

3-23-2009

Multimodal Text Designers: A Case Study of Literacy Events in a Multicultural Context

Mary-Virginia Feger
University of South Florida

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/etd>



Part of the [American Studies Commons](#)

Scholar Commons Citation

Feger, Mary-Virginia, "Multimodal Text Designers: A Case Study of Literacy Events in a Multicultural Context" (2009). *USF Tampa Graduate Theses and Dissertations*.
<https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/etd/1961>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the USF Graduate Theses and Dissertations at Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. It has been accepted for inclusion in USF Tampa Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usf.edu.

Multimodal Text Designers: A Case Study of Literacy Events in a Multicultural Context

by

Mary-Virginia Feger

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Childhood Education and Literacy Studies
College of Education
University of South Florida

Co-Major Professor: Kathryn L. Laframboise, Ph.D.
Co-Major Professor: Nancy L. Williams, Ph.D.
Linda S. Evans, Ph.D.
James R. King, Ed.D.

Date of Approval:
March 23, 2009

Keywords: English language learners, discourse, after-school program,
Latino/a adolescents, middle school

© Copyright 2009, Mary-Virginia Feger

Acknowledgements

Although my gratitude is ineffable, I would like to acknowledge the following exemplary professors and scholars whose assistance was influential in shaping and guiding my work on this study. First and most importantly, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Kathryn Laframboise for her patience and skillful direction. Second, I would like to express my deep appreciation to Dr. Nancy Williams for her kindness and support. Third, I would like to express my profound appreciation to Dr. James King for his caring, knowledge, and wisdom. Finally, I wish to thank Dr. Linda Evans for her gracious willingness to fill an unexpected vacancy on my committee and serve as a representative of my cognate area.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	vi
Abstract	vii
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Background of the Study	1
The Community	1
Erasing Literacy	2
Validating Literacy	4
Case Studies	5
Projective Identity	6
Participation and Reification	7
Purpose and Questions	8
Summary	8
Limitations and Key Assumptions	9
Definitions of Terms	9
Context	9
Culturally Responsive Pedagogy	10
Literacy(ies)	10
Multiliteracies	10
Literacy Practices	11
Literacy Events	11
Conclusion	11
Chapter Two: Review of the Literature	13
Introduction	13
Major Theoretical Issues in Literacy	13
Summary	15
Tensions in Literacy	17
Orality versus Literacy	17
Skills versus Practices	18
Literacy as Social Practices	19
Home and School Language Socialization	21
Summary	21
Discourse Practices	22
Culturally Appropriate Classroom Talk	22
A Critical View of Child Development Research	23
The Literacy Myth	24

Gee's Theory of Discourses	25
Meta-Level Knowledge is Learned	26
Discourses and Culture	27
Discourses and Literacies	27
Summary	28
A Critical Look at Literacy as Social Practices	29
Literacy in Action	31
Literacy Sponsors	31
Extending Social Practices	32
Summary	34
Visual Discourse	34
Valuing Non-mainstream Literacy Practice	34
A Diversity of Choices	35
The New Visual Literacy	36
Visual Discourse Practices Among Latino/a Youth	36
Summary	40
Identity Theory and L2 Learning	41
Identity and Literacy in an On-line Context	44
An Untapped Power	45
Summary	46
A Pedagogy of Pluralism	47
New Designs	48
Summary	50
Second Language Writing Theory and Pedagogy	51
Current Traditional Rhetoric	52
The Process Approach	52
The Genre Approach	52
Sociocultural Theory and Writing	53
The Social Constructionist Approach	54
The Reading-Writing Relationship	56
Reading Constructs Meaning	56
Summary	57
The Socio-Historical Context	58
An Oppressive Cultural Model	60
The Cultural Ecological Paradigm	61
A Forgotten Struggle	62
Monoliths and Misconceptions	63
Gender, Immigration, and Teaching	64
Summary	64
Culturally Responsive Pedagogy	65
Summary	69
Multimodality and Critical Literacy	70
Multimodality	70
Critical Literacy	72

Summary	73
Conclusion	73
Chapter Three: Methodology	75
Introduction	75
Outline of the Study	76
Theoretical Framework	76
Research Questions	78
Case Study Criteria	79
Participant Selection and Consent	82
Purposeful Sampling	82
Student Assent	83
Parental Consent	83
Teacher Consent	84
Data Collection	84
Data Sources	84
Fieldwork	87
Teacher Interviews	87
Data Collected from Students	87
Documents	88
Interviews	88
Data Collection Matrix	89
Character Chart	89
Data Management	90
Data Analysis	91
Introduction	91
Discourse Analysis	91
Three Characteristics of Multimodal Literacy	93
The Contextual Characteristic	94
The Intertextual Characteristic	94
The Social Characteristic	95
Grounded Theory	96
Open Coding	96
Axial Coding	96
Plan to Insure Credibility	97
Triangulation	97
Role of the Researcher	98
Presentation of the Case	99
Trustworthiness	100
Conclusion	102
Chapter Four: Results	103
Introduction	103
The Story of the Play Production	104
The Vote	105

A Summary of the Novel	108
Rising Action: Days 1 to 9	109
On the Stage: Day 7	109
An Audience: Day 8	116
The Turning Point: Days 10 to 17	125
Disagreement: Day 10	125
A Decisive Event: Day 12	128
Resolution: Days 18 to 20	134
Seriousness: Day 19	134
Discourse Analysis	140
Discourse model 1: Being Responsible	143
Summary and Critique	160
Table 1	164
Discourse model 2: Playing Around	166
Summary and Critique	173
Table 2	178
Characteristics of the Performances	179
The Contextual Characteristic	180
The Sociohistorical Context	180
The Contemporary Context	183
The Intertextual Characteristic	184
Designing Meaning	184
Being Initiated	188
The Social Characteristic	189
The Level One Social Characteristic	190
The Level Two Social Characteristic	192
Modeling	194
The Role of Parody	195
What Would Your Character Think?	198
Symbols of Participation	199
Acting in a Certain Way	200
Summary	201
Validation/Invalidation	201
Validation of the Final Performance	202
Invalidation of the Rehearsal Performances	206
Conclusion	209
Chapter Five: Conclusions	214
Introduction	214
Limitations of Discourse	215
Summary	219
Limitations of the Visual World	222
Summary	225
Multimodal Text Designers	225
Summary	229

A Design for Performance Learning	230
Responsibility	230
History	232
Teamwork	233
Summary	234
Implications	234
Implications for Administrators	235
Implications for Teachers	236
Implications for Researchers	238
Suggestions for Further Research	239
Educational Significance	240
References	242
Appendices	265
Appendix A: Consent/Assent Forms	266
Appendix B: Teacher Interview Questions	276
Appendix C: Student Interview Questions	278
Appendix D: Data Collection Matrix	279
Appendix E: Character Chart	280
Appendix F: Tables of Discourse Models	283
About the Author	End Page

List of Tables

1	The Discourse model of being responsible	164
2	The Discourse model of playing around	178
3	The Discourse model of strategies	283
4	The Discourse model of the complexity of performing	284
5	The Discourse model of the emotional effect of performing	285
6	The caring Discourse model	286
7	The Discourse model of unwilling participation	287

MULTIMODAL TEXT DESIGNERS: A CASE STUDY OF LITERACY EVENTS IN A
MULTICULTURAL CONTEXT

Mary-Virginia Feger

ABSTRACT

The erasure of Latino/a adolescents' multiliteracies in school settings affects both their views of education and their entry into the community outside of school. Framed by literacy-as-social-practices perspectives and communities of practice theory, this case study explored what happened when a group of 13 Latino/a adolescents and their Latina teacher engaged in a six-week play production in an after-school program and performed the play for parents. It examined the relationship between the participants' discourse practices and their performance, and determined how they validated their performances. Data collected included observations, interviews, students' written reflective responses, a fieldwork journal, and a DVD of the performance.

Data were analyzed using Discourse Analysis (Gee, 2005), three characteristics of multimodal literacy adapted from three features Cowan (2003) used to analyze Latino visual discourse, and Grounded Theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The findings revealed a complex performance community mediated by a set of discourse practices and tools, including a script and a video. The video's history, traced to a former 7th grade after-school group, and the participants' social practices framed their interactions. The findings revealed the discourse practice of playing around was constructed in relationship with the teacher's expectations and became an intractable

binary. After one actor assessed the situation as hopeless because of the teacher's involvement in the construction of the discourses, she "left" the play and constructed herself through a new critical discourse, and imagined an easier and more equitable discourse. Another discourse juxtaposed Discourses of immigration, recognizing them as speaking to one another across history.

Although the methodology was adequate for answering the research questions, it was inadequate for reaching findings on how the performances created effects for both the actors and audience. Both pedagogical and methodological errors were the result of how the visual world of print shaped our thought, extending the visual into the social world, separating it from the other senses.

