bilinguals co-construct their linguistic identities in relation to these language ideologies?

This specific excerpt was chosen due to the rich level of discussion that was present amongst the focal student and her family. The beginning boundary was identified because the conversation shifted when the family finished dinner. Dad had just come home from work, ate, and then at the 42-minute mark, he drew the focal participant into the discussion. The end of the excerpt was also bounded by a shift in discussion from talk including the focal participant to talk returning between just the parents and the focal student reading silently in another room.

The home observations for Gabriella, unlike Aanya, did provide a lot of rich data. There were numerous parts that I would have liked to use for microanalysis; however, I used this piece, because it was the most cohesive piece of audio that included the focal student in a discussion with her parents.

During the excerpt that was selected for microtranscription and data analysis, there were two sections of text that were highlighted during initial coding. I found that in Gabriella's home visits that "chunks" of text were selected for coding rather than individual lines because the meaning was only held within the context of the entire "chunk" of text. This is why it appears that there is such a small amount of coded data, when in reality a great deal was actually coded, but each code just contained multiple lines, sometimes even entire pages of transcribed discourse. Since there were only two "chunks" coded, it only resulted in this excerpt having two main categories: self-verification and positioning (G as a non-reader). You can see the codes, renaming, and primary category columns below for the two "chunks" of coded text.

Code	Renaming	Primary Category
------	----------	------------------

*Action-Self Doubt	*Action-Self Doubt (math computation)	Self-Verification
* Action-Positioning	Humor (M to D/G)	Positioning (G as nonreader)

Finally, the excerpt was broken into interactional units. There are two distinct units to the excerpt. The first interaction unit starts at the onset of the excerpt and details a problem/solution narrative structure. What we see is the parents stating that G does not read enough so they want her to start reading her book after dinner. G agrees to read the book, but wants to make sure that she reads enough pages each day to finish it by the five-day deadline that her parents set forth for her. She tries to solve the problem by asking for a calculator. Instead, a discussion occurs where she doesn't need to calculate it, she should just start reading. This struggle over reading continues to build throughout the first interaction unit.

Then, at 45:22, mom shifts the discussion of G's reading to a focus on Bill Gates. This parallel narrative structure marks the beginning of interaction unit 2. Throughout this interaction unit, mom tells the story of how Bill Gates as a child read constantly. This leads the parents to point out that G is the opposite of Bill Gates and they had a laugh at Gabriella's expense. The narrative (and excerpt) concludes by coming back to the point of the first interaction unit, that G needs to read. At the conclusion of interaction unit 2, G starts reading and the conversation shifts to a different topic.

Time	Line #	Speaker/Hearer	Message Unit	Additional Contextualization
Begin Interaction Unit 1: Problem/Solution (G tries solving own problem, interruption from Dad)				
42:45	001 002 003	M → G	Hey ↑ go read uh Judy Moody	
42:51	004 005 006	G → M	I have to use the calculator though ↓	
42:54	007	M → G	Why ↑	
42:54	008 009 010 011	G → M	Because you said That how many pages divided by days ↓	

42:57	012 013 014 015	M → G	No don't use calculator ↓ use uh your hand so you practice division ↓	5 second pause
43:08	016 017	G → M	*But I don't know two digits ↑	*This turn was said in a high pitched voice
43:12	018	M → G	Why ↑	
43:14	019 020	G → M	Uh I so I practically ↑	
43:17	021 022	M → G	144 divided by say by 5	
43:20	023 024	D → G	That's your reading what are you talking about digits for ↓	
43:23 43:24 43:24 43:25	025 026 027 028 029 030	G → D M → D G → D	I have to [She want to divide do math] so she knows how many pages She read a day ↓	
43:28	031	D → G	Just read ↓	
43:30	032 033 034	M → G	Divided by 5 so it's about 30 30 pages a day ↓	
43:37	035 036	G → M	Can I XXXX	G switches to speaking to mom in Mandarin
43:41	037	M → G	XXXX	*Speaks in Mandarin

