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Abstract
Cross-cultural learning and identity formation are an under-theorized but fundamental aspect of dual language bilingual schools, where heritage speakers and English-only learners of a foreign language are educated together through immersion in both languages (Parkes, Ruth, Anberg-Espinoza & de Jong, 2009; Reyes & Vallone, 2007). Previous research on dual language programs has shown that despite careful program designs to treat each language equally, asymmetries between Spanish and English still play out even in well-implemented programs (Palmer, 2004; Potowski, 2005).

Observation of such inequalities at the Espada School, a highly successful Spanish/English dual language school, spurred the current study, which seeks to explore in greater depth the language ideologies held by youth in such a setting.

In-depth interviews and group discussions were conducted with six middle school students who had attended the school for eight years. Drawing on Foucauldian discourse analysis and sociocultural linguistics (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Willig, 2009), the study sought to answer the following questions:

1) What discourses do bilingual youth at a dual language middle school draw on to talk about Spanish and English, and about speakers of each language?

2) How do they deploy these discourses of language for identity-building and world-building?

Three discourses of language were identified. The first, language as utilitarian, emphasizes the functional or practical use of language as a resource or tool. The second, language as internal, constructs language as a skill, proficiency, quality or accomplishment that is located inside the individual person. The last, language as connecting or excluding, treats language as a means of relationship-building and understanding or as leading to division between people. Analysis reveals the ways that these discourses were deployed in different ways by each participant to construct their own identities with respect to their future, their everyday language interactions and their perceptions of the relationship between language and ethnicity.

The study contributes to a theoretical understanding of ethnolinguistic and sociocultural identity formation from a youth perspective. Recommendations are also made for dual language educators interested in expanding the discourses of language available to students as one way of countering the lower status of Spanish.
I. Introduction

Dual language schools in the US—where content is taught through immersion in two languages—are increasing in popularity, and have long been considered a model for educating (1) heritage language learners\(^1\) in their heritage language and English; and (2) foreign language learners in a foreign language and their native English (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2010). Research has shown that these programs foster students’ bilingualism/biliteracy, support high academic achievement and promote positive cross-cultural attitudes (Howard, Sugarman & Christian, 2003). However, recent attention has focused on the third core goal of this model, that of biculturalism or cross-cultural competence, and the need for more understanding of both the construct and how cross-cultural learning occurs in these schools. Several authors have put out a call for additional research on the role of identity construction and peer interaction in the process of cultural learning (Howard & Feinauer, 2014; Parkes, Ruth, Anberg-Espinoza & de Jong, 2009; Reyes & Vallone, 2007).

Survey-based measures have focused on the attitudes and beliefs of dual language students, both toward themselves and their own ethnolinguistic group as well as toward the target language and members of that group. These studies indicate generally positive outcomes, with dual language students demonstrating

\(^1\) The term “heritage language” includes either native or ancestral language. In this proposal, I contrast heritage language learners and native English speakers for practical purposes, despite the fact that English may be the first, or dominant, language of a heritage language learners.
more positive attitudes toward self and other as compared with their heritage language peers in monolingual English schools (Howard, Sugarman & Christian, 2003; Lindholm-Leary, 2001).

Ethnographic studies have looked at the processes related to cross-cultural learning and shown mixed results. On one hand, learners from diverse linguistic backgrounds can support one another in their language and academic content learning (Hill-Bonnett, 2009; Palmer, 2004). On the other, the participation of white, or Anglo, students, can result in the subtle reproduction of institutional systems of privilege and asymmetries of status and power within dual language schools and classrooms (Palmer, 2009; Valdés, 1997). Furthermore, these studies have shown several trends which run counter to this goal such as: resistance to Spanish as students get older, the dominance of English use among both students and teachers, and devaluing of vernacular language varieties (Bearse & de Jong, 2008; Hausmann-Kelly, 2001; Potowski, 2005; McCollum, 1994). Ethnographic research has also illuminated how discursive practices in schools and classrooms reflect the cultures of schools and dominant discourses about language minority and majority groups and their linguistic and social practices (Freeman, 1998).

We live in a society where an assimilationist approach to immigration has fueled a fear of bilingualism (García, 2014; Olsen, 1997), where English is accepted as the language of social, cultural, and economic dominance (Gándara & Orfield, 2010), and where intergenerational loss of heritage languages is the norm (Wong Fillmore, 1991). Schools are microcosms of society with the potential to both reproduce and disrupt dominant assumptions about how the world works (Anyon,
Because of their focus on equality of the linguistic and cultural resources of all students, dual language schools in the US are a unique educational model, often touted as a solution to the linguistic isolation and remedial programs in which English language learning students are placed (Bale, 2012; Gándara & Orfield, 2010; Thomas & Collier, 2003). Indeed, dual language schools have the potential to provide alternatives to the negative dominant discourses associated with minority languages and their speakers. For example, in her ethnography of the Oyster school, Freeman (1998) showed how school-wide policies can create spaces where such “alternative discourses” are created when assumptions are questioned, and minority language speakers re-positioned as agents of change and equal partners in learning.

The primary aim of this dissertation is to contribute to our theoretical understanding of how cross-cultural learning happens among youth in these settings. I draw on interviews and group discussions with youth to center a youth perspective on language, majority and minority language speakers and the linguistic practices of these groups. I bound my definition of culture as a dynamic process of identity construction, which happens within social contexts and is made visible to the researcher through discourse (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, 2005; Hall, 1997; Norton, 2000). Specifically, I explore the language ideologies evident in the discourses of language circulating among a small group of six bilingual youth who have attended a dual language school together for eight consecutive years. I use the constructs of identity-building and world-building to capture the ways that youth construct notions of culture in interaction. Drawing on Gee and Green (1998), I define
identity-building as “assembling situated meanings about what identities are relevant to the interaction, with their concomitant attitudes and ways of feeling, ways of knowing and believing, as well as ways of acting and interacting” and world-building as “assembling situated meanings about ‘reality,’ present and absent, concrete and abstract” (p. 139).

This dissertation seeks to answer the following research questions:

1) What discourses do bilingual youth at a dual language middle school draw on to talk about Spanish and English, and about speakers of each language?

2) How do they deploy these discourses of language for identity-building and world-building?

Summary of chapters

In Chapter 2, I describe two research approaches that have been used to look at cross-cultural learning in dual language bilingual schools: one focused on measuring attitudes and beliefs, primarily through surveys and interviews, a second focused on exploring the social and discursive processes related to cross-cultural learning through ethnography and discourse analysis. I review literature and provide some critique of each tradition, though I situate this dissertation in the latter tradition due to the focus on language as social process. I also introduce some key concepts from the fields of bilingualism and second language acquisition: dynamic bilingualism, translanguaging (García, 2014), identity investment and imagined identities (Norton, 2006). I show how these have been influential in the social processes approach to dual language research. In the second part of the chapter, I highlight the research on linguistic asymmetry in dual language schools
and consider the plausibility of creating lasting “alternative discourses” aimed at countering the societally predominant deficit-oriented discourses about language minority and immigrant populations (Freeman, 1998; Palmer 2008). Drawing on the influential work of Ruíz (1984), I argue that such lasting shifts in discourse are possible. However, I posit that first more research is needed on current discourses in use and the ways they are used for identity-building and world-building.

In Chapter 3, I describe the research context chosen for this study and outline my methods. Six middle school youth were selected from one highly successful majority-Hispanic dual language school. Co-constructive interviewing techniques were designed in which participants took photos, created language maps, engaged in interactive group discussions on cases from the dual language research and other sociolinguistic topics. These techniques were used in both individual interviews and a series of group and pair interview sessions. I began data analysis with thematic coding, then selected language-related phases to code for discourses and created a codebook. In the second phase of data analysis, I used tools from Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (Willig, 2009) and sociocultural linguistics (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005). In this chapter I present my analytic framework, which illustrates that the relationship between discourses of language and identity-/world-building processes are mediated by the action orientation of the speaker.

In Chapter 4, I describe the three main discourses found in the data: language as utilitarian, language as connecting or excluding, and language as internal. I provide a definition and examples for each of these discourses. I then explain the organization of the following chapters, which are based on themes that emerged
from the interviews. In the second half of the chapter, I provide a series of snapshots of the participants which serve primarily to illustrate the unique ways that the three discourses of language made possible certain identity-building and world-building processes for each of them. The snapshots also function as an introduction to each of the participants so that their brief descriptive profiles can serve as a larger context in which to situate fragments of their discourse in future chapters.

In Chapters 5 through 7, I explore three salient themes from the data. In chapter 5, I look at participants’ constructions of the adult worlds of work, college and married/home life. In chapter 6, I look at their constructions of everyday language use. In chapter 7, I look at their constructions of the relationship between language and ethnicity. For each of these chapters, I use my guiding analytic framework outlined in chapter 3 to explore the ways that the three discourses of language are deployed with varying possibilities for identity-building and world-building. I discuss the positionings, practices and subjectivities made possible for speakers through these constructions.

I conclude in chapter 8 with a brief synthesis of the analysis and discussion of implications for future research and for dual language practitioners. My discussion of implications centers around two key ideas: 1) the need to expand the repertoire of discourses of language available to of dual language youth, and 2) creating pedagogical interventions which provide opportunities to practice using these various discourses. I also provide methodological reflections on the use of FDA and sociocultural linguistics for future work.
II. Literature Review

Part 1: Cross-cultural learning in dual language schools

Cross-cultural competence is one of three overarching goals of dual language (DL) education programs, but has been referred to as the “third goal,” putting it in the backseat in terms of importance both for those implementing DL programs and for researchers seeking evidence of progress toward this goal (Parkes et al., 2011). Part of the reason for this is that the goal itself has not clearly been defined, and indeed, is referred to with varying terminology, including biculturalism (Genesee, 1984; Lambert & Tucker, 1972; Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2001), student attitudes (Cazabon, 2000; Lambert & Cazabon, 1994; Gerena, 2010), pluralism (McCollum, 1994), cross-cultural awareness or understanding (Genesee & Gándara, 1999; Gort, 2008), or cross-cultural competence (Bearse & deJong, 2008; Howard & Feinauer, 2014; Lindholm-Leary, 2011).

“Dual language” is an umbrella term for a variety of different program models in which two languages of instruction are used to teach content through language immersion, and at least 50% of instructional time occurs in the partner

---

2 Segments of this literature review appeared earlier in my Qualifying Paper.
3 I use the term dual language because of its predominance in the literature and the convenience of a general term to look at a particular approach to bilingual education. Nevertheless, I agree with García’s (2014) critique of the political emergence of this term as part of a politically-driven erasure of bilingual education in public discourse. Lindholm-Leary (2003) has also noted that the term “dual language” is commonly used rather than “bilingual” by districts to appeal to privileged groups for enrichment or magnet programs.
language (i.e., the language other than English) (National Dual Language Consortium, n.d.). Under this umbrella are *two-way immersion programs* (which serve a mix of students from language minority background and English-speaking students) *developmental or maintenance bilingual schools* (which serve predominantly speakers or heritage learners of the partner language, as in majority-Hispanic schools), and *immersion programs* (which serve primarily foreign language learners). Most of the literature reviewed here refers to either two-way or developmental programs. In reporting the literature, I use the language of the researchers to refer to the constructs, program types and the populations they serve and clarify the language when necessary.

The research on cultural or cross-cultural aspects of learning in dual language (DL) schools can roughly be divided into two broad approaches. First are studies of cultural beliefs and attitudes, which use primarily surveys or a thematic approach to interview data. Second are process-oriented studies, which draw on ethnographic and discourse analytic methodologies (Howard & Feinauer, 2014). After a brief overview of the main findings from the former, I describe some limitations of this approach and then review research from the second approach. The primary aim of this dissertation is to contribute to our theoretical understanding of the discursive processes related to cross-cultural learning in dual language schools, with a focus on the perspective of youth participants in one such school. Given this focus, I include some discussion of the theoretical assumptions behind the research. I also highlight ways that previous methodological decisions informed my research design and choice of research tools.
Cultural attitudes and beliefs

The first approach has a long tradition dating back to early studies of French immersion schools in Canada by Wallace Lambert (Cziko, Lambert, and Gutter, 1980; Lambert, 1967; Lambert, 1977; Lambert, 1987; Lambert & Tucker, 1972) and Fred Genessee (1978, 1981). Early work in Canada showed that English speakers in both language Immersion students and control group students perceived distinct ethnolinguistic groups (i.e., French Canadians and English Canadians), and self-identified more strongly with the English Canadian group. However, compared with students in English-only programs, Immersion students perceived less social distance between English and French Canadians, and located themselves more closely to French Canadians in terms of similarity (Cziko, Lambert, and Gutter, 1980; Genesee, 1977).

Surveys originally designed for the Canadian context were later adapted and validated in dual language schools in California by Lindholm (1990; also, Lindholm & Aclan, 1993; Lindholm-Leary, 2001), and subsequently adapted for use in a number of other studies on US dual language programs, including notably a series of studies of the Amigos program in Massachusetts (Cazabon, 2000; Cazabon, Lampert & Hall, 1993; Lambert & Cazabon, 1994). These measures and results have had a strong influence on how the field has thought about biculturalism and cross-cultural learning as outcomes of dual language schooling. These survey instruments typically focus on three areas of student attitudes toward: 1) oneself and one’s own ethnolinguistic group versus other ethnolinguistic groups, 2) the majority and
minority languages and bilingualism in general, and 3) their dual language/immersion education and education more broadly.

In general, results from different types of DL schools in the US have shown that, when compared with a similar population in a mainstream school, dual language students are more likely to develop positive cross-cultural attitudes⁴. This is true in immersion (Genessee & Gándara, 1999; Wesely, 2012), two-way (Barse & de Jong, 2008; Cazabon, Lampert & Hall, 1993; Cazabon, 2000), and predominantly Hispanic settings (Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Lindholm-Leary & Block, 2010). I focus this review on the latter two types of programs because they are more closely related to my research context.

In one of the first adaptations of the Canadian survey instruments in the US, Lindholm and Aclan (1993) surveyed 236 native English speaking and native Spanish speaking students from three Spanish/English DL programs in California. All Spanish speakers were Hispanic and 95% of English speakers were Anglo. Students were surveyed first in third grade, and then again in fifth grade to see whether there were differences on several psychosocial measures between Spanish and English speakers and which measures from third grade best predicted academic achievement in fifth grade. They found no significant difference between the Spanish and English speakers in how students rated themselves on self-worth, motivation and physical appearance. However, English speakers rated themselves higher on academic competence, despite the fact that no significant difference was found between these groups in their academic performance. The authors speculate

⁴ A selection bias may be at play in these findings since families who choose such schools may be more likely to reinforce positive cross-cultural attitudes at home.
that this finding is related to the tendency of English speakers to be more prepared with readiness and literacy skills upon entering school, as well as the low social status of Spanish in society. Of the psychosocial variables, only motivation was shown to be a significant predictor of academic achievement in fifth grade.

Subsequent large-scale studies including more than 600 students from nine dual language schools of varying types, Lindholm-Leary (2001) replicated these findings, with generally positive attitudes.

Research on predominantly Hispanic schools have had similar results. In a longitudinal study of 8000 students in 20 dual language schools, Lindholm-Leary (2001) found no differences in self-perception or attitudes toward others, and slightly more positive attitudes toward the minority language among students attending “high ethnic density schools” (those with at least two-third of students language minorities) as compared with students in “low ethnic density” schools. In a related study, Lindholm-Leary and Block (2010) found that students at dual language schools with 80% or more Hispanic students were developing positive cross-cultural attitudes.

In a multi-year study of the Amigos dual language Program, Cazabon, Lampert and Hall (1993) also used an adaptation of Lindholm-Leary’s version of the Canadian survey tools, adding a sociometric tool, which indicated that students at Amigos chose friends from different ethnic or linguistic groups as frequently as they did from their own groups. They also piloted a self-esteem measure with Amigos third graders and found that English-speaking and Spanish-speaking students had comparable perceived personal competence when asked about their own academic
abilities and self-worth. In a follow-up report, Lambert and Cazabon (1994) surveyed fourth through sixth graders and found that students expressed a preference for ethnically mixed classes.

Rolstad (1997) looked at attitudes of Korean, Latino (primarily Mexican) and White students at a single school with two dual language strands—a Spanish/English strand and a Korean/English strand—as well as an English-only (EO) strand. Since Latino students were enrolled in all three strands, this site allowed a unique opportunity for comparison of this subgroup across contexts. Drawing on Lindholm-Leary’s survey instrument, Rolstad (1997) measured “ethnic identification,” by how students judged their own and other ethnic groups on a series of characteristics (e.g., nice/mean, hard-working/lazy). She found that Latino students’ rating of their own ethnic group was highest among those in the Spanish dual language program, followed by Latinos in the Korean dual language program, and lowest in the English-only program. Drawing on this finding, Rolstad argued that language immersion programs may foster ethnic identification more so than English-only programs. However, she also pointed out that Latinos in both the Korean DL and the English-only programs rated Whites slightly higher than Latinos. This was not true of Latinos in the Spanish dual language program, indicating that dual language education in the heritage language may be a key factor in ethnic identification.

Research with adolescent dual language learners

Most of the previous research has been done with elementary-age students. Few studies have considered the question of cross-cultural learning with
adolescents enrolled in or graduated from dual language schools. Lindholm-Leary and Borsato (2001) surveyed high school students who were graduates of three dual language schools in California. They analyzed the survey data in three groups: Spanish-bilingual Hispanics (Hisp-SB, those who had come to the program speaking only or primarily Spanish), English-bilingual Hispanics (Hisp-EB, those who had entered the program speaking mostly English), and Euro-American English bilinguals who entered the program as English-only speakers.

In comparison with their Euro peers, Hispanic students in this study more strongly agreed with the statement that their bilingualism would help them get a good job. All dual language graduates were using Spanish on a weekly basis, with both Hispanic groups reporting a slightly higher Spanish usage. They found wide variation in who different groups used Spanish with (close friends, family, etc.).

In response to the survey question “I am bicultural,” 35% of Euro, 49% of Spanish-Bilingual Hispanics, and 65% of English-Bilingual Hispanics agreed. Notably, about 80% of Hispanic students and 40% of Euro students were using both languages at home. When asked where they use Spanish, the majority reported using some Spanish with their families, family friends, their own friends, or in other social settings (72% of Hisp-SB, 63% of Hisp-EB and 65% of Euro students). When asked how comfortable they felt speaking Spanish in public, 59% of Hisp-SB, 72% of Hisp-EB, and 60% of Euro students reported feeling very comfortable or comfortable. Interestingly, more Euro students than Hispanic students reported having been complimented for their Spanish (70% vs. 45%) or for being bilingual (55% vs. Between 36-41%). In discussing their findings, Lindholm-Leary and
Borsato (2001) point out that Hispanic students enrolled in the dual language programs have developed some of the characteristics associated with resiliency such as motivation to study and go on to college, as well as positive self esteem.

Bearse and de Jong (2008) conducted surveys and focus groups with 166 Latino and Anglo students enrolled at the secondary level in a K-12 dual language program. The authors note that in K through fifth grade, the program follows a 50/50 model in which half of the instructional time is done in Spanish and half in English. The model then shifts in middle school to about one-third of instruction time in Spanish, and in high school students can choose to have one academic course in Spanish. The authors reported that respondents recognized the increasing importance of English over Spanish in their lives and the decreasing sense of equity between the two languages in the last few years of their dual language schooling.

They found that these two groups differed in how they perceived the linguistic and cultural capital that their bilingual education afforded. For Anglo students, future job opportunities was the primary focus, whereas Latinos also valued both potential economic benefits as well as personal connection with family and roots.

When asked about biculturalism, Bearse and de Jong’s Anglo participants acknowledged an affinity toward Latino culture and emphasized their friendships with Spanish-speaking peers, but few considered themselves bicultural, recognizing a need for more exposure to Latino culture in order to adopt such a term. Latino students fell into two groups when talking about biculturalism. On one hand, some (primarily Puerto Rican students) considered themselves bicultural, comfortably
identifying with both mainstream (Anglo) US and Puerto Rican cultures. On the other hand, some Latino students (primarily those from the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala and Mexico) were more inclined to identify with the home culture. Even when students in the latter group identified as bicultural, they tended to emphasize their connection to the home culture.

These studies with dual language adolescents provide some important insights into the complex ways that language, culture and identity interact and play out in their lives. As students get older, future application of their bilingualism seems to become more pressing as college, employment and other aspects of adult life loom closer. Furthermore, in each of these studies with older dual language learners, youth talked about being exposed to a larger social group that extended beyond Spanish speakers and bilinguals, which may provide new opportunities for awareness about the uniqueness of their own bilingualism in the US context. Bearse and de Jong (2008) call for further research on this important population who may be more able to articulate their perceptions of sociocultural aspects of their dual language school experiences. Finally, there continues to be a need for more research with early adolescents.

Dynamic conceptualizations of bilingualism & identity: Limitations to the first approach

The studies reviewed so far share a common focus on student attitudes and beliefs. They represent a considerable body of work, providing a starting place for how to design dual language bilingual schools to promote cross-cultural learning (Howard, Sugarman, Christian, Lindholm-Leary & Rogers, 2012). However, these
studies are also limited due to demographic shifts in the bilingual learner population, as well as new theoretical understandings in the fields of bilingualism and identity studies, which have given rise to a second approach.

Rolstad (1997) provides a lengthy discussion of the challenge of measuring ethnic identification of bi-ethnic or multi-ethnic children in these programs. In one example, it was difficult to decide how to categorize a student who identified as “Fil-Mex” (of both Filipino and Mexican descent), and she was unable to include this data point in her table comparing across groups. In addition, she points out that a number of students seemed to conflate American and White, making it hard to determine how to group students who classified, for example, as “Indonesian and American.” She discusses the measurement challenges:

“It was difficult to determine what approach to take with children of mixed ethnic backgrounds, whether to test each part of their ethnic background separately, have them choose which ethnicity they identified with most strongly and test only that one, or try to blend the ethnicities together and test the children’s identification with others of precisely that ethnic blend. Each of these possibilities was problematic” (p. 56).

Rolstad’s methodological reflection exemplifies a growing awareness among researchers of the limits to the attitude/survey approach to measuring biculturalism and cross-cultural learning in dual language settings.

The attitudes and beliefs approach to cross-cultural learning tends to categorize students by first language (L1) and first culture (C1), and survey them on their attitudes toward the second language (L2) or second culture (C2). Many have called into question this L1/C1 versus L2/C2 paradigm. While the question of who is a native speaker and who is not may have been fairly cut-and-dry in the early 1970s
when the first two-way bilingual dual language schools were started, demographic shifts have blurred the lines. In the context of “new immigration,” second and third generation youth engage in complex and shifting bilingual language practices in the home (Freeman 2004; Lindholm-Leary & Hernandez, 2011; Mancilla-Martinez & Kieffer, 2010) and at school (Canagarajah, 2011; García, 2009, 2014). Furthermore, the definition of who counts as a heritage language speaker becomes ever broader and more diffuse (Montrul, 2013).

Underlying the attitudes and beliefs literature are certain assumptions about language and bilingualism, including this notion of first/native language, or mother tongue. As Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) has pointed out, there are many good research and planning reasons for maintaining the notion of mother tongue, including the practical need of collecting linguistic data. However, she calls for caution when using these categories in policy and planning. The author outlines various criteria for defining mother tongue: by origin (the first language spoken), identification (the language with which the person identifies or is identified by others), competence (the language the person knows best), or function (the language the person uses most). Depending on the selected criterion, a given person may have one or more mother tongues. Furthermore, these may change over time so that a person’s mother tongue at age three may be different at age twelve or forty. Skutnabb-Kangas has shown how our definition of mother tongue is also related to status and institutional power.

García has pointed out that the construct of first and second language has led to the theory of additive versus subtractive bilingualism—once a helpful framework
for exposing the negative impact of a deficit approach to bilingualism and bilingual education (e.g., Zentella, 1997). This framework assumes a linear progression of the bilingual person’s languages, starting with one language and adding another (additive bilingualism) or replacing it with another (subtractive bilingualism). However, this linear conceptualization of bilingualism as two separate language systems constructs bilinguals as if they were two monolinguals in one, a misconception that has persisted despite strong evidence to the contrary (Grosjean, 1989; 1998). As Bialystok has pointed out:

“Bilingual children are different from monolinguals. The differences are evident in the way they acquire language, their experiences in school, and their socialization with their peers” (2001, p. 242).

García (2014) has proposed replacing this linear L1/L2 framework of bilingualism with what she calls dynamic bilingualism. She claims,

“A dynamic conceptualization of bilingualism (Garcia 2009) goes beyond the notion of two autonomous languages, of a first and a second language, of additive and subtractive bilingualism. ... Dynamic bilingualism sees languages not as monolithic systems made up of discreet sets of skills, but as a series of social practices that are embedded in a web of social relations” (p. 109).

Within this dynamic paradigm, García proposes that all bilinguals not be classified by their L1/L2, or as “native speakers of,” but as emergent bilinguals whose language practices are dynamic. García (2009, 2014) has shown how emergent bilinguals of different ages and backgrounds constantly draw on their various linguistic resources through translanguaging practices. The term translanguaging, first coined by Williams (1997), refers to “the ability of multilingual speakers to shuffle between languages, treating the diverse languages that form their repertoire as an integrated system” (Canagarajah, 2011, p 401).
Recent research with bilinguals has shown that, indeed, “translanguaging practices are not viewed (by multi- and bilinguals) as marked or unusual, but are rather taken to be the normal mode of communication” (Blackledge & Creese, 2015, p. 28).

García (2009) has argued that these two shifts—a view of bilingualism as dynamic, and of translanguaging practices as natural—constitute an important paradigm shift that has the potential to radically impact how bilingual learners are viewed and shape the educational services provided them. Her work in recent years has focused on helping practitioners make this discursive shift.

This fluid theory of bilingualism aligns with a similarly fluid view of identity formation, which has emerged as central to the fields of bilingualism and bilingual education (Block, 2007). The attitudes and beliefs studies outlined above are primarily grounded in a view of culture and identity as static, located inside the individual or group, and measurable through variable outcomes captured in surveys or interviews. Norton and Toohey (2011) have pointed out that such assumptions are inconsistent with current theories of identities and how they come to be.

Norton (2006) has summarized five characteristics of current conceptions of identity in the field of second language acquisition: identity as i) “dynamic and constantly changing across time and place,” ii) “complex, contradictory, and multifaceted,” iii) constructing and “constructed by language,” iv) “understood with respect to larger social processes, marked by relations of power,” and v) linked to social practices (p. 3).

These theoretical understandings of identity have given way to two key related constructs in the literature: *identity investments* and *imagined identities*. 
In her study of adult immigrant language learners, Norton (2000) uses the construct of identity investments to account for the surprising ways that her participants invested in opportunities to practice and learn English despite structural inequalities and power differentials between themselves and their employers, co-workers and others with whom they interacted on a daily basis.

Norton (2000; Norton-Pierce, 1995) proposed the construct of identity investment as a sociological construct meant to balance the psychological construct of motivation, which has traditionally had much influence in second language teaching. Second language theorists have described instrumental motivation as “the desire to obtain something practical or concrete from the study of a second language” (Hudson, 2000), such as a job or a degree. By contrast, integrative motivation assumes that "students who are more successful at learning a second language are those who like the people that speak the language, admire the culture, and have a desire to become familiar with or even integrate into the society in which the language is used" (Falk, 1978).

Norton (2000) points out that each constructs motivation as inherent or internal to the learner, rather than as co-constructed in interaction between language learners and native speakers with agency to choose how and when to use the target language. She further emphasizes the learner’s historical and social relationships within asymmetrical institutional and societal power relations. Drawing on Norton’s work, Potowski (2005) has pointed out that just providing opportunities to interact in the target language does not mean that learners will choose to do so. Rather, learners need reasons to invest in the language, and these
are necessarily wrapped up in their ideas about who they are. As Norton (2006) points out,

“Rather than seeing language learning as a gradual individual process of internalizing a neutral set of rules, structures, and vocabulary of a standard language [we see that] Speakers need to struggle to appropriate the voices of others, and to ‘bend’ those voices to their own purposes” (p. 5).

Building on Anderson (1991), some second language researchers have focused on the notion of imagined communities (or imagined identities) as a way of understanding how and why language learners choose to take up certain opportunities to practice a language. For example, Norton and Kamal (2003) studied how Pakistani youth began to invest more time in learning English after participating in an activity imagining global connections between their country and others in the future.

Identity and social processes related to identity formation have thus become central to the field, and stand in contrast to previous more static notions of attitudes and beliefs in the literature reviewed above.

**Language socialization approach: Translanguaging and identity formation in dual language schools**

García’s (2009) notions of dynamic bilingualism and translanguaging, along with Norton’s (2000) notions of identity investment and imagined identities, each rely on an understanding of language as a social process. Ochs’ (1986) influential theory of language socialization aligns with all of these constructs. Along with many linguistic anthropologists, Ochs has shown that “sociocultural information is generally encoded in the organization of conversational discourse,” and people
“acquire a world view as they acquire language” (p. 2). Speech in interaction is encoded with assumptions about the social world and the positions of interlocutors within that world; it shapes the way we see things and our actions and reactions to one another.

This language socialization approach characterizes the group of studies reviewed below. In contrast to the first set of studies, which focused on attitudes and beliefs as outcome variables, the second group of studies approach cross-cultural learning in dual language schools from a process-oriented approach and draw primarily on ethnographic and discourse analytic methodologies. These researchers take García’s (2009) and Norton’s (2000) conceptualizations reviewed above as a given. Many of these studies have focused on documenting the rich translanguaging practices of bilinguals in dual language classrooms. Others have focused on looking at discourses more broadly. In each case, the interplay between language practices and identity formation are central. To this approach.

Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz (2005) analyzed group interactions among third and fourth grade bilingual children to show how they take up opportunities to use all linguistic resources, including both Spanish and English, available to them when such a space is available. Coady and Escamilla (2005) have similarly shown how bilingual fifth graders who were encouraged to draw on both languages in writing developed their voices as writers and transferred a sense of themselves and their life experiences from one language to the other. Authors of each of these studies emphasize the careful pains taken to create opportunities for bilinguals to draw on their multiple linguistic resources. Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, Alvarez,
and Chiu (1999) showed how Martha, a third-grade bilingual Latina in a bilingual afterschool program, draws on hybrid literacy practices which include the use of Spanish and English words, structures and spellings in playful and creative informal email interactions with a bilingual adult. They argue that creating spaces for such hybrid languaging practices allows for meaningful collaboration. In an interactional ethnography of kindergarten and first grade classrooms at a dual language school, Hill-Bonnett (2009) found that bilingual peers with varying abilities in each language collaborated by pooling their linguistic resources during collaborative learning time.

While such possibilities for translanguaging practices exist, they are constrained by institutional constructions of bilingualism and whether teachers consider it important to create spaces for bilinguals to draw on their multiple linguistic resources.

Sook Lee et al. (2008) documented one school’s staunch policy of separating languages. Despite both teachers’ bilingualism, teachers only presented themselves as speakers of their language of instruction and adhered rigidly to the use of that language in and out of the classroom. By presenting themselves in this way, they led students to assume teachers were monolingual, thus limiting their exposure to bilingual translanguaging practices. Students took up this practice of dichotomizing people as either Spanish speakers or English speakers and reinforced those identities during informal interactions. For example, the researchers observed Spanish dominant students switch to English with an English-dominant student, Ella, despite her Spanish proficiency and attempts to use Spanish. The authors argue
that "Ella’s true ability may not matter in shaping the language choices of her interlocutors; rather what governs the language choices of the interactional spaces is how the students have come to be seen as a speaker of English or a speaker of Spanish" (p. 89). The authors note that such moments of positioning accumulate over time and contribute to what they call a “thickening" of linguistic identities. Furthermore, because English is so pervasive socially, the authors point out that Spanish dominant students tend to acquire English more quickly than do English dominant students Spanish. This leads to the expectation that Spanish dominant students accommodate English dominant students. This in turn may further limit English dominant students’ opportunities to practice Spanish and incorporate Spanish as part of their identities. Sook Lee et al conclude that, over time, the school’s adherence to strict language separation thus has important implications for linguistic identity formation.

Fitts’ (2006) study of a fifth grade dual language classroom shows how the term “first language" is commonly used to group students into cross-language pairs. Students are often asked to partner with a “native speaker” language model to work cross-linguistically. This frequently resulted in confusion because some students identified with both languages equally while others for whom Spanish was their first language (based on origin) actually felt more competent in English after six years at the dual language school. Such institutionally sanctioned practices inadvertently put students in the position of having to authenticate themselves as L1 Spanish or L1 English speakers and proving their ethnic affiliation. Again, Fitts (2006) argues that
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5 See my discussion of this construct in the Theoretical Framework chapter, on p. 35
such institutional practices may run counter to the school’s touted goal of language equality.

In another study, Palmer (2009b) showed that the practice of mixing Spanish and English during Spanish instructional time was stigmatized when the Spanish teacher used a motivational system that encouraged students to report their peers’ use of English during Spanish class.

Even in a highly successful dual language program where students were generally encouraged to draw on all linguistic resources and hybrid languaging practices was very common among both students and teachers, Fitts (2009) points out reasons for caution. In her ethnographic study of a fifth-grade classroom, she has shown that hybrid languaging practices often served as “bridges” between student knowledge and the curriculum or “navigational spaces” for considering difference between linguistic styles. Rarely did they lead to what she calls “transformational third spaces.” She argues that such spaces would serve to “de-center the Anglo-centric nature of the curriculum and give Spanish speakers a chance to be the experts” (p. 98).

The above studies illuminate the complex bilingual languaging practices of students and teachers in dual language programs, and give depth to the ways that identities are shaped through interaction in these settings.

Other studies have looked specifically at discursive practices in classrooms with a focus on the construction of academic and myriad social identities. Castanheira, Green, Dixon and Yeaberg (2007) documented how one fifth grade dual language teacher constructed “identity potentials” for her students through her use
of both Spanish and English during math class. By choosing to draw on each language to model mathematical thinking and talk about the activities, she constructed each language as potentially aligned with a mathematical academic identity in the classroom. The authors argue that this allowed the dual language learners to explore multiple potential identities—Spanish-speaking mathematician, English-speaking mathematician, bilingual mathematician—as they participated in the lessons. Potowski (2005) followed four dual language students during their fifth and eighth grade years. The author describes Melissa, who comes from an English-only Anglo home but emphasizes a strong connection with her Spanish identity and used Spanish during academic interactions more than any of the other focal students. Her Spanish identity investment was so strong that she was one of the only students who tends to use Spanish in social interactions with her peers. By contrast, Matt is a first generation Salvadoran who is more concerned with social interactions than with class work. Because English is the primary language for peer interactions in this classroom, this peer-focused identity supersedes his identity as a Spanish speaker, leading him to use more English even when he was equally comfortable using either language for both social and academic interactions. Potowski concludes that it is crucial to consider the role of agency and identity in the language learning process.