The actors drew from elements of the six modes of meaning to create a system of multimodal design in their performance text, and although they validated their final performance in reflective responses, they invalidated their rehearsal performances. Elements of their Discourse model serve as a blueprint for a Design for Performance Learning. The Design proposes that Latino/a adolescents take responsibility for their learning by producing sharable digital artifacts in after-school performance communities, which might prove to be contexts in which Latino/a adolescents' multiliteracies are validated rather than erased.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

The narratives that people share connect them through geography, history, language, and culture to other places on earth. Their artifacts, practices, and language shape their experiences and perspectives. These varied artifacts, practices, and languages are found in groups that gather for various purposes and wherein participants' experiences and viewpoints help them to make myriad conscious and unconscious decisions as they involve themselves in the community's shared practices. Yet these groups do not exist in a vacuum, but rather are embedded in broader communities that must be described in order to develop a complete understanding of each specific community.

The Community

This naturalistic case study of a group of 7th grade Latino/a ELLs and their Latina teacher who produced a play in the context of an after-school program took place at a middle school situated in a southwest Florida community that has undergone dramatic growth over the past two decades. As a result of a variety of changing economic, social and geographical factors that have drawn many diverse people to the region, the population expansion of this community has resulted in an enormous range of wealth as demonstrated by an array of multi-million dollar ranches and beachfront estates to the

more modest condos and apartments of middle and working class citizens and immigrants. The middle school is located in a neighborhood composed of a mixture of condominiums, apartments, and single-family homes. The local economy offers a range of employment opportunities that attract immigrants: tourism, health services, packing and shipping, construction, maintenance, and others. Given these employment opportunities, the likelihood exists for families to consider the dreams they have for their children.

Erasing Literacy

Many residents of the neighborhood ride bicycles, or walk their dogs on a concrete pathway that winds through a grassy tree-lined swath amid apartments and condominiums. Although its appearance has been sporadic, graffiti that signifies the names of rival gangs has appeared on the sidewalks, walls, or other surfaces in the neighborhood. However, what is done with the graffiti, and the possible reasons for these actions, is noteworthy.

Whenever graffiti has appeared in the neighborhood, whether on walls, fences, or sidewalks, it is painted over within a day or two of its appearance. Its swift removal suggests that the act of writing gang-related graffiti, is an unacceptable discourse practice and the action of painting it over has seemed to be effective to some extent in reducing its occurrence. While there may be other invisible factors involved in the reduction of gang activity and graffiti, such as parents or community officials' actions to discourage the practice, the graffiti-writers have not always heeded these interventions and have

managed to persist in occasionally seizing an opportunity to inscribe insignia on a neighborhood surface.

Although the exact reason for the reduction of graffiti is unknown, the tension between those who write graffiti and those who erase graffiti was important in terms of the issue in this case study, that is, describing a context in which adolescent ELLs' literacies are validated. Describing such a context in which adolescent ELLs' literacies are validated and supported rather than erased has a lot to say about how the adolescents assume literate identities and join the larger community outside of school.

In his dissertation on Latino visual discourse, Cowan (2003) related an interesting story in which he noticed that one of his difficult Latino students, contrary to his normal disruptive behavior, was making a concentrated effort on a task with his book for the unusual span of two or three days. Cowan did not apprehend the significance of the student's concentration until he checked the books at the end of the year and found that the student had erased a whole page of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's short story "The Speckled Band" from the school textbook. Cowan interpreted this behavior as the student's expenditure of an intense effort to erase dominant literacies. While this is so, it is important to ask why he wanted to erase the dominant literacies as represented in the classroom text and, how the student's erasure shaped his participation in his own and others' experiences of dominant literacies. As a consequence of the way he participated in dominant literacies, the next reader of the book (who turned out to be the teacher) had to deal with the new meaning the student had given to the text.

Analogously, those who write gang-related graffiti might be saying that the property owners' recognize their literacies at least in a minimal way through its removal,

and the property owners might be saying that writing on public surfaces is an unlawful practice that can be easily erased. Although literacies (whether mainstream or non-mainstream) can be easily erased, validating literacies involves challenges. These challenges were the focus of this naturalistic case study, which explored what happened when a group of 7th grade Latino/a ELLs and their Latina teacher produced a play in the context of an after-school program. This case study sought to explore the relationship between the participants' discourse practices and their performance and to determine whether the participants validated their performance and if so, how.

Validating Literacy

I proposed that the after-school context explored in this naturalistic case study was a setting in which the participants' multiple literacies were validated. I believed that the teacher's experiences and involvement in cultural events outside of school contributed to how she represented herself in her language, dress, thoughts, actions, and lifestyle. In addition, I believed that the participants brought unique knowledge and literacy practices to the after-school community and I wondered what would happen as they used their knowledge and literacy practices in the play production.

The after-school context bore little resemblance to a traditional classroom setting. Instead, the collaborative group activities occurred within a community of practice (Wenger, 1998), which is defined as a group of people working together toward a shared goal. The theory of communities of practice conceptualizes individuals' combined contributions to learning through meaning, practice, and identity. In communities of practice, Wenger stated, the purpose for learning involves integrating oneself into the community's shared performance, which means taking on new identities. Community of

practice theory was used as the theoretical framework in a recent study of middle school ELLs.

Case Studies

I conducted two searches to determine whether this type of case study had been conducted in the past. In the first search I used the key words *ELLs*, *case study*, and *middle school*. The results yielded 8 dissertations since 1997. Substituting the key word *adolescent* for *middle school* yielded 4 dissertations since 1997 and replacing *middle school* with *Latino*, yielded 7 dissertations since 1992. From among these nineteen dissertations on middle school English language learners (ELLs), one descriptive qualitative case study used Discourse Analysis and a community of practice framework to examine how 6th grade ELLs took up math discourse in a standards-based mathematics classroom (Hansen-Thomas, 2005). Hansen-Thomas concluded that, while standards-based instruction benefited the students, the curricula did not identify the necessary math discourse, and the onus was put on teachers to isolate the target discourse and make it explicit for students.

In the second search I used the key words *adolescent English language learners* and *after school program*, which yielded 9 dissertations since 1997. Another search using the key words *after school program*, *middle school*, and *ELLs* yielded 15 dissertations since 1999. Substituting the key word *Latino* for *ELLs* generated 35 dissertations. However, using the key words *drama*, *play*, or *performance*, *adolescent ELLs*, and *after school program* produced no results. As a result of these two searches, I decided that this case study promised to yield significant findings because it concerned a phenomenon that had not been investigated in depth in the past.

Projective Identity

The concept of projective identity is significant in learning. This concept is illustrated in the following vignette. Focused on preparations for a forthcoming cultural celebration, the adolescent ELLs were drawing their nations' flags, which most depicted as rectangular shapes. However, one student from Puerto Rico stepped forward to disagree with this representation, and, as everyone gathered around him, he placed a large piece of drawing paper on the floor and began to draw the flag as if the wind were blowing it and giving it life. As he drew, he argued that drawing the flag using a simple rectangular design did not communicate cultural pride, and the depiction of the wind blowing the flag was essential to communicate the cultural pride associated with the symbol of one's country (field notes, May, 2004).

According to Gee (1990/1996), many culturally and linguistically diverse students acquire meta-knowledge "because they have had certain experiences which have caused them to think about a particular Discourse in a reflective and critical way" (p. 140). The Latino student articulated his knowledge because he had acquired it as one of his Discourses. The student's ability to interpret the visual discourse was the result of the experience of becoming socialized into a particular Discourse. His discourse practices also demonstrated that he thought about his explanation in terms of what he thought the other students might expect. Acquiring a new identity, as the New London Group (1996) stated, is the goal of transformed practice, and takes place when two Discourses are juxtaposed.

Participation and Reification

In a community of practice (Wenger, 1998), participation is conceived of as playing an active role in a community and has to do with people's acknowledgement of others' humanity. In Wenger's view, for example, a pet fish does not participate in a family, but a puppy does because of people's ability to recognize that the puppy learns new things just as they do. According to Wenger, participation is differentiated from the more social term engagement because participation involves identity and is not subject to our intention or will.

Reification is the complement to participation. An example of reification is the forms and procedures involved in purchasing a home. The mortgage agreement with its figures, dates, and signatures reifies the responsibility of the mortgagee, at the same time as it confers the status of ownership. Almost all first-time homeowners talk similarly about the experience of signing the mortgage papers because of reification. They project themselves into the procedures and talk about what it meant to them and others, who participate similarly, also recognize their meaning.

Reification is a versatile ability of human beings to translate their experience into meaning by creating things that give a sense of reality to their experience. From simple things such as giving names to paint colors (e.g. Aztec Tan) to the complex classification of animal species (e.g. *Callinectes sapidus*, commonly known as the Chesapeake Bay blue crab), reification is pervasive and keeps human beings busy in the constant process of making meaning.

Purpose and Questions

The purpose of this naturalistic case study was to explore what happened when 7th grade Latino/a ELLs and their Latina teacher produced a play in the context of an after-school program and to determine the relationship between the participants' discourse practices and their performance. In addition, I sought to describe the characteristics of the performances and to find out if the participants validated their performance, and if so, how. The research questions that guided the exploration of this study were as follows:

1. What happens when a group of 7th grade Latino ELLs and their Latina teacher produce a play in an after-school program during the final six weeks of the school year?
 - a. What is the relationship between the participants' discourse practices and their performance?
2. What are the characteristics of the performances?
 - a. Do the participants validate their performance? If so, how?