43:45	038 039 040 041 042	D → M	So you are trying to give her a limit of how many pages to read I just want her to read ↑	Dad starts laughing
43:50	043 044	M → D	I didn't give her limited ↑ I just	
43:53 43:54 43:54	045 046 047 048 049	G → M D → G G → M	*You just said I have to finish this book [Just read in 5 days ↑]	*Voice is louder than previous turns Dad interjects while G is talking
43:55	050	M → G	Yeah ↑ so ↓	
43:56	051	D → G	Right now your ↓	
43:57	052 053 054	G → M	So it's easier if I calculate it ↑	
43:59	055 056 057 058 059 060 061 062	D → G	*Yeah but you just spent five minutes talking about how many pages to read when you could actually just read two three pages ↓	*Dad speaks quickly without any pauses
44:07	063 064	G → D	So I'll read 30 pages then ↓	Said in a question
44:11	065	D → G	*Just read	*Said in a whisper
44:13	066	M → G	Just read	

44:15	067	D → G	Just sit down and <u>read</u>	
44:16	068 069 070 071 072 073 074 075	G → M & D	*I still have to finish this book in <u>five</u> days ↑ so it's easier if I <u>calculate</u> ↑ so then I know how many pages I can read a day ↑	*First three lines are said loudly. This entire turn is said with confidence.
44:23	076	M → G	Ok ↓	
44:24	077	D → G	*Just read	*Said in a whisper
44:26	078 079 080	G → M	*So five thirty ↑ there's page 30 it's right	*Said like a question. 6 second pause after first line.
44:41	081 082	M → G	Can I have a tissue No uh paper towel ↓	
44:47	083 084	G → M	Can I just stop at this chapter ↑	Said as a question
44:50	085	M → G	Just read G ↑	
44:51 45:17 45:17	086 087 088 089 090 091 092 093 094 095 096 097 098	D → G M → D D → G	Now it's been almost seven minutes instead of talking <u>about</u> reading and not actually reading just talking about reading *why are you looking at me for why are you just staring at me	8 second pause 9 second pause *Dad is laughing while talking for this line and the next Overlapping talk between mom and dad

			with the page open [when do you that's why I said sit down] over there and <u>read</u> ↑	
Begin Interaction Unit 2: Parallel story (Mom tells a parallel story about reading that positions G as a non-reader)				
45:22	099 100 101 102	M → G	*G____ do you know who Bill Gates Bill Gates you don't know ↑	Said as a question. 3 second pause
45:28	103	D → G	<u>Bill</u>	
45:29 45:29 45:30 45:30	104 105 106 107 108 109	M → G D → M M → G	Bill [Gates Gates] he's the one who who has the Microsoft company like a Microsoft computer	3 second pause
45:41	110	D → G	It's how your computer operates ↓	
45:43	111	M → D	Yeah ↑	
45:44	112	D → G	It's the program ↓	
45:46	113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121	M → G	And anyway he's very rich and very famous ↓ and he get in trouble when he was young ↓ he likes to read	

			when they are eating he's <u>still</u> reading his parents get mad at <u>him</u>	
46:00	122 123	D → M	*We don't have that problem	*Mom and dad laughing while speaking
46:04	124 125	G → M & D	Because I don't like to read	Mom and dad still laughing while G speaks. They don't acknowledge her turn
46:05	126 127	D → M	We have the other problem ↓	* Mom and dad still laughing
46:07	128 129 130	M → D	Even even like it be eight days I would be very happy ↓	*Both mom and dad still laughing
46:15	131 132 133	D → M	I would be happy if you turn out the lights and flush the toilet and do ↓	
46:19	134	G → D	I <u>do</u> flush the toilets ↓	
46:22	135 136 137 138	D → G	*You do not Don't leave your <u>shoes</u> right by the stairs and the door	*Starts off laughing
46:28	139	G → D	*That's <u>hard</u> not to ↑	*Said in a louder tone
46:32	140 141 142	D → G	You will get forty times in a row ↑ we'll see ↑	
46:36	143 144	M → G	Ok Reading start ↓	

46:38	145 146	G → D	*Then next summer it might be to a <u>1,000 times</u> ↓	*Said like a question
46:40	147	D → G	You are still not reading ↓ (46:41)	