**Discussion: Emerging methodological and design considerations**

I began this chapter with a brief discussion of the wide range of ways that researchers have conceptualized cross-cultural learning in dual language settings. I
then reviewed two research approaches to this topic. The first, characterized by a focus on the constructs of attitudes and beliefs, has drawn primarily on survey and interview data and is limited by its reliance on clear divisions between ethnolinguistic categories. I have also pointed out that emerging conceptualizations of dynamic bilingualism and identity formation as part of language learning are misaligned with an attitudes and beliefs approach. Next I reviewed studies which adopt a language socialization approach and focus more on the processes related to identity formation and language learning.

My epistemological and theoretical grounding for this dissertation makes the language socialization approach a good fit for me. However, studies from the language socialization approach rely primarily on naturally-occurring ethnographic data in classrooms and other school-based spaces. While this provides a rich look at life inside dual language schools, these methods fail to shed light on how young people themselves make sense of such interactions, as well as how they construct their identities and worlds outside of school, and the role that their languages play in these constructions. Young people rarely have time to talk about and reflect on their language use and their social, cultural or ethnolinguistic identities in school. A study intended to deeply explore a youth perspective on cross-cultural learning and linguistic equality in dual language schooling requires a research design which allows for such rich interactions and time to reflect on topics which may be new to young people.

While the attitude survey approach to studying cultural outcomes of dual language schools has its drawbacks, it does offer tools for breaking down particular
aspects of the constructs of culture an culture-crossing. In my research design, I
drew on some constructs from the attitudes and beliefs survey tools. For example,
the two studies reported above by Lindholm-Leary and Borsato (2001) and Bearse
and deJong (2008), which were done with adolescents, provided an intriguing
starting place for designing this dissertation. Their data collection tools and findings
provided important insights that informed my research design. Lindholm-Leary and
Borsato (2001) provided a descriptive account of youth responses to questions
about current and future Spanish and English use and subjective experiences of each
language. Their survey tool did not allow for follow-up questions or more open-ended responses, which would provide rich discourse data for analysis from a
language socialization approach. The focus group approach taken by Bearse and
deJong (2008) provided youth with opportunities to build on one another’s ideas
and reflect on aspects of culture and language status. However, their decision to
group respondents by ethnic background did not allow for cross-ethnic
conversations.

Part 2: Linguistic asymmetry: Creating spaces for “alternative discourses” in
dual language schools

Dual language specialists have been very intentional in making linguistic
equality a guiding principle for programmatic, curricular and pedagogical decisions
(Howard, Sugarman, Christian, Lindholm-Leary & Rogers, 2012). Treating both
languages the same includes such minute details as giving each language equal
space in the daily schedules, enrolling an equal number of students who can serve as language models for each language, finding or creating high quality materials in each language. It also entails pedagogical decisions such as monitoring the participation of speakers from each linguistic group and giving equal opportunities to be active participants in everyday learning activities. In some schools, linguistic equity is even sought after when schools seek to counter the hegemony of English with practices such as offering more time in the partner language or hiring teachers who speak only Spanish. Even such simple things as referring to the two languages of instruction as “partner languages” rather than using terms such as minority versus majority language or mainstream versus other or foreign language reflects this guiding principle.

Despite these program designs, researchers have documented again and again examples of linguistic asymmetry and English hegemony in even the most high quality programs. For example, Potowski (2005) found that despite careful program designs, students tended to use Spanish less frequently than English in the middle school. In her analysis of classroom interactions in 5th and 8th grade during Spanish instructional time, the author showed that English was not only used about half the time but was also used for a wider variety of functions than Spanish.

Bearse and de Jong (2008) conducted interviews with Latino and Anglo high school students in a K-12 dual language program. The authors note that in K through fifth grade, the a 50/50 model is used, in which half of the instructional time is done in Spanish and half in English. The model then shifts in middle school to about one-third of instruction time in Spanish, and in high school students can
choose to have one academic course in Spanish. The authors report that respondents recognized the increasing importance of English over Spanish in their lives and the decreasing sense of equity between the two languages in the last few years of their dual language schooling.

The tendency to shift toward English dominance as the program-sanctioned dominant mode of communication in the upper grades is often due to external pressures such as testing or other policies (Garcia, 2009). Nevertheless, both Potowski (2005) and Bearse and de Jong (2008) point out the unintended negative effects of such programmatic designs, which relate directly to students’ opportunities to practice using both languages and impact students’ motivation to invest in the use of Spanish. As Bearse and de Jong (2008) note,

“differences in the assigned value of Spanish and English affect students’ linguistic choices over time with English becoming the unmarked, more accepted language choice and Spanish the marked, contested language choice” (p. 336).

Drawing on Norton (2000), these authors point out that students’ identity investments in English are integrally related to how they see themselves and how they relate to the world around them.

Palmer (2009a) found that teachers in one dual language school often gave Anglo students more opportunities to participate, a practice which one Spanish teacher she interviewed considered inequitable. Palmer also observed that Spanish teachers simplified their language for English dominant students more often than did English teachers for Spanish dominant students. The author points out that this pedagogical practice results in a less challenging and less authentic language
learning experience for Spanish-dominant students during Spanish language instructional time.

In another study, McCollum (1994) set about trying to understand why students tended to use more English than Spanish and what led to this shift over time despite the program’s espoused goal of language equality. She documented the various ways that a Spanish teacher demonstrated a negative attitude toward the students’ working-class variety of Spanish, frequently correcting their word choice, pronunciation and grammar in the classroom. In response, students often switched to English use in her class.

Lincoln’s (2003) case study of Juan, a Spanish/English bilingual student who recently moved from Texas to Chicago, tells a similar story. Despite the fact that Juan considers himself fluent and competent in Spanish and finds that reading a book on jaguars in a secondary heritage Spanish class gives him new knowledge about an unfamiliar topic, over time he describes feeling constrained and unable to participate in Spanish class. Juan’s Spanish teacher corrects his lexical choices in Spanish, preferring a more standard version to his vernacular. By contrast, Juan describes feeling understood in his ESL class, and even though he feels less confident with, participates more. Lincoln argues that by positioning Juan as an outsider in Spanish class and de-valuing his unique variety of Spanish, Juan’s Spanish teacher misses the opportunity to engage him in learning new content through a familiar language.
Discourse analysis is a common tool for the language socialization approach. Gee (2004) defines discourses as “ways of combining and integrating language, actions, interactions, ways of thinking, believing, valuing, and using various symbols, tools, and objects to enact a particular sort of socially recognizable identity” (p. 21). Certain discourses become ingrained in our way of talking as part of speech communities—communities of speakers who, over time, have developed shared ways of talking, seeing and being in the world (Gee, 2004).

Schools—specifically the cohorts of students who move through and across schools, are an example of a speech community. Some researchers have claimed that dual language schools can be places where language-related inequalities are disrupted and re-positioned through discourse used among such speech communities.

For example, in her case study of the Oyster dual language school, Freeman (1998) described the dominant societal discourses used to talk about immigrants and language minorities as predominantly negative. These include discourses related to immigrant student’s limited English proficiency, gaps in academic proficiency between language minorities and mainstream students, and general challenges related to the education of immigrant youth. Freeman points out that these dominant discourses locate the “problems” of educating this population in the children themselves, rather than locating problems in the system, institution, or
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6 Gee distinguishes between the linguistic concept of discourse (small d), which refers to extended segments of language beyond the word or sentence, and Discourse (big-D), defined here. In choosing not to follow Gee's orthographic distinction between D/discourse, I follow the lead of many social science researchers in the field of education who apply the term discourse in the larger sense of language as social practice. See Rogers, et al., 2005, for a review of this literature.
society in general. Freeman showed how the Oyster school’s discursive practices provided students with “alternative discourses” which positioned language minority speakers as valuable and knowledgeable contributors to their community and school, and located difficulties or problems in the larger school system and society. She argued that a strong coherence among the school’s clear social justice mission, policies, public language practices, and classroom discursive practices all aligned to promote linguistic equity. This environment provided students with rich opportunities to hear and practice alternative discourses, which position language minority students in positive ways. Freeman speculated that schools have the potential to be spaces where young people and teachers alike can question or resist negative dominant discourses and create alternatives.

Palmer (2004) found that students of mixed-SES and ethnic backgrounds positioned one another as co-constructors of knowledge and that language majority (mostly white, middle-class) students served as brokers to open spaces for their language minority peers to access opaque curriculum not explained by a monolingual teacher. These students took up opportunities to position their language minority peers as valid interlocutors in academic conversations, even to the point of overriding a teacher who had excluded language minority students from the conversation.

Palmer (2008) similarly showed how a second grade dual language teacher created discursive spaces to take up academic identities during Spanish instruction. The author argued that such moments constitute “alternative” discursive constructions of Spanish due to mainstream deficit-oriented discourses of Spanish.
She showed how students frequently took up these alternative discourses, but also often defaulted back to negative discourses. The author points out that the goal of linguistic equality in dual language schools carries with it an assumption that these institutions can influence long-term shifts in discourse patterns. She argues that because discursive constructions of language and the people who speak them are highly contextualized and run counter to mainstream societal discourses of minority languages and their speakers, they may not have a long-term impact. She concludes that

“even while attempting to engage students in a struggle to change their discourse patterns, we will find students slipping back repeatedly into inequitable patterns drawn from the expectations of the larger society” (p. 664).

In other words, Palmer (2008) questions the likelihood of creating spaces where alternative discourses that actually counter the hegemonic forces of English and monolingualism are taken up in the long term.

**Ruíz (1984) as a case of generating alternative discourses**

While Palmer’s argument is provocative, there are in fact examples of institutional discourses leading to change over time. Ruíz’s work in bilingual policy and planning provides an interesting case.

In his analysis of language planning documents, Ruíz (1984) identified two dominant language orientations: *language as a problem*, and *language as a right*. Defining language orientation as “a complex of dispositions ... toward languages and their role in society” (p. 16), he found that each orientation was associated with a different professional approach to language planning. The former—language as a
problem—was common in US bilingual education policies, while the latter—language as a right—to legal documents. Ruíz argued that each of these language orientations shaped the ways that people within that field approached language planning. Bilingual educators drew on a language as problem orientation to “fix” the lack of English knowledge, which often led to assumptions that the home language interferes or slows down English language acquisition. Civil rights officials drew on language as a right to provide guidelines for how educators should structure language programs around questions of equity and compensation.

In his discussion of these findings, Ruíz (1984) proposed a third language orientation, that of language as a resource, which carries with it the policy practices of language conservation and language development. Treating language as a national resource, Ruíz points out, requires language planners to take stock of the existing languages and find ways to conserve and develop them as quantifiable skills or abilities which have the potential to contribute to national goals such as security, trade and diplomacy. Ruíz further that the language as resource orientation could serve as a unifying approach across sectors (education, law, public policy).

**Figure 1: Ruíz’s orientations in language planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language as a problem</th>
<th>Language as a right</th>
<th>Language as a resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Primarily used in education</td>
<td>• Primarily used in legal discourse</td>
<td>• Proposed as a way of uniting diverse sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus on lack of English as problem to be fixed</td>
<td>• Used to provide educators with legal mandates in the form of compensatory, inclusive guidelines</td>
<td>• Focus on language as a skill to be used in the service of national goals (e.g., security, trade)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ruíz’s framework and has had a lasting influence among bilingual education scholars and practitioners and shaped the policy discourse around bilingual education. Ricento (2005) has pointed out that the metaphor of *language as a resource* has become ubiquitous in the field. The author even critiques its dominance because it obscures other ways of framing language planning and policies. For example, Ricento has proposed thinking of *language as an identity marker*, a crucial policy frame for the growing heritage language population. Ricento points out that because the *language as resource* orientation reduces language to a set of isolated skills or tools, it easily fits into a policy focus on 21st century skills. This may partly explain the predominance of this orientation in the language planning world.

Ruíz’s work has primarily been used to describe macro-level institutional discourses of language policy makers and planners. However, such discourses also operate in local, interpersonal, or micro-level settings, as when individuals interact in a particular school or neighborhood. McCoarty (2012) describes two such local discourses of language: *language as refuge* and *language as resistance*. She reviews several studies which provide evidence of each discourse. For the former, she shows how individuals take emotional or psychological solace in private, familial use of their language and connect this with their life trajectories. For the latter, she shows how individuals sometimes use “a language other than the mainstream code” (p. 94) to resist moments of oppression or conflict.

Ruíz’s (1984) three-part framework of *language as problem, language as right* and *language as resource* came to greatly influence the field of bilingual policy
and planning, both in the US and internationally. It also led researchers such as Ricento, McCoarty and others to explore local discourses about language and how they operate in particular contexts.

While I am sympathetic to Palmer’s (2008) previously quoted discontent with the limitations in the ability of dual language schools to counter hegemonic language asymmetries and their related negative constructions of minority language groups, I posit that a clearer understanding of the kinds of local discourses circulating among dual language youth is crucial for characterizing such limitations. I do not believe that we have done enough research yet into what these discourses are and how they function. Such a course of study would provide important information that might allow the field to create a framework (similar to Ruiz’s, but at the school level rather than the policy level) for implementing new structures.

Freeman (1998) and Palmer (2008) call for understanding the potential and the limitations to the local (possibly alternative) discourses used in dual language schools. I described the case of Ruiz’s (1984) creation of an alternative discourse for language planning purposes and have argued that more research is needed on the local discourses of language already circulating in dual language spaces.

**Research Goals: Discourses of language as constructing identities and worlds**

In this study, I seek to make visible the local, shared discourses used by youth in a dual language school to talk about their languages (Spanish and English). To do this, particular attention must be paid not only to the discourses of language themselves but also to the various ways that speakers construct themselves and the worlds around them. I call these processes identity-building and world-building. Gee
and Green (1998) define world-building as “assembling situated meanings about ‘reality,’ present and absent, concrete and abstract” and identity-building as “assembling situated meanings about what identities are relevant to the interaction, with their concomitant attitudes and ways of feeling, ways of knowing and believing, as well as ways of acting and interacting” (p. 139).

The discourses of language which we draw upon to construct our worlds shape the way we imagine those worlds, including the social, ethnic or cultural groups we associate with certain language practices. The same goes for how we construct ourselves and others as kinds of language users or insiders/outsiders to the various social and language practices which we take for granted.

Linguistic anthropologists use the term language ideology to describe this connection between discourses of language and related identity-building and world-building. Language ideologies are defined as “the ideas with which participants and observers frame their understanding of linguistic varieties and map those understandings onto people, events, and activities that are significant to them” (Irvine and Gal, 2000, p. 35). According to Woolard and Schiefflin (1994), a focus on language ideologies allows researchers to see how speakers “envision and enact links of language to group and personal identity, to aesthetics, to morality, and to epistemology” (pp. 55-56).

Thus, in designing my study I assumed that there was a relationship between the discourses speakers use to talk about language and the identity-building and world-building work they do in speech. Figure 2 illustrates how I think of discourses
of language, identity-building and world-building as three components of language ideologies.

Figure 2: Discourses of language, identity-building and world-building as the discursive work of language ideologies

- The shared ways of talking about language circulating among young people at a dual language school

- Situated constructions of "what identities are relevant to the interaction, with their concomitant attitudes and ways of feeling, ways of knowing and believing, as well as ways of acting and interacting" (adapted from Gee & Green, 1998)

- Situated constructions of "reality," present and absent, concrete and abstract (adapted from Gee & Green, 1998)

“the ideas with which participants and observers frame their understanding of linguistic varieties and map those understandings onto people, events, and activities that are significant to them” (Irvine and Gal, 2000, p. 35).

The aim of this dissertation is to flesh out our theoretical understanding of the processes related to cross-cultural learning in dual language schools—I believe that deepening our understanding of the relationship between discourses of language and identity-/world-building processes is central to this process.
In the next chapter, I show how I draw on methodological tools from Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (Willig, 2009) and sociocultural linguistics (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005) to operationalize this relationship to create an approach that allows me to document local examples of the kinds of discourses—and their use for identity-/world-building—currently circulating in a single dual language school setting.
III. Methodology

Research Questions

This dissertation considers linguistic data from two discursive contexts (personal interviews and group discussions), and seeks to answer the following research questions:

1) What discourses do bilingual youth at a dual language middle school draw on to talk about Spanish and English, and about speakers of each language?

2) How do they deploy these discourses of language for identity-building and world-building?

Research Context

Espada School: Dual language education in a majority-Hispanic setting

The Espada School is a small dual language bilingual public school of about 400 students in grades pre-K through 8. Located within a large urban district in the northeast United States, the student body at the time of this study was about 90% Hispanic, 6% white, and 3% African American. About 75% of students were from low income families, and 67% had a first language other than English. A majority of the teaching population were classified as Hispanic, with a third White and two African Americans, and most teachers are fluent bilinguals. This highly sought after school is known for its high academic performance, and follows a mostly “50/50” model of language immersion in which all subjects are taught in English and
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7 All names are pseudonyms.
8 These data are reported by the district.
Spanish.

This type of school is sometimes known as “two-way immersion” because student enrollment is based on language background, with about half from English-speaking homes and half from Spanish-speaking homes. However, this label does not quite fit the Espada school, where the Hispanic population is predominantly US-born, second and third generation students. Just under half of the Hispanic population is classified as “English dominant” upon enrollment, with the rest classified as “English language learner” (ELL). However, families have dynamic and complex language practices at home and Hispanic students come with varying degrees of proficiency in both languages. Such a demographic is characteristic of a trend in dual language schools, where a growing number of the English-dominant population is actually Hispanic heritage language students (Lindholm-Leary & Block, 2010; Lindholm-Leary & Hernandez, 2011).

Furthermore, the Hispanic population at the Espada is predominantly Dominican and Puerto Rican. Non-Caribbean students constitute the minority at the Espada, and include families of either European or Central/South American descent. By contrast with other dual language bilingual schools which emphasize membership to a global Spanish-speaking community and a multicultural curriculum, the Espada is a place marked by its tie to Caribbean language and cultural practices, which are characterized by parents as a warm, caring community on the one hand, but also as strict in the approach to discipline. Such a setting constitutes a language and cultural immersion experience of a particular type, providing Caribbean youth with an institutional enclave-like setting where
Caribbean linguistic and cultural practices remain vibrant and serve as funds of knowledge for learning. Graduates from the school often return to describe the jarring sense of confusion and culture shock they experience upon moving on to high school, where their cultural and linguistic reference points are no longer a given.

Despite the small percentage of non-Hispanic students overall, the ethnic makeup of classrooms is more balanced in the lower grades, with higher numbers of non-Hispanic students in kindergarten through third grade (due to a higher attrition rate of non-Hispanic students over time). Of the 30 students in sixth grade at the time of the study, six were identified by teachers as non-Hispanic\(^9\).

**Participants**

The first research question assumes that any group of middle school young people at the Espada has participated as part of a speech community at the Espada. Given that they have been interacting daily at this small school for eight years, I expected them to have some shared discourses of language that would be visible in the ways they talk about the two languages, their everyday use of these languages, and the people they know who speak them. Based on this assumption, I needed a small number of participants to participate in a number of extended opportunities to discuss the related topics with me and with one another.

After three months of participant observation at the school, I recruited six focal students from the sixth grade (aged 12-13) to participate in interviews and

---

\(^9\) Two of these students were selected for the study. I do not have additional information about the other four students.
group activities. All students in the class were invited to participate in the first step of the process, which was to take photos of people and places which they associated with Spanish or English. Twelve students signed up and six of these had schedules which allowed them to come together for a series of group activity sessions.

The small number of participants provides rich discourse data for each participant and allows for fine-grain discourse analysis of these data. Having few participants limits my ability to generalize beyond this particular group of students, and I have been careful not to make claims which go beyond this group. There is sufficient diversity within this group to provide close consideration of how discursive processes operate across sociocultural and ethno-linguistic boundaries of difference.

Four of the six participants were female. Four described their primary home language as English, though two of these used more Spanish at home when they were younger. Information about students’ neighborhoods and parents’ professions allowed me to approximate their socioeconomic status. One student was upper/middle class, three lower/middle class, and two working/lower class. A variety of ethnic backgrounds were represented. Three were bi-/multi-ethnic: one, Anglo/Jewish, another Anglo/Puerto Rican, another South American, Mexican and Anglo. The other three, like the majority at the Espada school, identified as Dominican. Chapter IV provides additional background on each participants’ use of different discourses of language, identity-building and world-building processes.

Table 1 provides a brief overview of the participants. In addition to their names (all pseudonyms) and sex, I have included 1) the language(s) they told me
they used before starting at the Espada School (in most cases they referred to this as their first language), 2) their parents’ jobs\(^\text{10}\), and 3) identity markers they used to describe themselves in personal interviews before group discussions took place. For identity markers, I did not include ethnic or other social labels that I or another participant introduced into the conversation. For example, Yanelis agreed that she would call herself Latina when asked during a group activity, but did not use that word to describe herself or her family before that.

Table 1. Six participants, by sex, L1, and self-described identity markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annie</th>
<th>Johnny</th>
<th>Luis</th>
<th>Nora</th>
<th>Perla</th>
<th>Yanelis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-identified “L1”</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Spanish/English</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ jobs</td>
<td>1-Design consultant 2-Doctor</td>
<td>1-Office manager</td>
<td>1-Computer Technician 2-House cleaner</td>
<td>1-Teacher 2-Financial consultant</td>
<td>1-Community Organizer</td>
<td>1-House cleaner &amp; Supermarket cashier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-described Identity Markers</td>
<td>Jewish &amp; Christian, Caucasian, partly Latino</td>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>Hispanic; Dominican</td>
<td>Puerto Rican; Latina</td>
<td>Mexican, Bolivian, French Canadian</td>
<td>Dominican</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Researcher’s Positionality**

My relationship with the Espada School is layered. Teaching at another dual language school in the district gave me opportunities to collaborate with and learn from some of its teachers. During that time, I came to admire its history, highly qualified faculty, and strong leadership. When my daughter was admitted to the

\(^{10}\) This information comes from the interviews and other conversations with them. In some cases I was able to confirm job titles with parents; in others, my knowledge of the participant's neighborhood or housing development allows me to confirm that these job titles are likely adequate reflections of their social class.
school as a kindergartener, I had the chance to reacquaint myself with the school community and embark on an ethnographic study in the middle school Spanish classroom.

My multiple hats in this school community—as colleague, parent, and researcher—have allowed me a privileged insider view. I have been welcomed into many spaces and conversations to which the average researcher might not have been privy, and I have a personal stake in this school’s future. Critical conversations with colleagues inside and outside of the Espada have helped me carefully draw lines between what counts as data in this project and what needs to be left out. I have worked to set aside communication that comes to me when I wear my parent “hat” during kindergarten welcome breakfast or conversations with other parents on the school’s front staircase. However careful I am to leave out confidential information, these insider interactions have shaped my research lens.

Validity

Data collection and analysis are recursive processes and I began keeping analytic and reflective memos during the early stages of collecting data. Since embarking on data analysis, I have made various efforts to validate my analytic approach and interpretations through peer review (Stringer, 2007). First, I piloted a methodological approach to explore how I might uncover discourses of ethnicity in a small segment of the group discussion data (Jacobs, 2014). I also attended two professional conferences11 in which I presented a small sample of my data analysis

---

11 The Working Conference on Discourse Analysis in Education Research at Ohio State University in May 2014, and The Ethnography Forum at the University of Pennsylvania in February 2015.
in working consultation groups with leading experts in the field. Finally, I have shared segments of my data analysis with Espada school teachers and administrators, as well as colleagues who are also educational doctoral candidates. My own reflective and analytic memo-writing have also helped me keep track of salient patterns and questions to come back to.

**Designing co-constructive interviewing techniques for data collection**

This study brings the theoretical lens of language ideologies (shown above in Figure 2 as comprised of discourses of language and related identity-building and world-building work), to the question of how cross-cultural learning occurs in dual language schools, with a particular emphasis on youth perspectives and the discourses of language present in interactions among bilingual youth. Because of my specific interest in having this group of bilingual youth talk with one another about language use, culture and identity—topics which rarely come up in regular classroom life—I created a simulation of naturally occurring conversation amongst this group by engaging them in activities meant to provoke discussion of these topics.

Some discourse analysts argue that naturally occurring data is ideal. However, there is a long tradition of conducting discourse analysis with data from interview and focus groups (Willig, 2007). This approach runs the risk of having participants orient their responses to my questions and prompts as interviewees in a research study (Willig, 2007, p. 97). Thus, I was particularly careful to make note
of any evidence of such trends in my field notes and later in reflective memos during the interpretive process. For the most part, participants seemed to forget about the presence of the camera, even occasionally expressing surprise when I moved to turn it off or shift its position. They also did not back down from questioning me or one another in informal ways, which indicated a level of comfort during group interactions.

Two methodological antecedents served as points of reference for my research design. Critical exploration (Duckworth, 1996), also called extended clinical interviewing, is a qualitative research/teaching methodology in which the researcher uses interviewing techniques, often with a small group of participants, to follow their understanding of a subject matter while simultaneously helping them articulate and deepen their own understanding of the subject. During these teaching/research sessions, the researcher develops a kind of curriculum to provoke deeper reflection and questioning of the topic. Luttrell (2003) used a similar approach, drawing on co-constructive interviewing techniques with a group of teenage mothers attending an alternative high school program. These approaches served as models for me in creating curricular materials on sociolinguistic topics to provide a starting place for our interviews and group discussions.

I used three co-constructive interviewing techniques in my data collection process: 1) photovoice, where participants brought photos they had taken, 2) language mapping, where participants create maps of places where they use each

---

12 While I use the terms research and participant here, this methodology touts itself as both a teaching/learning and a research methodology. As such, the terms teacher/researcher and participant/learner are often used interchangeably.
language (including virtual "places" such as FaceBook), and 3) research-based scenarios. The scenarios are based on some of the ethnographic studies cited in my literature review, and were designed to get participants talking about such sociolinguistic phenomena as language status or "high" varieties of Spanish. For example, I took the story of Juan from Lincoln's (2003) ethnography and shared some of his experience being corrected during Spanish class. I also shared data from Potowski's (2005) classroom observations of Spanish and English use in a Spanish classroom. These scenarios provided rich starting points for conversations related to the participants’ own language use without putting them in the potentially defensive position of having to explain a particular interaction in their own school. Conversation tended to turn to their own experiences as a result of these rich starting points. These three techniques gave youth a concrete starting place and a chance to co-construct their understanding of these topics together with peers. Appendix 1 provides a summary of the activities and topics from group discussions.

The Photovoice component of data collection was a bridge between individual interviews and initial group discussions. Participants brought in photos they had taken with cameras I provided, and these served as the starting point for the semi-structured interviews. About half of the interview time was centered around their descriptions of the various places and people with whom they use Spanish, English or a mix of both. In addition to these, I asked a series of more structured interview questions about each participant’s language history, anticipated future language use and how they identify themselves and their families.
Participants were interviewed once individually and eight times as a group\textsuperscript{13}, totaling in 14 interviews. They were given the option of using Spanish or English for personal interviews. For group discussions, we alternated between Spanish and English using each language for about half of each session. While group interviews constitute a sort of focus group, I use the term group discussion to forefront the interactional and situated nature of language data collected during these sessions, focusing analysis and interpretation on language use in social interactions (Hollander, 2004; Luttrell, 2003).

Figure 3 shows a timeline of the overall project, including participant observation prior to data collection for this dissertation, and a summary of data collected.

Figure 3 Timeline and Overview of Data Collected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>February-April</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May-June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant Observation</td>
<td>Personal Language Interviews</td>
<td>Group Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3 hours/week for 12 weeks in Spanish middle school classroom</td>
<td>• 6 Personal Interviews, 1-2 hours each</td>
<td>• 8 Group Discussions, 1.5 - 2 hours each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fieldnotes &amp; reflective memos gathered</td>
<td>• Total: 475 Minutes 72,000 Words</td>
<td>• Total: 725 Minutes 55,000 Words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All interviews were audio recorded, and group sessions were video-recorded as well. Video data were used primarily during transcription to clarify who was

\textsuperscript{13} Some of these included all participants, but I also conducted some group discussions with fewer participants depending on the topic. For example, Luis and Johnny played baseball in the same league, so I conducted an extended pair discussion with them separately on that topic.
speaking and to capture context clues. Appendix 2 includes more details on transcript preparation and how I took into account context cues (such as gestures like pointing or nodding, voices heard out the window, or similar non-verbal cues).

Data Analysis

Research Question 1: Thematic coding, selecting language-related phases, and coding for discourses

The first research question is:

1) What discourses do bilingual youth at a dual language middle school draw on to talk about Spanish and English, and about speakers of each language?

The first stage in coding was low-inference coding of all interview and group discussion transcripts. I kept coding memos during this first stage to keep track of big patterns and topics, which I then used for more detailed reflective and analytic memos (Waring, 2012).

In order to answer my first research question, I identified the segments of data in which the discursive object was language use or a speaker of either English or Spanish, which I call “Language Phases.” I conducted a second round of thematic coding on just the language phases. Following Guest et al (2012), I created a theme-based codebook, summarizing the main themes with their definitions, illustrative examples and notes. Writing one memo helped me clarify the crucial methodological distinction between themes and discourses. I concluded this memo (included in full in Appendix 3) with the following insight:

“in my initial thematic coding of these data, I asked myself “what” is the speaker talking about? As I coded for discourses, the question
shifted: “how” are they talking about this theme or topic? In the final stage of FDA coding, described below, I asked a more nuanced series of questions to gain depth of understanding about the implications of a given discursive construction of language for the speaker’s identity- and world-building.” (J. Jacobs, analytic memo, August 2015)

Figure 4: Similar theme constructed by different speakers using different discourses

Having clarified this distinction, I re-coded the data for discourses. I then created a new working codebook of the discourses participants used to talk about language, writing memos about novel uses of the discourses or differences across discursive situations, which allowed me to further refine and expand the codebook. Three salient discourses emerged which were shared across at least three of the interviews, as well as other discourses which were unique to one or two participants. The codebook of discourses is included in Appendix 4. Chapter IV provides a detailed description of these three discourses with examples.

Having already identified the salient discourses of language, I went back and created a “discourse map” for each participant in which I noted the themes and discourses of language for each of the language phases for that participant.

From these discourse maps, I selected salient phases for close discourse analysis in an iterative fashion. I began by selecting the richest segments available
for each discourse of language—those in which the discourse was very clear, the
student talk or group interaction was particularly extensive, or the subject of the
talk was particularly surprising or memorable. This initial list of language phases for
discourse analysis included between six and nine excerpts of text in for each of the
discourses of language identified. Once I had completed discourse analysis of these
excerpts, I went back to the discourse maps and reviewed the language phases for
each participant, making note of additional excerpts that might help me flesh out my
understanding of how the discourses were being deployed for identity-building and
world-building in different ways. For example, I realized that many of my examples
for the third discourse came from Yanelis’ interviews so I went back and identified
additional examples of this discourse from other sources. Conversely, I excluded
segments which were less rich\(^{14}\) or which constituted an additional example of a
scenario I had already analyzed several times\(^ {15}\). Appendix 5 provides a sample
discourse map and data excerpt with my discourse analysis coding.

**Research Question 2: Using Foucauldian Discourse Analysis and Sociocultural
Linguistics to explore language ideologies**

The second research question is:

2) How do they deploy these discourses of language for identity-building and
world-building?

\(^{14}\) For example, when a participant responded to my question with brief answers or did not give
examples of what they meant.

\(^{15}\) For example, I analyzed six out of twelve detailed accounts by Yanelis in which she described
using Spanish and English with extended family members. Those which were not analyzed were
shorter or were repetitions of a similar scenario.
My second research question relies on a theoretical understanding of the relationship between discourses and identities. This relationship is complex, and depends on the linguistic concept of indexicality. According to Bucholtz and Hall (2005), “an index is a linguistic form that depends on the interactional context for its meaning (and) involves the creation of semiotic links between linguistic forms and social meanings” (p. 594). They further point out that there are multiple indexical processes related to identity formation. These include 1) talk about social categories or labels, 2) direct or indirect positioning, 3) stance or evaluative language, and 4) “the use of linguistic structures and systems that are ideologically associated with specific personas and groups” (p. 594). I provide more detailed examples of these different indexical processes below.

My second research question considers how the discourses of language shape the identity- and world-building processes among this group. To answer this question, I used Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA) (Hall, 1997; Kendall & Wickham, 1999; Willig, 2009). Foucauldian discourse analysis (FDA) allows the analyst to make connections between local language use and broader institutional, cultural or social phenomena. Willig (2009) points out that while other approaches to discourse analysis may be primarily concerned with the local discursive work happening interpersonally between speakers, FDA provides the researcher with tools for moving between micro-level or local discursive work and broader societal level work. Given my interest in making connections between the local discourses of
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16 See also Ochs (1992) and Silverstein (1976) for explanations of indexicality in language.
language used and the participants’ identity-building and world-building, this research tool is very helpful.

According to Willig (2009), FDA includes six stages: 1) discursive constructions, 2) discourses, 3) action orientation, 4) subject positions/positionings, 5) practices, 6) subjectivities. Each of these stages is explained below.

In the first stage, the FDA analyst identifies all of the discursive constructions, or “the ways in which discursive objects are constructed” (Willig, 2009, p. 115). These are all the different manifestations of a discourse in the data being analyzed. For example, Ruiz (1984) found that language (the discursive object of interest here) was constructed by educators in terms of “poverty, handicap, low educational achievement, little or no social mobility” (p. 19). All of these, he argued, were discursive constructions of language that contribute to a discourse of language as a problem. In stage two, the analyst groups all of the discursive constructions and names the discourses they fit with.

The third stage of FDA is to identify the action orientation of the discourses. The assumption here is that speakers achieve social goals through talk (Wetherell, 2008). For example, if I say to you “wow, it’s cold in here,” I may be politely asking you to close the window near you. The words themselves are merely a description, but the action orientation, or social goal, of my speech is a request.

The action orientation of a discourse in use may be deliberate or have some degree of intention, as in this example. In my analysis I drew on previous research from discursive psychology to identify and describe certain kinds of strategic or
apparently intentional discursive action such as excusing or blaming (Edwards & Potter, 1992; Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Willig, 2009).

The action orientation of a speech act is often more routine or unconsciously accomplished, especially in identity work. For example, in her study of self-described “nerds” at a high school in California, Bucholtz (2001) showed how their use of hyper-correct English served indirectly to mark their whiteness and distinguish them from their black peers. When these young people engaged in such practices as splitting hairs—providing dictionary definition of terms or clarifying a tiny distinction between two terms—they accomplished the social act of identifying as nerds, but also indirectly or unintentionally distancing themselves from racial minorities in the school.

In most of the discourse data collected for this study, the speakers are accomplishing the social action of explaining, describing, or justifying their languaging practices to me. I draw extensively on Bucholtz and Hall (2005) to complement Willig’s third step. Bucholtz and Hall argue that much of the discursive action of identity construction has to do with how speakers emphasize or highlight their relationship to others or to groups with respect to one of three axes: similarity/difference, genuineness/artifice, and authority/delegitimacy. These are depicted in Figure 5.
Bucholtz and Hall (2004) point out that these discursive tactics “are not qualities that inhere in speakers or in social practices and ideologies, but rather are analytic tools to call attention to salient aspects of the discourse situation.” The authors review previous studies from sociocultural linguistics to show examples of each dyad. The first axis, similarity and difference, has been most widely researched. This includes the processes of emphasizing one’s similarities with, for example, someone else from a particular ethnic or affinity group. The opposite tactic would be to de-emphasize similarities in order to distinguish or differentiate oneself from that person or group.