Summary

The contrasting themes of erasing literacies and validating literacies constitute one of the major tensions in the education of linguistically and culturally diverse students. This tension was the focus of this naturalistic case study, which explored what happened when a group of 7th grade Latino/a ELLs and their Latina teacher produced a play in the context of an after-school program. In addition to exploring what happened during the play production, this study sought to explore the relationship between the participants' discourse practices and their performance and to determine whether the participants validated their performance and if so, how.

The answers to these questions would be useful in moving the field forward by establishing a theory based on the main issue in the case. This issue was how to describe and understand the participants' engagement with literacy practices and to explain their perceptions in order to facilitate culturally responsive pedagogy to support academic learning.

Limitations and Key Assumptions

One of the limitations of the study consisted of the unusual time frame for the study. Although the final six weeks of the school year might be considered an atypical time frame in which to conduct a case study, the unusual nature of the unit of analysis—the play—with its alternative approach to literacy and its context in an after-school program, made it necessary to conduct the study during this time. In addition, the school district granted permission to collect data during the last six weeks of the school year. Finally, a key assumption of this case study was that the findings would not be generalizable because the focus of the case was in learning about how this particular case worked.

Definition of Terms

For this study, the terms context, culturally responsive pedagogy, literacy(ies), multiliteracies, literacy practices, and literacy events were defined as follows:

Context

In qualitative research, context is crucial to understanding (Patton, 2002). Context consists of who, what, where, when, why, and how that describe the details of the case. Naturalistic inquiry maintains the details of the context (Patton, 2002). A key tenet of constructivism is that meanings are unique to the individuals in each context, therefore

results from one context cannot be generalized to another context (Guba & Lincoln, 1989).

Culturally Responsive Pedagogy

According to Ladson-Billings (1995) this type of instruction refers to a compatible connection between the culture associated with the context of the home and the culture associated with the context of the classroom. In other words, the teacher has acquired practices that match practices of the home culture, or the teacher is from the same cultural background as the students.

Literacy(ies)

Gee (1990/1996) defined this as “the mastery of a secondary Discourse” (p. 143). In addition, because there are innumerable secondary Discourses, it is always plural (Gee, 1990/1996). Since it is a practice, or set of practices, determined within cultural groups, users participate in various personal as well as academic practices within school, at home, and within other groups (Ferdman, 1990; Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group, 1994; Faulkner, 2005). The traditional definition refers to a more narrow set of skills used when individuals engage print on a page of text (Lee & Croninger, 1994).

Multiliteracies

This notion considers how students can be connected to ways of using language and texts that reflect the culturally and socially diverse aspects of the students’ knowledge. This idea refers to the different visual and electronic forms in which literacy appears in the globalized economy (Smagorinsky, Cook & Reed, 2005; New London Group, 1996; Street, 2005).

Literacy practices

This concept links the actions of reading and writing with the social context that shapes and is shaped by their practices. These include literacy events (incidents that involve literacy) and the models of those events in addition to the “ideological preconceptions that underpin them” (Street, 1993, p. 12-13).

Literacy events

These are “any event involving print, such as group negotiation of meaning in written texts (e.g. an ad), individuals ‘looking things up’ in reference books” (Gee, 1990/1996, p. 62). According to Heath (1983), incidents that involve “the written word...have their rules of occurrence and appropriateness” and are regular, repetitive activities in life (p. 200).

Conclusion

This naturalistic case study explored what happened when 7th grade Latino/a adolescents and their Latina teacher formed themselves into an after-school group. This after-school group was seen as a community of practice in which the participants focused on a shared objective, namely the production of a play. While the skills approach to literacy instruction isolates skills by decontextualizing them with the goal of getting students ready for future employment, by doing so, it gives up the important element of production. In addition, forfeiting production does not take advantage of participation and reification. On the other hand, a community of practice perspective focuses on the task at hand, which is thought to have economic or social value. In addition to describing what happened during the play production, this study sought to determine the relationship between the participants’ discourse practices and their performance. To explore the

context further, this study sought to describe the characteristics of the performance and to determine if the participants validated their performance, and if so, how.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Five major areas are of interest in this study. In this literature review, I will first review major theoretical issues in literacy to document the historical development of theory that has brought literacy learning to the point where it is today. Second, I will describe the development of theory and research in second language writing. In order to know how to improve writing instruction for ELLs, a review of the theoretical underpinnings of writing research brings to light the scholarship of the past and situates new research on this trajectory. Third, I will examine the social-historical context in order to dispel some of the common myths about linguistic minority students. Fourth, I will present the research on culturally responsive education that provides a theoretical background necessary to describe the classroom context in this study. Finally, I will discuss multimodality and critical literacies to provide a means to discuss the decisions the participants make in the design of their texts.

Major Theoretical Issues in Literacy

A direct result of the former Soviet Union's 1957 launch of the space capsule Sputnik was that foreign language expertise became vital in the global power struggle (Raimes, 1991). At that time, instructional approaches in foreign language education were influenced by behaviorism (Skinner, 1953) and featured the language labs that

called for extensive repetition. Structural approaches to linguistics (Chomsky, 1965) had an effect on instruction with an approach to L2 writing known as controlled composition in which grammatical features were manipulated to form new sentences. Structural linguistics drew from the work of Saussure and the Russian Formalists who identified and evaluated the literary qualities of texts on the basis of formal elements (Gee, 1989c). Certain elements were considered evidence of oral forms and others signaled literary forms. This theory of differentiation in language forms caused the structural linguists to sequence the teaching of oral language before the teaching of writing (Raimes, 1991).

The theory that oral language should be learned before writing was translated into the audio-lingual method (Fries, 1945). In high school language labs, students learned to speak a second language by listening to tapes and recording responses. According to Ferris and Hedgcock (1998), controlled composition in second language writing instruction called for students to manipulate tenses and syntax in writing models in systematic ways drawn from Chomsky's (1965) theory of grammatical competence. The theory of grammatical competence accounted for the speaker's unconscious knowledge of the formal structures of the language; however, it did not account for the speaker's "ability to use this grammatical knowledge in real-life situations" (Johnson, 2004, p. 30). Despite the instructional longevity of controlled composition and the audio-lingual method, these two approaches faded from the classroom with the introduction of the notion of communicative competence (Hymes, 1974).

The notion of communicative competence (Hymes, 1974) differentiated language knowledge into two distinct areas: knowledge of rules and knowledge of the

appropriateness of language in various contexts. Hymes' theory involved how language occurred in the activities of learners in social contexts and their communicative competence rather than the individual mental processes of language and its grammatical competence with which Chomsky was concerned (Johnson, 2004). Communicative competence accounted for speakers' acquisition of language through apprenticeship in a social context, as well as their motivation to engage with other speakers (Hymes, 1974).

According to Farr and Barajas (2005), "Hymes' call four decades ago for an anthropology of language was intended to fill an important... gap between disciplines" with linguistics "focused on cognitive rather than social aspects of language," and anthropology's disregard of "language almost entirely" (p. 20). This led to several important ethnographic studies on language socialization (Heath, 1983; Scribner & Cole, 1981/1988; Street, 1984).

According to Gee (1990/1996), language acquisition is "a process of acquiring something subconsciously by exposure to models, a process of trial and error, and practice within social groups, without formal teaching" (p. 138). In contrast, learning is a conscious process that entails teaching through analysis, that is, breaking down the components of a concept or situation and gaining meta-knowledge (Gee, 1990/1996). Both language acquisition and language learning take place through activities in social contexts (Heath, 1983; Gee, 1990/1996).

Summary

Although some learning theorists are left out (e.g. Piaget), the sequence of theory development on language learning outlined in broad terms above provides some of the background knowledge, albeit very briefly, needed to situate the current study. As this

general outline attempts to show, although second language learning differs from first language learning, they share a social aspect, and although much is understood about the complexity of these social processes, there is still much to be learned about how language is learned through social interaction in classrooms. Social interaction in classrooms is where much of the current research is focused (Short, 2000; Hansen-Thomas, 2005). For example, I examined three dissertations that used case study methodology to explore how middle school teachers promoted English language learners' (ELLs) academic discourse in three disciplinary areas: science, social studies and mathematics.

Short (2000) analyzed oral interaction between sheltered science teachers and ELLs and identified discourse strategies and knowledge of content and performance strategies needed to for academic tasks. Hansen-Thomas (2005) found that standards-based instruction benefited ELLs, but the necessary math discourse was lacking in the curricula and thus the onus was placed on teachers to isolate the target discourse in order to teach it. Tiede (1996) used a sociocultural perspective and found that ELLs in an 8th grade science class learned academic language through negotiation and interaction, but that they were often restricted by the voices of others. These representative studies have successfully identified discourse strategies and knowledge, and they have used theory to confirm how students appropriate academic language in the content areas. However, the research lacks a description of how literacy is promoted in middle school ELLs' language arts classrooms to improve literacy instruction.