The second axis, genuineness and artifice, refers to how speakers accomplish the discursive action of authenticating themselves or others as true insiders or real members of a particular group. In his study of US-born Dominicans, for example, Bailey (2000) showed how young men at a high school used Spanish to counter
assumptions that they were African American. Their use of Spanish served to
authenticate them as Dominican and denaturalize racialized assumptions about
them based on phenotype.

The final axis is *authority and delegitimacy*. According to Bucholtz and Hall
(2005), the former “involves the affirmation or imposition of an identity through
structures of institutionalized power and ideology,” while the latter “addresses the
ways in which identities are dismissed, censored, or simply ignored by these same
structures” (p. 603). Bucholtz and Hall describe, for example, how a group of Korean
students studying in the US make fun of their Korean friend’s Americanized
pronunciation of the city “Denver.” They argue that it is a shared ideology of
Koreanness which allows them to delegitimate this friend’s apparent bid for a semi-
American identity through such a pronunciation

I drew extensively on Bucholtz and Hall’s tactics of identity-building in stage
three of FDA (see Table 2), using these three axes—similarity/difference,
genuineness/artifice, and authority/delegitimacy—in my coding process. Figure 6
shows in red how Bucholtz and Hall’s three axes were used as part of the FDA
coding process.
As Figure 6 shows, in order to make the connection between discourses of language and the identity-building and world building implications of these discourses, I combine the tools of FDA and sociocultural linguistics. I group the last three stages of FDA—positioning, practices, and subjectivities—broadly as the implications of how a given discourse of language is deployed in a particular way. Thus, stage three of FDA, the action orientation, is pivotal in understanding the relationship between a discourse and its implications for identity-building and world-building. The action orientation of a discourse—the ways it is deployed by a given speaker at a given moment—shapes the possibilities for positioning, practices and subjective experiences. This is what is meant when discourse analysts describe discourse as “constitututive” of the social world (e.g., Rogers, 2005).
The fourth step of FDA is positioning. As discourses are deployed in speech, they make available certain subject positions, which are recognizable kinds of people or figures, such as helper, teacher, translator. Hall (1997) clarifies that from a Foucauldian perspective, the discourses themselves construct subject positions and such positions only make sense from within the discourse which created them. Davies and Harré (1990) further assert that “once having taken up a particular position as one’s own, a person inevitably sees the world from the vantage point of that position and in terms of the particular images, metaphors, story lines and concepts which are made relevant within the particular discursive practice in which they are positioned” (p. 46). Positioning has implications for agency.

Positioning theory and the construct of subject positions are foundational in understanding what Bucholtz and Hall (2004) call the Emergence Principle of identity construction, that is, that “Identity is best viewed as the emergent product rather than the pre-existing source of linguistic and other semiotic practices” (p. 588). From this perspective, the interview context with me is an opportunity for participants to try out explanations, stories, descriptions of events and people and places in their lives in the service of an ongoing, dynamic process of identity-building that emerges through just such interactions.

Seeing identity as emergent does not mean that there is nothing beyond the moment-to-moment interactional construction of identities. Bucholtz and Hall note that “resources for identity work in any given interaction may derive from resources developed in earlier interactions” (p. 588). The notion of “thickening” identities (mentioned in the review of literature) was first proposed by Holland and Lave
(2001) and fleshed out by Wortham (2004), who draws a distinction between *positioning* and *thickening*. He defines “positioning as an event of identification, in which a recognizable category of identity gets explicitly or implicitly applied to an individual in an event that takes place across seconds, minutes, or hours (and is) context-specific and often unpredictable.” By contrast, thickening is “the increasing presupposability of an individual’s identity over ontogenetic time, as the individual and others come increasingly to think of and position him or her as a recognizable kind of person” (p.166). Completing stage four of FDA provided insights into specific instances of positioning in the data. Combining this coding process with my thematic codes allowed me to document ethno-linguistic identity work for each participant over the course of their interviews and group discussions and create a “snapshot” of each participant\(^{17}\).

The fifth stage of FDA is to identify practices. As with subject positions, discourses make available or construct certain social practices as normal or given. For example, in Rampton’s (1995) study of a multiethnic, multilinguinal high school in the UK, he describes a discourse of language as “crossing,” which allowed youth from Anglo, Afro-Caribbean, and South Asian backgrounds to construct hybrid varieties mixing three different registers of English. By contrast, in Zentella’s (1997) study of New York Puerto Ricans, a discourse of Spanglish as bad or incorrect
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\(^{17}\) I do not claim that these snapshots constitute a documentation of “thickening” in Wortham’s sense. Indeed, this would require additional data collection over a longer period of time. However, I offer his construct as a way of illustrating how the principle of identity as emergent exists on something of a continuum between momentary positionings and somewhat more stable notions of self.
Spanish justified parenting practices of reinforcing English-only use among their children.

Finally, in the sixth stage of FDA we identify subjective experiences. Discourses make possible certain subjectivities in the form of feelings, experiences or other personal and interpersonal possibilities. In the case of Zentella’s participants, the discourse of Spanglish as bad created the subject position of Spanglish speaker and the language practice of speaking Spanglish (or speaking incorrectly). This construction of the practice of using Spanglish carried with it feelings of shame or, alternatively, of resistance or anger.

My adaptation of Willig’s six stages of FDA, along with additional sub-questions from Bucholtz & Hall (2005) are included in Table 2 below. I drew on the questions in this table for each FDA analysis I conducted, though certain questions or stages were more salient in the data than others, making each analytic process unique.
Table 2: Summary of FDA Stages, adapted from Willing (2009), with emphasis on identity-building from Bucholtz & Hall (2005)

| 1) Discursive constructions | • How is the language being constructed in the text?  
|                            | • What are all the ways that language is talked about?  
|                            | • What are its characteristics as expressed in the text? |
| 2) Discourses              | • What discourses of language are being used?  
|                            | • What is their relationship to one another?  
|                            | • How do the various ways language is constructed fit together into wider discourses of language? |
| 3) Action Orientation      | • What do these constructions achieve?  
|                            | • What is gained by deploying them here?  
|                            | • What is the speaker doing?  
|                            | From Bucholtz & Hall (2005):  
|                            | • What discursive tactics are being drawn upon that are specific to identity-building?  
|                            | • How is the speaker emphasizing similarity or difference from someone or some group?  
|                            | • How does the speaker accomplish authentication or denaturalization with respect to groups or kinds of people?  
|                            | • How does the speaker legitimate or undermine institutional structures of authority? |
| 4) Positionings            | • What subject positions are made available by these constructions?  
|                            | • What are the positioning implications of the discourse(s)?  
|                            | • Who has agency? Who is responsible or blameworthy? Who is powerful? |
| 5) Practices               | • What social, cultural or other practices are made normal?  
|                            | • What possibilities are mapped out by these subject positions?  
|                            | • What can be said & done from within these subject positions?  
|                            | • What are the implications of the discourse(s) for future action? What past or current practices are made normal?  
|                            | • What options are (or are not) available?  
|                            | • What obligations are assumed? Who is under obligation to whom? |
| 6) Subjectivity            | • We cannot infer internal states from discourses but we can infer what is available for subjective experience within the discourses  
|                            | • What possibilities are made  
|                            | • What can potentially be felt, thought or experienced from the available subject positions? |
Thus, FDA allows me to make connections between local discourses of language in use and larger ideological assumptions about people/kinds of people, social practices, and potential subjectivities embedded in my participants’ speech. These six stages of FDA provide both a theoretical and methodological framework for my analysis. Willig (2009) asserts that FDA “aims to map the discursive worlds people inhabit and to trace the possible ways-of-being afforded by them” (p. 125). I have chosen to integrate Bucholtz and Hall’s (2005) three axes of identity-building tactics to bring additional theoretical strength to stage three, the action orientation of the discourse.

In the next chapter, I turn to my own data, beginning with a brief description of the three main discourses of language which appeared to be the most salient among this group of middle schoolers. I provide some examples of the discourses and the choices I made in reporting the more detailed findings in Chapters V through VII.
IV. Three Discourses of language

Youth participants in this study drew on three salient shared discourses of language: *language as utilitarian, language as connecting or excluding,* and *language as internal*\(^{18}\). Other discourses of language are evident in the data, but because these were the most prominent and appeared in almost all of the interviews I have chosen to focus on them and map out how they function. My purpose in reporting on these discourses is not to provide an exhaustive list of all discourses of language in use among my participants. Rather, through close analysis of the patterns of use in interaction, I hope to illuminate how these discourses shape identity-building and world-building among this group.

**Language as utilitarian**

*Language as utilitarian* constructs language in two ways in these data. First, language is treated as a resource or commodity, which can be exchanged for other goods such as success in a job or at college. Second, language is treated as a tool for efficiently and effectively accomplishing tasks. This discourse emphasizes practical or functional uses of language.

In interactions focused on their futures, participants who use this discourse talk about the importance of bilingualism for travel, schooling or future jobs, mentioning work-related tasks such as answering phones, teaching or translating. In

\(^{18}\) See Codebook in Appendix 4 for overview of these.
Excerpt 1, language comes across as a commodity that, once acquired, can be showcased on a resume and leveraged for professional gain.

Excerpt 1: Nora, language for your resume

| 1  | JJ | Do you think in general that it’s important to learn more than one language or not really? |
| 2  | N  | I think that if you only know one language it’s fine, but I think that it is important to learn more than one language because then like when you’re trying to get a job or something like you can put it on your resume, “oh, I also know this language,” so. |

In excerpt 2 Luis constructs Spanish as a commodity which may help him in college or to get a job.

Excerpt 2: Luis, Spanish for future college/job

| 1  | JJ | How do you imagine using Spanish in the future, maybe when you’re 25 years old or something like that? |
| 2  | L  | Um. Like if I continue going to college, maybe I’ll have, I’ll use it more, like to get other jobs that require people to be bilingual, answering calls. |

In the final example, Annie constructs language as utilitarian in her story about going to Mexico with her parents when she was younger. She describes Spanish as a tool for helping her accomplish things like getting directions.

Excerpt 3: Annie, Spanish for travel

| 1  | JJ | So do you think it’s important to know more than one language? |
| 2  | A  | Yeah. I’d say so. |
| 3  | JJ | Why? |
‘Cause if you’re, if you need to help someone or if you’re going somewhere else, like I went to Mexico before, so it was helpful to know Spanish ‘cause you could ask where things were, and what something is, so um.

**Language as Internal**

The second primary discourse, *language as internal*, constructs language as a skill, proficiency, quality or accomplishment that is located inside the individual person. In contrast with the other two discourses, the orientation of this discourse is to individual and internal aspects of language, which is constructed as inside one’s mind.

Participants who use this discourse sometimes describe bilingualism as opening their minds.

---

**Excerpt 4: Annie, Another perspective**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Um, so do you think it’s important to know more than one language?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Yeah. I’d say so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>‘Cause it could help you figure out more things, like um, I don’t know it’s like, I don’t know. ... But it can help you see things in another perspective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

In other cases, language is associated with increased cognitive capacity, as in Perla’s response.

---

**Excerpt 5: Perla, You’re smarter**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Do you think it’s important to learn more than one language?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>How come?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>... it’s very important cause it just gives you more skill in your head and you’re smarter and stuff so yeah.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In a similar vein, they sometimes talk about how knowing a second language makes it easier to learn, or communicate with people in, an additional language. In Nora’s words,

Excerpt 6: Nora, Your mind has opened up

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>are you interested in learning another languages?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Um, yeah, ... I’ve heard some people say before that um, like once you learn one language, like most, a lot of languages are based off of like one language or another, and so like once you learn like one language, other languages tend to be a lot easier ‘cause your mind like almost has opened up to more in a way, so.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all of these examples, language is constructed as internal or individual. By contrast to the other two discourses, this discourse does not foreground language as part of an interaction or relational process.

**Language as connecting or excluding**

*Language as connecting* emerged from the data as a discourse characterized by an emphasis on mutual understanding, making an effort to reach out and relate to others. Language is treated as more than just communication for getting something done, but as a way of learning about, listening and responding to one another. Because participants often focused on the absence of connection, the barriers created when a common language did not connect or people intentionally left someone out, I include in this section instances of what I call *language for excluding*. Rather than treat *connecting* and *excluding* as separate discourses, I argue
that they are a binary; two sides of the same ideology of language, which assumes that a common language connects and not sharing a language divides or excludes. This discourse emphasizes the relational aspect of language.

It is not uncommon for discourses to be constructed as part of a binary, or as two opposing forces. Such constructions reflect our ideological assumptions of how the world works. According to Irvine and Gal (2000), “oppositions do not define fixed or stable social groups... Rather, they provide actors with the discursive or cultural resources to claim and thus attempt to create shifting "communities," identities, selves, and roles, at different levels of contrast, within a cultural field” (p. 38). As we shall see below, I found that such a binary was used to construct language by my participants as connecting or excluding, which are two sides of the same language ideology based on the assumption that a shared language leads to connections between people and thus not sharing leads to a lack of connection, barrier or exclusion of some sort.

*Language as connecting* is a discourse that Nora uses in conversations about her future, as well as her current life. In Excerpt 7, she imagines using Spanish if she travels to Puerto Rico one day. Nora emphasizes how using Spanish will allow her to connect, “understand and communicate” with people, and avoid “just standing there” and not connecting with the people there.

**Excerpt 7: Nora, Future Spanish**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>How do you think you’ll be using Spanish in the future?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Um, when I travel and like for example if I go to Puerto Rico, then like I’d be able to like understand people and communicate with them, rather than just standing there feeling really awkward.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perla also draws on the discourse of *language as connecting* in the following excerpt:

**Excerpt 8: Perla, Benefits of bilingualism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JJ</th>
<th>Do you think it’s important to learn more than one language?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>How come?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>(…) So I want to learn other languages because it’s important to me to learn that because it’s part of me, and then also out of all the places in the world it’s important because if you know only one language that’s for that place, but if you know more than one language at two languages, that’s gonna be a whole ‘nother place that you can speak to, and that counts for the whole different places,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Perla’s construction of bilingualism, knowing a language allows the speaker to connect with a place. Implied in this statement is the assumption that not knowing the language of either place would mean the speaker could not connect with that place.

As mentioned above, the discourse of *language as connecting* relies on the assumption that sharing a language leads to a connection. As such, I include examples in which the absence of a shared language is constructed as leading to the opposite of connection: exclusion or misunderstanding. Johnny draws on a discourse of language as excluding in the following example, to critique the social practice of bullying someone based on their language.
Excerpt 9: Johnny, “A lot of people get bullied”

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>So what do you think about learning more than one language? Do you think that’s important?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>Yeah. It’s, a lot of people get bullied because they don’t know,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>like they’re talking about them but. They’re talking a different language but they don’t know.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discourses of language, identity-building and world-building: Snapshots illustrating this relationship

By choosing to structure the following three chapters around the discourses, I worried that the participants themselves and their stories can get lost. In the end, it is these stories which give meaning to the larger project of understanding how discourses shape identities and worlds. As such, I include here a brief snapshot of each participant. These snapshots serve the dual purpose of giving life to each unique research participant, and to illustrate the ways that the components of FDA actually play out in multiple and varied ways across a group of individuals.

Each of my participants is a complex and unique individual, with their own multiple and layered identities and worldviews. There is no single story which captures any of these individuals; however, in these snapshots I have attempted to capture a central aspect of ethnolinguistic identity-building and related world-building work which was salient for each participant during the months I spent with them. I drew on my guiding analytic framework—a simplified version of Figure 6, shown in the previous chapter.
Figure 7: Analytic Framework: Discourses, action orientation and identity-/world-building

**Discourses Of Language**
- Utilitarian
- Internal
- Connecting/Excluding

**Action Orientation**
(social action of the discourse)

**Identity- & World-building**
- Positioning
- Practices
- Subjectivities

Johnny: Bridging worlds “so they could understand”

Self-described as Dominican, Johnny embraced the term “bicultural” in our interview, saying, “yeah, I’m always talking about that but I never knew that’s what it’s called. Bicultural, yeah.” Perhaps more than any other participant, Johnny’s kept coming back to bridging his worlds. One world he described is his “boring” but comfortable middle-class neighborhood—where he spends hours hanging out after school playing with his Irish-American neighbors, doing parkour moves off the front porch, or playing video games and watching TV in his room. These are spaces where “no one speaks Spanish.” He builds on these spaces as he describes a future: he will use his physical prowess to gain access to the arts academy as a dancer and make money as a producer of video-game walkthroughs and cheats. By contrast, Johnny describes a variety of other worlds where an array of bilingual and primarily Spanish configurations exist for him. He describes switching to Spanish at his dad’s house and struggling to be understood during trips to the DR. His mom’s multi-family home is a place where these different worlds sometimes overlap, providing unique insights into the language use practices. On special gatherings with extended family, the adults use Spanish and the kids use English. When Johnny goes up to the
third-floor apartment, he uses English with his aunt and interacts very little to his predominantly Spanish-speaking grandparents. When cousins come over, they use only English to talk about the video games but use Spanish to interact with his mom or with one another about mundane daily topics like snacks or when they have to go home.

Johnny works on authenticating himself as a legitimate insider to each of these worlds (his neighborhood, his dad's house, multigenerational gatherings at his mom's house, the DR, his gaming world), often drawing on a discourse of language as connecting to do so. For example, when describing interactions with other youth in the DR and Irish-American kids in his neighborhood, his use of language as connecting positions him as a cultural broker. He emphasizes how he explains American music and teaches English to the former and introduces Spanish music and food to the latter. Such instances of authentication are often paired with examples in which Johnny emphasizes being treated as an outsider, as when he talks about being stared at in the DR because of his choice of music or the way he talks. Johnny also draws on a discourse of language as internal as part of these authentication tactics. On the one hand, he explains how his own lack of Spanish proficiency makes him feel embarrassed when speaking with Spanish dominant people. On the other, he frequently positions himself as a proficient bilingual who can help people understand one another.

During group interactions, Johnny often positions himself as the funny guy. Using Spanish to imitate the voice of a Spanish teacher or other Spanish-speaking adult generally provokes appreciative laughter from his peers. Such interactional
tactics serve to emphasize social bonds between Johnny and his peers, as well as to authenticate himself as a creative, fluent bilingual who can wield the two languages for humor. Johnny particularly tends to emphasize similarities and social bonds with Yanelis (commenting on similarities between their families) and Luis (responding positively to Luis’ comments about video-gaming, baseball and being guys). During one group discussion Johnny provokes extended discussion when he insightfully questions the institutional connection between language and national identity, and the role of schools in teaching English as part of a national identity.

Yanelis: “Spanish is my first language, but I lost it”

Yanelis began her interview with a photo of her mother’s _espagueti con pollo_ (pasta with chicken). The recipe was passed on from her grandmother to her mother, but her mother shoos Yanelis from the kitchen so she can not watch the creation of this secret dish. This game—Yanelis peeking to watch how the traditional dish is made, and her mother pushing her from the room—has become a tradition at home. Yanelis’ last photo shows raindrops caught in the screen on her bedroom window. “It reminds me of the DR,” she says wistfully, “I wish I was there. My dad’s probably taking me this summer... he says that he will but he never does, you know.” Themes of roots slipping away, or just out of reach, come up repeatedly throughout my conversations with Yanelis.

When Yanelis talks about her life, she describes many worlds in which Spanish is the primary or only language: her grandmother’s house, her church, several extended family member’s homes, and her grandparents’ home in the DR. Her descriptions of these spaces are full of her obligations to live up to adult
expectations of her. At church, where “everyone speaks Spanish,” she must use Spanish for prayer in mass, to talk with church officials, and to demonstrate her knowledge of church rituals and history in catechism classes. At home, Yanelis must help her sister out with Spanish homework. In extended family interactions, Yanelis describes the complex negotiations related to choosing which language to use, based partly on each person’s proficiency in Spanish and English and partly on respect for adult family members. Yanelis draws on discourses of language as connecting and language as internal to describe managing both the expectation that she help adults out with English if needed (by translating or serving as a language model) and that she accommodate their communicative needs (by switching to whichever language is most comfortable for them).

Yanelis emphasizes repeatedly that although Spanish was her first language, she is losing it. She draws on a discourse of language as internal to distinguish her own Spanish proficiency from that of her older brother, whose first language was also Spanish and can speak quickly without getting tongue-tied as she claims frequently happens to her. Perhaps partly to mitigate her sense of embarrassment at losing her Spanish, Yanelis often highlights her authentic Dominican identity. She describes her own family as “not normal,” “loud” and “dysfunctional.” Such descriptions function to distinguish her family from an abstract and undefined norm against which she compares her own family. By highlighting her own similarities with her family and emphasizing her responsibilities to family, Yanelis authenticates herself as Dominican despite her perceived loss of Spanish.

---

19 This repeated claim runs counter to my own observations of her as one of the strongest Spanish speakers in her grade level.
In group interactions, Yanelis is often positioned as a leader. Her peers frequently seek Yanelis’ attention; when she speaks others will rarely interrupt, stopping to give her their full attention, and nodding or providing supporting comments. At times they also appear to seek her approval, looking at her when they crack a joke or change their position on a question.

Yanelis tends to pronounce Spanish words with a decidedly Spanish pronunciation (in contrast to some of her peers, who occasionally use a more muted or anglicized pronunciation for Spanish words). She distinguishes herself in small ways from her peers, for example by emphasizing the particularly small size of her house when they are all talking about where they live. She frequently emphasizes similarities and social ties with Annie by referencing popular bands, sports activities and social events. In one instance, she positioned Annie as “partly Latina” due to Annie’s extended history at the school. During one group discussion, Yanelis legitimates the school’s language separation policy and legitimates their teachers’ reinforcement of this policy. Later she distinguishes between Spanish language proficiency and being Latino, which serves to reinforce her own authentication of herself as both Dominican and someone who is losing her Spanish.

**Luis: “I don’t like when people categorize people”**

The first photo Luis shared with me is of his father, who Luis greatly admires and from whom he has gained powerful insights into social inequalities. Luis’s parents immigrated to the US from the DR and had his two sisters soon after. Luis was born more than a decade later, resulting in a fairly solitary childhood; his sisters have both moved out and started families of their own, and his parents spend long
hours at their jobs as computer technician and housecleaner. Most days Luis walks from school to a local hair salon run by an aunt and plays video games alone upstairs while he waits to be picked up.

When he shares another photo, of his home, he tells me,

“I took this picture to show that my family’s not the richest and we don’t live in the best neighborhood, because I don’t want people to pick up the wrong image of me, that I’m just, that I was born with money.”

This concern with how others view him is a thread that runs throughout our conversations. He hopes that people will see past the dark hair, the olive-skinned exterior, and the dangerous neighborhood to appreciate and connect with him for who he really is. Luis’ descriptions of the worlds he occupies—his baseball team, his neighborhood, school, video games, and future worlds of college and work— are full of examples of how human connections, understanding, or trust can supersede ethnic, linguistic or other labels. Luis repeatedly downplays the importance of ethnic background or language for friendship, coaching, teaching and learning or playing together. When I ask him what he means when he says Hispanic, he tells me,

“When I hear Hispanic, I don’t think automatically of the race, and I’m not trying to say that anybody who speaks Spanish is Hispanic, that’s not true. But I automatically think that they have... a connection in some way or they didn’t have any connection at all and just wanted to learn, and spend a lot of time doing that. So I kind of have a good connection with those people, that um, have studied and tried. (...) people use race to kind of categorize people, and I don’t like when people categorize people ... I actually have friends from all over the place, from Japan, Britain, Costa Rica, so I don’t think of them differently, that they’re categorized in that country, they’re categorized as those people, you have to treat them a certain way, it doesn’t make me feel comfortable.”
And yet his stories and descriptions indicate a struggle to make meaning of such categories and their use in various spaces, as evidenced in his description of hearing a virtual opponent shout “shut up you Mexican!” through the game console after he spoke Spanish, or his explanation that English will be more useful to him because Caucasians make more money than Hispanics. More than any other participant, Luis brought up social class, race and ethnicity as factors relevant to our discussions of his future and his decisions around language use.

When he is concentrating on something important to him, Luis’ gaze has an intensity and sharp focus which make him look older than his twelve years. In group interactions, Luis listens carefully to his peers, asks them and me probing questions, expresses confusion and frustration with the complex ideas he is navigating.

Perla: “If you ever go to Mexico you can not be a vegetarian!”

When Perla leans across the table to describe how her trips to the Smithsonian museum in Washington, DC, have helped her imagine what it might be like to travel to Lake Titicaca with her Bolivian grandfather, the term global citizen comes to life for me. It is not only that she has watched her French Canadian grandmother learn enough Spanish to communicate with her husband’s family in Bolivia, or that her father’s Mexican relatives have helped her navigate the challenges of being vegetarian during visits to Guadalajara, or that she and her cousins from Finland have created their own version of sign language to

---

20 The video game incident occurred while Luis played Xbox at home with various opponents physically located in various other locations and connected virtually through the gaming system. Luis’ reporting of the video game incident is analyzed and discussed in chapter VI; his claim that Caucasians make more money than Hispanics is analyzed in chapter V.
communicate with one another during summer visits to the beach cottage; rather, it’s the ways that Perla talks about each of these worlds, easily positioning herself as part of them. Travels, both real (past trips to Méjico), mundane (summers at the beach cottage), and imagined (future trips to the Andes) are described with similar enthusiasm and detail, featuring Perla connecting with extended family members.

In constructing these worlds, Perla’s use of the discourse of language as connecting allows her to emphasize her similarities with family from various nationalities and authenticate herself as part of these different places. In her words, “out of all the places in the world [language is] important because if you know only one language that’s for that place, but if you know more than one language, that’s gonna be a whole ‘nother place that you can speak to.”

Perhaps because of interactions with her mother, a community organizer, Perla often acts as an instigator in group discussions, provoking others with insightful examples or comments which are often taken up by the group. For example, when she turns to the group and expresses her surprise that they do not use more Spanish since most of them are Latino, an extended series of interactions ensues in which she and her peers reflect on why they tend to use more English. Later her definition of the terms Hispanic and Latino—the former, based on family background and the latter on feelings or association—provides fodder for the group to clarify their positioning of Annie as Latina. More than once, Perla positions Annie as an outsider, despite the majority positioning her as Latina.
Despite being the only participant who identifies as a simultaneous bilingual from birth\textsuperscript{21}, Perla describes the culture shock she experienced coming to the Espada at age four. On the one hand, her bilingualism helped her because

“when you’re little, when you’re four it’s hard to get your feelings out, ... but when you know (both languages), it’s better, because then you have more ways to express yourself.”

However, during discussions of the Spanish teachers, Perla and others describe several “strict” teachers who regularly yelled at students. When her pre-k Spanish teacher would yell at her, she says,

“it felt scary because I wasn’t raised, I think some people were raised differently. Some parents would hit their kids or yell at their kids but my mom wouldn’t get mad at me like that. It’s different at home.”

In these constructions of her early experiences at school, Perla juxtaposes two different social/cultural practices: language for self-expression and language for discipline.

\textbf{Nora: “Oh you’re Puerto Rican? That’s cool”}

“There’s seven girls including me who are Latina.”

Nora mentions this casually, in passing, as she describes her softball teammates. Despite my training and interviewing experience, I am barely able to contain my surprise this first time I hear Nora refer to herself as Latina. Several of her teachers had identified her as Anglo American, I knew her mothers —both

\footnote{Perla reports that she “used both languages equally” since she was a baby. Nora and Annie describe learning English first at home; Johnny, Yanelis and Luis describe learning Spanish first at home.}
white, monolingual English speakers—from school events, and I had observed her reluctance to participate and heavy reliance on English during Spanish class.

My curiosity was piqued that this phenotypically white girl with mousy light brown hair, fair skin and round, freckle-covered cheeks identified as Puerto Rican. I learned that her biological father, who she sees once a year and lives in another state a day’s drive away, is Puerto Rican. When I asked her when she began to think of herself as Latina, she explained,

“(Before this year,) I didn’t have that recognition that that’s more what I am because like, I used to think of myself as from (this city), like that’s it. While, this year, like at hip-hop (at the Espada school), it’s kind of like, “Oh you’re Puerto Rican, Ok.” [Flat/monotone] While (at the city dance studio) it’s like “Oh, you’re Puerto Rican, really? That’s cool.” [enthusiastic tone] and more like questions, while here it’s just like everybody, well more or less everybody is Latina, so.”

Identifying as Puerto Rican has created the opportunity for Nora to see how others react to this ethnic identity label; we see here that reactions have been neutral at school (where most kids are Latino), but enthusiastic in her community dance classes. Nora similarly describes friends from summer camp being “curious” about her when they hear she is Puerto Rican. This emerging identity has opened the opportunity for Nora to see herself as unique and special:

“it kind of feels special [to be Latina] because ... (in this city) there are not as many Latina or Latino people ... and so it feels special in a way, like, it’s in this way it’s good to be different ... it means you have a different background than like other people and it makes you feel like, really special.”

Surely her biological parentage gives Nora the right to claim this Puerto Rican heritage. And yet Nora’s situation provides an unusual case for thinking about language, culture and identity. Her life outside of school is primarily monolingual
English. Though her younger brother is attending the Espada school, she could think of only one instance when they had used Spanish with one another, and she describes school vacations as times when she “never” gets to practice her Spanish because her family does not speak it. Even during occasional visits with her father, he does not speak Spanish with her.

Nora spent much time in her interview using discursive tactics which authenticate herself as Latina. She emphasized her similarities with other Latinos, described her future plans to travel to Puerto Rico, raise bilingual kids, marry a bilingual spouse, and seek opportunities to practice her Spanish. These descriptions were filled with the discourse of language as connecting, which allowed her to authenticate her Latina identity and create positive subject positions for herself as teacher, helper and generally someone who could be truly understood by others. I got the sense not that she was trying to prove herself to me, but that she took advantage of our interviews to explore this emerging sense of herself.

It is one thing to begin to see oneself as Latina and another to publicly identify as such among peers who have seen you as Anglo for most of your eight years together. In group interactions, Nora remained mostly quiet, though she clearly followed the discussions, laughing when others did or watching the speaker. During our second group session, Nora revealed her father’s background to her peers by adding a Puerto Rican flag to her language map. She was questioned briefly by Yanelis, who asked “So you’re Puerto Rican?” and Johnny, who asked how frequently she saw her dad. Having a Puerto Rican dad seemed to suffice for them to not question her any further on this topic.
Early in the fifth group activity I asked everyone to stand up and position themselves as agreeing or disagreeing with a series of statements. The first prompt was, “I am Latino.” Nora quickly moved to the agree position, but was clearly nervous. Her shoulders were hunched, she bit her nails, and she shifted back and forth from one leg to another as she looked around at her peers. As the conversation progressed and her peers discussed what it means to be Latina, Nora continued to silently watch others participate. When Johnny vacated the spot directly under the agree sign to get some water, Nora stepped into that position, all the while watching Yanelis. Johnny returned to the corner and did not challenge her position. At this point, Nora visibly relaxed, her arms moving to her sides, her back straightening. From this moment on, her posture seemed more relaxed and soon after she contributed to the discussion of what it means to be Latino. Such context cues provide some insight into the peer social dynamics of identifying publicly as Latina for Nora in this school.

**Annie: “I get really pressured”**

Most of the photos Annie shared are of herself with her close school friends; posing formally behind an elaborate birthday cake at a party, dancing together at the annual Fiesta Night school fundraising event, or smooshing their heads together for an intimate selfie. Annie’s enthusiasm for these friendships are apparent; she giggles as she describes learning dance moves on the Wii and sighs nostalgically when she talks about separating next year in junior high. Clearly, her time at the Espada has led to strong, caring friendships. As we look over the photos, Annie’s blond ponytail and blue eyes stand in contrast with the kinky black hair and dark
eyes of her friends, and as she recounts stories of going to one another’s houses and interacting with one another’s families it is clear that these friendships have also created moments when Annie has navigated being different. As an upper-middle class Jewish/Catholic European American at a high-poverty majority Hispanic school, Annie is among the minority both socio-economically and ethno-linguistically.

Annie often draws on a discourse of language as internal to position herself as different from her friends. For example, when talking with her friends’ family members she says, “when they ask me questions and I don’t know how to answer it then I just like, don’t know what to say.” Later she tells me “I don’t speak directly Spanish to them, but they’ll speak Spanish to each other, like they speak Spanish really fast to each other and I don’t think I can speak it that fast so I’ll just answer back if they ask me a question in Spanish like I’ll answer back in English most of the time … (but) I understand what they’re saying.” Even with her friends, she says, “I get really pressured” when they are all speaking Spanish together. For example, “One time, my friends asked me a question and I didn’t know what to say. Like, I had it in my head but I just, I don’t know, I couldn’t say it out loud.”

I noticed two discursive patterns that seemed to help Annie navigate spaces of difference on a regular basis. First is this tendency to highlight her strong friendships. In group interactions, Annie frequently made displays of social ties and bonds with Yanelis, leaning on her, whispering to her about an upcoming volleyball game or gossiping about a teacher. The two made reference to Justin Bieber and One Direction, emphasizing their shared love of boy band icons.
The second discursive pattern was Annie’s tendency to emphasize her position as insider of the Espada community. For example, during her interview she described herself as bicultural and “partly Latina,” emphasizing her appreciation for and relationships with the Latino community through school. When she described talking with her friends’ parents, she told me “I like hearing their stories if they go to the DR ‘cause I like hearing what it’s like there.” During group activities, she chose to share her photos of school events during our first group meeting, and would call out to someone walking in the hallway or on the street next to the school while we were working together. Initially I interpreted these behaviors as indicative of Annie’s failure to take the discussion topics seriously, but as time went on and I looked back at transcripts and videos I realized that these are likely tactics she has learned over time to emphasize similarities as a way of mitigating the discomfort of being different.

Discussion

In this chapter, I have provided a brief overview of the three discourses of language: language as utilitarian, language as internal and language as connecting/excluding. I have provided a brief “snapshot” of each of the participants as a way of illustrating the interplay between discourses and identity-/world-building processes. This chapter is meant to provide the reader with a broad overview of the data and a clear understanding of my analytic framework, which uses the six stages of FDA to understand the ways that the discourses of language identified here are used with particular action orientations (e.g., to emphasize
differences or authenticate oneself as part of a group) as a way of constructing identities and worlds.

In the coming chapters, I have included primarily excerpts of data in which the topic was not the school or classroom, but in which we talked about home, neighborhoods, family interactions, the future. This decision made sense for two reasons. First, extensive additional background information on the school is required to contextualize conversations about classroom or general school-based interactions. Second, the literature on dual language students’ out-of-school experiences is sparse. Unfortunately, this methodological choice has resulted in reporting primarily on data which was collected in English, as much of the discussions which happened in Spanish were focused on the school context. The decision to report primarily on non-school-related data excerpts does not take away from the larger aim of this dissertation, which is to understand the discursive processes that occurred in these conversations. While the “what” of talk about classrooms and teachers differed from what is reported here, the “how” of this talk, including the three discourses of language and the ways they served to create construct identities and worlds, remains similar.