Tensions in Literacy

Orality Versus Literacy

The first of two common tensions in the field of literacy has been the tension between orality and literacy. This tension was described in a seminal article by Goody and Watt (1968/1988) who sought to account for the relationship between literacy and thinking in literate and non-literate cultures. Goody and Watt (1968/1988) explained that one of the key limitations of non-literate societies was that in oral language there was a necessity for a direct “relationship between symbol and referent” (p. 5). This direct relationship meant that meanings of words had to be negotiated in face-to-face contexts characterized by a high degree of socialization (Goody & Watt, 1968/1988). Goody and Watt (1968/1988) explained that in pure oral cultures the negotiation of meaning in local contexts often led to a profusion of vocabulary, for example multiple words for objects important in the culture.

With the introduction of writing; however, the direct relationship between words and objects was altered, and words and the objects they represented were related in an abstract way (Goody & Watt, 1968/1988). Although Goody and Watt (1968/1988) rejected outright “differences between the mental attributes of literate and non-literate peoples,” they made the guarded statement that, “there may still exist general differences between literate and non-literate societies” (p. 13). According to Goody and Watt (1968/1988) oral and literate cultures differed, the latter benefiting from the cognitive consequences that were the result of the development of alphabetic writing, with one example being its emphasis on individual thought. Goody and Watt’s theory prompted considerable reflection and criticism. For example, Scribner and Cole (1981/1988) expressed concern that

“inferences about cognitive changes in *individuals* are shaky if they rest only on the analysis of *cultural* phenomena (p. 59) [italics in original].”

Goody and Watt’s seminal article was pivotal in the development of literacy into an interdisciplinary issue. Mignolo (2003) credited these two authors’ article with a reorientation of “thinking toward the social and political dimension of writing rather than to its metaphysical underpinnings (p. 321).” In addition, Mignolo credited the authors’ article as the source of thousands of literacy studies.

Skills Versus Practices

The second common tension in the field of literacy has been the tension between individual skills and social practices. Like the folk tale in which the blind men construed the elephant in different ways, literacy theory has many definitions that can be traced to the power held by the observers. Observers who see literacy from the vantage point of the schools believe that literacy is a collection of separate skills known as the autonomous model (Street, 1995). This group believes that literacy skills are like digitally coded bits of information downloaded onto a compact disk and, at the appropriate time, teachers simply insert the disk into the students’ brains and literacy skills are loaded with the click of a mouse. This “emphasis on the ‘neutrality’ and ‘autonomy’ of literacy” hides the power structures that all literacy research reveals based on the researcher’s reading of “power, authority and social differentiation” (Street, 1995, p. 161).

However, according to Street (1995), observers who see literacy from the vantage point of the ideological model do not “deny the technical skill or the cognitive aspects of reading and writing” but see them as embedded in the social practices of diverse cultural groups “and within structures of power” (p. 161). Street (1995) argued that the use of the

term ideological “signals quite explicitly that literacy practices are aspects not only of ‘culture’ but also of power structures” (p. 161).

Observers who see literacy from the vantage point of the schools believe in structures of power controlled through mainstream cultural models. The mainstream represents individuals who look outside their immediate context for “rules and guidance in ways of dressing, entertaining themselves, decorating their homes, and decision-making in their jobs” (Heath, 1983, p. 236). According to Heath (1983), these rules and guidance are thought of as normal and natural, instead of “learned and shared habits of a particular social group” (p.398).

Literacy as social practices. According to Barton and Hamilton (1998), literacy is “an activity, located in the space between thought and text” (p. 3). While it may be easy to think about acquiring a language as an activity, the problem is that a teacher Discourse, or “identity kit” (Gee, 1989b), has fixed, limited, school-based ideas about literacy, which make it difficult to separate literacy from its print-based form (Moje, 2000, p. 655). Nevertheless, literacy is a more complex social activity imbued with the significance and routines that we, and everyone else around us, use daily.

The literacy practices of any community are associated with the individuals’ beliefs about, and the meaning they draw from their environment, thus literacy practices create and are created in social and cultural contexts (Heath, 1983; Gee, 1990/1996; Scribner & Cole, 1981/1988; Street, 1984, 1995). Scribner and Cole’s (1981/1988) research on the literacies of the Vai people of Liberia demonstrated that their literacy practices were discretely situated within each of their three languages (Vai, Arabic, and English) and that use and language of use accounted for their skill differentiation.

According to Scribner and Cole (1981/1988), the more widespread indigenous Vai script was transmitted informally and valued in both personal and public contexts.

Although fewer people learned Arabic script than Vai script, the Arabic script was useful in religious contexts. An even smaller portion of individuals, who were literate in both Vai and Arabic, were also literate in English, the official literacy that was taught in school. These different literacies arose as individuals engaged in social processes that reflected separate and unique contexts and meanings.

Scribner and Cole's (1981/1988) measurement of the cognitive outcomes of each of the Vai's three literacies demonstrated that literacy is important for learning as well as being an indicator of how people learn. The Vai script displayed letters without separating them into words, so the reader's first task was to decode individual phonemes until they became linked together to form a word. The activities involving Vai literacy were learned through tutoring. On Scribner and Cole's tests of listening comprehension, Vai literates tested better than Arabic literates. On the other hand, Arabic literates, who learned through memorization of religious texts, demonstrated improvements on memory tasks. Neither the Vai nor the Arabic literates demonstrated skills that English literates had learned in school (Scribner & Cole, 1981/1988).

According to Scribner and Cole (1981/1988), these studies offered strong evidence "that activities involved in reading and writing may in fact promote specific language-processing and cognitive skills" (p. 68). Gee (1990/1996) stated that Scribner and Cole's research recognized the importance of social practices in the acquisition of literacies and added weight to the argument that "what matters is not literacy as some

decontextualized ability to write or read, but the social practices into which people are apprenticed as part of a social group” (p. 57).

Home and school language socialization. Shirley Brice Heath’s (1983) seminal ethnographic study of the linguistic differences among the people of three southeastern communities in the United States showed that children acquired language through socialization, or enculturation, in their families. Heath’s (1983) research on language socialization found that the questioning patterns parents used with children in the home differed from the questioning patterns their teachers used in school and when teachers were able to change their patterns, outcomes for the children also changed.

According to Gee (1989d), Heath’s research implied that if culturally diverse individuals were “to acquire mainstream, school-based literacy practices” they would have to repeat, “at an appropriate level for their age of course, the sorts of literacy experiences the mainstream child has had at home” (p. 58). However, as Gee (1989d) stated, schools “are good places to practice mainstream literacy once you have its foundations, but they are not good places to acquire those foundations” (p. 58). Gee (1989d) noted that Heath had students study the use of language with their teacher, including how reading and writing was practiced in their communities as an important way of apprenticing students to school-based literacy, the values of which “are in fact best exemplified in the ideology and practice...of academic work” (p. 58).

Summary

The major theoretical tensions between orality and literacy and home versus school language socialization have produced a significant number of studies and scholarly research. The challenge of understanding the best way to teach the English language within

the realm of school literacies while considering ELLs' home language environment continues to elude educators. Two recent studies have revealed some important findings about the connection between home and school literacies. In her dissertation, Bell (2004) conducted six case studies and presented the findings in a verbal portrait that focused on the home and school contexts, and the voices of students and their families. One of the recurring themes that emerged in all of the childrens' lives was that of a significant person who played a key role in their language learning.

In her case study of a single high school Latina, Reyes (2001) examined the connection between the student's cultural practices and her school literacy practices. Four pedagogical suggestions were given: validation of students' experiences, use of culturally relevant pedagogy, issuing a cognitive challenge to ELLs, and a challenge to administrators to sponsor more teacher training and mentoring of students. These two case studies highlight key facets in the connection between home and school literacies, namely, the importance of a significant person to validate the students' learning. This is pertinent to the present study because to add to our understandings of how ELLs engage in literacy events we must understand how they assume projective identities, design their written and oral texts, and how their texts are validated.

Discourse Practices

Culturally Appropriate Classroom Talk

Twenty-five years ago, a prevailing educational theory was that disadvantaged minority students lacked basic skills; however, Au argued that the social organization of classrooms impacted the learning of minority children and based her belief on the competence/incompetence paradox, or the observation that minority children evidence a

high level of cognitive and linguistic competence in daily life, but do not reflect the same level in school (Au & Mason, 1981).

In their research, Au and Jordan (1981) focused on the literacy learning of diverse students as evidenced by the types and numbers of social interactions with their teacher. Using a microethnographic approach, videotape data revealed detail not apparent to the classroom observer and made it available for analysis in terms of its social organization. The teacher with low contact (LC) and the teacher with high contact (HC) conducted their reading lessons differently, and through data analysis, Au and Jordan were able to show that teacher HC displayed higher levels of achievement-related student behavior than teacher LC.

A new construct, the balance of rights hypothesis, described a culturally appropriate way of speaking between teacher and students that contributed to the students' success in school. The teacher with high contact (HC) allowed students to speak in self-directed structures; in other words, she did not adhere to the rule of one speaker at a time. The data showed that the teacher with low contact (LC) received little response from the students. There were numerous observations of students nodding, lowering and raising hands, but very few complete phrases. On the other hand, the teacher with high contact (HC) elicited many complete phrases from the students. Au pointed out that almost all (5 out of 6) of the students had the opportunity to speak in a very short time, hence there was a balance, or equitable distribution of time given to the speakers' rights.