In the next three chapters, I provide examples of several FDA analyses to explore the deployment of these discourses in conversation about three broad themes in the interviews: constructions of adult life, constructions of everyday language use, and constructions of the relationship between language and ethnicity.

In Chapter V I include several excerpts of participants’ constructions of the world of adults, including the worlds of work, college, and married life. While
participants drew on all three discourses in these conversations, *language as utilitarian* was most frequently drawn upon in these conversations, often to invoke some aspect of economic success.

In Chapter VI, I include analysis of excerpts in which participants constructed everyday language use, looking primarily at constructions of what language practices are considered “normal” and who is expected to accommodate whom in these interactions. I explore the ways that my participants’ use of the three discourses of language makes available certain subject positions, which in turn normalize certain language practices and make possible subjective experiences such as shame, pride or even despair. While language as internal is the most frequently used discourse in these excerpts, I also explore how the other discourses of language actually have slightly different implications for constructing identities and worlds.

In Chapter VII, I explore the ways that participants constructed the relationship between language and ethnicity. I first consider several excerpts that illustrate speakers’ awareness of a dominant ethnolinguistic ideology which assumes a one-to-one relationship between language and ethnicity (i.e., Spanish is for Latinos and English is for Anglos/”Americans”). I show how my participants sometimes engaged in discursive action which reified this ethnolinguistic ideology and other times seemed to talk back to this ideology. In the latter, sometimes they engaged in justifying a distinction between Spanish and being Latino, other times they lamented the separation.
V. Constructing the future imagined world of adults

In this chapter, I draw on my analytic framework (see Figure 6) to explore the ways that participants used the three discourses of language to construct the adult worlds of work, college, and married life.

In asking participants to talk about their imagined future lives (including their future spouse, future children, and future language use), my intention was not to be able to predict what those futures will be like. From a discursive perspective, the language my participants use to respond to questions about their futures provides me with insights into the discourses currently available to them to talk about the worlds of adults. My interest here is how these discourses relate to their current identity-building and world-building processes, and the subject positions, practices and subjectivities made possible by those discourses.

In conversations about their imagined futures, participants drew on all three of the discourses of language at some point. All six participants drew on a discourse of language as utilitarian, while the other two discourses were used in these conversations by two or three participants.

Constructing a successful future identity through language as utilitarian

The first four excerpts are taken from Luis’ interview. After talking about his photos and I ask him some final questions about language and about his future.
Excerpt 10: Luis, Learn another language

1 JJ  So, Luis, do you think it’s important to you to learn more than one language?

2 L  Yeah.

3 JJ  Why?

4 L  To be prepared.

5 Like, you never know what’s going to happen, like if you don’t know,

6 like if you get maybe shipped off to a place,

7 to do something you might want to learn the language,

8 and maybe it would help you, it helps you if you learn it already.

9 JJ  Did you say if you get shipped off?

10 L  Like, they send you, like you have a job and they send you off somewhere,

11 JJ  Oh.

12 L  Out of the country.

In this segment, we can see how Luis is engaged in world-building; that is, his response is focused on constructing the world of work, including the common social practices and responsibilities of employers and employees in that world. I begin my analysis using FDA by asking what subject positions are made available in Luis’ construction of working life. Luis constructs two potential subject positions: employer and employee. In lines 4-5, he positions the employee as not knowing what will happen and not part of decisions about relocation. By implication, the employer is positioned as the one who would know or would make such a decision. The next question in FDA asks what social practices or possibilities for action are made available in this discursive construction of work life. Luis constructs the social practice of moving or traveling for work and being sent out of the country as normal possibilities. He also constructs the employee as responsible for being prepared for such unanticipated decisions on the part of the employer. Again, it is implied that the employer has the power to make such decisions.
In lines 7-8, Luis constructs *language as utilitarian*, as a resource or tool that will help the employee in the world of work. We hear in line 7 how this discourse of *language as utilitarian* – this construction of language as a tool or resource – makes available the possibility for action for the employee. When Luis says “to do something you might want to learn the language” he constructs a way for the employee to be prepared for the unexpected demands of work. Constructing *language as utilitarian* also creates the possibility for employees to distinguish themselves in the world of work, which we can see in line 8, “maybe it would help you, it helps you if you learn it already.”

Luis is also engaged in identity-building in this segment; he aligns himself with the employee throughout this segment. Any action on the part of the employer is implied through Luis’ construction of the employee. I return to Luis’ identity-building work at the end of this section.

Excerpt 11: Luis, Sister went abroad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>JJ</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yeah, that sometimes happens to people, huh? Do you know somebody that that happened to?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>My sister got, went abroad, at college, and she went to Rome and then she went to Africa, and then she went to Italy, so. Well, she basically went to Italy and Africa.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Do you know what part of Africa she was in? (pause) No? Wow, so she went off to study there? (pause, Luis nods) Uh huh? And she needed to know the languages in those places?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yeah, but it’s kind of similar to Spanish, so it wasn’t that hard to understand.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yeah, cool. So that’s an important thing for, and is that what you meant when you said shipped off?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this excerpt, I follow up with Luis’ comment about being “shipped off,” asking him for examples. Luis continues to engage in world-building in this segment.
as he constructs the world of college. Recounting his sister’s trip makes available the subject position of a college student and makes possible the social practice of travel or study abroad during college. Again, Luis draws on a discourse of language as utilitarian when he constructs his sister’s Spanish as a resource or tool for travel. Possession of this resource positions Luis’ sister as a successful traveler and makes possible easy navigation of other places because “it wasn’t that hard to understand.” This positioning of his sister as successful also makes available the subjective experience of pride and inspiration; while he does not say as much, it is clear in this construction of the study abroad trip that his sister’s easy navigation of the languages while traveling are not creating negative or shameful reactions.

Excerpt 12: Luis, Father had to come here

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>You can get shipped off somewhere? OK. Do you know anybody else who’s had to go somewhere else and learn another language?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Yeah, my dad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Your dad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>He had to come here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>He came here, yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>He had to learn how to speak English. He was already learning a little English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>How come your dad came here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>’Cause he was getting married.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>To get married, yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>My mom was already here, so she was living here before he did, so, they wanted to get married over here.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Luis moves here from constructing college life to constructing the world of adult married life. Taken together, we can see how excerpts 10, 11 and 12 are all part of a larger attempt to construct the world of adult life, which gives us insights into how Luis imagines his own future.
Luis’ story of his father’s move to the US to marry creates the subject position of spouse and makes available the social practice of relocating to be with one’s fiancée. Luis positions his father as dutiful in lines 22 and 24, when he says that he “had to come here” and “had to” prepare for coming here to marry his mom. Again he draws on a discourse of language as utilitarian; deployment of this discourse allows him to emphasize his father’s hard work in preparing for the journey and life here. This positioning of his father makes available the subjectivity of pride and inspiration in his father’s actions.

Excerpt 13: Luis, Future Spanish and English

1  JJ  How do you imagine using Spanish in the future, maybe when you’re 25 years old or something like that?
2  L   Um. Like if I continue going to college, maybe I’ll have, I’ll use it more,
3   like to get other jobs that require people to be bilingual, like answering calls.
4  JJ  So you might use it for work, or you might use it for college, you think?
5  L   Yeah.
6  JJ  Any other ideas about how you might use Spanish in the future?
7  L   Um (pause)
8  JJ  No? (pause)
9   Ok. How about English? Do you imagine using it in the future?
10 L   Yeah.
11 JJ  How do you think you might use it?
12 L   I think I’ll use it more than Spanish if I stay here in this country,
13 because most people of the higher class, like people that like are I think are the higher class that are like Caucasians,
14 so I’ll use that more than Spanish.
15 JJ  What does Caucasian mean?
16 L   Ah, a person that’s white,
17 that’s from this, no not from this country, they don’t have to be from this country, but
18 JJ  So, but it’s anybody who’s white is Caucasian?
19 L   I don’t, I really don’t know
20 JJ  And you feel like most, you said something about higher class Caucasians, are there—
Like they, they get paid more than most Latinos, not all of them, Hispanics.

In Excerpt 13, which happened just minutes after Excerpt 14, Luis continues constructing the world of adults, including college and jobs, which he groups together in lines 2-3. In this response, he creates the subject position of college student and office worker for his future self. “Answering calls” is likely a reference to an office job, which, combined with the college reference, serves as an index of a middle-class successful future. His use of language as utilitarian allows him to constructs Spanish as a resource which is useful in college and could make him eligible for such an office job.

In response to my question about using English in the future, Luis continues to construct the world of work, which makes available two subject positions: Latinos and Caucasians or white people. He positions Caucasians as “higher class” and paid more than Latinos. This construction makes available the social practice of one group getting better pay than another based on ethnicity or race. Luis constructs two possible exceptions to this social practice. First, in line 16, he begins to construct whites as people “from this country,” presumably native-born people who are not immigrants. He stops himself and then qualifies this construction with “they don’t have to be from this country, but.” This discursively creates the possibility that some people from other countries can be white. Again, in line 20 Luis positions whites as getting paid more than Latinos, and then adds the qualifier “not all of them,” creating the possibility that some Latinos might get comparable pay to whites or that some whites might get paid less than some Latinos. This entire excerpt, lines 8-20, is in response to my question about how Luis sees English in his
future. We can see in his complex response that he constructs English as a resource or commodity in the world of work, in which white people are positioned as more powerful.

Taken together, Excerpts 10 through 13 provide evidence for seeing how the discourse of *language as utilitarian* figures into Luis’ construction of his future self and future world as an adult. As I take these four excerpts together to make sense of Luis’ identity-building, I draw on Bucholtz and Hall’s tactics of intersubjectivity, an analytic tool from sociocultural linguistics. To begin with, I ask how Luis discursively emphasizes similarities and differences between himself, his family, and others. Luis aligns himself in Excerpt 10 with the employee, who is positioned as not knowing or not able to make some decisions in the world of work and has to prepare for the unknown. In Excerpt 13 Luis aligns himself with Latinos, who are positioned as getting paid less. By drawing on their stories to construct the adult worlds of college and work, Luis also aligns himself with two family members, his sister and father, who are positioned as having more agency in their lives than the employee subject position. In terms of differences, Luis emphasizes a distinction between (most) whites and (most) Latinos, highlighting that the former are better paid and generally higher class.

The next analytic question is related to how Luis navigates authenticity in these segments. By emphasizing his sister’s and father’s success in the world of college and work, Luis authenticates his family as participants in social practices...

---

22 These tactics of identity-building from sociocultural linguistics are included in Chapter III.
23 See additional evidence that Luis constructs his father as successful in the world of work in the Appendix to Chapter 6.
associated with the social mobility (college, study abroad, working hard). The final analytic question is how Luis authorizes or affirms structural or institutional power and/or illegitimates or questions or resists them. Luis’ construction of work life in Excerpt 10 legitimates the authority of the employer by constructing it as normal. In Excerpt 13, he affirms the power of whites and the unequal treatment of Latinos but also creates the discursive possibility for some Latinos to be better paid.

This analysis allows us to see some of the complex discursive processes involved in how Luis’s construction of his future creates certain possibilities for himself. Luis’ preoccupation with social class, professional success, and the position of Latinos in the world was salient in these segments focused on the future, but also came across throughout my many interactions with him. His deployment of language as utilitarian plays a central role in shaping the possibilities for imagining his future. Luis’ preoccupation with social class comes across not as a source of shame but rather as one of inspiration and agency.

**Habitual positioning of Spanish speakers as needing help**

Discourses of language in use have many implications for how speakers construct the world, themselves and others in the world. When used to construct a successful professional future for the speaker, the language as utilitarian discourse often created a helper subject position for my bilingual participants, which allowed them to imagine themselves as translators, interpreters or providing some other valuable bilingual service. This tended to also create a help-needing or helpless subject position for those that my participants imagined in need of such services.
Frequently, Spanish speakers were positioned as needing help, perhaps not
surprisingly given that they live in an English-dominant society. This is shown in the
next three excerpt.

**Excerpt 14: Annie, Future Spanish**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>OK. And what about Spanish? How do you imagine using Spanish in your future?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I don’t know, if,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>well my friend’s mom is a translator, from English to Spanish and Spanish to English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>So, if you need to translate something for someone,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>or in your job if you’re like working in a store, and the person, someone comes up and they only know Spanish, then you could help people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In constructing the future world of work, Annie draws on a *language as utilitarian* discourse to construct Spanish as potentially instrumental for her as a worker. Two subject positions are created in this construction: translator and person in need of services. Describing her mother’s friend allows Annie to establish her own knowledge about how translating works: “from English to Spanish and Spanish to English.” This starting point seems to assign equal status to both languages, as translation goes both ways and the two languages are positioned as parallel. In lines 4-5, Annie provides two scenarios of translation, which flesh out the help-needling subject position. In line 4, she uses a neutral footing with non-specific referents “something” and “someone.” However, in line 5, the help-seeking person is positioned as “only” knowing Spanish, which is constructed as a problem which requires assistance.
As above, in the next two excerpts Yanelis draws on a discourse of language as utilitarian when talking about bilingualism in the context of her future work and makes a connection to her current knowledge about translating.

**Excerpt 15: Yanelis, Importance of learning more than one language**

1. JJ Do you think it’s important to learn more than one language?
2. Y Yeah.
3. JJ How come?
4. Y ‘Cause I think it would help you more in the long run.
5. Help you with like a better job so you could like assist more people that know a different language. Yeah.

In lines 4-5, Yanelis constructs *language as utilitarian*: that is, as a tool for accessing a better job with the ultimate goal of helping people. She creates two subject positions: bilingual helper and person in need of assistance. Yanelis constructs the latter as neutral: “people that know a different language” could be interpreted in a variety of ways (not necessarily as Spanish-dominant or monolinguals). In her response to the next question, Yanelis is more specific in her description of people that need help.

**Excerpt 16: Yanelis, Future English and Spanish**

13. JJ How do you imagine using Spanish or English in the future? We could start with English maybe.
15. JJ For everything? What about Spanish?
17. JJ Translating. Like how, like what kinds of translating do you think you might do?
18. Y Well, I kind of do it now, but for my grandmother, I translate for her.
19. JJ Uh-huh.
Or like, when someone needs help, in the future,
and like they only speak Spanish, and like
they’re in an English I guess, only people are
speaking English around,
I could like help them be like “yeah, over
there” and, um, yeah.

The contrast between Yanelis’ opening construction of English as useful “for
everything” and Spanish as useful for “translating” is particularly stark in this
segment. Her construction of future Spanish use again creates the subject positions
of helper and person in need of help. This time the latter is explicitly constructed as
those who “only speak Spanish” in line 21 and the former is constructed as bilingual.
In line 22, Yanelis positions herself as a potential helper.

As she constructs her future Spanish use, Yanelis draws on the example of
helping her grandmother now. She says, “Well, I kind of do it now, but for my
grandmother,” thus constructing her current experience helping her grandmother
as similar to future potential experiences translating for other Spanish speakers.

Talking about language as utilitarian in these examples creates a world
where bilinguals can be helpers. Annie and Yanelis’ use of language as utilitarian in
these excerpts allowed each girl to authenticate herself as potential insiders to this
professional24 community of translators. Annie emphasizes her mother’s connection
to a professional translator and displays her knowledge about how translating
works. Yanelis authenticates herself as an experienced translator who has helped

---

24 While Yanelis does not explicitly mention a professional setting in the second
excerpt here, she did talk about translation throughout her interview as both a
personal/familial practice as well as a professional one.
her grandmother and thus knows how to navigate other such help-giving practices. These are positive potential identities we want to encourage.

However, I found that the subject position of needing help was habitually used for Spanish speakers. Such a construction is not in itself problematic or unexpected. Indeed, I am sure that Annie has witnessed many of her friends’ parents needing translation during school open houses or other meetings and it is clear that Yanelis has frequently been in the position of translating to help family members. Nevertheless, the normalizing of Spanish dominant people as needing help may be problematic if alternatives to these subject positions are rarely or never explored.

Such a pattern may be an indication that these dual language youth in fact have a limited repertoire of discourses available to them to talk about Spanish speakers—despite their dual language schooling. Limited discursive resources for positioning Spanish speakers runs counter to the larger goal of linguistic equality in dual language programs.

Indeed, in my data, I found very few examples of counter-examples, in which an English monolingual was positioned as needing help or a Spanish-speaker as helping someone. The following excerpt from Nora’s interview is one a unique exception to this pattern.

Excerpt 17: Nora, “I taught my mom Spanish”

| 48 | N | ... (I’ll use language) to sometimes like help people like if they want to learn something, like you could teach them, like I taught my mom in Spanish what her favorite day of the week was, which is Saturday, so I said it’s Sábado, and like I taught her how to say it. Now she knows her favorite day of the week. |
In this excerpt we can see how Nora uses a discourse of language as connecting in that she describes using Spanish to help her mom learn a word which is particularly meaningful to her. Nora emphasizes the personal connection with this word, “now she knows her favorite day of the week.” Nora’s construction of this teaching moment with her mother creates the subject positions of helper (teacher) and person in need of help (learner). She positions the latter as obligated to learn in line 51 when she says “she should know like one thing.” This sense of obligation may be related to the mother’s obligation as a parent in a bilingual school community, which relates to the mother’s interaction with the principal in line 50.

While it is refreshing to see Nora break with the habitual positioning of Spanish speakers as needing help, Nora’s construction of the act of helping is qualitatively different from the previous two examples in terms of what is at stake for those needing help. Nora’s mom learning a favorite word in Spanish for personal enrichment is less urgent than Yanelis’ grandmother needing translation or the imagined person seeking help in a store from Annie’s story.

**Future Spouse & Children**

The last set of excerpts from the future segment of interviews come from our conversations about their future spouses and children. I have selected excerpts from the interviews with Annie and Nora to illustrate how each draws on different
discourses of language in their constructions of their future home life, and the role these discourses play in world- and identity-building.

The first excerpt is from Annie’s interview. So far in her interview, Annie has positioned herself as bicultural and “partly Latina,” emphasizing her social ties with friends from the Espada school and their families.

In the above analyses, I have drawn primarily on two tools from FDA: subject positions and social practices. Another analytic tool from FDA is the consideration of the action orientation of the discourses used by the speaker. This refers to what a speaker is doing or achieving with their speech in a given text. For much of the data I present in this study, the action orientation is world-building and identity-building; that is, my participants are explaining, describing, or at times justifying the ways they construct their worlds (home, school, future, etc.) and performing or enacting certain aspects of their identities through their interactions with me. On some occasions, the action orientation of a participant’s discursive construction involves more than this; one clear example is when participants make a joke or ignore my question as a way of displaying social bonds with one another.

In my analysis of the next excerpt, I had to take into account not only the subject positions and social practices made available by Annie’s constructions, but also the action orientation of her speech. Annie initially side-steps directly answering an uncomfortable question, introducing what seems to be an entirely different topic. The central analytic question for starting my analysis of this section thus became: what does she achieve by shifting the topic from future marriage to

---

25 The action orientation of discourse is similar to speech act. See Chapter III.
junior high Spanish classes? Once I explored this, I was then able to look closely at Annie's construction of her future family more broadly.

Excerpt 18: Annie, Future spouse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IU 1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>JJ</th>
<th>So, if you get married one day, do you think you would want to marry a Latino person?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I don’t know. Um, it would depend if I still know Spanish. I mean I want to still know Spanish, but since I’m leaving the school and they don’t speak Spanish [there]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>They don’t speak Spanish at the school you’re going to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>There’s Spanish classes, but they’re not that great.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Right, so you think you might lose your Spanish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Not all of it, but most of it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>And so if you don’t know too much Spanish you might not be able to marry a Latino person, if you wanted to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Well, if I wanted to, I could.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>If you wanted to you could.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I mean, they’ll probably know English too. (nervous laughter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Yeah? Um, do you think you’ll marry someone who speaks both English and Spanish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Sure. (nervous laughter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Is that important to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(quiet) Um. Not only if they knew Spanish. (nervous laughter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU 2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(barely audible) I don’t think it could be possible. Well, it could be possible, (nervous laughter) (whispering) but it’s hard to know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Wait, you mean if they knew only Spanish and not English it would be hard?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(barely audible) Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>OK. Is it important to you that the person you marry, if you decide to get married. You don’t have to get married if you don’t want to, but if you decide to get married, is it important to you that that person be bilingual?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(volume increases slightly) It’s not important. But, it would be nice. (nervous laughter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU 3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>But it would be nice. OK. And then the other question is, if you choose at some point in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

26 I return in Chapter VII to Annie’s conflation of the Spanish language and Latino ethnicity.
your future to have children, do you think you would speak
with them mostly in English, mostly Spanish, or both?

22  A  (more clearly, normal volume) Um, well, if my husband knows
Spanish, if he speaks Spanish, then I mean he'd probably speak
Spanish to them, so I could speak Spanish to them, but if I
marry someone that doesn't speak Spanish then I don't think I
would.

23  JJ  Do you want to learn another language?

24  A  Not really. I like Spanish. So if I had to choose a language to
learn I would keep learning Spanish.

25  JJ  Keep learning Spanish. Do you have any plans to figure out a
way to keep learning Spanish?

26  A  Yeah, well in 8th grade at this school, you have to pick a
language, but I would be in Spanish 1, which would be really
easy for me, but if I was in Spanish 2 then I would have to be
on the 9th grade schedule, which would be weird.

Several context cues throughout this segment signal Annie’s discomfort with
my questions. These include her deflection of the question in interactional unit
(IU)1, her nervous laughter and decreased volume in IUs 2-3, and my own attempts
at helping her get more comfortable in IUs 2-3 (including my careful emphasis on
her agency in choosing whether or not to marry and my “blaming” the interview
protocol for the questions in line 21, “the other question is”).

She also uses a disclaimer in line 2, “I mean, I want to still know Spanish but.”
This is a rhetorical device which indicates a concern with warding off any judgments
or negative attributions one’s interlocutor may harbor toward the speaker. Annie’s
disclaimer positions herself as appreciative of the Spanish language and shifts the
responsibility for any future language loss away from herself to the institutional
barriers of the school.

In IU 1, Annie draws on a discourse of language as utilitarian, treating
language as a commodity or resource which the school doles out according to
institutional structures which are not easily adapted for fluent bilingual/biliterate dual language school graduates. Emphasizing the authority of the school to structure such language opportunities shifts the responsibility for maintaining the language away from Annie herself. The action orientation of this interaction, thus, is to shift responsibility for the anticipated unlikelihood that she would marry a Latino onto the school and her anticipated Spanish attrition.

In IU 4, Annie again emphasizes her appreciation of the Spanish language and authenticates herself as a fluent bilingual for whom the junior high Spanish classes would be too easy. She then reaffirms the school’s institutional authority to limit her access to the appropriate level classes.

Bilingualism and Spanish are clearly not central to Annie’s construction of her future home life (or academic life as she does not express any qualms about losing Spanish or plans to continue studying it). “It’s not important but it would be nice” if her future husband knew Spanish, and if he does not, she most likely would not use Spanish with her children.

By contrast, Spanish use with her children is central to Nora’s construction of the future. She and Perla were the only two respondents who spontaneously brought up using Spanish in this way in their future, without my prompting them to think about future children.

Excerpt 19: Nora’s future Spanish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>JJ</th>
<th>How else do you think you might use Spanish as you imagine your future?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Like, if I ever had kids, like, I could teach them Spanish and like send them to a school like this [the Espada School] and then they’d be able to have all, two languages and, unlike some kids</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
where at home they have, they speak one language or another, while like if I’d be bilingual and they could be bilingual from home as well as school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>JJ</th>
<th>Why do you think it would be important for you to have your kids speak both languages?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Because then like I could communicate with them, like if it’s something that’s a little embarrassing, like, did you use the bathroom in your pants or something. Like, I could like talk to them and it’s, for example, like if we’re in a school like, where nobody spoke any other language but English, like I could talk to them and like they wouldn’t have to be embarrassed. Because nobody would understand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In line 4, Nora constructs the world as having two kinds of homes: bilingual and monolingual. Nora then distances herself from the monolingual home (“some kids...they have/they speak”) and aligns herself with the bilingual home (“I’d be bilingual”). Constructing her future home as bilingual creates the subject position of bilingual mother for her future self, which affords her the resources to teach her kids Spanish and provide them with the opportunity of a bilingual school. In line 6, Nora further constructs the bilingual home as a place where communication is improved because parents and children can talk freely about embarrassing topics without others understanding.

Nora also constructs the world as having two kinds of schools. Bilingual schools are constructed as places where her future children would “be able to have all,” while “a school where nobody spoke any other language but English” is constructed as a place where “nobody would understand.”

The language as connecting discourse allows Nora to position her future self as a resourceful bilingual who can communicate with, teach, and understand others. This contributes to her recent exploration of what it means to be Latina.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>So you mentioned before that you think it’s possible you might have children one day. I’m wondering if you were to get married one day, what do you imagine that person would be like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Um, interesting, um, and, maybe they’d be able to speak Spanish but if they didn’t I would teach them. ‘Cause then I would be able to communicate with them too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Does it matter to you if that person is Latino or not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Not really.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>It doesn’t matter? And it sounds like it doesn’t matter if they speak Spanish or not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No, but I kind of want them to be willing to be able to learn something. ‘Cause then, like, I could use like my Spanish for more than with like just my kids. Like also with them, so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>And what about if that person speaks no English, does that matter to you if that person didn’t know English?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Not really ‘cause then I could just teach them English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>So hopefully they would know one of the languages that you know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yeah, otherwise that would be kind of hard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Yeah. And what about somebody from like a totally different racial or cultural background, like just completely different, would that be ok to you to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>As long as they could speak English, ‘cause otherwise it would be very hard to communicate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Ok, any thoughts about what’s the most important thing about this person that you might marry?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Um, that they have like an open mind and are willing to learn new things, and even if they don’t like, even if they can’t speak Spanish by the time, like if we have kids, that they’d be open to me teaching our kids Spanish and then maybe they could learn Spanish during that period of time too.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this excerpt, Nora continues drawing on a discourse of *language as connecting* in her construction of her future home. Two possible subject positions are made available to her future spouse as either “able to speak Spanish,” or lacking Spanish and needing to learn from Nora. Either way, Nora continues positioning her future self as a resourceful bilingual who can help them learn.
Nora’s use of “communicate” in lines 50 and 60 seems to have a particular situated meaning for her. Just prior to these segments, Nora used the word “communicate” to describe possible future trips to Puerto Rico. She explains that if she uses Spanish, she will “be able to understand people and communicate with them, rather than just standing there feeling really awkward.” As with the previous excerpt, Nora constructs the world as having two different possibilities; understanding and communicating is contrasted with non-communication (“just standing there”) and a feeling of alienation or otherness (“feeling really awkward”) in the presence of someone with whom communication is not possible. Nora maps these two possibilities for action onto her dual construction of the world of bilinguals and that of monolinguals.

Nora’s use of “communicate” in Excerpt 20 (lines 50, 60) provides a window into the subjectivities made available by her construction of her future. On the one hand, bilinguals have available to them opportunities to communicate and understand, reduce embarrassment, and teach others. On the other hand, monolinguals are faced with feeling “awkward” as they experience alienation and otherness in particular contexts.

Annie and Nora draw on different discourses of language—the former, language as utilitarian, the latter language as connecting—to construct their future spouses and children. Annie’s use of the discourse of language as utilitarian is leveraged to achieve a larger discursive goal; that of shifting responsibility for future language loss away from herself onto institutional structures and thus excusing her for constructing a future where she is unlikely to marry a Latino. The action
orientation of her response is more focused on deflecting my uncomfortable questions than on describing her future spouse. Nora’s responses emphasize the differences between bilinguals and monolinguals, positioning the former as connecting and understanding more than the latter. She firmly aligns herself with the former and constructs a future in which her bilingualism is central to family life.

Discussion

In this chapter I have analyzed the ways that two discourses—*language as utilitarian* and *language as connecting*—were used in constructions of the adult worlds of work, college, and married life during conversations about my participants’ futures. Drawing on my analytic framework (see Figure 7 in Chapter IV), I highlight some of the ways that these two discourses function for identity-building and world-building. In chapter 2 I discussed the idea of language ideologies, which I have proposed to operationalize for analytic purposes as the dynamic interplay between discourses of language and the identity-building and world-building work made available by such discourses.

In my discussion of the findings presented here, I will emphasize that this is primarily a story about the discourses themselves and how they shape discursive possibilities for identity-building and world-building in these discursive contexts. By foregrounding the discursive action in these data, I hope to make visible the affordances of FDA as a tool for understanding how the use of certain discourses of language constitute and are constituted by language ideologies.

The *utilitarian* discourse made available particular subject positions in these constructions. To summarize these key findings, I will provide here only two brief
examples rather than an exhaustive summary of all the examples shown above. In constructions of the workplace, the *utilitarian* discourse made available the following positions: bilingual employee, bilingual office worker, translator, bilingual helper, monolingual (Spanish-dominant) help-seeker. These positions in turn made normal certain social practices. For example, the bilingual employee was positioned as having a competitive advantage because their bilingualism allowed them to be prepared in case the employer might send them to another country to work. In this construction, the practice of doing what their employer asks and using bilingualism as a resource or commodity to compete for such opportunities is made normal, as is the subjective experience of being unsure about the future and needing to wait for the boss to decide how and when to capitalize on the resource of your bilingualism.

I have shown how the same discourse made possible the bilingual translator/bilingual helper position, which normalizes the social practice of using one’s bilingualism to help others and feel proud and useful in so doing. This discursive construction of the world of work simultaneously necessitates the position of monolingual person in need of help, which was constructed as a Spanish monolingual in these data. The monolingual help-seeker again normalizes, in this context, the social practice of needing help and carries with it some degree of humility, dependency on others or helplessness. While such a discursive construction of what is considered normal is not surprising given the larger US societal context, such discursive constructions could, over time, be limiting if other imagined situations and discourses are never, or rarely, considered.
The discourse of *language as connecting* was used to construct adult family life, making available the subject positions of bilingual parent, monolingual parent, bilingual spouse and monolingual spouse. The bilingual parent position normalized the practice of raising kids bilingually, which allowed for secret, private conversations that made possible the subjective experiences of avoiding embarrassment, and deepening familial understanding.

By removing the participants’ names in these summaries, I hope to foreground the analytic work of FDA and underscore the value of close consideration of the discourses which are circulating among participants in dual language schools as speech communities. This detailed look at the circulating discourses of language has allowed me to begin making tentative claims about the kinds of discursive patterns we might be seeing, and the implications of these patterns for dual language youth in terms of their identity-building and their world-building.

Some initial considerations which emerge from this chapter are summarized here. However, I discuss these with the caveat that these are not generalizations that go beyond the particular discursive situations analyzed here. Any generalizations I can make are limited to application of the method itself with other groups in other settings. I am not making claims that the particular ways these discourses are deployed for identity- and world-building in these data might be replicated, but that the process for looking at such deployments and for collecting such data can be used in future work. The value of this analysis, then, is in its ability
to shine a bright light on the processes related to emergent language ideologies in dual language settings where linguistic equality is sought.

The salience of language as utilitarian to construct bilingualism for future economic success is not surprising; Bearse and deJong (2008) similarly found that both Latino and Anglo students dual language programs talked about the economic benefits of bilingualism. However, they also found that Latino students tended to talk about future Spanish use as a way of preserving their cultural or heritage, which was not something I found here. I can not claim that a discourse of cultural preservation is not available to these participants; it is possible that a different activity or set of interview questions, or simply a different interviewer, would have prompted the use of such a discourse.

I speculate, however, that the Hispanic dominant context offered by the Espada School, where students have not fully encountered the hegemonic forces of assimilation, may be at play in the fact that such a discourse did not appear in these data. Indeed, during my interview with the school Spanish teacher I learned that graduates often return to the school and talk about their surprise at feeling like a minority. Perhaps preserving culture will become more salient as they move on to other settings. If this is the case, then the Espada school has done a nice job of providing a protective enclave for cultural heritage, but may also need to consider preparing its older students with opportunities to engage with a wider variety of discourses for constructing future Spanish use.

Such speculations relate to an important point. The discourses of language my participants draw on are those which are available to them in a given moment. It
seems pretty clear that when engaged in talking about their futures and constructing the imagined worlds of adult life, language as utilitarian is a handy way of talking about Spanish, English, bilingualism and monolingualism for these dual language youth. Such a discourse of language becomes “handy” or readily available for deployment in identity-building and world-building because most likely youth have had multiple opportunities to hear such discourses used in these ways in the past, and have very likely had opportunities to practice using them. So, for example, we can imagine (and I observed many instances of this) an Espada Spanish teacher reminding students that their Spanish will be useful for them in the future so they can get into college, get a job, or help people. This analysis does not provide an exhaustive list of all the discourses they have ever heard, just the more salient ones which they see as pertinent in interviews and group discussions with me.

The “handy” discourses of language—those which are most readily available to talk about Spanish, English and bilingualism in each of the different conversations I present in this dissertations—constitute what I call a repertoir of discourses of language. In my discussions of findings for each chapter, I will come back to this notion of the repertoir of discourses available to speakers in a given moment. I posit that a central task for dual language educators who truly seek to pursue the goal of linguistic equality in such schools will be to create ways to expand the repertoir of discourses available to dual language youth and provide varied opportunities to practice deploying these discourses in ways that open new possibilities for identity-building and world-building.
For example, I do not claim that Yanelis is unable to imagine Spanish monolinguals as resourceful helpers or that she does not have another discourse available to her to construct such a position. Nevertheless, I witnessed myriad micro-moments in which she deployed the utilitarian discourse to position Spanish monolinguals as needing help and depending on others. These micro-moments contribute to the “handiness” of the utilitarian discourse for constructing Spanish monolinguals. I posit that the accumulation of such tiny micro-moments of interaction matters a great deal in the long run. The habitual positioning of Spanish speakers as needing help, over time, may seem like a normal consequence of living in an English-dominant society, but it is this very phenomenon that dual language schools set out to counter with their focus on language equality.

The repertoire of discourses available to Yanelis may change depending on the discursive context. Perhaps when talking with her mother or a friend outside of school, or to herself, she draws on a discourse of language as cultural preservation. But when such discourses are relegated to some spaces and never brought into school, then she may be missing out on the chance to expand the ways that she deploys such discourses. In this way, repertoires of discourses have implications for dual language youth who need to invest time in continues Spanish language learning. Bilingual learners need good reasons to invest the time and effort into maintaining the minority language.

Finally, this analysis brings to light the unique circumstances of Anglo students in majority Hispanic dual language schools. Given the goal of cross-cultural learning in dual language schools, it is also incumbent on dual language educators to
create spaces for students like Annie to explore her own cultural or ethnic heritage.

As an Anglo minority in a majority-Latino school, Annie’s discomfort and apparent embarrassment during the conversation analyzed here was evident throughout her interview and during many of the group interactions. Whereas the school supports her progress in academic Spanish, perhaps more support in conversational Spanish has been lacking. Ethnolinguistic differences and related aspects of social status seemed to be new topics for all of my participants except for Luis and Perla, who described talking about these topics with their parents but not in school. I often wondered what might happen if Annie had more opportunities to safely discuss such topics with her peers and reflect about her own position. Might this allow her to more comfortably engage in future conversations?

27 In addition to her nervous laughter, I have elsewhere (Jacobs, in press) documented her use of a variety of interactional tactics to mitigate discomfort, including the two patterns mentioned in Chapter V.
Appendix to Chapter 5: Additional excerpts from Luis’ interview

A1: Luis’ dad, “he’s a workaholic”

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>So you want to tell me more about your dad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>He’s kind of a workaholic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>He’s a workaholic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>He doesn’t spend much, a lot of time at home, um, yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Yeah. What else can you tell me about your dad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>He’s getting kinda old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>He’s getting kinda old?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>He says he wants to get another job. Cause he, he’s in a high, has a lot of power kind of, in the company, and he thinks it’s a little bit too stressful for his age</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This excerpt provides some additional insights into how Luis constructs the world of work. This brief description of his father creates the subject position of workaholic and the social practice of spending many hours in the workplace. Luis positions his father as powerful in his company and under a lot of stress because of this power.

A2: Luis, “my family’s not the richest”

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Do you want to tell me a little bit about this picture and why you took it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I took this picture because, to show that my family’s not the richest and we don’t live in the best neighborhood because I don’t want people to pick up the image like, the wrong image of me, like that um, I’m just that I was born with money, like, not born with it, but like family-wise, yeah,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>so I took this picture to kind of showcase how I’ve lived for the last eleven years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>mm-hmm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>so, I live in a kind of rough neighborhood, um, so that when I come to school I, I don’t want to imitate what’s going on in my, in my neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>What kinds of things are going on in your neighborhood that you don’t want to imitate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Like, people just walking, it’s not necessarily like people,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>most people I think would say like oh, doing drugs or gangs because of there’s, I haven’t seen drugs or gangs, but I’ve seen people like pull their pants down, like almost to the ground and then like, and then they act with aggression toward other people, that I don’t want to do.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this excerpt Luis constructs his family as “not the richest” and his neighborhood as rough.
VI. Constructing Everyday Bilingual Language Use: What’s normal? Who’s in charge?

In chapter V, we saw how the three salient discourses were used to construct the adult worlds of work and married life. In this chapter, I consider how they use the three discourses to construct everyday bilingual interactions with adults and peers.

Much of the data presented in this chapter support established understanding of bilingualism from prior research, which holds that bilinguals are used to fluid configurations language use in different contexts (Bialystok, 2001; Grosjean, 1989; 2010). For example, my conversations with these bilingual youth reveal sophisticated awareness that 1) drawing on both languages is part of everyday life, 2) language use is always context dependent, and 3) maintaining both languages requires work. The data presented here give breadth and depth to these topics commonly cited in bilingualism literature. They illustrate the richness, complexity and fluidity of bilingual learner’s lives and identities from the unique perspective of youth attending a dual language school.

However, my intention in this chapter goes beyond illustrating what we already know about bilingualism. My application of FDA as a lens for looking closely at my participants’ constructions of everyday language use affords a novel approach to this research on bilingualism. Rather than ask how they construct their own and others' language practices, my purpose in this chapter is to explore how the three
discourses of language in these constructions serves to shape possibilities for them in world-building and identity-building. Specifically, FDA expands our understanding of how discourses create certain subject positions, which in turn make available subjective experiences. This lens allows us to situate the accounts given by bilingual youth within a societal context which has shaped the discourses of language available to them to talk about their bilingualism. In other words, despite the fact that they have had the opportunity to attend a dual language school which honors their maintenance of two languages over an extended period of time, they still live within a broader US social context in which monolingualism is the norm and perceptions of bilinguals as two monolinguals in one predominate (García, 2014; Grosjean, 1989).

In this chapter, I explore excerpts from individual interviews and group discussions in which my participants discussed everyday interactions in their lives outside of school. These excerpts come from their rich descriptions in interviews of their photos of people or places where they use Spanish or English in their lives, as well as an extended group discussion of times when they felt more or less comfortable using each language.

**Spanglish as creativity or deficit**

Consistent with the translanguaging literature reviewed in chapter II, my participants frequently talked about drawing on both languages as a common part of their everyday language use. Furthermore, there were often moments when the omnipresence and normality of translanguaging stood in stark contrast to the
possibility of monolingual spaces. The following interaction, during a discussion with Yanelis about her home language practices, provides a clear example of this.

Excerpt 21: Yanelis, “only Spanish at home?”

11 JJ Ok. Are there times when you only speak Spanish at home?

12 Y (pause, furrowed brow) No. Like, what do you mean, like only speak Spanish?

Yanelis expresses confusion at the idea of moments when “only Spanish” would be used at home. After a pause, and my own attempt at trying to describe possible scenarios when people might use only Spanish, Yanelis switches the topic of conversation to describe her church, a Spanish-dominant space in her life.

Participants often referenced the term “Spanglish” in our interviews. When they did, I would ask them to explain more about what they meant or how they used it. For example, Perla said she likes to go back and forth between languages just for fun:

Excerpt 22: Perla, Sometimes I mix it up just for the fun of it

17 JJ Are there any like times when you use, when you switch into Spanish or switch into English?

18 P Sometimes I'm like talking about homework, or like if we're just doing it just to joke around, something, I don't know. Sometimes we'll just randomly switch. I'll be like, or speak Spanglish I'll be like "Hola yo voy al corner store and I wanna get some chips. Que tipo should I get?" Like, just like, sometimes I mix it up just for the fun of it, you know? Just because.

Perla’s example of playing with language is embedded in our conversation about how she uses language with her friends and family. She begins constructing language as utilitarian; her description of switching from one language to another is
related to getting a task done. She and Johnny both draw on a discourse of language as internal to construct the social practice of playing with language and mixing them together in novel ways. This discourse creates the subject position of creative and competent bilingual, which emphasizes their personal agency in choosing words from either language to play with.

Nora’s explanation of “Spanglish” demonstrates two common ways that participants framed instances of switching between languages. In this excerpt, Nora talks with admiration about a classmate, Isabella, who frequently uses Spanglish.

Excerpt 23: Nora, Spanglish

1  JJ  can you tell me about Spanglish?
2  N  (laughs) um, it’s kind of funny, because um, some people, like Isabella (Nora smiles, eyes light up) who’s in my class? she’ll use it all the time,  
3  cause like sometimes I think that some people use it because they can’t think of the right English words or just because they want to use it,  
4  but like she’ll (Isabella) be saying something like, sometimes it’ll just be a completely random, like there’s one word in English, the next word in Spanish, and the next word’s in English, and you’re just like “what?” (laughs with admiration) and it’s just like kind of weird and funny at the same time.

In line 3 Nora juxtaposes two ways that she explains Spanglish: when “they can’t think of the right English words or just because they want to use it.” Nora’s description of Isabella in lines 2 and 4 seem to provide an example of the latter. Nora’s use of language as internal positions Isabella as a creative bilingual who draws on her skills in two languages to produce fun language mixing that entertains her classmates and evokes their admiration. By contrast, in line 3 Nora also
describes how she sometimes interprets Spanglish as occurring when someone cannot remember the right word. In this case, the practice of language mixing is not constructed as part of the bilingual’s natural curiosity and playfulness, but as a deficit in word knowledge.

In this segment, we can see how the discourse of language as internal allows speakers to construct individuals as choosing which language to use and switching from one language to another as either based on lack of knowledge or based on the bilingual person’s own creativity, curiosity or enjoyment.

**Language Use as Context-dependent**

Like many bilinguals, participants in this study tended to think of language use as situated or contextual, in that people, place or activity shapes their language choices. For example, Johnny told me his language use “depends where I am. I don’t really mind, like people don’t really mind if I do something in English. If I’m somewhere in Spanish.” Similarly, Perla said, “I think just like for certain things I’ll use English and then for like different things I’ll use Spanish.”

Participants often associated a language with a particular activity: Johnny and Luis agreed that English was the language for video games and baseball, Nora similarly associated English with softball, camp and hip-hop classes. In some cases, language use was clearly associated with certain places and people: Yanelis associated Spanish with her grandmother’s house and church, Johnny uses Spanish with his friend’s mom or his older cousin, Luis uses English with his niece. An initial look at participants’ language maps and photos shows a general picture of language use breaking down in this way, according to activity or task, place, and people.
This is perhaps not surprising; indeed, the field has long understood that bilinguals tend to associate a particular language with a particular communicative context (Bialystok, 2001). This fact tends to be explained as the natural result of the accumulation of opportunities to use a given language with particular people, in a given place or for a given task or activity. However, my conversations with participants in this study reveal a more complex picture of the interactional nuances involved with navigating these spaces, and the ways that apparently monolingual spaces—Spanish only at church, English only at baseball—are actually sites of both complex language use and identity-building.

The use of inquiry tools from FDA allows me to tease out such complexities and explore more deeply how context can be understood as more than simply a backdrop within which languages are practiced and developed.

In bringing to life the ways that context came to bear on which language they used, participants re-constructed scenarios to describe typical interactions in certain places or with certain people in their lives. Participants’ use of a particular discourse of language in these scenarios makes available certain subject positions to the speaker or others in her account; these positions in turn make possible a finite set of social practices and subjective experiences of those practices. Such discursive constructions, laid bare through the methodology of FDA, provide windows into the ways that these young people construct everyday language use and their own obligations, responsibilities and agency to decide which language to use in interactions.
To illustrate this point, I draw on excerpts from my data related to generational differences in Spanish and English use. As has been shown elsewhere, my participants associated Spanish use with the older generation and English use with the younger generation (Alba & Nee, 2003). After providing a few examples to illustrate how generational differences in language use came across as a thematic pattern in these data, I then use FDA to analyze extended segments from two interviews. The FDA analysis peels back some of the layers of complexity in what we tend to think of as a fairly straightforward generational linguistic divide.

In each of the following excerpts, the social norm of using Spanish with the older generation and English use with peers or younger adults is clear.

Excerpt 24: Johnny, It depends who I’m with

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>So some people say oh, I think I would use more Spanish in my work, or more Spanish at home, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>I’d probably use more Spanish with, ah, see it depends who I’m with. Like if I’m with my grandma, I would talk in Spanish, my mom English, my sister English, my grandpa Spanish, my aunt span, no my aunt English.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above, Johnny’s description leaves little doubt that he associates Spanish with his grandparents and English with the next two generations. Below, Annie also describes using English with friends but Spanish with friends’ parents.

Excerpt 25: Annie, We speak more Spanish at their houses

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>were people talking different languages to each other? Or mostly one language? That day?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Um, I mean, we were probably speaking both.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Um, well, yeah, I mean when (my friends and I are) together I mean we speak more Spanish when I’m at</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
their houses, ‘cause their parents speak more Spanish. So like they speak Spanish to their parents and then so I’ll just like speak Spanish but at my house we all speak English to my mom. Maybe when we’re in my room or something we speak more Spanish, but

In my first rounds of coding I found repeated examples of this kind of generation-dependent use of Spanish or English. However, as I looked more closely at these segments I found that the generational divide was more complex than this, with kids sometimes choosing to use Spanish with their peers and adults sometimes tolerating or even requiring English use when interacting with youth or children.

For example, at one point Yanelis tells me that she used Spanish with her grandparents, but later she says they expect her to use English with them so they can practice for their GED. Another time while describing her most recent trip to the DR, Yanelis says:

Excerpt 26: Yanelis, They wouldn’t expect the English response

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>mm-hmm. Ok. And what about when you’re in the DR?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>I speak Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Only Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Yeah. Cause they’re not gonna understand me at all. ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Does your mom go with you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>No, like my, it was me, my sister, my aunt, and my grandparents. And they all spoke English, except for my grandfather and my grandmother, but yeah. Like, we could speak English ‘cause they understand. But like, they, we wouldn’t like expect the English response back, they would speak Spanish.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In each of these cases, Yanelis’ interactions with her grandparents and aunt
are revealed to be dynamic and layered, rather than clearly marked by generational (or other contextual) differences.

Another time while describing family gatherings on Sundays Johnny shares an extended description of his interactions with cousins.

Excerpt 27: Johnny, If the kids are talking, they usually talk in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JJ</th>
<th>So when everybody’s hanging out like your cousins are there and other people from your family are all there and you’re having pancakes and getting things ready, are people usually mostly speaking Spanish or English or both?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Well, if we’re talking, if like the kids are talking to each other they usually talk in English, or like my little cousin, the one that she does all dishes and everything, she thinks she’s like really big and old, not in a bad way but like, yeah, not like a bad way but she’s like, like, she talks to them in Spanish. And like she’ll be like “oh, like go do this, and like go get some more batter upstairs, go get some more eggs or bacon downstairs, and” (laughs) she like orders people around a lot, she’s like “go get it, go do it, go, go.” And they actually do it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Did you say she speaks Spanish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Yeah, she speaks Spanish and English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Uh-huh, so when she gives you orders does she say them in English or Spanish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>To me?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Both.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Johnny constructs English as the preferred code among the kids in his family, emphasizing their preference for English. Johnny’s detailed account of his unusual cousin in this segment provides insights into what is considered normal adult and kid behavior and the ways Spanish and English are related to these norms.

These examples illustrate how a generational divide both existed as a social norm for these participants and was also constantly being re-negotiated. In the next
section, I use FDA to analyze how two participants’ use of particular discourses of language to describe everyday language use with family and friends functions as part of their identity-building.

In the first excerpt, Yanelis has just told me about her extended family in various places. She periodically goes with her mother and younger sister to visit her mother’s two adult cousins, one in New York and the other in Florida.

Excerpt 28: Yanelis, cousins in NY and FL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IU 1</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>JJ</th>
<th>So, and then when you’re in New York staying at your cousin’s house, do you guys mostly speak Spanish or English?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Mostly English. Does anyone there in that part of the family speak mostly Spanish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Yeah, well, he speaks like equally both, but when he’s talking with my mom he speaks Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>But when he’s like talking with my sister, cause my sister’s like not that good at Spanish I guess, he talks to her in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU 2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Huh, and what about with you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>In English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Why does he speak to you in English?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>I guess he thinks it’s easier for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>But sometimes he like makes jokes in Spanish, and I’m like what? He can say like, I don’t know like some random joke in Spanish, and I look at him like what did you say? Like, did you just insult me? Like, yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU 3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>So you think he speaks English because it’s easier for you. Is it easier for you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Yeah, even though Spanish is my first language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Interesting. And then, what about Florida, do you go there sometimes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Yeah, I speak Spanish there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>You speak Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Yeah, ‘cause my cousin,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>I mean he’s good in English but like, well like, he’s not like, no, he’s decent in English. He understands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yanelis describes two scenarios in this excerpt; the first, at her cousin’s house in New York and the second in another cousin’s house in Florida. Her construction of each scenario draws on a discourse of *language as internal* in that Spanish and English are treated as an individual proficiency located in the speaker\(^{28}\). This discourse creates two subject positions: that of fluent bilingual and that of less proficient bilingual. In the first scenario, Yanelis positions her NY cousin as a fluent bilingual who “speaks equally both,” and herself and her sister as less proficient bilinguals because “my sister’s not that good at Spanish” and for Yanelis herself English is “easier.” The subject position of fluent bilingual makes possible the social practice of using Spanish for teasing or insulting because the less proficient Spanish speaker can be left out. This social practice puts the less proficient bilingual in a position of vulnerability to such exclusion.

In her second scenario, Yanelis describes a very similar situation; visiting another adult male cousin of her mother’s who is older than her. In this scenario, Yanelis herself is positioned as the relatively more proficient bilingual. However, rather than making available the social practice of teasing her older male cousin, this subject position requires Yanelis to accommodate him by using Spanish.

We can see how Yanelis carefully negotiates the discursive act of positioning her adult cousin as less competent than herself. Yanelis heads off possible claims

\(^{28}\) A discourse of *language as excluding* is also present but I have not taken this discourse up in my analysis. My goal is not to provide an exhaustive overview of all discourses of language but to highlight how such discourses function in interaction as part of ongoing identity-building and world-building processes which have real implications for creating possibilities for action and subjective experiences for these young people.
that she is disrespectful of his English with hedging phrases ("I mean," “well like,” “kind of”) and repeated expressions of appreciation for his English ("he’s good in English,” “he’s decent in English,” “he understands”). The repeated use of “but” and the juxtaposition of good/decent/understands with her final statement, “he doesn’t really speak it?” as well as the rising intonation, all have the effect of mitigating the discomfort of Yanelis’ message: that her adult cousin’s Spanish dominance requires her to use Spanish with him and not English. By carefully showing appreciation for his English skills, she avoids possible censure and positions herself as a person who is respectful of family. This is one example of how obligation and respect for adults are constructed as norms when Yanelis speaks.

In line 46, she concludes with two claims: first, that this cousin “doesn’t really speak (English)” and second, that she uses Spanish with him. Her use of “so” linking these two claims in line 46 constructs her Spanish use as a result of his lack of English proficiency. The social practice of switching to Spanish when the other person’s English is not as strong is constructed as a norm or given in this description. With this last line, Yanelis thus positions herself as both a fluent bilingual and as someone who fulfills her obligation to accommodate family members by using the language in which they are more competent.

Throughout this excerpt we can see how Yanelis is drawing on a discourse of language as internal in describing these mundane scenarios of navigating family language use. This contributes to her ongoing identity work of authenticating herself as a dutiful Dominican daughter who accommodates the language needs of adult family members.
I next turn to Annie, who similarly draws on a discourse of language as *internal* to describe two mundane scenarios in which she also navigates everyday Spanish and English use while interacting with close friends from the Espada School, as well as their adult family members.

In the first excerpt, she describes a photo of her and her best friend. She opens this segment by emphasizing their friendship, “we have like a really strong bond ... So we usually go to each others’ house, like yeah, she'll just decide, like ‘can I go to your house?’”

Excerpt 29: Annie, English with friends at my house

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IU 1</th>
<th>JJ</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>So here you were at your house, so were you speaking a little more English or Spanish or both?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IU 2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Well, it was just us two. And she knows that I like mostly speak English, so we were speaking English to each other. Yeah. Like if we’re talking about someone and like we’re like quoting them, we might, even if it’s like something they said in Spanish, then they’ll put it, we’ll put it in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Do you think it’s easier for her to speak English than it is for you to speak Spanish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>I think so. I mean like I can speak Spanish, but I get really pressured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>You get pressured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>If it’s like speaking out loud. If I read it on paper, it’s fine, but like if they’re like. One time, my friends asked me a question and I didn’t know what to say. Like, I had it in my head but I just, I don’t know I couldn’t say it out loud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IU 3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>OK, that makes sense. Um, I was just thinking about, ‘cause you said she knows it’s easier for you so she speaks English. I think, is that what you said? So, I was just wondering if it’s easier for her to speak English or Spanish. Do you have any idea?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>She, I mean like, she’s pretty like equal. She knows a lot of English, and she’s from the DR so she speaks Spanish. And her mom speaks Spanish to her. So like, she knows more Spanish and she speaks more of it, but she knows a lot of English too.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       | JJ  | 13      | Hmm. When you say she knows more Spanish, you think she knows more Spanish than English, or she knows more Spanish than
you know Spanish? When you say more what do you mean there?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>No, like at her house, like around, like with her family she speaks a lot more Spanish than English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>OK, I see what you mean.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annie’s use of a discourse of *language as internal* (as a skill or ability internal to the individual) creates two subject positions: fluent bilingual and Spanish learner. Annie positions her friend as a fluent bilingual who is “pretty equal” and who “knows a lot of English” and “knows more Spanish and speaks more of it.” She positions herself alternately as a Spanish learner who is better with reading and less proficient in “speaking out loud.”

Two possibilities for action are made available to Annie and her friends through these positionings. On the one hand, speaking Spanish is an option, but has the consequence of negative feelings for Annie (“I get really pressured”), or a breakdown the flow of communication because Annie “had it in my head but … couldn’t say it out loud.” On the other hand, they could speak English, which is not constructed as having negative consequences for Annie. Despite my prompting to consider the consequences for her friend, Annie constructs the use of English or Spanish as equally comfortable for her friend. Thus, in an encounter between a fluent bilingual and a Spanish learner, the use of English to accommodate the Spanish learner is constructed here as a normal social practice resulting in a sense of comfort for the learner.

In the next excerpt Annie describes going to her friend’s house.

---

29 This is not the only discourse of language evident in the text, but will be the focus of this analysis.
Excerpt 30: Annie at her friend’s barbecue

1 A Yeah, that’s me with my friends. That’s the two girls I spend a lot of time with them. That was this vacation. That’s at her house. We were outside like the whole day, in the stre—

2 JJ So you were at her house, but you were outside?

3 A Yeah, um they were having like a barbecue I guess? like lunch with hot dogs and hamburgers and stuff? but there was like Spanish music going on really loud I guess, and like I guess that’s what they do at, like around, she lives like in the projects.

IU 1

4 JJ Right.

5 A So, like there’s like everybody there is Latino. So they had like a lot of her friends that live like there over there, like they come over and there’s music and we rode her bikes around and we played the basketball and stuff.

IU 2

6 JJ So can you tell me a little bit about what languages were going on? You said there were a lot of people speaking Spanish around?

7 A Um, her dad would like ask me questions and I would answer in Spanish ‘cause I don’t think he knows English, but um yeah, but I would speak mostly English with them. Yeah.

IU 3

8 JJ And spanglish too, or just English?

9 A Um, I guess Spang... I don’t know. (laugh) Um, I don’t speak directly Spanish to them, but they’ll speak Spanish to each other, like they speak Spanish really fast to each other and I don’t think I can speak it that fast so I’ll just answer back, if they ask me a question in Spanish like I’ll answer back in English most of the time.

10 JJ So, when they speak Spanish, your friends speak Spanish to each other really fast like that do you feel pretty comfortable like you understand what they’re saying?

11 A Yeah, I understand what they’re saying.

In IU 1 Annie emphasizes her social bonds with her friends in lines 1 and 5, but also discursively distances herself from them and their world in line 3. She uses the word barbecue to describe the event at her friend’s house, but couches the term in hedging language (“like,” “I guess”) and uses rising intonation to express doubt, which shows the event only partly fits her definition of a barbecue. She then gives more detail: “lunch with hot dogs and hamburgers and stuff” seems to fit her idea of a barbecue. Her use of the word “but” signals that the loud Spanish music did not fit her expectations of a barbecue. Then she says “that’s what they do around [there],”
leaving ambiguous the meaning of who “they” is. It could be that “they” refers to her friend and her friend’s family, or to the two girls in the photo we’ve been talking about. However Annie later references “the projects,” and then says “everybody there is Latino,” indicating a more general “they.” She (and I) continue to refer to a general “they” or “them” in IU 2 and 3 as she describes navigating decisions about Spanish and English use.

Annie describes talking with her friend’s father, as well as with a general “them,” which presumably refers to this general group of Others which she has described earlier when she says “everybody there is Latino.”

Again her use of the language as internal discourse creates the subject positions of fluent bilingual for “them” and Spanish learner for herself. In this setting, positioning herself as a Spanish learner makes speaking only Spanish not a viable option because of her lack of ability to speak as quickly as others. This positioning creates the obligation for Annie to accommodate others’ use of Spanish by listening and understanding them and also provides her with an excuse for responding in English so that her slower Spanish does not interfere with communication. This positioning also normalizes the social practice of responding in English when spoken to in Spanish.

A third subject position is also created in this scenario. Annie positions her friend’s dad as Spanish dominant and not proficient in English, which in turn positions Annie as the relatively more proficient bilingual and creates the obligation for her to speak Spanish with him. Similar to Yanelis’ description of her interaction with the cousin in Florida, we see how this positioning also carries the obligation to
accommodate Spanish dominant adults during interactions regardless of the Spanish proficiency of the bilingual person.

In these two excerpts, the discourse of language as internal positions Annie as a Spanish learner and her friends and their families as fluent bilinguals, which in turn creates the expectation that others will accommodate or adapt to Annie’s language preferences. It may be that her repeated highlighting of her strong friendship with these friends is a discursive tactic meant to mitigate any judgment I may have as the interviewer upon hearing Annie describe how she uses mostly English\textsuperscript{30}.

Table 3. Accounts of everyday language use with adults and peers, showing 5 steps of FDA analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Discourse of language employed</th>
<th>Action orientation of the discourse</th>
<th>Subject positions made available</th>
<th>Social practices made available</th>
<th>Subjective experiences made available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annie</td>
<td>Language as internal</td>
<td>Used to explain using English</td>
<td>Fluent bilingual &amp;</td>
<td>Use of English among friends</td>
<td>Comfortable; neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yanelis</td>
<td>Language as internal</td>
<td>Used to explain Spanish use and show respect to adult male cousin</td>
<td>Less proficient Bilingual IU 3</td>
<td>Switching to Spanish when the other person’s English is not as strong</td>
<td>Obligated to accommodate adult family member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Used to justify English use with adult male cousin</td>
<td>More Fluent Bilingual IU 2</td>
<td>Teasing or insulting someone for not knowing Spanish</td>
<td>Having agency to choose which language to use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self as less proficient Bilingual IU 2</td>
<td>Being teased, needing to defend oneself</td>
<td>Exposure to vulnerability or exclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{30} After all, she knew me first as an assistant to her Spanish teacher.
The interactions described in Excerpts 28, 29 and 30 are summarized in Table 3. These interactions provide nuanced insights into how the stakes involved in navigating how and when to use which language are somewhat different for students like Yanelis and Annie. Yanelis positions herself more fluidly, occasionally as a Spanish fluent and other times as a Spanish learner depending on the communicative context. By contrast, Annie maintains a relatively fixed self-positioning as a Spanish learner in most of these contexts, which leads generally to feelings of pressure and the need for others to accommodate her as a learner.

My analyses suggest that there may be a pattern in the expectation of who is accommodated during such interactions among bilinguals. Whereas Yanelis was expected to accommodate her older family members’ expectations, in interactions with her friends’ family members Annie sometimes expected others to accommodate her based on her position as a Spanish learner. If such expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annie internal</th>
<th>with friend at Annie’s house</th>
<th>self as Spanish learner</th>
<th>in social situation as normal</th>
<th>consequences. When Spanish, she “gets pressured”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Used to justify avoidance of slowing down the flow of conversation with friend’s family</td>
<td>Fluent bilingual &amp; self as Spanish learner</td>
<td>Listening to Spanish and responding in English as normal</td>
<td>Others obligated to accommodate Annie; relief of pressure for Annie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used to explain Spanish use with friend’s father</td>
<td>Spanish dominant adult &amp; self as more proficient bilingual</td>
<td>Using Spanish when speaking with Spanish-dominant adult</td>
<td>Obligation to accommodate adult (friend’s father)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were to become habitual over time, this could contribute to a “thickening” of identities based on a person’s perceived first language rather than on their actual proficiency (Sook Lee et al., 2008). Such a pattern is discussed in the next section.

**Constructions of Spanish maintenance**

The social phenomenon of language shift, in which immigrant communities gradually lose the heritage language over three generations, has been well documented (Fishman, 1966; Wong Fillmore, 1991). By contrast to this predominant pattern, Tse (2001) documented protective factors which contributed to language vitality among a group of US-born bilinguals who were able to maintain their language. Tse defines language vitality as “the status and prestige of a language from an individual’s perspective as shaped by a host of social, political, cultural and psychological influences” (n.p.).

Typical of bilinguals, the youth participants in this study demonstrated a keen awareness of the hard work involved in maintaining two languages. In the excerpts analyzed here, I explore how the subject positions of L1 Spanish speaker (someone whose first language is Spanish) and L2 Spanish speaker (or Spanish learner) make available different social practices, leading speakers to emphasize either Spanish loss or Spanish maintenance and opportunities to practice. I further explore how responsibility for loss or maintenance is constructed.

Yanelis, Johnny, Luis and Perla all talked about Spanish as their “first language” or as the language they were more comfortable with earlier in life. Yanelis in particular repeated the phrase “Spanish is my first language” throughout our
conversations, nearly always juxtaposing this with recent examples of forgetting or stumbling when speaking Spanish now or her preference for English\textsuperscript{31}. Nora and Annie were clear that English was their first language and that they began learning Spanish when they came to the Espada school\textsuperscript{32}.

In my interactions with Espada teachers, they often referred to students as “Spanish dominant,” or “English dominant” or mentioned which language was their “first language.” Such labeling is commonly used in schools and it is not unusual for bilingual students grouped by their first language or identify their first language for a teacher (e.g., Fitts, 2006). In my analysis of the next few sections, I will show how such categorical positioning shapes possibilities for agency and for the subjective experience depending on the way the construct the practice of mixing or going back and forth between two languages. In some discursive contexts, this practice is described as forgetting and making mistakes, in others it is described as learning and practicing.

In the next two excerpts, Yanelis and then Johnny talk about how Spanish is their first language.

Excerpt 31: Yanelis, Spanish with future kids

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>And what about if you have children one day, do you think you’ll speak to your children mostly in English or Spanish or both?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>In Spanish, because I don’t want them to do the same thing that I did, like I kind of forgot my Spanish, even though Spanish is my first language,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>so I’ll like talk to them in Spanish more, and then like make them go to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{31} We saw another such example above in the excerpt related to her cousin in when she acknowledged that English is easier for her.  
\textsuperscript{32} At one point, Nora emphasized that “even though I never spoke Spanish until I came to this school, but I was still Puerto Rican.”
school for English I guess,

but like, make sure they don’t forget their Spanish.

Yeah? Why is that important?

Cause, like now, when I’m doing something,

like when I’m doing homework, and I’m like “how do you say dress in Spanish?” I remember I forgot that, my mother said, she goes “hello, it’s vestido,” I was like “oh, ok.”

So like, so they don’t I guess so they don’t forget or like, yeah.

Excerpt 32: Johnny, I learned Spanish first but I know English better

But when you’re playing video games or when you’re hanging out with your cousins or anything do you ever use any Spanish?

We always talk in English when we’re playing video games.

It’s a lot easier, like I like that I know Spanish, but I’m, well I learned Spanish first but I know English better. It’s weird, I don’t know why but, it’s just I learned Spanish first but,

I learned Spanish first, but then I know English, well I like speaking English better, like I’m more used to it and it’s more comfortable,

cause sometimes I get stuck with Spanish words. I’m like ahh, what’s that word, and I say it in English, like I did earlier.

In each of these excerpts, the speakers are drawing on a discourse of language as internal because language is constructed as something inside their heads, a word not known. This discourse requires each speaker to explain their loss of Spanish over time and creates the subject position of “first language (L1) Spanish speaker.” This subject position makes available the social practice of calling the lack of word knowledge “forgetting” or getting “stuck” because it is assumed that if Spanish was your first language then you must have previously known the word and then forgotten it.

Normalizing the notion that Spanish L1 speakers were at one point fully competent in Spanish creates the assumption that current gaps in proficiency are due to a process of forgetting or language loss, rather than, for example, the natural result of more opportunities to practice English than Spanish in certain contexts. In
this way, positioning themselves as L1 Spanish speakers also implies a personal responsibility for language loss.

The examples above contrast with Annie’s use of the *language as utilitarian* discourse in constructing her future Spanish loss once she transfers to junior high.

The abbreviated excerpt (presented in full in chapter V) is included again below.

---

**Excerpt 33: Annie, Future spouse/Spanish loss**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>So, if you get married one day, do you think you would want to marry a Latino person?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I don’t know. Um, it would depend if I still know Spanish. I mean I want to still know Spanish, but since I’m leaving the school and they don’t speak Spanish [there]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>They don’t speak Spanish at the school you’re going to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>There’s Spanish classes, but they’re not that great.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Right, so you think you might lose your Spanish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Not all of it, but most of it. (...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Do you want to learn another language?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Not really. I like Spanish. So if I had to choose a language to learn I would keep learning Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Keep learning Spanish. Do you have any plans to figure out a way to keep learning Spanish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Yeah, well in 8th grade at this school, you have to pick a language, but I would be in Spanish 1, which would be really easy for me, but if I was in Spanish 2 then I would have to be on the 9th grade schedule, which would be weird.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Her use of *language as utilitarian* creates the subject position of Spanish learner for Annie while also legitimating the school as the source of Spanish learning. By constructing the school as responsible for her language loss, Annie’s own agency to keep up her Spanish is diminished; thus, her response to my question in line 25 is a repetition of the school’s language teaching practices.

---

33 It could be that Yanelis’ emphasis on using Spanish with her own children implies some responsibility of her mother’s for her own Spanish loss, though this is not explicit. Regardless, the responsibility for language loss is personal rather than structural; the school or other institution is not blamed.
In all three excerpts above, the emphasis is on past or future language loss as a normal result of time. For Yanelis and Johnny, the subject position of L1 Spanish speaker constructs momentary shifts into using English as mistakes, for which they are personally responsible. For Annie, the subject position of Spanish learner constructs the school as responsible for Annie’s language loss.

By contrast, in the next segment, the use of a discourse of *language as connecting* highlights language maintenance and opportunities to practice rather than language loss and forgetting a word.

**Excerpt 34: Nora, keep up our Spanish at camp**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IU 1</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>JJ</th>
<th>Is there any other time that you use Spanish or English in front of people so that people don’t understand?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Um, not really. But it will be kind of fun when I go to camp because Frida is also going and like, at this camp like you can find maybe some like African American people or darker skin people but not many people can actually speak Spanish and I think I might be like up until now I might actually be the only Latina who is going, like when I went.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And so now Frida is going to go with me, and so we were talking about how it’ll be fun because then we can like keep up our Spanish (...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And, ‘cause like during the summer I never really ever get to keep up my Spanish because I’m often like visiting family or something and none of my family like really speaks Spanish and so like now it’s going to be nice because I can keep up my Spanish where I’ve never been able to actually speak anything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>That’s awesome. So, have you imagined, how do you think people will react to when you and Frida speak Spanish at camp?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Um, I think that they’ll be like interested and kind of curious like, how do we know that, and like how do we know each other? ‘Cause, there are like a lot of other people who know each other, but Fr-, especially like from camp and seeing each other before, but Frida’s never been to camp, and so it’ll be kind of interesting to say like yeah, she goes to my school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nora draws on a discourse of *language as connecting* throughout this segment by focusing on how Spanish will allow her and Frida to enjoy Spanish use together, and how it will spark curiosity with their peers. *Language as connecting* is also used to construct her use of English with her family, since they can not understand her if she uses English. This discourse positions Nora and Frida as unique and special Latinas, making possible the social practice of sharing their history and reinforcing Nora’s positive associations with being Latina. By contrast to the subject position of L1 Spanish speaker, this positioning emphasizes the girls’ agency to seek moments to practice Spanish together, rather than the loss of Spanish.