A Critical View of Child Development Research

Van Kleeck (2004) described the practice of storybook sharing in parent-child dyads as part of the beliefs that constitute literacy practices in mainstream culture. In

mainstream middle-class culture, traditional parental values are projected into education, which includes books and other forms of print-based literacy. Reciprocally, academic governance of children's lives comes from schools into homes. Mainstream literacy practices that occur in homes include the practice of storybook sharing, which is believed to foster literacy growth for mainstream middle-class English-speaking students (van Kleeck, 2004). While van Kleeck (2004) acknowledged the variety of ideological perspectives among scholars regarding home book-sharing practices, she also argued that there is a "tendency in child development research to treat mainstream socialization practices as normative and preferred" (p. 176). In this case, despite the variation in book-sharing practices, the practice itself is taken up as an unquestioned beneficial ritual of "good parenting." In van Kleeck's (2004) view, beliefs and values vary among cultures and "the value of literacy depends on the purposes it serves within a particular society" (p. 179).

The Literacy Myth

According to Graff (1982/1988) literacy's connection to theories of social development and individual advancement has constituted "a literacy myth" which has proved to be insufficient in explaining "the place of literacy in society" (p. 82). As Graff (1982/1988) noted, literacy has often been viewed as "representative of attitudes and mentalities" (p. 83). For example, religious attitudes sustained Sweden's dramatic literacy rate increase during the 17th century (Graff, 1982/1988; Kaestle, 1985/1988). According to Kaestle (1985/1988), spurred on by church-sponsored laws and without significant school input, the Swedish literacy rate grew from 35% in 1660 to 90% in 1720. According to Gee (1989e), the Swedish literacy program "was based not just on

compulsion, but on... a need internalized in village reading and family prayers” (p. 155). As Gee (1989e) noted, while the law prescribed how the text was to be read, writing was not part of the law’s requirement, which impeded the value of the literacy.

According to Gee (1989e), the case of Sweden was the historical parallel of Scribner and Cole’s psychological research on the Vai, which demonstrated schooling’s lack of measurable cognitive effects outside of contexts in which such practices are rewarded. The importance of Scribner and Coles’ research, Gee suggested, was that it proved that schooling results in particular skills, which are of no use when taken out of the contexts in which they are practiced. Literacy is meaningless as an abstract set of skills, Graff (1982/1988) asserted, without the meaning given to it in practice by its users and applied in “specific material and cultural contexts” (p. 83).

According to Gee (1989e), Graff’s work was noteworthy for tracing how literacy has been used throughout history in various contexts to reinforce the social order, empower the privileged, and as a means of control. Literacy is used to control, Gee stated, but it can also be used to liberate. As examples of the latter, Gee (1989e) cited the emancipatory literacy of Paulo Friere (1970/2003) and the work of Bakhtin (1986). Gee’s (1990/1996) theory of Discourses also functions in this way. “Apart from Discourses,” Gee stated, “language and literacy are meaningless” (p. 190).

Gee’s Theory of Discourses

As Gee (1989b) defined it, discourse with a lower case ‘d’ means ordinary “connected stretches of language that make sense” (p.6). To emphasize the interrelatedness of language and human activity, Gee (1989b) used the same word, Discourses with an upper case ‘D’, to indicate the identity gear that individuals embody

in their manner of thinking, acting, feeling, believing, and dressing. Through this identity gear, individuals are able to distinguish others as embodying a particular Discourse, or identity. Gee (1989b) described a Discourse as an “identity kit” that “comes complete with the appropriate costume and instructions on how to act, talk, and often write, so as to take on a particular role that others will recognize” (p. 7).

All individuals have a primary Discourse acquired within their family, whereas secondary Discourses are acquired outside of the home (Gee, 1990/1996). Secondary Discourses are acquired through the apprenticeships people have within their occupations or social class, and the various aspects of these secondary Discourses signal to others the specific “identity kit” that the individuals embody (Gee, 1989b). As Gee (1999) noted, Discourses are always changing and, at any point in time, several secondary Discourses are in progress, or becoming. Individuals can, in theory, acquire several secondary Discourses during their lifetimes, and their ‘core identities’ are the histories of their involvement with a variety of groups (Gee, 1999).

Meta-level knowledge is learned. Gee’s notion of Discourses applies to every social act in people’s lives including literacy. According to Gee (1989d), “literacy is seen as a set of discourse practices, that is, as ways of using language and making sense both in speech and writing” (p. 39). Gee (1990/1996) defined literacy as “the mastery of a secondary Discourse” (p. 143). Because there are innumerable secondary Discourses, Gee asserted, “literacy is always plural” (p. 143). According to Gee, in order to critique a Discourse, individuals must have acquired at least two Discourses, and they must have learned, not acquired, “meta-level knowledge about both Discourses” (p. 145). According to Gee, meta-level knowledge is learned through teaching, which entails analyzing the

item under study so that students are able to discuss and explain it. However, Gee (1990/1996) reminded us that not only is teaching defined differently in some cultures, but also in our own schools teaching in practice does not always follow this description and entail students' practice in discussing and explaining meta-level knowledge.

Discourses and culture. Through culture, individuals add their ideas and meanings to their environment (Lankshear, 1997). For example, as we listen to a surfer's explanation of how he is able to 'read' the ocean, the wind, and the waves; how nature consists of signs in which he 'reads' meanings, we recognize that his Discourse allows him to draw these meanings from his environment. Lankshear (1997) observed that there is a "relationship between culture, as addition to the world, and Discourse. Discourses are about making meaning" (p. 16). Making meaning is an activity embedded within social events. In the surfer's social experience, he acquires specific ideas, beliefs, laws, and assumptions about the world. His way of thinking about his body and ability, the ocean and his relationship to it, as well as his achievements riding the waves is an example of a Discourse. As Lankshear (1997) explained, "through Discourses human life is organized into shape and form which can be recognized and understood-it can be 'read' as having 'meaning'-by ourselves and by others" (p. 16).

Discourses and literacies. Gee's (1990/1996) notion of Discourses applies to every social act in people's lives including the social groups in schools. Discourses emerge from the affiliations people have, such as work, social class, recreational, or special interest, to name just a few. A classroom has a minimum of three Discourses in use: the Discourse of the discipline, the classroom Discourse, and the students and teacher's social Discourses (Moje, Collazo, Carrillo, & Marx, 2001). The classroom

Discourse emerges out of the ideas teachers and students have about what constitutes knowledge in the particular discipline of the classroom. The social Discourses are the ways of thinking, acting, feeling, believing, and dressing that people acquire through membership in their families and communities (Gee, 1990/1996). Instructional Discourses involve the language of the subject, or discipline, for example, when and how to ask or answer questions, and what resources to use and how to use them (Moje et al, 2001).

Summary

The preceding section presented a review of several key theories that have important implications in the present study because they all speak to the issues of literacy, culture, and power. Au found that negotiating power in the classroom through culturally appropriate ways of speaking between teacher and students contributed to the students' success in school. There is more to be learned by considering the question of how power is equitably divided in among those in classrooms or after-school programs so that all participants' rights to speak are validated.

Van Kleeck provided an important reminder that the value literacy holds differs among cultures and depends to a large extent on the purposes literacy fulfills in the particular culture. The purpose for engaging in literacy practices was explored by Rubinstein-Avila (2001) in her dissertation. First, she conducted a survey of over two hundred adolescent ELLs to determine their reported literacy practices. She followed that with interviews of four students and found that the students had three purposes for engaging in literacy practices: entertainment, obtaining information, and practicing English. Multiple regression analysis revealed two predictors of varied literacy practices:

mother's educational level and students' beliefs about their English ability. In addition, the research concluded that ELLs had limited access to school literacies and that this lack of opportunity necessitated further research.

The purpose of this case study was to understand the literacy events in which the students participated in an after-school program to find out if their access to participation was limited, and if the context allowed them access to school literacies.

A Critical Look at Literacy as Social Practices

Literacy as social practice challenges the theory that literacy is a context-free technology housed in a "set of skills" that transforms human learning and culture (Gee, 1990/1996, Street, 1984, 1995). Looking at mainstream book sharing practices through the lens of the social practice paradigm, reading and writing are seen as contextualized cultural practices acquired as part of our primary Discourses (Gee, 1990/1996). However, in a critical analysis of the literacy as social practices model, Brandt and Clinton (2002) argued that the model is "undertheorized" and limited in its ability to explain how literacy operates in specific contexts. They contended that contextualizing literacy overstates cultural groups' control over the meaning and shape that their literacy practices take. Researchers who take the approach of literacy as social practices know that it is based on observation, and as such, it tells what, but does not research why.

Brandt and Clinton considered the possibility that literacy not only originates in local interactions, but also "arrives from other places" (p. 343). One example of this kind of literacy, the researchers explained, was in Besnier's (1995) ethnography on the Nukulaelae people of Polynesia who adopted the practice of letter writing and sermons they had learned from colonial travelers to the island. Besnier (1995) observed mature

women wearing shirts imprinted with off-color sayings that were imported to the island from Westernized urban centers. Besnier noted that the sayings had no relevancy to the people and were not featured in any of their literacy events.

According to Brandt and Clinton (2002), “the presence of print can indicate the presence of somebody else’s meanings – in this case, the slogans refer to the reach of a global market economy into family gift-giving” (p. 344). As Brandt and Clinton stated, just as the people pay no heed to the print, “the print ignores the Nukulaelae people...yet it incorporates them into Western commercialism in an intimate way” (p. 344). The researchers concluded that the “material forms,” the “technologies of literacy” have the ability to travel and to create meaning outside of immediate literacy events.

To relate a personal anecdote that is probably familiar to many second language teachers, I was teaching Asian newcomers to the U.S. one Christmas season in Philadelphia and one newcomer gave me a card that read “Merry Christmas, Mom and Dad.” Although the print on the card was appreciated as a design element and a positive sentiment, it was not recognized as a message derived from analysis. However, if the print on the card were interpreted as literacy in action, we would say that it demonstrated the power of business to incorporate the student into Western commercial culture and “do something” with him even though he did not celebrate this holiday in his culture. Brandt and Clinton (2002) called this, “figuring out what things are doing with people in a setting” (p. 349).

Brandt and Clinton (2002) contended that, “figuring out what things are doing with people in a setting becomes as important as figuring out what people are doing with things. According to Latour (1993), the “myth of the soulless, agentless bureaucracy, like

that of the pure and perfect marketplace, offers the mirror-image of the myth of universal scientific laws” (p. 121). The myth of the bureaucracy can be dissolved through the realization that “if we wander about inside IBM...if we study the process of selling and buying a bar of soap, we never leave the local level” (p. 121). According to Latour (1993), the connecting link is “the thread of networks of practices and instruments, of documents and translations” (p. 121).

Literacy in Action

Brandt and Clinton (2002) proposed exchanging the literacy event as the unit of analysis for literacy-in-action. A study of literacy-in-action would trace the history of objects in a setting to see if the actors in the context adopted them or not. Brandt and Clinton proposed that they could also study the role of objects in “framing the interaction and figure out the social load, so to speak, that they carry in the setting” (p. 349). The researchers stated that such an analysis would be achieved by following the “processes by which these things link the setting to other places-how they deliver meanings from other places and transform local actions into meanings bound for or relevant to other places” (p. 349). Cowan (2003) did this when he found that the images of the Virgin of Guadalupe linked Latinos in the Bayside, California community and linked the members of the Latino community in Bayside to their heritage in Mexico.

Literacy Sponsors

According to Brandt and Clinton (2002), “the concept of the literacy sponsor recognizes the historical fact that access to literacy has always required assistance, permission, sanction, or coercion by more powerful others” (p. 349). Objects act as substitutes for the interests of others who are not on the scene and following how the

objects and who is interested in them are linked permits us to carefully map out the inequitable power “flowing through literacy practices” (Brandt & Clinton, 2002). For example, a standardized test document acts as a proxy for the interests of the mainstream. The researchers stated that through mapping, it would be possible to address the ‘autonomous’ aspects of literacy while avoiding the autonomous model.

Cowan (2003) used both literacy-in-action and the literacy event as his units of analysis to study the meanings of the images in Latino lowrider art and to study how both the meanings and the images were transculturated (Cowan, 2003), that is, the images moved and new meanings were added to them in their new contexts. According to Cowan (2005), the term “transculturation” created “by Cuban sociologist Fernando Ortiz (1940/1995), is set in counterpoint to assimilation, the dominant model of cultural integration” (p. 151). In addition, by investigating the meanings and objects, Cowan learned about the social practices in which the drawings were made and shared. In his conclusion, Cowan (2003) wondered, “what other connections between Latino visual discourse and school-based literacy might innovative teachers be using, or be able to dream up, if Latino visual discourse were recognized as a significant, culturally valued system of literacy?” (p. 347).

Extending Social Practices

In order to talk about literacy-in-action, Latour (1996) invented three key terms that expand the notion of literacy as a social practice (Brandt & Clinton, 2002). The first term, localizing moves, is defined as “actions of humans and things in framing or partitioning particular interactions” (p.351). An example of localizing moves would be the practice of book sharing. Brandt and Clinton noted that literacy objects “localize a

context by framing it and holding it in place” (p. 351). These literacy objects are what Street (2005b) called “cultural artifacts,” which are either real or conceptual, and given meaning by cultural groups. As Cowan (2003) discovered, cultural artifacts, such as the image of the Virgin of Guadalupe, which originated in Mexico, were given meanings there, and when the images were transculturated, they were given new meanings associated with the local context. The literacy objects drawn by the Latino lowrider artists “localized” the context by holding the individuals in place with a sense of solidity and permanence that implies “no confusion about what...you are doing” (Brandt & Clinton, 2002, p. 345). Cowan’s (2003) research linked the literacies in Latino lowrider art to the historical investments layered with meaning with the result that the cultural artifacts assumed a magnified form larger than the people themselves.

Like his first term, Latour’s (1996) second term, “globalizing” can also refer to actions of humans and objects (Brandt & Clinton, 2002). Latour (1996) defined globalizing as “the shifting out of individuals as well as the knitting together of interactions” (p. 351). According to Brandt and Clinton, “globalizing” occurs when people “shift out of local scenes of reading and writing in many different ways—for instance, by joining abstract constituencies or categories” (p.351). These groups, or constituencies could be quilting or bridge clubs, or Internet blogs. In Cowan’s (2003) study, the image of the Virgin of Guadalupe, originated in Mexico and traveled to California and, in the process of transculturation, took on new meanings that could be read only by the people in the new context.

Latour’s (1996) third term is called “folding in” and conveys the ontological relationship, or the existence of “relationships between people and things” (p. 353).

Brandt and Clinton (2002) used the example of the research journal to illustrate the concept of “folding in.” Authors of research articles fold themselves into a journal and other people read their article while the authors are occupied in other endeavors (Brandt & Clinton, 2002). The same concept applies in art, or other modes of expression. Brandt and Clinton noted that human activities employ the “technologies of literacy” to “de-localize” or globalize meaning, and by doing so, they award literacy the position of power to those who display control over it.

Summary

The concept of the literacy sponsor is what Cowan (2003) and Grady (2002) discussed in their research. In their research, both Cowan and Grady found that literacy sponsors provided access to literacy in terms of assistance and contact with communication networks. Cowan found that the lowrider art magazine was a visual literacy sponsor and Grady found that Latino artists had roles as sponsors of visual discourse.

Visual Discourse

Valuing Non-mainstream Literacy Practices

Even though the literacy practices of every culture involves making meaning, some practices are thought of as more valuable and are given more status than others (Cowan, 2003; Lankshear, 1997). Cowan (2003) described how the visual discourse of Latino adolescents allowed them to take meaning from their environment and produce artwork that functioned as cultural artifacts with important meanings for the members of the community.

According to Cowan (2003), his research made a significant statement through its refusal to ‘succumb’ to the notion that some cultural creations can be dismissed because they reflect non-mainstream practices. Moreover, he asserted that his research “elevates adolescent artwork as an equally worthy subject of study as those other mainstream practices of visual literacy. (p. 339). The following is a review of the theoretical background that situates Cowan’s study of the meanings of Latino visual discourse.

A Diversity of Choices

“Grammar needs to be seen as a range of choices one makes in designing communication for specific ends, including greater recruitment of nonverbal features” (New London Group, 1996, p. 79). Saussure analyzed grammar in written text and evaluated the literary qualities of texts identifying certain structures as oral forms and others as literary forms (Gee, 1989c). According to sociolinguistic theory, language (one of many sign systems) fulfills communication needs by providing a range of meaning choices based on a particular context (Halliday, 1978). According to Halliday (1978), the meaning of a text cannot be ‘decontextualized,’ that is, it cannot exist apart from its surroundings. To analyze texts necessitated the development of a grammar to define how the parts work together to compose the meaning taken from the social context.

Halliday and Hasan (1989) defined the grammatical features of the social context as field, tenor, and mode. Field is the form of action, or event, for example an anthropology class, or a baseball game. Tenor has two meanings, the first is a role associated with social behavior, such as the role of a doctor, or a police officer. The second meaning of tenor is a role associated with the language, for example, the roles of interviewer, or interviewee.

Mode is associated with the genre, or forms a text takes on to perform specific textual functions, such as expository, persuasive, or descriptive.

These three features are expressed through language functions: field is expressed through the experiential function; tenor is expressed through the interpersonal function; and mode is expressed through the textual function. In this social linguistic framework, the elements of texts cater to the needs of context and therefore genres have specific social functions within cultures. The grammar of written texts outlined by Saussure and Halliday and Hasan formed the basis of the New Visual Literacy (Kress and van Leeuwen, 1996) that Cowan used in his dissertation to analyze the features of Latino visual discourse.

The New Visual Literacy

The new visual literacy (Kress and van Leeuwen, 1996), based on Halliday's (1978) theory of sociolinguistics, explains how the components of visual design work together as the elements of grammar in language to create meaningful themes. In constructing a theory of the new visual literacy, Kress and van Leeuwen (1996) borrowed Halliday's three functions of language to create three metafunctions of visual literacy: the ideational, the interpersonal, and the textual metafunctions. The ideational metafunction concerns how the sign system in illustrations stands for the world of ideas as distinct from the artist. The interpersonal metafunction represents the interaction between the observer and the image. The textual metafunction illustrates how the sign system creates complex, coherent visual texts that match the context in which they were created.