In these four excerpts, we have seen how drawing in different ways on the three discourses—language as *internal*, as *utilitarian*, and as *connecting*—positioned these speakers in different ways (as L1 Spanish or Spanish learner), resulting in either a focus on language loss or language maintenance. An emphasis on language loss constructed either personal or institutional responsibility for that loss, while an emphasis on maintenance constructed a sense of individual learner’s agency to seek opportunities to practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Discourse of language employed</th>
<th>Action orientation of the discourse</th>
<th>Subject positions made available</th>
<th>Social Practices made available</th>
<th>Subjective experiences made available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yanelis</td>
<td>Language as internal</td>
<td>Used to explain or justify</td>
<td>L1 Spanish speaker</td>
<td>Forgetting or getting stuck with a word</td>
<td>L1 speaker as blame-worthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish loss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annie
- **Language as utilitarian**
- **Used to shift responsibility for language maintenance to the school**
- **Spanish learner**
- **School scheduling constraints normalized**
- **Regret, appreciation of Spanish, L2 learner as not blame-worthy**

### Nora
- **Language as connecting**
- **Emphasizing social/ethnic bonds**
- **Latinas**
- **Seeking opportunities to practice Spanish together**
- **Ethno-linguistic identity as enviable, provoking curiosity among peers**

As mentioned in the review of literature, the usefulness of the concept of “first language” and the subject position “native speaker” is questionable in these contexts where hybrid languaging practices are the norm, both in and out of school. This analysis has provided some insights into the ways such positioning might make certain identities available more readily than others, and the implications for subjective experiences of such practices for language learners.

**Extended group reflection on subjective experiences of everyday language use**

So far we have seen how the subject positions of L1 Spanish speaker and Spanish learner, combined with different discourses of language, make available a variety of social practices related to language loss and maintenance. In this section, I analyze an extended group discussion in which all six participants had the opportunity to further explore this topic together. Analysis of their examples of negotiating Spanish use with others provides windows into the subjective and
emotional possibilities made available by social practices such as switching languages, forgetting a word, being corrected or insulted.

During this group discussion, I asked participants a series of questions aimed at getting them to talk about their feelings related to using Spanish and English. In response to each prompt, I ask them to locate themselves on a continuum between two positions—agree or disagree. The whole group discussion consisted of thirteen such prompts. Here I include analysis of three of these prompts: 1) “I never feel uncomfortable speaking Spanish,” 2) “I never feel uncomfortable speaking English,” 3) “I know enough Spanish now, so I don’t really need to keep studying it.” In my analysis, I first trace the use of language as internal (in IUs 1, 2, and IUs 5 through 13), then go back to the use of language as connecting/excluding (in IUs 3 and 4). The data are shown in their complete form, by discussion prompt.

Use of internal discourse to shape practices and subjectivities

In this section, I first describe how the discourse of language as internal creates the L1 Spanish and Spanish learner subject position. It further constructs as normal various social practices, such as: translating or helping others learn, speaking wrong, correcting and being corrected, saying a word in English as “not knowing” Spanish, being judged as “stupid,” falling behind in conversation, forgetting Spanish, and “messing up.” These social practices make available certain subjective experiences in the scenarios described: feeling comfortable or proud, feeling embarrassed, ashamed, feeling nervous or stressed when expected to perform well in Spanish, a heightened awareness of others’ expectations or one’s own obligation to “know more,” feeling silenced, avoiding being judged, wanting to
know more, and feeling overwhelmed or daunted by the impossibility of ever knowing it all. Again, the L1/L2 framework here has real implications that play out in these data, in sometimes problematic ways.

Excerpt 35: Group Prompt “Agree or disagree? I never feel uncomfortable speaking Spanish” (Yanelis, Perla and Annie disagree, Nora and Luis stay in the middle, Johnny agrees.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IU 1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>JJ</th>
<th>Ok, let’s start on this side. “I never feel uncomfortable speaking Spanish.” Johnny, what do you think? Are you ready to speak?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>So, I really don’t feel uncomfortable, because it’s like my first language, so it’s not hard for me, it’s easy. Like people actually learn from me. ‘Cause my friend will be like oh, what does that mean, and I tell him what that means, I have go home or eat or something.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>(Luis is physically moving back and forth between the middle and Disagree as Johnny is talking, finds a space between two desks, walks through it and walks toward the Disagree area, disappearing behind the shelf again, to show extreme disagreement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>So you don’t feel uncomfortable? Awesome,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>somebody who does feel uncomfortable? Yanelis, why don’t you start us?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>So, I have this friend, she’s like extremely Dominican like she was born there and she like speaks that good Spanish and sometimes I’m like, when I speak Spanish and I’ll say something wrong, like, not, like, I kind of feel embarrassed. Or like with my grandparents, like, I try to speak Spanish with them, and then, there was this one time, I was outside with my sister’s teacher and I tried to speak Spanish and all that just like went away, I’m like “necesito coger a ella para la foto, esto y lo otro,” and like my Spanish just went away, and I sounded like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>(nodding, inaudible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(nodding, inaudible)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(see analysis of IUs 4-5 below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IU 3</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>JJ</th>
<th>Nora Why are you in the middle?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Because, sometimes I feel fine speaking it, like in school ‘cause we all speak it, while, like if I’m at places not many people speak Spanish and I’m just speaking it to speak it, I feel kind of embarrassed because like it seems like I’m showing off kind of. So, I don’t want anybody to feel like oh, she’s a show-off.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pe</td>
<td>Ew</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the discussion of prompt 1, various subjective experiences are constructed as a result of the different social practices related to Spanish use. Johnny begins the discussion in IU 1 emphasizing his comfort speaking Spanish. This feeling of comfort
is made available through the social practice of translating for his friends who do not know Spanish and helping them learn. These social practices in turn are the result of the subject position of L1 Spanish speaker made available by the discourse of *language as internal*.

In IU 2, Yanelis describes her feelings of embarrassment, her nervous stuttering in Spanish, and the feeling that her Spanish “just went away.” Such subjective experiences result when she “tr(ies) to speak Spanish” and “say(s) something wrong,” particularly in the presence of stronger or more authentic Spanish speakers like her “extremely Dominican” friend, grandparents, or Spanish teacher. The discourse of *language as internal* in this segment thus makes available certain subject positions and social practices, which in turn create the possibility for embarrassment and stress. (Since IU 3 and IU 4 draw primarily on the connecting/excluding discourse, I return to them later in this section.)

In IU 5, Perla also describes feeling uncomfortable and ashamed, subjectivities made available by the social practice of being corrected by her grandfather. As with Yanelis’ scenario, the discourse of *language as internal* creates a subject position of less proficient L1 Spanish speaker for Perla, and strong Spanish speaker for her grandfather, which normalizes the social practice of correcting and being corrected. Being corrected leads to feelings of shame because being an L1 Spanish speaker carries with it the obligation that she “should know better Spanish.”
Excerpt 36: Group Prompt “Agree or disagree? “ I never feel uncomfortable speaking English”
(Perla and Johnny disagree, Luis moves to the middle and Yanelis, Annie, and Nora agree. Yanelis and Nora shift to the middle when Johnny talks in IU 7)

(see analysis of IU 6 below)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I’m never uncomfortable speaking English because like that’s what I’ve been speaking my whole life, and I know like good English. (looks at Yanelis) I know like supercali (stutters, repeats)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Supercalifragilisticexpialidocious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(overlapping with Yanelis) Supercalifragilisticexpialidocious means, yeah. From Mary Poppins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>What does it mean, then?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I don’t know. (Annie is sitting holding her knees on the chair, she lets go of her legs and almost falls off the chair here. All laugh, including Annie.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>What does that have to do with this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Um, because I know English GOOD. (“good” emphasized and pronounced with an edgy tone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Because you know English good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>And I’m never uncomfortable, except for, oh my god what is wrong with this? (acting as if she’s falling out of her chair again, she leans over an grabs onto Yanelis, who helps her back into the chair. Both smile.) Except for when my grandma corrects me, my English grammar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>She corrects your English grammar sometimes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>... somebody over on this side (near disagree sign), one of you guys?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>So, sometimes, like let’s say I’m speaking Spanish, then I don’t know how to say something, then, I feel that if I say it in English, I would get like embarrassed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Yes!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>So it’s like really embarrassing,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Awkward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>I’m like, “ah, sí, yo quiero usar la,” I’ll be like, ahhhh, and I’ll say it in English and I’ll be embarrassed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Mmm-hmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>That happens to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Y,</td>
<td>(Move to the middle as Johnny is talking, indicating a change in their positions.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Exactly!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Do you feel embarrassed in front of certain people, or in certain places, or? Like where, and,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>Sometimes I feel like my, my grandpa, like he’ll correct me,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I’ll be like oh, and I’ll just stop talking.

| IU 8 | 23 | JJ | Ok, Luis is in the middle, what do you have to say? |
|IU 9 | 24 | P  | I was gonna talk! |
|IU 8 | 25 | L  | Well, this is my point of view, but when I say something in Spanish to someone who speaks English, I don’t really feel embarrassed. I kind of feel like um, that I kind of feel like, Ok. |
| IU 8 | 26 | Jo | That’s not, that’s not what I’m saying. |
| IU 8 | 27 | Y  | (to Johnny) I know what you’re trying to say. Like, let’s say that I’m saying, puedo usar la, and then you’re trying to say, you want to say computadora but you say computer, you feel like, like, oh, I should know this, you’re embarrassed, |
| IU 8 | 28 | L  | Oh, oh, oh. |
| IU 8 | 29 | P  | That’s what I was gonna. |
| IU 8 | 30 | L  | Oh, that’s what I missed. |
| IU 8 | 31 | JJ | ... Perla if you’ve got something to say that’s different...? |
| IU 9 | 32 | P  | Well, it’s kind of different. Sometimes when I’m speaking English, and then somebody that I know, like some of my friends are like better at English than me, because I’m pretty fluent in English but some words I don’t know, sorry, and then, when they say a word I don’t know it’s kind of awkward because I want to ask them but I don’t want to sound stupid. Which makes it even more, like ohh, |
| IU 9 | 33 | Jo | (nodding) I agree with that. Like, it’ll be like, “oh my god I’m such a protagonist,” like what’s that? And that’s how (inaudible). Well, I didn’t know what it was, but then somebody said it and it took me a minute (inaudible) |

In interactional units 7 and 8 Johnny, Perla, and Yanelis continue to draw on a discourse of language as internal as they co-construct the embarrassment related to having to use English when they cannot think of the word in Spanish.

In IU 7, Johnny seems to have picked up on the theme of language loss from the previous discussion prompt, and now draws on a discourse of language as internal to construct his own Spanish proficiency. While he does not explicitly mention that Spanish was his first language in this segment, he indexes his Spanish proficiency through his use of Spanish phrases and his awareness of the awkwardness of not being able to think of the word in Spanish.

---

34 I return to IU 6 below. Though Annie also uses a discourse of language as internal, her discursive tactics merit separate analysis.
roots when he mentions interacting with his grandfather in line 22. Again, the
subject position of L1 Spanish speaker constructs the moment of switching from
Spanish to English as a lack of proficiency and the grandfather’s intervention as
“correcting.” This positioning silences Johnny and leads to feelings of
embarrassment. In response to Luis’ probing in IU 8, Yanelis provides a similar
eexample to Johnny’s in which she emphasizes her personal responsibility for
Spanish maintenance with “I should know this” in line 27.

Perla, and then Johnny, continue to draw on a discourse of language as
internal in IU 9 to emphasize their lack of proficiency in English. Positioning herself
as an English learner makes available the social practice of avoiding being judged as
“stupid” by peers and leads to silence for Perla. Not knowing words like
“protagonist” when his friends use them means that Johnny falls behind in the
communication: he says “it took me a minute” to catch up or figure out what was
being said.

Constructing language as internal in IUs 7, 8 and 9 brings the focus to
speaker’s lack of Spanish and then English proficiency. Throughout these group
interactions, maintaining language proficiency is primarily constructed as the
responsibility of the individual rather than that of the school or family. This makes
available the social practices of correcting, judging or even insulting and results in
feelings of embarrassment or shame when a word is not known. By contrast, we can
imagine how a different focus might position these speakers as learners and
construct these same moments as opportunities to learn a word in Spanish that is
already known in English, or to expand an already impressive bilingual vocabulary.
Excerpt 37: Group Prompt “Agree or disagree? I know enough Spanish now, so I don’t really need to keep studying it”
(All but Johnny move to Disagree; After everyone is on the Disagree side, Johnny also moves to that side)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J</th>
<th>Annie, speak.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>So, next year, I’m not going to be learning Spanish. I think I’m going to forget some of it ‘cause I don’t speak it anywhere else. And it’s like Lupe says in music, if you stop studying the notes then you’ll forget it. And so, yeah, but if I stop now I’ll probably remember, like know a lot for a couple of years like my brother, he went here but he doesn’t really like remember anything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>He doesn’t remember very well? Nora?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>It’s like (inaudible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Um, like last year in 5th grade, I, when the school year ended I was like I wonder why we still have Spanish class, I know so much, I’m so smart,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Who said that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>but it’s not anything, like I, I was thinking that, like it’s not any more I could possibly learn, there’s not that much, it’s not that much harder than English, and then I came here and I was like wow, I really don’t know that much, and so I just feel like there’s always more to be learned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Same, I agree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Agree, agree. Johnny, why are you way over next to the computer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>Because I really disagree a lot, because I can talk, I can have a conversation, but I can’t have a conversation without messing up, so there is a lot I need to know. Like what I said earlier, I mess up, I say words in English, and then I feel embarrassed, so I don’t want to feel embarrassed anymore. I’d like to learn as much Spanish as I can, as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Ok, Yanelis, last word on this one?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>So, I think that, no matter as much, like, I can’t say the words right. Like, no matter how much you think you know, like, even though you think that you know the most, like you know the most that you can, you know everything about it,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>you still don’t know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>(to Luis) yeah, you still don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>It’s like, it’s like, oh, I beat this entire game, but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>(to Luis) Oh, I have a good example. Ready?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Ready. (turns to her)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>So, Justin Bieber said that, someone told him that he was a good dancer, he said, and then the guy said do you think you need to improve? He said that I think I’m a good dancer but I think I do need to improve because Michael Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>didn’t stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>didn’t stop, exactly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I saw that too.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout the discussion of Prompt 3, participants draw primarily on a discourse of language as internal, constructing language as something that can be forgotten (line 2), as knowledge that makes one smart (5), or as an ability that can
be improved (10, 12-14, 18) to talk about the topic of improving their Spanish. These constructions have different implications for speaker’s agency in working toward better Spanish.

In IU 10, Annie positions herself as an L2 Spanish learner, emphasizing this point with the story of her brother, who forgot his Spanish. She locates the responsibility for Spanish maintenance on the school when she says “I don’t speak it anywhere else (besides school).” By constructing Spanish loss as normal in her family and constructing the school and not herself as responsible for her Spanish, she excuses herself for the fact that she also expects to forget it.

Nora also positions herself as an L2 Spanish learner in IU 11, but emphasizes her own agency in learning more. By juxtaposing what she thought she knew in fifth grade with realizing how much she still needs to learn in sixth grade, Nora constructs language learning as a process of growth and positions herself as able to improve incrementally.

In IU 12, Johnny constructs the act of saying English words as “messing up” and positions himself as “need(ing) to know” more. He also positions himself as having the agency to improve, saying “I’d like to learn as much Spanish as I can.”

Finally, in IU 13, Yanelis and Luis co-construct themselves as never able to know all the Spanish they might like to. Luis gives the example of gaming: “it’s like, oh, I beat this game but,” implying that there is always another, harder game out there. Yanelis gives the example of Justin Bieber and Michael Jackson who may have been great dancers but believed in always working to improve. In these constructions, Nora, Johnny, Yanelis and Luis co-construct a sense that Spanish
learning or mastery is a daunting task that can sometimes feel overwhelming but is also a goal toward which you can work.

In summary, in this analysis I have traced how the discourse of language as internal creates the subject positions of Spanish speaker and Spanish learner, which in turn normalize a variety of social practices and makes available certain subjective experiences for my participants during everyday bilingual interactions.

### Table 5: Social practices and subjective experiences made available by the *language as internal* discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject positions made available</th>
<th>Social Practices made available</th>
<th>Subjective experiences made available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 Spanish Speaker</td>
<td>• Translating</td>
<td>• feeling comfortable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Helping others learn</td>
<td>• feeling proud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Speaking wrong</td>
<td>• feeling embarrassed or ashamed,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish learner</td>
<td>• Correcting and being corrected</td>
<td>• feeling nervous or stressed when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Saying a word in English as “not knowing” Spanish</td>
<td>expected to perform well in Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Being judged as ‘stupid’</td>
<td>• a heightened awareness of others’ expectations or one’s own obligation to “know more”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Falling behind in conversation</td>
<td>• feeling silenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Forgetting Spanish</td>
<td>• avoiding being judged wanting to know more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Messing up</td>
<td>• feeling overwhelmed or daunted by the impossibility of ever knowing it all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annie’s unique use of the internal discourse**

I now return to Annie’s participation in IU 6. Like many of her peers, Annie draws on a discourse of *language as internal* when she says “I know English good” and mentions her grandmother correcting her grammar. She positions herself as an L1 English speaker when she says “I’ve been speaking my whole life.” This
positioning makes available the possibility of using big vocabulary words and allows Annie to feel comfortable speaking English.

However, something else is going on in this interactional unit. My initial reaction to what I interpreted as silly theatrics and a lack of serious consideration of the topic was to dismiss Annie’s contribution. Upon later reflection and repeated viewing of the video from this interaction, I realized that various contextual cues point to reasons why Annie suddenly felt the need to recite a song from Mary Poppins and fall out of her chair twice.

Closer analysis of Annie’s glance at Yanelis in line 1, their joint recitation of “Supercalifragilistic-expialidocious,” and her leaning on Yanelis in line 9 are all strong displays of a social connection with Yanelis. Her shift from “I know like good English” in line 1 to “I know English GOOD” in line 7 also stands out in that her pronunciation of “good” in line 7 is spoken with an edgy, almost pretentious way, which is reminiscent of the way that Yanelis often speaks. All of these cues in her talk point to an emphasis on her similarities and connections with Yanelis.

I posit that these interactional tactics serve to mitigate feelings of discomfort for Annie. Two possible sources of discomfort are evident in the data. First, Yanelis has just described her sense of shame related to forgetting Spanish, which she has constructed as her first language. By emphasizing her own comfort with English and constructing it as her first language, Annie draw a parallel scenario to that of Yanelis in which Annie has been successful in maintaining her own first language but Yanelis has not. The subject positions of L1 English speaker and L1 Spanish speaker are constructed within this conversation as parallel, and the discourse of language
as internal constructs each subject as individually responsible for their own language maintenance. Within this construction of the world and themselves, we can see how Annie is moved to emphasize her social bonds with Yanelis.

Second, as the only decidedly Anglo member of this group, and as a minority at this school, Annie’s identity frequently became the object of discussion, particularly during this group activity (This occurred in separate segments not analyzed here). For example, while discussing why they frequently switch to English during Spanish time, an extended conversation ensued about how Annie had received an award for her Spanish during the annual middle school awards ceremony. While talking about whether they considered themselves Latino, several students positioned Annie as “partly Latina” and engaged in lengthy conversation about why. Later, Perla argued at length for why Annie could be Latina but not Hispanic. Such moments emphasize Annie’s difference from her peers, and over time it makes sense that she would seek to de-emphasize the distance between her and her peers by creating moments to emphasize their similarities and social bonds.

Use of the connecting/excluding discourse to shape practices and subjectivities

The units analyzed so far have all been interactions in which speakers drew on a discourse of language as internal. I now return to IUs 3 and 4, in which Nora and Luis draw on a discourse of language as connecting/excluding to construct scenarios where they felt uncomfortable speaking Spanish. These IUs are copied from above:
Nora Why are you in the middle?

Because, sometimes I feel fine speaking it, like in school ‘cause we all speak it, while, like if I’m at places not many people speak Spanish and I’m just speaking it to speak it, I feel kind of embarrassed because like it seems like I’m showing off kind of. So, I don’t want anybody to feel like oh, she’s a show-off.

So, sometimes you feel comfortable, sometimes you don’t

Yeah, but like mostly I feel comfortable ‘cause like I’m around, most times when I speak it I’m around people who actually know it, who if I speak it, like around people that like, don’t really speak it that much, then I feel like, it seems like I’m showing off, almost like, oh I can speak Spanish, so

Interesting, … Luis, something different?

Yeah, it feels like, because I don’t like talking to people outside, like in public, because the reason is because

Yeah, I don’t like, well, I don’t like speaking in general, so it’s like when, like Xbox for example I wouldn’t talk Spanish, right? And there are these things called parties and everybody in the party would be like aaah, somebody’s speaking Spanish, and they say, “shut up you Mexican,” and they’re like “what’s wrong with Mexicans,” and you, it’s like, and then I just, just stopped talking because I don’t know what to say.

Ok, so this was a time when you were on Xbox and somebody spoke Spanish and somebody else insulted them.

No, no, no, I spoke Spanish, and then the people in the party tried to talk Spanish and then they were like “shut up you stupid Mexican.”

Ok, so that felt, so that didn’t feel comfortable to you.

Yeah, so then I just stopped talking. No, I kicked them from the party.

You’re kicked!

In IU 3, Nora constructs a scenario different from those described above but which also results in embarrassment and a heightened awareness of how others perceive her. Nora’s construction relies on an assumption of the social norm of using the language with which people around you are most familiar, which is made available through the discourse of language as connecting/excluding. The use of
Spanish around people who do not know it is constructed as a breach of this norm.

Nora positions herself as a Spanish learner; by choosing to speak her second language “just ... to speak it,” she legitimates the perception that she would be “showing off.”

Indeed, it is only from the Spanish learner subject position that Spanish use can be constructed as showing off. This construction of Spanish as showing off relies on the assumption that Spanish knowledge is enviable and that bilingualism is enrichment or exceptional.

By contrast, as we have just seen for Yanelis, Johnny and Perla the position of L1 Spanish speaker constructed bilingualism as an obligation or taken-for-granted fact. The discourse of language as connecting/excluding further allows Nora to align herself with her school community, where shared languaging practices allow her to feel comfortable.

The scenario described in IU 4 by Luis results in his feeling silenced and the need to retaliate against his virtual gaming opponents. Drawing on a discourse of language as connecting/excluding, Luis describes a similar norm as that expressed by Nora: there is an established social norm during the Xbox parties that “I wouldn't talk Spanish, right?” (line 20). Luis thus legitimates his own use of Spanish as a breach of that norm, positioning himself as noncompliant with the community’s expectations. This positioning further normalizes the practice of language monitoring by his fellow players, who first imitate his use of Spanish and then say,

---

35 In a previous discussion, Johnny and Luis have explained to me that English is the norm in the gaming world and that they never use Spanish for talking about video games.
“shut up you stupid Mexican” (line 22). The result of this language monitoring is Luis’ silence; he repeats twice, “I just stopped talking.”

However, in line 24, Luis shifts his footing, possibly to save face in the group setting. Stating “No, I kicked them from the party” serves to delegitimate his peers’ actions and re-position Luis with the authority to kick them out of the game.

In each of these two Excerpts, the discourse of language as connecting/excluding normalized the social practice of using the language people around us are most familiar with and the related practice of monitoring others’ language use to ensure that this norm is followed. For Nora, violating this norm brought with it the risk of being judged by others as “showing off.” For Luis, it meant being insulted and excluded from the community of video gamers. The question of stake comes up again here.

The table below summarizes the positioning, practices and subjectivities made available by these two students’ use of language as connecting/excluding in their constructions of everyday language use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject positions made available</th>
<th>Social Practices made available</th>
<th>Subjective experiences made available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish learner</td>
<td>• using language that those around you are most familiar with as expected social norm</td>
<td>• subject to moral judgment for breach of social norm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• using Spanish around people who don’t know it as “showing off”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>• established social norm in</td>
<td>• feeling silenced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Positions, practices and subjectivities made available by the connecting/excluding discourse when talking about everyday language use.
**Speaker**

- Xbox parties to not talk Spanish
  - use of Spanish as breach of social norm
  - language monitoring as accepted practice
  - imitating and insulting noncompliant player (who uses Spanish)
  - stop talking
  - feeling the need to retaliate by kicking opponent out of the game

---

**Discussion**

In this chapter, I have analyzed the various ways that youth participants talked about their everyday language use, describing scenarios in which they use Spanish or English or a mix of both with different people in their lives. Participants primarily drew on a discourse of language as internal, treating language as something inside their heads, as related to word recall, or as an individual proficiency or skill. In some instances, language as connecting/excluding was also used, treating language as a way of fostering relationships or drawing barriers between people. Drawing on FDA, I have shown how these different discourses carry with them a focus on different social practices: *language as internal* created a focus on Spanish loss in several instances, while *language as connecting* led to a focus on language maintenance and opportunities to practice Spanish for Nora. These discourses further made available particular subjective possibilities such as embarrassment and discomfort, or pride and creative expression.

Drawing on Bucholtz and Hall’s interactional identity-building tactics, I have explored some of the ways that participants’ use of these discourses contribute to
their ongoing identity work. For example, positioning themselves as L1 Spanish speakers allow Yanelis, Johnny and Perla to authenticate themselves as Dominicans, a subject position which carried social norms of obligation and responsibility with some emotional consequences. Positioning herself as a Spanish learner excuses Annie for using English with her friends and their families, while also creating space for her to feel comfortable in Spanish-dominant spaces. For Nora, the same Spanish learner positioning carries with it the social norm of seeking opportunities to practice as long as she is not excluding others, which would be perceived as “showing off.” These and several other examples provided in this chapter paint a picture of the real consequences that deployment of different discourses of language has for identity construction for these young people when talking about everyday language use scenarios.

Although translanguaging—fluid use of both languages—was a normal practice in their everyday realities, participants did not construct their identities as fluidly. Rather, they tended to construct L1/L2 subject positions for themselves and others, with varying consequences. García (2009) has proposed the term “emergent bilingual” as a category to replace L1/L2 labels. This proposal goes well beyond simply introducing a new label for bilinguals; it requires a paradigm shift. Rather than constructing bilingual education as a linear movement from L1 to L2 (or the equally linear adding L2 on top of L1) this proposal constructs it as a dynamic process of drawing on two languages as linguistic resources which are always available and shifting. Such a paradigm shift constructs languaging practices such as borrowing a word from one language when talking another language as normal,
rather than as forgetting, getting stuck, or making a mistake, and language use as always context-dependent. The data presented in this chapter support the claim that such a shift has real implications for world-building and identity-building work of bilingual youth in dual language programs. For example, I came away from the group discussion analyzed above with a sense of futility about language maintenance. Yanelis’ words, “no matter how much you think you know ... you still don’t know,” and Johnny’s statement “I can’t have a conversation without messing up,” both illustrate a sense of defeat in the face of the daunting expectation of maintaining their Spanish.

Mindset interventions have been used successfully to provide youth and their teachers with discursive alternatives to fixed notions of learning (Rattan, et al, 2015). The findings analyzed here beg the question of whether similar interventions might provide bilingual youth with different ways of talking about bilingual language maintenance.

It has been noted that investing in Spanish language learning has different identity implications for young people from different ethnolinguistic backgrounds in dual language schools (Palmer, 2008; Potowski, 2005). Indeed, my analysis supports the notion that the stakes for Spanish maintenance are qualitatively different for those positioned as L1 Spanish speaker versus Spanish learner. In my review of literature, I described Sook Lee and colleague’s (2008) finding that Spanish dominant students may tend to be expected to accommodate English speakers more often than the other way around in dual language settings. These authors pointed to various examples in which speakers’ “thickening” linguistic identities as either L1
English or L1 Spanish speakers were reinforced by the school’s policy of separating languages by teacher and classroom. Several examples of such identity thickening are suggested in my analysis and would be worth exploring further in future research. For example, I compared Annie’s self-positioning as a Spanish learner—which normalizes the social practice of her friends and their families accommodating her—with Yanelis’ self-positioning as L1 Spanish speaker—which obligated her to accommodate her adult family members’ language preferences.

Language monitoring and correcting someone’s use of a language other than the language of instruction was a common practice at the school. I also observed that participants frequently monitored one another and their own language use during our group discussions. For example, during discussions in Spanish, participants would point out when someone used English or they would call out “en español!” to indicate they should switch to Spanish. The literature suggests that it is not uncommon for peers in dual language schools to engage in such language monitoring practices (Sook Lee et al., 2008; Hadi-Tabassum, 2006). Yet the process of normalizing of this social practice of language monitoring may have implications outside of school as well, particularly in a case like Luis’ where such a practice is used to insult and exclude him from a favorite activity.

With these limited data, I can not claim that the L1/L2 subject positions are the only or necessary result of the language as internal discourse, or that pride in language use is the natural result of a discourse of language as connecting. Such claims are well beyond the scope of this study. It is possible that similar discussions on such topics might result in a different set of discourses of language and
deployment of those discourses, with another group or even with the same group at a different moment in time. Nevertheless, my analytic approach combining FDA and sociocultural linguistics provides a unique lens for understanding how discourses of language can shape possibilities for identity-building and world-building. Although the particular findings of language ideologies and how they are leveraged by these young people may not apply to other groups or other schools, the methodological approach to looking at such processes can be reproduced and may result, in the long run, in providing the field with a more general understanding of the kinds of language ideologies prevalent among bilingual youth at different kinds of dual language schools.
VII. Constructing the Relationship Between Language and Ethnicity

The relationship between language and ethnicity is complex and has been a central area of interest among sociolinguists for decades. Early work by Labov (1966, 1972) made the link between language and ethnicity clear, showing how language is a marker of ethnicity, strongly correlated with linguistic variation across groups.

From a linguistic perspective, a language variety or a language is never identified completely with a certain ethnicity (Baugh, 2000; McWhorter, 2000). Yet researchers have shown how speakers’ use of linguistic variation often functions socially as an index for ethnic or racial identities in interactional contexts. In other words, since racial and ethnic categories are socially constructed, variations in language use often function as an index or social signal that leads people to make assumptions about a speaker’s ethnic identity. For example, Bailey (2000) found that the use of Spanish by second-generation Dominicans served to counter assumptions that they are African American. Bucholtz (2001) similarly described how superstandard (or hyper-correct/academic) English used by self-described “nerds” (who identify as highly intelligent and interested in academic pursuits), served to emphasize their whiteness and allowed them to distinguish themselves from their black peers.

As mentioned in Chapter 2, Irvine and Gal (2000) define language ideologies as “the ideas with which participants and observers frame their understanding of
linguistic varieties and map those understandings onto people, events, and activities that are significant to them” (p. 35). These studies provide opportunities to see how predominant language ideologies shape our assumptions about the relationship between language and ethnicity, as well as they unique ways that young people talk back to such ideologies and construct alternatives to predominant assumptions about this relationship. Riley (2014) refers to the taken-for-granted assumption of a relationship or association between language forms and ethnic or cultural identities as “ethnolinguistic ideologies” (p. 497), a term which I adopt in my discussion here.

While we might expect middle school youth in mainstream schools to reproduce such ideologies, previous work which has looked at youth interactions and identity-building work in multi-ethnic, multi-lingual spaces provide rich examples of alternative ideologies. In her study of older elementary students in an ethno-linguistically diverse neighborhood, Kromidas (2011) showed how immigrant youth positioned themselves and their peers in ways that re-defined notions of difference across racial and ethnic lines. Drawing on racial formation theory, Kromidas shows how, rather than reproduce alienating notions of racialized identities, these young people co-constructed alternative identities which crossed and mixed such notions. In his work with multi-ethnic immigrant youth at a high school in the UK, Rampton (1995) showed how the practice of language crossing—moments when youth “borrowed” from their peers language varieties in novel ways during interactions to signal aspects of their identities and break down traditional notions of social and cultural grouping. Finally, in his work with immigrant youth of color at a high school, Paris (2011) showed that AAVE, Spanish and Pacific islander
languages were used as social and identity-building tools among bilingual and bi-
dialectical youth. AAVE was widely accepted as a shared resource across ethnic
groups, while other languages were frequently used to position people as insiders or
outsiders to social groups. These studies combine ethnographic and discourse
analytic tools to explore a youth perspective on ethnolinguistic and sociocultural
identities, centering youth voice by exploring both how language use serves as a
marker of identity as well as how notions of language, culture and ethnicity are
explicitly talked about among youth.

In a methodological pilot in which I analyzed a different set of data from this
study, I showed that participants in this study drew on four discourses to construct
ethnic identity (Jacobs, 2014). These discourses of ethnicity include: *ethnicity as
roots* (based on family background/ heritage), *ethnicity as history of participation*
(based on one’s relationships and participation in a Latino community), *ethnicity as
birthplace* (based on one’s own birthplace or that of one’s parent) and *ethnicity as
language* (language as marker or proof of ethnic identity). In group interactions,
*roots* emerged as the most salient and dominant discourse of ethnicity. I also
showed that participants had emerging notions of what ethnicity is; none were
familiar with the term but all spoke of a sense of belonging to a larger ethnic group
based on parents’ national, cultural or religious origins.

In this chapter, I provide a more in-depth exploration of the discourses of
language they used to construct the relationship between language and ethnicity,
and the ways these discourses were used in different ways for identity-building and
world-building. I contribute to the above literature by providing a case study of how
youth in one dual language cohort construct this complex relationship between language and ethnicity. The perspective of these dual language middle school youth is of particular interest given their unique schooling experience in a setting which prioritizes relatively equal treatment of both Spanish and English.

In moments when participants constructed the relationship between language and ethnicity, I found that the primary discourse of language used was language as connecting/excluding, though other discourses of language sometimes play a part in these constructions. Embedded in the discourse of language as connecting is the assumption that languages are shared by groups of people, who are able to build relationships and understand one another better as a result of their common language. The opposing binary, language as excluding, carries with it the assumption that people who do not share a language will not connect and that the absence of a common language leads to divisions, barriers, or exclusion. Given these orientations, it is not surprising that this discourse would be the primary one functioning in moments when participants spoke about ethnicity and its relationship with language.

I found three discursive patterns in the ways participants constructed the relationship between language and ethnicity. First, speakers sometimes constructed language and ethnicity as overlapping or as indexing one another. These constructions tended to be subtle and not emphasized, suggesting an ethnolinguistic ideology or implicit set of assumptions. Second, at other times speakers explicitly emphasized a distinction between language and ethnicity. In most instances of this discursive pattern, participants highlighted this distinction and engaged in
explaining or justifying why Spanish was not actually required for being Latino\textsuperscript{36}, for example. The primarily explicit nature of this discursive pattern suggests that my participants were talking back to a deep-rooted ethnolinguistic ideology, finding novel ways to re-construct the relationship between language and ethnicity as distinct and not wholly overlapping. Finally, I noted a third discursive pattern unique to Luis, whose explicit de-emphasis on the distinction between language and ethnicity served a larger world-building purpose. While this pattern seems to overlap with the first one, I treat it as unique. By lumping language and ethnicity together and highlighting their distinction from a broader approach to caring human relationships, Luis constructed a world in which ethnic and racial categories were less important. Constructing such a world allowed Luis to take up a subject position of connector between himself and his friends from various nationalities.

In this chapter, I provide examples of each of these three discursive patterns of the construction of language and ethnicity. In describing the first two patterns, I explore the significance of implicit versus explicit talk about these relationships, as well as the particular salience of the second discursive pattern in group discussions. In my discussion of the third pattern, I describe how Luis’ unique construction of language and ethnicity serves his own particular world-building and identity-building, and consider some of the practical implications of what happens when a

\textsuperscript{36} In this chapter I use the terms Latino and Anglo to capture two pan-ethnic categories, each of which includes a variety of cultural and national backgrounds. See Perry (2007) for a discussion of the invisibility of white racial identities, and Pew Hispanic Center (2012) for a discussion of the various ways that the terms Hispanic and Latino versus national origin or other labels are used among heritage Spanish speakers in the US.
unique or novel discourse conflicts with a shared discourse during group interactions.