Visual Discourse Practices Among Latino/a Youth

Teachers who have Latino/a students in their classes are likely to observe unique artwork and drawing practices in their classrooms; however, they may not know that the

images in the drawings have important cultural meanings (Grady, 2002; Cowan, 2003). Moreover, not only the images, but also the social practices in which these images are created and shared broaden the notions we have about ELLs' literacies (Moje, 2000; Cowan, 2003; Grady, 2002; Weinstein, 2002).

In his dissertation, Cowan (2003) used Kress and van Leeuwen's (1996) theory of new visual literacy to analyze the images in the artwork of Latino adolescents. Kress and van Leeuwen's (1996) three metafunctions are the textual metafunction, the ideational metafunction, and the interpersonal metafunction. Cowan (2003) described Kress and van Leeuwen's (1996) ideational metafunction as "how the sign system represents the world around us" (p. 110). The interpersonal metafunction describes "how the grammar of visual design creates patterns" (p. 110). And the textual metafunction describes "how the sign system has to have the capacity to form texts" (p. 110).

Cowan (2003) argued that these three metafunctions, while helpful for describing mainstream codes of visual communication, were unsatisfactory for explaining other systems of visual literacy like the images drawn by the students in the Hispanic after-school program. Therefore, he had to expand Kress and van Leeuwen's (1996) metafunctions. Kress and van Leeuwen's (1996) ideational metafunction became Cowan's (2003) intertextual feature. Kress and van Leeuwen's (1996) interpersonal metafunction became Cowan's (2003) social feature. And Kress and van Leeuwen's (1996) textual metafunction became Cowan's (2003) contextual feature.

As a result of Cowan's (2003) expansion of Kress and van Leeuwen's theory, he discovered the existence of a "system of visual literacy distinct from but operating parallel to Western visual design" (p. 338). He concluded that the social practices that

gave birth to the artwork as well as how the art functioned in adolescent groups to be as significant as the symbols and meanings of the artwork themselves. Similarly, in her study of Latino artwork, Grady (2002) focused on the students' social interaction as they engaged in drawing activities and found that the students assumed three interdependent social roles in connection with their drawings: "artist, consumer, and artifact bearer" (p. 181). Both researchers found that students shared beliefs and practices around their drawings, but that many of the beliefs and practices were guarded from outsiders (Grady, 2002; Cowan, 2003). For example, Cowan (2003) asked one of the artists to explain her drawing, but she refused.

Cowan (2003) stated that systems of visual literacy account for the social context in which they exist, their history, and the effect of transculturation (Ortiz, 1940/1995), a process in which a cultural icon changes in form and meaning as it moves from one community to another. When literacy is viewed as situated in the social context, that view may entail being critical of the power structure in the social context (Fairclough, 1989). In Cowan's (2003) view, "doing colonial semiosis to speak the present means how, in the postmodern/postcolonial period of globalization autonomous models of alphabetic literacy continue the spread of Western practices of literacy rendering other practices subaltern by making them appear primitive and inferior" (p. 198-199).

In his study, Cowan (2003) did "colonial semiosis" (Mignolo, 1995/2003), the purpose of which was to contest the views that cause particular literate practices to be regarded as substandard. Similarly, in his colonial semiosis, Mignolo (2003) stated his intention to study "the relationship between discourse and power during colonial expansion" (p. 7). As Mignolo (2003) stated, colonial discourse, or colonial semiosis is

meant to show “a change in our understanding of the construction of a New World during the sixteenth century,” one that repositioned the European center creating a new “perspective in which the darker side of the Renaissance is brought into light and a change of voice in which the European Renaissance is looked at from the colonial periphery” (p. 8).

Foucault’s (1977) approach to understanding how knowledge is created in social interaction, called “decentering the subject,” suggests a method to show how the subject is constructed by systems of ideas that link power and knowledge. According to Siegel and Fernandez (2000), Foucault “called these systems of ideas discourses” and studied “how discourses, as historical practices, construct objects...both across disciplinary boundaries and within material practices across social locations” (p. 148). However, Mignolo (2003) argued that Foucault’s “locus of enunciation...was mainly concerned with the disciplinary and institutional grounding of discursive formations and gave less attention to the personal history of the understanding subject” (p. 5). Mignolo (2003) asserted that “from the perspective of locus of enunciation, understanding the past cannot be detached from speaking the present, just as the disciplinary (or epistemological) subject cannot be detached from the nondisciplinary (or hermeneutical) one” (pp. 5-6).

According to Mignolo (2003), colonial discourse sets “colonial discursive production in a context of conflictive interactions” (p. 7). Mignolo (2003) proposed that there is the need for methods that emphasize “events and cultural artifacts in themselves as well as on the discourses by which events and artifacts are conceptualized from within and outside a given community” (p. 9). While Mignolo examined ancient Amerindian texts, Cowan investigated current Latino lowrider art. In Cowan’s (2003) research, the

Virgin of Guadalupe, an important religious icon in Mexico, went through the process of transculturation when it moved into communities in the United States and became part of the iconography of lowrider art. In this process of transculturation, the icon assumed new meanings that can be read by initiates into the culture when they observe the images, become curious about their meanings, and learn about their significance (Cowan, 2003).

Cowan's pioneering study paves the way for more studies using Kress and van Leeuwen's (1996) new visual literacy and invites further research into the promising area of culturally diverse students' visual discourse and multimodal texts. Cowan identified the lowrider artwork as Latino, a term that he defined as embracing, "native Spanish, native Portuguese and native English speakers, foreign born, U.S. born, and those whose families never crossed over a border but, rather, experienced the border crossing over them as a result of 19th century U.S. imperial expansion" (Cowan, 2003, p. 9). In his study, Cowan described drawings that were unique to the Latinos in Bayside, California; however, Latinos from regions such as the Caribbean and South America draw different images. For example, the student from Puerto Rico, who conceptualized the flag as billowing in the wind, painted a large image of the coqui-a frog native to the island and a cultural icon for the Puerto Rican people. He painted the coqui brown, and on its back he painted the Puerto Rican flag.

Summary

The studies on visual discourse practices among Latino youth have demonstrated the complexity of the practices and meanings associated with non-mainstream literacies. This research has illuminated how the participants project themselves into the icons to create new drawings, and other participants recognize and interpret their meanings. These

studies have shown that through the processes of participation and reification the youth translated their experiences into meaning in the creation of artifacts. As Cowan demonstrated, the various illustrations with their different meanings in multiple contexts reflect the persistence of reification outside of school. However, there is much more to be learned about how ELLs take on literate identities in after-school contexts through productions that benefit from participation and reification.

Identity Theory and L2 Learning

According to Mansfield (2000), the Enlightenment way of thinking envisioned the subject as created by Nature to be “a free, autonomous and rational being” (Mansfield, 2000, p. 13). However, Foucault (1984) argued that the Enlightenment myth of the autonomous individual hid power. Rather, Foucault (1984) argued, power appears first, and is accepted because “it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, [and] produces discourse. Power, according to Foucault, needs to be considered as a “productive network which runs through the whole social body” (p. 61).

Cultural identity is “the person’s sense of what constitutes membership in an ethnic group to which he or she belongs” (Ferdman, 1990, p. 192). According to Ferdman (1990) “how a person’s identity as a member of an ethnocultural group is intertwined with the meaning and consequences of becoming and being literate” (p. 182). He argued that literacy and cultural identity exist in an inverse relationship and that cultural identity influences what students learn and how students acquire their literate identities, which then transforms their “perceptions of themselves in relationship to their ethnic group and the larger society” (Ferdman, 1990, p. 201). Ferdman (1990) concluded that teachers’ primary mission is to encourage students’ pride in their cultural identities.

According to Cummins (1986), “although conceptually the cognitive/academic and social/emotional (identity related) factors are distinct, the data suggest that they are extremely difficult to separate in the case of minority students” (p. 23). Learning and becoming literate are woven into the process of constructing and representing an identity (McCarthy & Moje, 2002; Ibrahim, 1999; Norton-Peirce, 1995). According to Ibrahim (1999), learning is seen as “an engagement of one’s identity, a fulfillment of personal needs and desires (of being), and an investment in what is yet to come” (p. 366). Norton-Peirce (1995) emphasized the dynamic nature of the learner’s identity, and noted that ELLs are multifaceted beings and that “the individual language learner is not ahistorical and unidimensional, but has a complex and sometimes contradictory social identity, changing across time and space” (p. 26).

Although Finders’ (1996) ethnography did not include ELLs, it did explore 7th grade adolescent girls’ literacies and negotiations of group norms in school. Finders argued that to understand the learner, one must examine the context in which the learner exists. She found that the girls both complied with and resisted school demands and that their literate performances in the classroom were affected by the school context as well as social affiliation. Finders concluded that rather than considering classrooms as neutral spaces for learning, “it would be more productive to openly articulate the complexities and consequences that accompany literacy learning” (p. 126).