**Reproducing & talking back to ethnolinguistic language ideologies**

The first discursive pattern, the construction of language and ethnicity as overlapping, was the most salient and perhaps the most difficult construction of this relationship to capture because speakers often indexed ethnicity in implicit and subtle ways. For example, in the following excerpt (taken from a longer group discussion analyzed later in this chapter), Perla’s positioning of Annie relies on the implicit assumption of a relationship between speaking Spanish and appearing Latino.

**Excerpt 38: Perla positions Annie as not appearing to speak Spanish**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Annie, where are you? What’s your thought on this one?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I agree (that you can be Latina and not speak Spanish) ‘Cause my neighbor is Puerto Rican but she doesn’t speak Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Ok. (...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Around YOU (turns to Annie, leans toward her as she speaks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By positioning Annie as someone her Puerto Rican neighbor would not speak Spanish with, Perla draws on an assumed ideology that language and ethnicity are interconnected. Such subtle interactional moments occurred frequently in group interactions.

---

*Note that in this interaction, Annie is explicitly constructing language and ethnicity as distinct and separate, which is part of the second discursive pattern discussed below. Here, my intention is to draw the reader’s attention to what Perla is doing in line 38.*
The most common way that language and ethnicity were constructed as the same thing is when participants responded to a question about language by talking about ethnicity, or vice versa. We have already seen several examples of this above. In Excerpt 16 (Annie’s Future Spouse), Annie responds to my question about whether she would want to marry a Latino person by talking about losing her Spanish. In Excerpt 27, Nora responds to my question about language use by talking about the race and ethnicity of people at camp.

I use the following excerpts from Annie’s and Yanelis’ interviews to describe the first discursive pattern, and some of the ways that the association between language and ethnicity was predominantly constructed as a given by my participants.

**Excerpt 39: Annie, “Since I’m Caucasian … people might judge me”**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>If I’m with a group of my peers and there are people that don’t speak Spanish, I feel comfortable speaking Spanish in front of them. ... Agree or disagree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I have to say something. So, since I am Caucasian and people wouldn’t think that I know Spanish, I don’t know, if they like see me talking Spanish, they might like, I don’t know, like judge me or something. I don’t know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>You think they would judge you more because you’re Caucasian?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Yeah. ’Cause they’ll be like, “oh, why is she speaking Spanish?” Not judge me, but they like might question me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By positioning herself as Caucasian, Annie legitimates others’ authority to question her use of Spanish as not authentic or genuine. Her construction relies upon the assumption that certain physical characteristics are associated with language use; more specifically, that what she terms “Caucasian” racial or ethnic background is associated with English use and Latino background is associated with Spanish use. Annie’s construction erases the reality that these groupings actually are much more fluid in the world; subject positions such as light-skinned Latinos, black
or Asian Spanish speakers, or Latinos who speak only English, are simply not made available in this construction. By highlighting the one-to-one association of English = Caucasian/Anglo and Spanish = Latino, Annie creates a narrow set of possibilities for action for herself: she can either adhere to this social expectation based on her ethnic identification and speak English, or disrupt the norm and suffer what she constructs as others’ legitimate judgment of her for speaking Spanish.

Excerpt 40: Yanelis, “I kind of feel embarrassed”

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>I never feel uncomfortable speaking Spanish. Agree, disagree. (...) Somebody who does feel uncomfortable? Yanelis, why don’t you start us?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>So, I have this friend, she’s like extremely Dominican like she was born there and she like speaks that good Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>and sometimes I’m like, when I speak Spanish and I’ll say something wrong, like, not, like, I kind of feel embarrassed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Or like with my grandparents, like, I try to speak Spanish with them, and then, (throws hands up, shivers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>there was this one time, I was outside with my sister’s teacher and I tried to speak Spanish and all that just like went away, I’m like (switches to a staccato, non-fluent rhythm with awkward pauses between words) “necesito, coger, a ella para la foto, esto y lo otro,” and like my Spanish just went away, and I sounded like x—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this Excerpt, which we also saw in the previous chapter, Yanelis constructs “good Spanish” as central to being Dominican, giving the examples of her “extremely Dominican friend,” grandfather, and teacher as people whose good Spanish proves their genuine Dominican identity. Like Annie, Yanelis constructs a one-to-one relationship between Spanish language and Dominican ethnicity/culture. By legitimating this taken-for-granted relationship, Yanelis makes certain possibilities for action available to herself: speaking correct or fluent Spanish authenticates her as genuinely Dominican, while saying “something wrong” or speaking less fluently positions her as less authentic and results in feelings of embarrassment or
frustration. In each of these and myriad other instances, participants constructed the relationship between Spanish language and ethnicity as a taken-for-granted fact.

In all of these examples, a discourse of language as connecting/excluding positions speakers as insiders or outsiders to ethnic groups and legitimates certain social norms within these groups.

At other times, participants drew on language as connecting/excluding to construct their complex ethnolinguistic identities in ways that explicitly emphasized a distinction between Spanish language and Latino ethnic identity. By constructing language as not a requirement for ethnic authenticity, and vice versa, they disrupted this taken-for-granted relationship. In the next set of examples, I provide evidence from two interviews and an extended group interaction to explore the second discursive pattern and how my participants talked back to this pervasive ethnolinguistic ideology.

In the next segment, Johnny describes what it is like for him to be a US-born Dominican, navigating cultural expectations in the DR and US. He distances himself from certain aspects of Dominican culture and behaviors, while simultaneously highlighting the ways he finds to connect with people who share his family's heritage.

Excerpt 41: Johnny, Being Bicultural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IU 1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>JJ</th>
<th>And you were saying that your family’s Dominican, would you say that’s kind of part of who you are too?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t, ah, I’m not really related like, a lot of Dominicans they like different music and I, like there’s music that Dominicans listen to called Dembow I hate, I don’t really like that music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>(...) Dembow?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Yeah, I don’t like, I, I hate that music. (nervous laughter) Oh MY (...)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>If somebody asked you, what would you call yourself? Would you say you’re Dominican? Or would you say something different?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>I would say I was born here, but my parents are Dominican.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Ok. Some people use the word bicultural to mean when you feel like you’re part of two cultures. Would you say you’re bicultural?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>I keep talking about that but I never knew that was IT. (laughs) yeah, bicultural, yeah.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>So, it’s kind of like, when there’s two cultures and you feel kind of like you’re part of both. Is that how you feel?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Can you tell me what that’s like for you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Like, I, like, not like act, like I would go to places but I wouldn’t have to act different but I would be like, I like had to do things how they would understand it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Like especially in DR? Like when I go? Like it’s, like some people, they feel like, (laughs) “oh, yeah, I know how to speak English too,” and they try to like talk to me, I’m like, “what are you saying?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>(laughs) And like, ah, like, it’s easy to teach them. Not easy, but. Like they get the hang of it and they start to want to know it more and they study it, and they end up knowing it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>So when you’re in the DR do you feel like pressure to act like you’re from there? Or do you feel like you’re more—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>I feel like they’re just going to stare at me, like what are you doing?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Why would they stare at you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Well, like they do that over there. Wow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Like what kinds of things would people stare at you about?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Like, like, for my music, they’re like “what are you listening to?” (nervous laughter)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>But they listen to some of that music, like, the music that we have here, they listen to it over there like a few months later, and the music that they have over there,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>IU 3</td>
<td>like I’ll be over there, and I’ll hear that song and when I come back to Boston, I hear it like three months later.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>I’ll be like, “oh, yeah I heard this song in the DR.” They’ll be like “really, why did we get it so late?” “I don’t know.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>So, music comes out there first and then comes here?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>For the Spanish songs, they come out over there first, and then they come over here like a few months later.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>And then, like when we get English music here, they get it over there like a few months later. Not they get it but they find it out.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So I thought I heard you saying something about like how you have to act, like we were talking about being bicultural and you said something about being, having to act like you’re part of something when you’re with people or something like that. And then you were saying that in the DR you kind of have to, is that what you were saying, or did I understand it wrong?

No, like, not that I have to act different, but I mean like, I would have to like. Hmm.

Like, say it how they would understand it.

Not like say it, but like, be how they would understand it.

The relationship between language and ethnicity constructed here is layered and complex. On the one hand there are elements of the first discursive pattern in that Johnny reproduces the familiar pattern of Spanish (or Spanish/Dembow music) = Dominican and English (or English music) = American. In IU 1, Johnny begins “I don’t, I’m not really related” in response to my question about whether he share his family’s Dominican background. He constructs listening to Spanish music, particularly Dembow\(^{38}\), as a normal social practice of the Dominicans he knows in the DR. Claiming he does not listening to this iconic music genre, even going so far as to say he does not like it, emphasizes a distinction between him and his Dominican peers and positions him as an outsider. In line 10, Johnny’s use of “but” distinguishes him (born here) from his parents (Dominican). In IU 3, Johnny describes feeling ostracized and misunderstood when people in the DR position him as an outsider. He voices their taunting reactions to his atypical behavior, “they do

---

\(^{38}\) Dembow is a popular musical genre which originated in the DR and was at its height of international recognition around the time of our interview. It has had enduring popularity but is somewhat controversial among both Dominicans on the island as well as among the Diaspora due to its origins in marginalized high-poverty areas of Santo Domingo, its identification with violence and gang culture, and its sexually explicit videos and lyrics. For more, see: &lt;http://wayneandwax.com/index.php?s=dembow&page=3&gt; &lt;http://cultura.elpais.com/cultura/2013/09/17/actualidad/1379427097_644929.html&gt; &lt;http://www.listindiario.com/la-vida/2012/4/4/227835/El-dembow-un-genero-controversial&gt;
that over there? Wow." His nervous laughter underscores the emotions such interactions trigger. Then he provides a specific example, describing how others question his musical preferences, “what are you listening to?” Taken together, these elements of Johnny’s speech reproduce the first discursive pattern, constructing Spanish language and music as a natural part of being Dominican, and positioning himself as an outsider to this ethnic/cultural identity.

However, Johnny also talks back to this taken-for-granted assumption, constructing his relationships with Dominican peers as more complex than that and positioning himself as a bridge between these two worlds. This excerpt seems to follow a pattern of reproducing the Spanish=Dominican pattern (lines 2-10, 16, 20-24), and then talking back to it (lines 18, 25-30).

In IU 2, Johnny describes being bicultural as having to perform or behave “how they would understand.” He positions himself as an outsider when interacting with Dominicans, whose social or cultural practices are very different from his own. The outsider positioning carries with it the obligation to accommodate others, performing or acting for them. Johnny then describes a common scenario when he is interacting with peers in the DR and they use English with him. From this outsider positioning he has constructed for himself, Johnny criticizes their attempts at English, constructing such attempts as not successful.

In line 18, there is a discursive shift when Johnny shifts his positioning of himself. Rather than emphasizing his outsider status, he constructs a subject position of teacher for himself. This subject position allows him to participate in helping his peers in the DR to learn English and evaluate their progress and hard
work. This shift serves as an identity-building tactic, which allows Johnny to straddle the insider/outsider positions during interactions with people in the DR. In this way, Johnny disrupts the ethnolinguistic ideology and asserts that his English knowledge can allow him to build connections with Dominicans.

Later in line 25, a second shift takes place when Johnny shifts his emphasis from differences to similarities in musical preferences among himself and those in the DR. When he says “but they listen to some of that music, like the music that we have here,” Johnny then elaborates on international musical trends, explaining the delay that occurs when a song is released in one place and then comes out in another place at a later date. Johnny again talks back to the ethnolinguistic ideology that Dominicans listen to Spanish music and vice versa. Instead, Johnny constructs “English music” and “Spanish music” as moving across boundaries.

The distance in time and place between his home and the DR is highlighted through the repeated use of deictics in lines 22 through 30 (they/we, that music/this song, over there/here). Johnny positions himself as crossing the distance: “I’ll be over there ... and when I come back ...” and as an authority on international musical trends, “Oh, yeah, I heard this song in the DR.” This creates space to position others as not knowing and turning to him for understanding when they ask him “why did we get it so late?” Taking up the subject position of music authority is another identity-building tactic for Johnny, allowing him to teach his peers by explaining international music trends. This positioning also discursively serves to excuse individual in the DR for not understanding Johnny. In this construction, it is not necessarily differences in personal musical preferences but
rather delays in the music industry and the novelty of the music itself which is responsible for the moments of misunderstanding between him and his peers in the DR and back home.

Throughout this example, Johnny's use of language as connecting/excluding allows him to alternatively emphasize his similarities and differences with other Dominicans. Twice in this excerpt, he positions himself as an outsider, reproducing the first discursive pattern and the ethnolinguistic ideology that Spanish is associated with being Dominican. Each time, he shifts this construction to position himself as knowledgeable—first as English teacher, then as an authority on the music industry—in ways that could be valuable to his Dominican counterparts. In this way, Johnny draws on a discourse of language as connecting to construct a world in which he can cross the distance between home and the DR and ultimately be understood in both places.

In the following segment, Nora recounts her initial encounter with her softball teammates and describes how they discovered that she was Latina.

**Excerpt 42: Nora, Softball teammates and language use**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IU</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>JJ</th>
<th>Can you tell me a little bit about what the girls (at softball) are like?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Um. Like, they’re, like. It was only my second practice. So, I don’t really have like an idea of what they’re like really, but from what I’m getting is they’re fun, and pretty friendly, and like, they just like are willing to try new things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>How do you know they’re willing to try new things?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Cause, some of them, this is their first year playing softball, and um, they like doing, like some of them are pitching like me for the first time, and some of them are like playing, like doing completely different things like pitching, being a catcher, like things that they had never done before. So they’re like trying things that they hadn’t done before.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>what do you think about that?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Um, I think that it’s interesting because it’s also kind of it’s also kind of cool because there are seven girls including me who are Latina, and um we all like, I don’t know but from what I’m getting it’s like we all feel kind of connected in a way. ‘Cause like, you know, we’re Latina and like we come from similar roots. And so like,

So out of the fifteen, there’s seven girls who you would say are Latina?

Yeah, well, ‘cause like, on the, at the first practice, um, they were talking about who, like, being Latina. and they were asking, ‘cause most of them like looked Latina, like with the darker skin, and um, and they were asking, and then they said “are you Latina” and I said “yeah, my dad’s Puerto Rican,” and they said “oh, that’s cool, there are six other girls who are, that,” and then they said, “now there are seven girls who are Latina on the team.”

Who said that? One of the other girls or one of the grown-ups?

one of the other girls. (...)

Do you use Spanish or English with them [your softball teammates]?

Um, I really just use English, cause you know we’re just like meeting each other and so I don’t want to feel like I’m excluding anybody since I don’t actually know anybody else on my team.

I don’t want to be the person that’s like, “oh, I don’t like her.”

Cause like I don’t even have anybody that I know except for one girl, and I only know her because of softball.

Social relationships with her teammates are central to how Nora constructs the world of softball. Nora begins by highlighting her similarities with her teammates, saying they share common interests and willingness to try new positions on the team. She then authenticates herself as genuinely Latina based on her father’s Puerto Rican background (line 8), minimizing the importance of skin color (line 11). She describes how her teammates accept her as authentically Latina and an insider to this small group. This positioning allows her to feel special or “cool” and connected with others.
In lines 20-21, Nora draws on a discourse of *language as connecting* to forefront the importance of forming social bonds with her teammates, which allows her to justify not using Spanish with them on the softball field. She positions herself as someone who is new to the team, not knowing anyone very well and needing to build social relationships. She also highlights the risk of social exclusion if she were to use Spanish because it might be perceived as excluding some teammates. These circumstances require Nora to avoid excluding others—through the use of English—so that she can make friends.

In constructing the world of softball, Nora de-emphasizes the association between Spanish language and Latina ethnicity. Her Latina peers’ recognition of her as Latina does not depend on her using Spanish to authenticate this identity. Nora’s use of the discourse *language as excluding* in constructing Spanish on the softball team stands in contrast to her previous use of *language as connecting* to construct Spanish in her future family life (Excerpt 8). Whereas being bilingual and using Spanish with her future children and spouse were paramount to her construction of the future, it is not central here. However, in each instance, *language as connecting* creates the opportunity to forefront social connections and bonds in these two different worlds. In her future, emphasizing Spanish use allows her to construct imagined connections with family, while at softball it is English use which allows her to construct peer social relationships and Spanish which is constructed as excluding.

In each of these excerpts, we see how Johnny and Nora engage in talking back to the taken-for-granted ethnolinguistic language ideology which assumes that Spanish is part of an authentic Dominican or Puerto Rican ethnic identity. Notably,
both Johnny and Nora used the decoupling of Spanish from ethnic identity in part as a way of justifying English use. I found that this was a pattern across the data: in instances when participants emphasized a separation between language and ethnicity, I had often coded the action orientation as “justifying English use.” An emerging question for me as I noted this pattern became: what is gained by emphasizing a separation between language and ethnicity? More specifically, what is gained by de-emphasizing the relationship between Spanish and Latino, Hispanic, Dominican or Puerto Rican identity? For each participant, the answer to this question was slightly different, depending somewhat on the identity-building and world-building work they were engaged in within a particular discursive situation. For Johnny, it is his knowledge of English (teaching English to Dominicans in the DR and explaining the musical trends of English songs arriving later) which allows him to construct a bridging identity and feel connected with Dominicans. These constructions contribute to a thickening of Johnny’s identity as a bridge between Dominican and middle-class American cultures. For Nora, it is her use of English on the softball field which allows her to socialize with and build relationships with her mostly Latina teammates. This contributes to thickening her emerging Latina identity.

**Transcending ethnolinguistic ideologies**

By contrast to the previous examples where speakers talk back to the given ideology of language and ethnicity as overlapping, in the next series of excerpts I look at how Luis takes up this ideology explicitly in order to contrast it with his
broader world view of human connections that transcend the boundaries set by ethnolinguistic categories.

In the next excerpt, Luis and I discuss a photo he took of his baseball team’s trophy from last season. He has just described his frustration with the inexperienced players on this year’s team and his desire to help his teammates improve. In contrast to Nora’s focus on building social relationships, Luis’ focus is on winning another trophy, and the discourse of *language as utilitarian* emphasizes efficiency of communication in order to strategize and improve the game. While a discourse of *language as excluding* constructs Spanish as potentially leaving one teammate out, Luis’ main emphasis in this segment and throughout our conversation thus far about baseball has not been on relationships with teammates, but the ultimate goal of playing better.

**Excerpt 43: Luis, Using English on the baseball field**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Do other kids on the team, or from other schools, speak Spanish and English too?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Yeah. There was this actually this one kid that didn’t know Spanish, I think, at least, so we didn’t really talk that much Spanish. Because the things we mostly talked about was like strategizing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>About the baseball that you’re playing, you don’t really talk about other stuff?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>It’s because, it’s kind of like a rule. Cause if we did talk about anything else but the game, like the coaches would get mad at us, or they would like separate us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Uh-huh, so does anyone ever use any Spanish out on the field?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Yeah, sometimes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Yeah? Can you think of an example of when that happens?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Like, double play they would yell out double play in Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>And everybody would understand. And, even the person that didn’t talk Spanish they would like make hand signs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>um, not like hand signs, they would like put a two up and they</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
would know what that meant. (holds up two fingers)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Mmm. So how would you say double play in Spanish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Um, doa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Doa? And then somebody would put the two fingers up and so the kid who doesn’t know Spanish would know what they meant. Are there any other examples of when people use Spanish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>When, it’s mostly Hispanics I play with so, but some aren’t so, we try to use as much English as we can.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this construction of the world of baseball, the discourse of language as utilitarian creates the subject position of efficient communicator and normalizes the social practice of using English as the most efficient tool for strategizing on the field. Spanish use is constructed as a violation of this norm, and requires players to rectify any possible gap in communication through hand signals. The use of Spanish on the field is treated in Luis’ account as accidental, occurring spontaneously when someone “yells out” a word in excitement, as when a double play happens. Constructing Spanish use as accidental serves to minimize any blame on Luis’ teammates, emphasizing their unified effort to improve the game.

While accidental use of Spanish by bilingual players is constructed as an infraction which they are obligated to fix, the non-Spanish speaker is not positioned as responsible for learning any Spanish vocabulary to facilitate communication. In this way, the dominance of English is neatly erased from Luis’ account.

By constructing team players as efficient communicators, language as utilitarian emphasizes a common goal among teammates so that “everyone would understand” even when Spanish is used. After saying they would use “hand signs” to make sure the non-Spanish speaker understood, he is quick to correct himself: “not like hand signs, they would put up a two and they would know what that meant.”
This de-emphasizes any extra effort put out by bilingual players to make themselves understood by their teammate; Luis holds up his hand in the interview space to show me how simple it is to flash a two at someone who does not know the word “doa.” De-emphasizing these social practices of accommodating non-Spanish speakers on the team deflects any possible interpretation that bilingual teammates might be carrying any extra burden.

In line 14 above, Luis responds to my question about language with a reference to ethnic identity, thus grouping language and ethnicity together. In the next excerpt, I follow up with a prompt about the coaches, and he again jumps into talking about ethnicity, mentioning language in line 16 almost as an afterthought. I argue that Luis’ tendency to lump language and ethnicity together serves a larger discursive purpose for him, described below.

Excerpt 44: Luis, Baseball coaches

13 JJ Mm-hmm. What about the coaches?
14 L Some of the coaches, there was actually one that wasn’t Hispanic, but um, but he understood there was mostly,
15 The founder of the league actually, is um, is Hispanic. He works with my dad. Um, yeah so he hires people that he’s most comfortable with. (…)
16 So he did get the coach for a reason, like because he helps kids. And he understands Spanish but he doesn’t speak it as well. But he helps kids. (…)
17 JJ What about the other coaches, do they also help kids?
18 L Um, I don’t want to talk about my coach,
19 but there was another coach that, um, he understood Spanish and he wasn’t the best, but I noticed that he
20 and my coach didn’t yell at him, so he kind of understood what he was saying, so he, I guess he hired him because, I really don’t know why he hired him, not, I’m not trying to say like he was bad, or give off the wrong image, I was trying to say that he,
21 I don’t really understand the reason why he hired him, not in a bad way.
22 JJ Ok,
The discourse of *language as utilitarian*—language use as aimed at efficiency of communication for improving the game—creates two subject positions: that of good coach and bad coach. Luis describes three coaches here. The first he mentions is not Hispanic, understands some Spanish but does not speak it, and “helps kids.” The second is the Hispanic founder. The third is Hispanic, knows Spanish and does not help kids.

Luis goes through a series of discursive acrobatics in the next few lines which initially confused me. Careful use of FDA has helped me clarify that Luis’ larger purpose here is to talk back to the taken-for-granted expectation that Hispanic/Spanish-speaking coaches will connect with Hispanic/Spanish-speaking players on the team, and vice versa. In order to do this, Luis lumps Spanish language and Hispanic ethnicity together, and distinguishes these ethno-linguistic characteristics from the social acts of connecting with players and doing a good job. In other words, through this account, Luis disrupts one of the three main discourses of language: *language as connecting/excluding.*

Extreme case formulation is a discursive tactic which uses a rare case or example of an uncommon or unlikely scenario to forefront the speaker’s point. Luis uses an extreme case formulation when he says “there was actually one [coach] that wasn’t Hispanic.” Even as the word “actually” signals the rarity of this particular case, Luis’ fore-fronting of this example serves to normalize the case, making it seem as though the presence of non-Hispanic coaches who help kids but may know little
Spanish were common. Before saying anything more about this coach, though, Luis shifts his focus momentarily to legitimate his claims by establishing the authority of the league’s founder. Luis establishes his own insider knowledge about the founder, who he tells us works with Luis’ dad. Luis explains that the founder is Hispanic and hires coaches he’s comfortable with. Throughout the rest of the interaction, Luis repeatedly legitimates the authority of the founder and the coaches; even when he indirectly questions their decisions. Once Luis has established the authority of the league’s founder, he invokes trust in that authority to assert that the coaches chosen by the founder are there “for a reason,” which is to “help kids.” Coaches sometimes understand Spanish, but Spanish knowledge doesn’t go hand-in-hand with helping kids.

By virtue of their authority, the founder and coaches can monitor each other’s work (“my coach didn’t yell at him, so he kind of understood what he was saying”). By contrast, Luis and the other players are not expected to question coaches; rather, they must show respect for coaches and trust the founder’s capacity to select coaches. Luis skillfully inserts his own questioning of the adults’ decision while simultaneously showing respect for their authority. For example, when he says “I don’t want to talk about my coach,” it is implied that if he were to “talk about” him, Luis might question the man’s competence. Later, Luis uses a disclaimer to ward off any accusation that he might be criticizing the coach: “I’m not trying to say

---

39 In fact, nearly all coaches in the league are Hispanic, which I confirmed through document review of the league’s publications, additional conversations with Luis and Johnny, observations of games, and a parent whose children have played.
40 This is one of several instances in his interview in which Luis’s use of the term “talk” refers to negative gossip-like talk behind someone’s back.
he was bad or give off the wrong image.” Rather than directly position the adult’s actions as wrong, Luis expresses confusion and positions himself as not understanding.

Positioning himself as a knowledgeable insider of the league and a respectful player who trusts the authority of the coaches creates the space for Luis to look critically at the coaching that happens on the league and highlight the ways that his experience actually departs from the taken-for-granted assumption that Hispanic/Spanish = connecting and non-Hispanic/no Spanish = not connecting.

In the above interview segment, Luis de-emphasizes any separation between language and ethnicity, instead lumping together ethno-linguistic characteristics of coaches and highlighting that these are not requirements for connecting or helping.

In the next segment, he constructs the ethnic label Hispanic as connecting, and explicitly excludes Spanish as unimportant or irrelevant for connecting. In my analysis of the next segment, I focus on the action orientation of Luis’ speech, asking: How does NOT talking about language serve Luis? and, What does he gain by distinguishing between “connecting” and Spanish or English language use? I argue that constructing categories of people as based on connections rather than language or ethnicity allows Luis to 1) emphasize similarities and social bonds with Luis’ classmates from diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds, and 2) draw a distinction between himself and people who use ethnicity labels to categorize people and emphasize differences.

At this point in the interview, Luis has just finished talking about baseball, and has used the word “Hispanic” a few times to refer to people on the team. I begin
the next series of questions attempting to understand what he means with the word Hispanic, which he seemed to be using as a placeholder for Spanish speakers in the baseball discussion.

Excerpt 45: Luis defines Hispanic as connecting

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU 1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>JJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU 2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two subject positions are made available in this construction of the world:

people who categorize based on race or national origin and people who do not.

The former are constructed as engaging in social practices of insulting and excluding or isolating people based on where they are from, while the latter “have a

---

41 It is evident here and elsewhere in his interview that Luis associates the term race with national origin rather than with skin color and phenotype as is more common in the US. This conflation of race/ethnicity and nationality has been well documented among US-born Dominicans (Bailey, 2007).
connection” or “just want to learn and spend a lot of time doing that.” Luis distances himself from the former and aligns himself with the latter position, which I call the “connector.” Taking up the subject position of connector creates the possibility for Luis to emphasize his social bonds with friends from various nationalities. This also allows him to distance himself from the uncomfortable subjective experiences created when people categorize others as “they’re like this,” “those people,” “you have to treat them a certain way.”

Luis’ unique construction of Hispanic as connecting distinguishes him from others who reduce their thinking about people in terms of categories, and allows him to imagine the possibility of movement across categories (transcending labels or racial/social categories). Constructing the world in this way creates possible opportunities for him to associate with others who try to understand him for who he is rather than such superficial features. In Chapter V, I showed how Luis’ deployment of a utilitarian discourse of language allowed him to imagine a professional or middle class future profession for himself. We can see how he uses Hispanic as connecting to build on these constructions of himself and his world. Furthermore, Luis explicitly constructs Spanish as not part of what he means by Hispanic as connecting.

---

42 The examples he gives—Japanese, British, and Costa Rican—are all US-born classmates of his at the Espada School, whom I met during my time as a participant observer in the classroom. His friend Akira is the son of a second-generation US-born Japanese father and US-born mother of white European background. The reference to a “British” classmate is most likely Mike, a white student of Anglo background whose ancestors are US-born for several generations. The last is Daniel, whose Costa Rican-born parents emigrated to the US before he was born.
When discourses clash

So far, Luis has constructed ethnicity and language as interrelated (i.e., he diminishes or erases the difference between them), and distinguished these from personal understanding and connection. By contrast, we have seen in Excerpt 44 how Yanelis constructs Spanish language knowledge as separate from ethnicity: one can be Latino/a or Dominican and not know Spanish. Emphasizing the separation between language and ethnicity allows Yanelis to authenticate herself as Dominican despite her (perceived) diminishing Spanish proficiency. In her interview, she contributed to this process of authentication by providing extensive examples of the varying levels of Spanish proficiency among the Dominicans she knows (some quite fluent, others knowing little or no Spanish) and locating herself somewhere on a continuum between “decent” and having forgotten her Spanish/incapable of basic communication with a teacher.

In this way, the discursive move of erasing the difference between language and ethnicity serves a particular identity-building function for Luis, while the opposite move—highlighting the distinction between language and ethnicity—serves another identity-building function for Yanelis.

Furthermore, Luis and Yanelis draw on different discourses of language as they construct these identities. For Luis, it is crucial to construct language as utilitarian and his own bilingualism as a commodity which will serve him for a professional future. It is also crucial to de-construct the link between language and connecting such that connecting with others transcends ethnolinguistic categories and reinforces the possibility of him locating himself in a middle class/professional
world associated with white or Anglo people. On the other hand, Yanelis draws heavily on a discourse of *language as internal* to construct her obligation to use her Spanish proficiency to help family members, which contributes to her identity as a responsible member of her Dominican family.

In the next excerpt, the group explicitly discusses the relationship between language and ethnicity, and we can see how Luis’ and Yanelis’ different discursive constructions of this relationship clash and eventually feed one another.

The following excerpt is taken from the same group discussion activity described in Chapter VI. After having just discussed the fact that Annie could be considered Latina due to her long time at the Espada School, Yanelis adds in IU 1 “and she speaks Spanish,” as another reason why she is partly Latina. She then pauses and shifts her focus, de-emphasizing the relationship between speaking Spanish and being Latino in IU 2. This prompts an extended conversation about how speaking Spanish does not necessarily mean that someone is Latino and that you can still be Latino even if you do not speak Spanish.

**Excerpt 46: Group Prompt “Agree or disagree? You can still be Latino if you don’t speak Spanish”**
(Y, N, A, P go to “Agree,” Luis between Agree and Neutral, Johnny at Neutral)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IU 1</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>and she speaks Spanish (gives Annie a thumbs-up)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>well that doesn’t matter, she doesn’t have to be Latina if she speaks Spanish, but yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>What, so you don’t have to be, speak Spanish to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>You don’t have to speak Spanish to be,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>to be Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>I know a lot of people who are Puerto Rican but they don’t know how to speak Spanish. I mean, they know how to speak Spanish, but not, like,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>Fluent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Fluent (moves slightly toward Yanelis as she speaks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Yeah, but they’re, Latinos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(...)

25 JJ You can still be Latino even if you don’t speak Spanish.
26 L Well, it depends, like, like,
27 JJ Decide where you are, you either agree, you disagree,
28 L It’s kind of a tough one. Yeah, because, I have a question.
4 JJ Does the person like, have like a book of Latino people? Like, do they know their—
(over next few lines, Luis moves back to where the activity is taking place, positioning himself as neutral, between Agree and Disagree)

35 JJ Annie, where are you? What’s your thought on this one?
36 A I agree. ‘Cause my neighbor is Puerto Rican but she doesn’t speak Spanish.
(Johnny moves to Agree position)
37 JJ Ok. (...)

6 38 P Around YOU (turns to Annie, leans toward her as she speaks)
41 N Nora?
42 N Um, ‘cause like even though I never spoke Spanish until I came to this school, but I was still Puerto Rican, so
7 43 JJ Ok, so even before you started at this school, when you didn’t speak Spanish, like when you were three or four, you were still Puerto Rican, you were still Latina, Ok.
(...)

48 L Luis, where are you on this one?
49 L I’m not really sure because I think that question, the statement is kind of broad, so I’m not.
54 JJ Ok, and how come?
8 55 L Because what they’re saying I don’t think it’s specific enough.
56 JJ What more information would you need?
57 L Kind of like the life the person has. Do they hang around people that are Latin? Do they have, what type of school did they go to? Like, it’s a lot of information but,

58 JJ Ok. Yanelis, what are you thinking?
59 Y Agree (with discussion prompt given by JJ in line 25)
60 L I think he means kind of like maybe confusing the question
61 and it’s like, if I’m, let’s say my grandparents are Puerto Rican, and like my mom was Puerto Rican, and half white or something, and she doesn’t really speak Spanish. And she’s Puerto Rican, she’s half Puerto Rican, that means I’m, whatever, half or a quarter Puerto Rican,
9 62 L I’m still Latina but I don’t speak Spanish because my mom doesn’t speak Spanish, but she’s Latina.
64 L It doesn’t make sense but yeah, it’s kind of like, yeah, I could still be Latina, like Puerto Rican or half Puerto Rican but I don’t speak Spanish.
65 L (moves toward “agree” sign)

10 66 JJ Luis, did you just change your mind?
67 L Yeah
68 JJ What made you change your mind?

43 I have not included in this transcript lines 11-24, a series of interactions in which several people spoke at once, and Yanelis and I clarified her statement and I asked her peers to take a position in response to the statement on a continuum between “agree” and “disagree.” This was a spontaneous prompt added to the discussion in the moment in response to Yanelis’ statement.
What she just explained.

In IU 2, 3, 5 and 7, Yanelis, Annie and Nora construct the separation between language and ethnicity in similar ways, giving examples of people who are Latina but do not speak Spanish, or at least are not fluent. Nora uses herself as an example. In IU 4 and 8, Luis expresses confusion about the question, saying he would need more information about the person to be able to answer it.

In line 32, Luis physically moves forward, removing himself from the activity and refusing to take a position on the question until he has more information. After we hear from Nora and Anne, Luis is still in a neutral position. He then describes the kind of additional information he would need: “the kind of life the person has,” who they hang out with, what kind of school they go to (line 57). These questions make evident that Luis is constructing being Latino not as based on language, roots or family background but from a broader focus on grouping people based on their connections and shared history.

In other words, he is drawing on his discourse of Latino or Hispanic as *connecting*, which we saw in the previous segments. It appears that this unique discourse, which is not a shared discourse I have observed in the speech of other participants, actually interferes with Luis’ ability to engage with his peers’ discussion about the relationship between language and ethnicity. It is not until Yanelis provides an extended explanation of this relationship, drawing on a shared discourse of *ethnicity as roots* which Luis himself has used earlier in this same group activity, that Luis returns to the activity and aligns himself with Yanelis in the agree position.
Two pedagogical implications of this interaction emerge. First, his peers’ lack of engagement in Luis’ discursive construction of this relationship may be evidence that the discourse he is using is unfamiliar and far removed from the ways they construct language and ethnicity. Second, while I have argued in Chapter V for interventions aimed at expanding the repertoire of discourses of language, and more exposure to novel discourses—just such as the one Luis brings to this conversation—this example sheds light on the difficulties in making alternative discourses seen and heard by both peers and a group facilitator. Luis is fairly clear in his refusal to proceed without more information and is eloquent in his request for more information, but the rest of us had trouble hearing him. If the difficulty lies at least partly in the effort required to step out of a familiar shared discourse then I posit that more opportunities to reflect on and name various ways of thinking about this relationship could be helpful.

Discussion

As discussed in the introduction, ethnolinguistic language ideologies, which assume a one-to-one relationship between language and ethnicity, are prevalent in the US (Riley, 2014). While such ideologies are typically reproduced in US society, I reviewed several examples of research with youth in multi-ethnic, multilingual spaces where these ethnolinguistic language ideologies were disrupted and alternatives constructed.

Early in this chapter, we saw various examples of how the assumption that language and ethnicity are interrelated is prevalent in these data. The predominant construction of this relationship is that language and ethnicity serve as indexes of
one another. As I have already highlighted, this conflation of the two serves to erase the nuanced ways that individual differences can depart from the simple assumption that Spanish = Latino and English = Anglo.

Although this was the predominant discursive pattern used for constructing ethnicity and language, there were also instances where participants explicitly talked back to this dominant assumption. Whereas instances of the first discursive pattern, conflating language and ethnicity, tended to be implicit, instances of the second, distinguishing between language and ethnicity, tended to be explicit. The fact that this second pattern was less frequent and more explicitly emphasized, as in the group discussion analyzed here, indicates that this is a novel or less familiar way of constructing the relationship between language and ethnicity. As I analyzed instances of this discursive pattern, I began to conceptualize these as moments when participants were talking back to a deeply rooted assumption embedded in their worlds. The group discussion moment when Yanelis stated "she doesn’t have to be Latina if she speaks Spanish" produced a flurry of reactions from her peers and led to an extended group interaction on this topic. Such moments are often windows into research participants' underlying assumptions because they indicate a disruption or clash in such assumptions (Green, Skukaskaite & Baker, 2012).

In an era where the second and third generation of “new immigration” fill classrooms and blur the lines between second language and heritage language learners (Olsen, 1990; Montrul, 2013), it is perhaps not surprising that my participants grapple with the degree to which language is a necessary part of ethnic authenticity. Bailey (2007) has pointed out that for US-born Dominicans in
particular the black/white racialized context of US assimilation represents a complex landscape and the symbolic use of the Spanish language can be central to drawing a distinction from African American groups.
VIII. Conclusion & Implications

This dissertation responds to a call for more research on the goal of cross-cultural learning in dual language bilingual schools, specifically with respect to the role of identity construction and peer interactions (Howard & Feinauer, 2014; Parkes, Ruth, Anberg-Espinoza & de Jong, 2009; Reyes & Vallone, 2007). These schools are designed to create educational environments in which the linguistic and cultural resources of students from both heritage language and English backgrounds are valued, and are often looked to as a model for overcoming the linguistic isolation and remedial programs for English language learners (Bale, 2012; Gándara & Orfield, 2010).

Previous research falls into two general approaches; those which draw on primarily survey-based methods, and those which use ethnographic and discourse analytic methods (Howard & Feinauer, 2014). Studies from the first approach have found a generally positive trends in student attitudes toward self and one's own ethnolinguistic group, toward the partner ethnolinguistic group, and toward bilingualism in general (Howard, Sugarman & Christian, 2003). However, this approach tends to rely on categorizing survey respondents by first language and first culture (L1/C1) in order to gauge attitudes toward others, an approach which is increasingly out of step with the current reality of the dual language population. The growing heritage language population of second and third generation youth are engaged in dynamic (trans)language practices at home and at school (García, 2014; Mancilla-Martinez & Kieffer, 2010).
Research from the ethnographic tradition has provided rich descriptions of dynamic bilingual languaging practices in dual language schools and shown how young people from different ethnolinguistic backgrounds co-construct identities in these settings (i.e., Fitts, 2006; Potowski, 2008; Sook Lee et al, 2008). This body of research has also shown how well dual language programs do with respect to the goal of linguistic equality. Despite well-intentioned designs, social inequalities and power dynamics related to language status are often reproduced in dual language schools. Middle-class, Anglo, English-dominant students tend to dominate classroom interactions, English tends to have higher status, and resistance against Spanish is often pervasive (Bearse & DeJong, 2008; DePalma, 2010; Palmer, 2009; Potowski, 2004). However, there is also evidence that interactions over time in dual language schools can also provide opportunities for young people to acquire alternatives to deficit-oriented discourses of language and minority ethnolinguistic groups (Fitts, 2009; Hill-Bonnett, 2009; Freeman, 1998).

My methodological approach is informed by data collection tools from both survey-based and ethnographic studies of cross-cultural learning in dual language settings. Drawing on cases from past studies, as well as co-constructive interviewing techniques, my participants and I created a sociolinguistics curriculum to engage one another in discussions about language, culture and identity. Such discussions can create spaces for youth to explore potential aspects of identity as it relates to language.

I have sought to look closely at the how discourses of language circulating among a small group of bilingual youth shape and are shaped by their constructions
of their worlds and themselves and others in the world, as a way of making visible the language ideologies they hold.

My research questions are:

1) What discourses do bilingual youth at a dual language middle school draw on to talk about Spanish and English, and about speakers of each language?

2) How do they deploy these discourses of language for identity-building and world-building?

In response to the first research question, I conducted two rounds of thematic coding to identify three salient discourses of language shared by participants: *language as utilitarian, language as internal, and language as connecting or excluding*. These were not the only discourses of language in these data. However, my goal with this project was not to provide an exhaustive overview of all discourses of language circulating among these young people, but to highlight how some particularly salient discourses function in interaction in order to slow down and look closely at how language ideologies are both reflected in speech and shape possibilities for speakers.

*Language as utilitarian* emphasizes practical or functional uses of language and treats language as a resource or commodity to be exchanged for other social goods or as a tool for efficiently completing a task. *Language as internal* emphasizes an individual’s skill or proficiency and treats language as a personal accomplishment (or deficit) that the individual can work to improve through practice or is obligated to maintain. *Language as connecting or excluding* emphasizes the relational aspect of language. This discourse functioned as a binary based on an underlying assumption that a shared common language allows people to connect,
understand, relate to, or learn from one another and that the lack of shared language leads to isolation, barriers, misunderstanding or exclusion. The three discourses of language identified in this study are described in Chapter IV.

In response to the second research question, I drew on Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA) (Willig, 2009) and Bucholtz and Hall's (2005) sociocultural linguistics to explore patterns in the ways that participants deployed these discourses of language for identity-building and world-building. This approach provides insights into the ways that particular discourses position speakers of each language, the kinds of social practices which are normalized and the subjectivities made available as a result of these positioning and practices. My analysis has shown that the discourses of language available to these young people have real implications in their ongoing processes of identity-building and world-building.

In initial design of this project, I expected that I might find patterns in the use of such discourses with respect to participants’ ethnolinguistic backgrounds. For example, I assumed that participants from monolingual English-speaking homes would draw on different discourses of language than those from Spanish-speaking homes. Instead, I found that all participants drew on all three discourses of language but that some patterns emerged in the use of these discourses based on the discussion topic. Broadly speaking, participants tended to draw on a discourse of language as utilitarian during conversations about their futures, language as internal to describe scenarios of everyday language use, and language as connecting/excluding to construct the relationship between language and ethnicity.
Rather than think of these discourses, then, as reflecting a home or culturally-based language ideology, I began to see them as shared discourses which circulate among this small group of youth who have been part of a speech community during their eight years of dual language schooling together.

I have also shown that these discourses are deployed in unique ways as part of each participant’s identity-building work. Bucholtz and Hall (2005) propose that identity is emergent and is interactionally co-constructed, but also point out that previous interactions may come to bear on a given moment of identity-building.

In their constructions of the future, participants drew primarily on a discourse of language as utilitarian to construct middle-class or successful futures for themselves. I have argued that the predominance of this discourse for constructing the future results in a habitual positioning of Spanish speakers as needing help, which may contribute to world-building focused on a deficit orientation toward this population. Such an orientation runs counter to the larger goal of language equality in dual language schools. By contrast, I provide two examples of how Nora draws on a discourse of language as connecting, which positions an English speaker as needing help and makes available a future family life in which bilingualism leads to mutual understanding and social advantages.

I have argued that one way to work toward the goal of cultural learning and language equality is the expansion of dual language students’ repertoire of discourses of language (see discussion in chapter V). While I can not claim that these are the only discourses of language available to these young people, I have shown how different discourses of language construct alternative future worlds and future
potential identities for them to explore.

In constructions of their negotiations of everyday language use, I have shown that participants have complex understandings of what it means to be bilingual and how to navigate language use with adults and peers in different settings. Translanguaging is the norm for them, but they construct moments of switching between languages in two ways: as either a deficit, or as a fun, creative and admirable act. Their use of language as internal in these conversations creates L1/L2 subject positions, which have different implications for which languaging practices are seen as normal, as well as for the subjective experiences of these practices. I showed how language as internal emphasized language loss, while language as connecting emphasized language maintenance and opportunities to practice. However, in constructing scenarios which resulted in negative subjective experiences of embarrassment and shame, both language as internal and language as connecting/excluding were drawn on.

In summarizing these data, I have argued that these findings support a need for a paradigm shift and different terminology for talking about bilingual people and bilingual language practices in dual language settings. My analysis supports García’s proposal for a framework of dynamic bilingualism, which includes use of the terms emergent bilinguals (rather than L1/L2) and translanguaging (rather than code-switching or other, more pejorative, terms).

Finally, in constructing the relationship between language and ethnicity, I have shown that participants frequently drew on a discourse of language as connecting or excluding. I described three patterns in the ways they constructed this
relationship. Speakers primarily reproduced the implicit ethnolinguistic ideology that constructs ethnicity and language as overlapping. However, there were also interesting examples of how my participants talked back to this ideology, for example in emphasizing a distinction between Spanish use and being Dominican or Latino/a. The ways that participants reproduced, talked back to, or took up ethnolinguistic ideologies had real implications for identity-building and world-building. I have shown, for example, how Luis took up ethnolinguistic categories in order to distinguish them from a larger goal of connecting with others based on a shared humanity. This discursive move allowed him to construct an identity for himself which transcended categorical constraints and emphasize friendships with people from diverse nationalities. Finally, I discussed an example of what can happen when different discourses clash in a group discussion. When Luis and Yanelis brought different discourses of language to a discussion of whether speaking Spanish is part of being Latino, Luis’ perspective was not taken up by his interlocutors, including me. I speculate that it can be challenging for interlocutors to hold on to multiple language ideologies at once and that novel or hybrid discourses might be lost in discussion.

My analysis of these interviews and group discussions offers dual language educators and practitioners an innovative approach to designing conversations with young people in these settings and exploring the discursive processes related to cross-cultural learning in these settings. Throughout this dissertation, I have attempted to acknowledge the limitations of a study based on such a small group of youth from a particular type of dual language school. While my findings as such (i.e.,
the three salient discourses, the identity-building work of these particular young people) may not be generalizable, I am hopeful that my methodological approach to these processes can be applied in other settings, with the goal of building a more complete theoretical picture of what cross-cultural learning entails. With this goal in mind, I offer the following final summary of the discursive processes outlined in Chapters V through VII.

In chapter V, I first drew on data from Luis’ interview to provide a picture of how his use of a discourse of language as utilitarian was deployed as part of his world-building and identity-building. In this case, Luis’s use of this discourse made available certain middle-class subject positions for him and his family and allowed him to construct a potential place for himself in the world of work. I followed this with a caveat regarding the habitual positioning of certain ethnolinguistic groups in particular ways; in this case, Spanish speakers as needing help. Finally, I provided two examples of how young people’s use of different discourses of language (utilitarian vs. connecting) allowed them to distance or align themselves with a particular social group as they constructed their future family lives.

In chapter VI, I provided a detailed description of how different discourses of language make available different subject positions for language learners, which normalizes certain language practices and social practices (i.e., practicing, correcting, insulting). These varied deployments of language as internal versus language as connecting or excluding had different implications for the subjective experiences of shifting proficiencies and levels of comfort with using English and Spanish.
Finally, in Chapter VII, I provided a discussion of the implicit ethnolinguistic ideology which normalized the assumption that certain languages are associated with certain ethnicities. I showed how participants reproduced this ideology through the use of language as connecting or excluding, but also how they talked back to it and how Luis explicitly took up this ideology for his own world-building and identity-building purposes.

In Chapter V, I suggested that dual language educators consider designing interventions to expand the repertoires of discourses of language available to bilingual youth in dual language schools. However, introducing new and varied discourses of language may not be as simple as just telling students about different ways to see language, or even just providing activities or readings with alternative discourses in them. As we have seen above, when two different discourses of language clash during a discussion, participants may not recognize that their interlocutor is drawing on a different ideological approach to language. When Luis and Yanelis interacted regarding feelings of discomfort when speaking Spanish, most of us interpreted Luis’ questioning as confusion rather than seeing his contribution as a different way of constructing language. Seeing confusion as a space for new learning requires careful listening and questioning on the part of the teacher and peers.

Furthermore, there is a need to create safe spaces for discussions related to language status and ideologies. Annie’s position as a minority/majority student made her the object of conversation many times. Moreover, discussions of language loss and the related feelings of embarrassment, shame or of being silenced, require
careful consideration.

The discussion of discourses of language and their deployment among this small group of bilingual youth at one dual language school offered in this dissertation is a first step toward designing new curriculum and research interventions for dual language programs interested in building on this work.
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## Appendix 1: List of Activities & Language Used (English/Spanish) in Group Discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Lang. Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Discussion 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1: Group confidentiality</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2: Our language use</td>
<td>Phase 1: Intro</td>
<td>E, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2: Days, weeks, hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 3: You won't understand my Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 4: Are we all comfortable?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 5: Whole thing in English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3: Sharing Photos</td>
<td>Phase 1: Intro</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2: Johnny's photos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 3: Nora's photos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 4: Luis' photos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 5: Yanelis' photos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 6: Annie's photos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 7: Houses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 4: Photo Grouping</td>
<td>Phase 1: Moving photos</td>
<td>E/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2: Making posters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 5: Discussing Photos</td>
<td>Phase 1: Intro</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2: What we notice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 3: What confuses us</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 6: Our Language use</td>
<td>Phase 1: Hour by hour</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Discussion 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1: Language use today</td>
<td>Phase 1: Lang today</td>
<td>E, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2: Map making</td>
<td>Phase 2: Making maps</td>
<td>S, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3: Sharing Maps</td>
<td>Phase 3: Yanelis' map</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 4: Johnny's map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 5: Annie's map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 6: Nora's map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 7: Jenny's map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Discussion 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1: Language use today</td>
<td>Phase 1: Catching Perla up</td>
<td>E, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2: Language use today</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 3: In Clara's &amp; Joanne's classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 4: Transition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Activity 2: Language at School
- **Phase 1:** Intro
- **Phase 2:** Classroom pets bilingual
- **Phase 3:** Teachers

### Activity 3: Cases of Language Varieties & Status
- **Phase 1:** intro
- **Phase 2:** Case 1 (Selva/Bosque tropical)
- **Phase 3:** Using Spanish in Middle School
- **Phase 4:** Case 2: Classroom excerpt
- **Phase 5:** Changes next year
- **Phase 6:** Case 3: Cindy

### Activities Phases Lang.

#### Group Discussion 4
**Activity 1: Cases of Language Varieties & Status**
- **Phase 1:** Intro
- **Phase 2:** Spanish use in class
- **Phase 3:** La selva
- **Phase 4:** Books

**Activity 2: School Language Map**
- **Phase 1:** Making map
- **Phase 2:** Discussing map

**Activity 3: School Admissions**
- **Phase 1:** intro
- **Phase 2:** Most kids speak Spanish
- **Phase 3:** Teaching Spanish illegal?
- **Phase 4:** White, Asian, Black, kids

**Activity 4: Personal maps**
- **Phase 1:** Luis shares map
- **Phase 2:** Perla’s map
- **Phase 3:** sleepovers

**Activity 5: Reading & Writing**
- **Phase 1:** intro
- **Phase 2:** outside of school
- **Phase 3:** Spanish?
- **Phase 4:** In school

#### Group Discussion 5
**Activity 1: Places**
- **Phase 1:** Intro, set-up
- **Phase 2:** Stick post-it notes
- **Phase 3:** Observations (observaciones)
- **Phase 4:** I wonder (me pregunto)
- **Phase 5:** Interpretations (interpretaciones)
- **Phase 6:** Why so hard to stay in Spanish?
- **Phase 7:** English not language of America
### Activity 2: Dialogue Continuum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1: Intro &amp; windows</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2: I am Latino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3: No Spanish, still Latino?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4: Latino &amp; Hispanic same thing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5: I would call myself American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 6: Never uncomfortable in Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 7: Never uncomfortable in English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 8: Most people in Boston are bilingual.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 9: Spanish/English for every language?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 10: Most people in US are bilingual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 11: Most of my friends are bilingual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 12: I know enough Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 13: Being bilingual has been helpful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 14: Sometimes I feel more Latino/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 15: Spanish w/ English-only peers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Activities and Phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Lang. Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair Discussion 1: Annie &amp; Yanelis</td>
<td>Phase 1: Yanelis' map</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2: Annie's map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 3: My home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 4: Language at school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 5: Next year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair Discussion 2: Luis &amp; Johnny</td>
<td>Phase 1: Gaming</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2: Baseball</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 3: Who am I?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total: 96 Phases** from group/pair discussions
Appendix 2: Preparation of transcripts & consideration of context cues

I represent speech in message units and interactional units. Message units are the smallest unit of conversational meaning and interactional units are “the smallest units of joint social activity ... involv(ing) both the actions and reactions of people toward each other” (Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto & Shuart-Faris, 2005, p. 26).

Discourse analysts must make decisions about how to frame data, and what aspects of social, cultural, political or other aspects of contexts to take into account. My analysis considers data within a particular interview or group discussion context. As such, I include contextual clues (movement, facial expressions, gestures, pronunciation, intonation) directly relevant to the specific unit of interaction. In very few cases, I go beyond the unit of interaction to draw on additional data from the study to provide additional background to help interpret a segment of data. This may include the topic of discussion or discourse in use just prior to the data being analyzed, what was said on the same topic during a previous session, or related data from field notes. For the most part, however, my analysis stays close to the text.
Transcription key (partly based on Bloome et al, 2005)
A      Annie
Jo     Johnny
L      Luis
N      Nora
P      Perla
Y      Yanelis
JJ     Jenny (researcher)
S      Student participant, unidentified
SS     Multiple students talking at once

*italics* Translated speech which was originally spoken in Spanish
^      indicates shift in language spoken (English to Spanish or vice versa)
,      comma indicates short pause
.      period indicates longer pause
?      rising intonation at end of utterance
—      interrupted by next line
v+     elongated vowel
*      voice, pitch, or style change
(...)  indicates break in transcript, where there is dialogue that is not included
X      inaudible talking
XXX    extended inaudible talking
[home] words in brackets indicate referent that may be unclear in this particular segment
[she?] words in brackets followed by question mark indicate possible interpretation of barely audible speech
[she?/they?] indicates two possible interpretations of barely audible speech
[[ ]]   double brackets mark time on audio file
[[[ ]]] triple brackets mark time on video file
(nods)  words in parentheses are my notes on relevant context cues
Appendix 3: Example of an analytic/reflective memo

Distinguishing between theme and discourse

A crucial aspect of this analysis is the distinction between theme and discourse. To illustrate this, I draw on two excerpts in which the interviewee is explaining the use of English and Spanish on the baseball or softball field.

In the first example, Luis and I are discussing a photo he took of his baseball team’s trophy from last season. After describing his frustration with the inexperienced players on this year’s team, he describes his hope to help his teammates improve their game. Improving the game is central to the entire interaction. At one point, I ask whether his teammates are also bilingual. Luis explains that, although nearly everyone, including the coaches, is bilingual and of Hispanic background, Spanish is not used on the field. In his explanation, Luis draws on a discourse of language as utilitarian, that is, language as a tool or instrument for getting something done, in this case, strategizing about baseball to improve the game. He begins,

“there was this actually this one kid that didn’t know Spanish, I think, at least, so we didn’t really talk that much Spanish, because the things we mostly talked about was like strategizing. ... It’s because, it’s kind of like a rule. ‘Cause if we did talk about anything else but the game, like the coaches would get mad at us, or they would like separate us.”

In Luis’ description of the team, it stands out that the majority are Spanish/English bilinguals. We can see how Luis draws on a utilitarian discourse of language here. The purpose of language on the field is expedient communication among players to improve their game. The coaches reinforce this rule not by prohibiting Spanish use, but by saying they can only talk about the game on the field. Luis accepts the implicit assumption of English as the language of baseball and the normalcy that a majority of bilinguals suppress one of their languages in order to accommodate the one monolingual kid.

In the second example, Nora has been telling me about her weekly routine full of afternoon activities, which includes softball. She has told me that she admires her mostly older teammates, whom she describes as “fun, pretty friendly ... willing to try new things.” She has also told me that she is one of seven girls on the team who are Latina, and that sometimes girls use Spanish with one another. Throughout these interactions, Nora’s focus is on fitting in with her older teammates and gaining their acceptance. When I ask whether she uses Spanish or English with her teammates, Nora replies:

“I really just use English, ‘cause you know we’re just like meeting each other and so I don’t want to feel like I’m excluding anybody since I don’t actually know anybody else on my team. I don’t want to be the person that’s like, oh, I
don’t like her. ‘Cause like I don’t even have anybody that I know except for one girl, and I only know her because of softball.”

Nora draws on a discourse of *language as connecting* as she focuses on the need to use English so that she does not exclude anyone or alienate herself from potential friendships on the team.

The theme of these two excerpts is the same: language use on the field. However, Luis and Nora draw on different discourses to talk about this theme (see Figure 1).

Figure 1: Similar theme constructed by different speakers using different discourses

As illustrated in these examples, in my initial thematic coding of these data, I asked myself “what” is the speaker talking about? As I coded for discourses, the question shifted: “how” are they talking about this theme or topic?

In the final stage of FDA coding, described below, I asked a more nuanced series of questions to gain depth of understanding about the implications of a given discursive construction of language for the speaker's identity- and world-building.
Appendix 3: Codebook of discourses and FDA coded samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Discourse</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>Language as Utilitarian</td>
<td>This discourse is characterized by a concern with being prepared for a task and finding the most expedient or direct way of getting something done. Language is treated as a tool for accomplishing a task or life goal and often treated as a resource or commodity that is attained or lost.</td>
<td>L (36) I continue going to college, maybe ... I’ll use it (Spanish) more A (20) in your job if you’re like working in a store N (28) if I like went to Puerto Rico and lived there for a while, then Spanish would probably be most important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>Language as Internal</td>
<td>This discourse treats language as a skill, proficiency, quality or accomplishment that is located inside the individual person. The focus is often on word use (remembering/forgetting a word, word play).</td>
<td>A (14) it can help you see things in another perspective P (6) it’s very important cause it just gives you more skill in your head and you’re smarter and stuff J (8) I like having a lot to think about ... how words sound similar from Spanish and English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONN</td>
<td>Language as Connecting</td>
<td>This discourse emphasizes speakers’ effort to understand, connect with, or learn from or about others. Using Spanish or English, or trying to learn, strengthens that connection between people.</td>
<td>L: like people that try, because I know they’ve known, they learn about it they tried to make connections N: I’d be able to like understand people and communicate with them, rather than just standing there feeling really awkward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCL</td>
<td>Language as Excluding</td>
<td>This discourse emphasizes the absence of connection, the barriers created when a common language does not result in connection, or when people intentionally use language to leave someone out, talk about them, tease them or isolate them from the group.</td>
<td>J: a lot of people get bullied because they don’t know, like they’re talking about them but. They’re talking a different language but they don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key for coding:
DC: Discursive Construction D: Discourse
AO: Action orientation POS: Positioning
PRAC: Practices SUBJ: Subjectivities
Summary of FDA Stages, adapted from Willing (2009), with emphasis on identity-building from Bucholtz & Hall (2005)

| 1) Discursive constructions | • How is the language being constructed in the text?  
| • What are all the ways that language is talked about?  
| • What are its characteristics as expressed in the text? |
| 2) Discourses | • What discourses of language are being used?  
| • What is their relationship to one another?  
| • How do the various ways language is constructed fit together into wider discourses of language? |
| 3) Action Orientation | • What do these constructions achieve?  
| • What is gained by deploying them here?  
| • What is the speaker doing?  
From Bucholtz & Hall (2005):  
• What discursive tactics are being drawn upon that are specific to identity-building?  
• How is the speaker emphasizing similarity or difference from someone or some group?  
• How does the speaker accomplish authentication or denaturalization with respect to groups or kinds of people?  
• How does the speaker legitimate or undermine institutional structures of authority? |
| 4) Positionings | • What subject positions are made available by these constructions?  
| • What are the positioning implications of the discourse(s)?  
| • Who has agency? Who is responsible or blameworthy? Who is powerful? |
| 5) Practices | • What social, cultural or other practices are made normal?  
| • What possibilities are mapped out by these subject positions?  
| • What can be said & done from within these subject positions?  
| • What are the implications of the discourse(s) for future action? What past or current practices are made normal?  
| • What options are (or are not) available?  
| • What obligations are assumed? Who is under obligation to whom? |
| 6) Subjectivity | • We cannot infer internal states from discourses but we can infer what is available for subjective experience within the discourses  
| • What possibilities are made  
| • What can potentially be felt, thought or experienced from the available subject positions? |
### Coded data sample 1: *Language as utilitarian* discourse in use

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>So, Luis, do you think it’s important to you to learn more than one language?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>To be prepared. Like, you never know what’s going to happen, like if you don’t know,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>PRAC: being prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POS: “you” = employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AO: generalized “you” aligns self with employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRAC: at whim of employer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUBJ: insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>like if you get maybe shipped off to a place,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>PRAC: being shipped off; being made to travel to a new place as normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>to do something you might want to learn the language,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D: UT; language as a resource or commodity to gain access to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>and maybe it would help you, it helps you if you learn it already.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AO: “you” aligning self with person getting shipped off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRAC: getting shipped off as normal practice/expected that employer can make this decision and employee has obligation to follow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Did you say if you get shipped off?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Oh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Out of the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRAC: international travel as normal employment practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Yeah, that sometimes happens to people, huh? Do you know somebody that that happened to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>My sister got, went abroad, at college, and she went to Rome and then she went to Africa, and then she went to Italy, so. Well, she basically went to Italy and Africa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC: adult world of college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POS: college student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRAC: travel abroad as normal or expected practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D: UT; language as a resource or commodity for success in travel abroad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   |   | AO: demonstrating knowledge about international geography → this serves to align him with his sister and emphasize similarity between them; Luis is part of this family that knows something about travel abroad, a key practice which is part of the adult
Do you know what part of Africa she was in? (pause) No? Wow, so she went off to study there? (pause, Luis nods) Uh huh? And she needed to know the languages in those places?

Yeah, but it’s kind of similar to Spanish, so it wasn’t that hard to understand.

Yeah, cool. So that’s an important thing for, and is that what you meant when you said shipped off?

You can get shipped off somewhere? OK. Do you know anybody else who’s had to go somewhere else and learn another language?

Yeah, my dad.

He had to come here.

He had to learn how to speak English. He was already learning a little English.

How come your dad came here?

‘Cause he was getting married.

To get married, yeah.

My mom was already here, so she was living here before he did, so, they wanted to get married over here.

So, and then when you’re in New York staying at your cousin’s house, do you guys mostly speak Spanish or English?

English.
**Mostly English. Does anyone there in that part of the family speak mostly Spanish?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Mostly English. Does anyone there in that part of the family speak mostly Spanish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Yeah, well, he speaks like equally both, but when he’s talking with my mom he speaks Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>But when he’s like talking with my sister, cause my sister’s like not that good at Spanish I guess, he talks to her in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Huh, and what about with you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>In English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Why does he speak to you in English?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>I guess he thinks it’s easier for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>But sometimes he like makes jokes in Spanish, and I’m like what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>He can say like, I don’t know like some random joke in Spanish, and I look at him like what did you say?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Like, did you just insult me?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Like, yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>So you think he speaks Spanish (said Spanish but meant English here) because it’s easier for you. Is it easier for you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Yeah, even though Spanish is my first language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Interesting. And then, what about Florida, do you go there sometimes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Yeah, I speak Spanish there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pos: self as competent Spanish speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>You speak Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Yeah, ’cause my cousin,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I mean he’s good in English but like, well like, he’s not like, no, he’s decent in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pos: Cousin as Spanish dominant/ not fluent bilingual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|      |      | AO: Disclaimer: avoids being disrespectful to a family member by appreciating his English skills (Lang as
He understands but he doesn’t really speak it. So I kind of speak Spanish to him.

Coded data sample 3: *Language as connecting/excluding discourse in use*

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>And you were saying that your family’s Dominican, would you say that that’s kind of part of who you are too?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>I don’t, ah, I’m not really related like, a lot of Dominicans they like different music and I, like there’s music that Dominicans listen to called Dembow I hate, I don’t really like that music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>(...) Dembow?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Yeah, I don’t like, I, I hate that music. (nervous laughter) Oh MY (...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>If somebody asked you, what would you call yourself? Would you say you’re Dominican? Or would you say something different?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>I would say I was born here, but my parents are Dominican.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Ok. Some people use the word bicultural to mean when you feel like you’re part of two cultures. Would you say you’re bicultural?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>I keep talking about that but I never knew that was IT. (laughs) yeah, bicultural, yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>So, it’s kind of like, when there’s two cultures and you feel kind of like you’re part of both. Is that how you feel?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Can you tell me what that’s like for you?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|16 | J  | Like, I, like, not like act, like I would go to places but I wouldn’t have to act different but I would be like, I like POS: self as outsider when interacting with Dominicans who do not understand him unless he performs,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>had to do things how they would understand it? or “acts,” for them in a certain way. PRAC: obligation to change his behavior to accommodate others/ so others would understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Like especially in DR? Like when I go? Like it’s, like some people, they feel like, (laughs) “oh, yeah, I know how to speak English too,” and they try to like talk to me, I’m like, “what are you saying?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>(laughs) And like, ah, like, it’s easy to teach them. Not easy, but. Like they get the hang of it and they start to want to know it more and they study it, and they end up knowing it. Discursive shift: Johnny moves from criticizing their English to highlighting his own success with teaching them; POS: self as bridge/connector/helper POS: others as successful learners of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>So when you’re in the DR do you feel like pressure to act like you’re from there? Or do you feel like you’re more—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I feel like they’re just going to stare at me, like what are you doing? AO: Distinguishing self from DR peers SUBJ: feeling ostracized and misunderstood when interacting with others in the DR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Why would they stare at you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Well, like they do that over there. Wow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Like what kinds of things would people stare at you about?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Like, like, for my music, they’re like “what are you listening to?” (nervous laughter) PRAC: taunting/questioning musical preferences from different places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>But they listen to some of that music, like, the music that we have here, they listen to it over there like a few months later, and the music that they have over there, AO shift: emphasis on similarities in musical preferences PRAC: international music trends AO: distances in time/place emphasized (through deictics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>like I’ll be over there, and I’ll hear that song and when I come back to Boston, I hear it like three months later. POS: self as crossing the distances of time/place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I’ll be like, “oh, yeah I heard this song in the DR.” POS: self as possessor of knowledge about music trends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | They’ll be like “really, why did we get it so late?”
|   | “I don’t know.”
| 28 | JJ | So, music comes out there first and then comes here? |
|   |   | POS: others as not knowing English music/ not understanding the trends |
|   |   | PRAC seeking knowledge from J |
| 29 | J | For the Spanish songs, they come out over there first, and then they come over here like a few months later. |
|   |   | POS: self as knowledgeable/international music authority |
|   |   | PRAC: explaining music trends |
|   |   | AO: distances in time/place emphasized (through deictics) |
|   |   | PRAC: “Spanish songs” there \(\rightarrow\) here |
| 30 | J | And then, like when we get English music here, they get it over there like a few months later. Not they get it but they find it out. |
|   |   | PRAC: “English songs” here \(\rightarrow\) there |
|   |   | UT: songs as commodities “they get it” |
|   |   | CONN/EXCL: “they find it out” b/c J explains it to them |
**Appendix 5: Luis’ Discourse Map**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Discourses</th>
<th>FDA</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ACTIVITY</td>
<td>Baseball: Teammates</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>similarity, social ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACTIVITY</td>
<td>Baseball: Coaches</td>
<td>CONN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>authenticity, respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>HISPANIC LABEL</td>
<td>Hispanic means</td>
<td>CONN, ROOTS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>social ties with friends; de-emphasizing difference between lang/ethn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PLACE</td>
<td>My street</td>
<td>CONN/EXCL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>distancing from drug/gang, aggression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td>Family talk</td>
<td>ROOTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Distinction; feeling othered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td>Family heritage/race</td>
<td>ROOTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td>Family unique</td>
<td>ROOTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAMILY/SELF</td>
<td>“I'm Hispanic”</td>
<td>ROOTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LANG/FUTURE</td>
<td>Learn another language “to be prepared”</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Similarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANG/FUTURE</td>
<td>Future Spanish: college, jobs</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANG/FUTURE</td>
<td>English if I stay in US</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Authorizing; linking language &amp; social class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANG/FUTURE</td>
<td>Spanish/English equally important in the future</td>
<td>ROOTS, CONN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANG/FUTURE</td>
<td>Future spouse</td>
<td>~</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANG/FUTURE</td>
<td>Future children</td>
<td>ROOTS, CONN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FUTURE SCHOOL</td>
<td>High school: bilingual “average” importance</td>
<td>UT, CONN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3.1.3</td>
<td>LANG USE AT SCHOOL</td>
<td>Joanne’s class, “huevitos”</td>
<td>INT, CONN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Illegitimating Joanne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3.2.3</td>
<td>LANG USE AT SCHOOL</td>
<td>Strong Spanish teachers</td>
<td>EXCL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Distancing self from strict Spanish; denaturalizing father’s Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3.3.2</td>
<td>LANG VARIETIES AT SCHOOL</td>
<td>Selva tropical case: student needs to be respectful in resistance</td>
<td>CONN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Distinguishing Spanish varieties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Authorizing student to resist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5.2.2</td>
<td>BEING LATINO</td>
<td>Don’t you kind of feel?</td>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Emphasizing similarities w/ Annie; authenticating Annie as partly Latina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.3</td>
<td>SPANISH V. LATINO</td>
<td>I would need more information</td>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Emphasizing overlap between lang and ethn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.6</td>
<td>UNCOMF SPKG SPAN</td>
<td>“shut up you Mexican”</td>
<td>EXCL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Distinguishing; authorizing self to kick others from the game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.14</td>
<td>FEEL MORE LATINO</td>
<td>When with Spanish speakers</td>
<td>CONN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Distancing self from those who shun Spanish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
References