Identity is a product of the experiences that engage learners in the social practices in their classroom communities (Ibrahim, 1999; Norton-Peirce, 1995; Broughton & Fairbanks, 2003; Vyas, 2004; Ybarra, 2004; Lam, 2000; Kanno, 2003). Research has shown that if a student’s cultural identity is ignored in school, her investment in learning

English is likely to be low (Ferdman, 1990; Finders, 1997; McKay & Wong, 1996; Cowan, 2003; Norton-Peirce, 1995; Ibrahim, 1999). In addition, learners' symbolic or material investments are directly connected to the continuing creation of their social identities (Cowan, 2003; Grady, 2002; Ibrahim, 1999; Moje, 2000). Ibrahim (1999) found that the immigrant African students' language demonstrated code switching and assimilation of specific words, while focus groups revealed that they were also impacted by popular culture and sports.

In mainstream classrooms, culturally and linguistically diverse adolescents are expected to adapt to a narrow range of mainstream literacy practices (King & O'Brien, 2002; Willis, 1995; Ybarra, 2004). Moreover, teaching reading and writing to linguistically and culturally diverse students involves more than print-based skills, it is seen as a "hostile attempt" to change students' cultural identities (Ybarra, 2004). This often results in anxiety or refusal to participate, which is perceived as failure to acquire school literacy practices (Willis, 1995; McCarthy, 2001). When she noticed her son's anxiety about his classmates' scrutiny of his writing, Willis (1995) called it "the subtle, yet ever-present and unquestioned role of cultural accommodation that occurs in the school literacy experience of children from diverse backgrounds" (Willis, 1995, p. 32). Citing the research of Delpit (1988) and Heath (1983), Willis (1995) argued that these researchers have voiced "concerns about the narrowly defined culture of acceptable school literacy" (p. 33).

McCarthy (2001) studied 12 diverse fifth graders' views of their reading abilities, as well as the views of others who were influential in their literacy development, namely parents, teacher, and peers. McCarthy (2001) explored to what extent a color-coded reading curriculum shaped the students' identities. The results revealed that half of the

students had ‘coherent’ identities, that is, they were confident and self-assured about their literacy behaviors. The remaining students had less ‘coherent’ identities and were not conscious of the views others had of them (McCarthy, 2001). McCarthy (2001) reasoned that the disparity in other people’s judgments of the students had to do with “students’ awareness of how others might talk about them” (p. 143).

McCarthy (2001) disparaged the custom of identifying students by color-coded reading groups because it limited their view of reading and because the goal of good teaching is to align students’ literate identities with their cultural identities. The alignment of students’ literate identities and cultural identities can be accomplished through the practices of culturally responsive teaching (Au, 1993; Gay, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 1995) and a framework for teachers offered by the continua model of biliteracy (Hornberger and Skilton-Sylvester, 2000).

Identity and Literacy in an On-line Context

Research has begun to examine the relationship between identity and literacy in on-line contexts (Albright, Pruhit, & Walsh, 2002; Lankshear & Knobel, 2002; Gee, 2004; Lam, 2000). Technology teaches users significant lessons about how to transform an identity on the screen (Gee, 2004; Lam, 2000). In a case study of an adolescent’s literacy practices and identity in a computer-mediated communication (CMC) context, Lam (2000) investigated a Chinese student’s literacy practices in on-line chat files, e-mail, and communications on his home page to understand how these exchanges fostered his L2 literacy acquisition. In this study, Lam examined the student’s genres and discourses to see how the student constructed his identity while involved in a CMC. Lam collected data in the form of observations, interviews, and texts from the student’s on-line

chat files, e-mail, and communications on his home page. Lam's conclusion was that the CMC fostered group connections, which led her to suggest that they are promising for the development of shared endeavors to support students' literacies.

In Gee's (2004) analysis of Lam's study, he noted that the CMC benefited the student because it provided him with a community that shared his beliefs and valued his participation. Because of these shared beliefs, the student made investments in literacy and appropriated the views of the individuals with whom he communicated. In addition, his newfound agency and literacy practices helped him kick off plans for future learning. The CMC experience for this student suggested that it may help students acquire new literacy practices as well as new Discourses as writers. Gee (2004) noted that the student has learned "to think of himself in entrepreneurial terms" empowered by his sense of agency" (p. 294). In addition, the social elements of literacy learning enable ELLs to experiment with on-line communication (Black, 2005, Lam, 2000).

An Untapped Power

Technology has enormous power to dissolve Discourse boundaries (Gee, 2004; Lam, 2000; Albright, Pruhit, & Walsh, 2002) as well as raise questions for education (Albright, Pruhit and Walsh, 2002; Lankshear & Knobel, 2003). In a study of the use of on-line chat rooms in interdisciplinary classroom contexts in middle school, a number of these important questions were raised (Albright, Pruhit and Walsh, 2002). Albright et al (2002) noted that technology has challenged teachers, researchers, and theorists alike "to appreciate and contend with" the array of new texts and possible meanings for texts" (p. 702). In addition, Albright et al (2002) voiced concerns about whether educators will be

able to sustain relevancy of the curriculum in the face of students' power to control their own learning.

In their study, Albright et al (2002) found that the students' expressed frustration with the turn taking on-line and blamed their inability to find answers to their questions on the free-flow of turn taking. Even more telling, the researchers found that the students did not take on projective identities as scientists. Gee (2004) asserted that, "if learners in classrooms...take on a projective identity...it becomes one of their real world identities" (p. 302). However, the students in the study by Albright et al (2002) did not do so, suggesting that the skills model of literacy restricts taking on projective identities and that in such contexts, even with technology, "there are no degrees of freedom for the projective identity to take wing" (Gee, 2004, p. 303). Similarly, Warshauer, Knobel, and Stone (2004) found that there was a regular pattern of performativity involved in students' use of technology with instructional emphasis on mastery of hardware rather than on learning outcomes.

Summary

Identity is the product of students' social interactions within the classroom (Norton-Peirce, 1995). Furthermore, if the student's cultural identity is ignored in school, investment in learning English is likely to be low (Finders, 1997; McKay & Wong, 1996). On the other hand, in a computer-mediated communication (CMC) context, Lam (2000) found that a Chinese student's literacy practices fostered his L2 literacy acquisition and accrued positive benefits in the formation of his identity because it provided him with a community that shared his beliefs and validated his participation. As a result of projecting himself into the computer-mediated world, the student made

investments in literacy and assumed a literate identity and encouraged his plans for future learning. In the CMC, the student exercised choice to participate in a community that validated his literacies, whereas in the classroom, students do not have much choice about the makeup of the classroom community. The current research is interested in how this difficulty is bridged to allow ELLs to take on literate identities.

A Pedagogy of Pluralism

As Suárez-Orozco (2001) stated, immigration in the United States rose by thirty percent during the 1990s, and it was during the same decade that a group of researchers known as the New London Group (1996) met to discuss the intersection between the shifting social context of schools and a new approach to teaching literacy called “multiliteracies.” The group’s purpose was to reach new understandings about the requirements of literacy pedagogy given the exclusion of many students from the technological benefits accrued to those whose education and training allows them to gain access to lucrative jobs (New London Group, 1996).

The group’s agenda was to provide a view of “the current social context of learning and the consequences of social changes on the substance and shape of literacy pedagogy” (New London Group, 1996, p. 63). The group’s discussions centered on two major issues: first, “the increasing multiplicity and integration of significant modes of meaning-making, where the textual is also related to the visual, the audio, the spatial, the behavioral,” and second, “multiliteracies as a way to focus on the realities of increasing local diversity and global connectedness” (p. 64). The first issue is associated with Kress’s (2003) notion of “literacy and multimodality” and the second issue relates to cultural diversity’s mandate that in people’s work they must “interact effectively using multiple languages, multiple

Englishes, and communication patterns that more frequently cross cultural, community, and national boundaries” (p. 64).

The New London Group’s (1996) project was to design a new curriculum for a “pedagogy of multiliteracies” that would guide the social futures of today’s students began by deciding what languages would be necessary in three areas of people’s lives: work, citizenship, and private life. The nature of work has been transformed in recent years as a result of technology with its “iconographic, text, and screen-based modes of interacting” and with less vertical management structures requiring a more “informal, oral, and interpersonal discourse” (p. 66). For example, the Group noted that the typical top-down management structure of the past has been reinvented and vocabulary used to describe people’s interactions has taken up educational terms, such as mentoring.

The New London Group (1996) identified globalization’s impact on schools’ cultural and linguistic diversity with the consequential change in “the meaning of literacy pedagogy” (p. 69). The academics stated that, “cultural diversity is a classroom resource” that helps everyone because “there will be a cognitive benefit to all children in a pedagogy of linguistic and cultural pluralism” (p. 69). Furthermore, imbued with conviction, the scholars issued their cornerstone belief that “when learners juxtapose different languages, discourses, styles, and approaches, they gain substantively in meta-cognitive and meta-linguistic abilities and in their ability to reflect critically on complex systems and their interactions” (p. 69).

New Designs

According to the New London Group (1996), multiliteracies refers to “the increasing complexity and inter-relationship of different modes of meaning” (p. 78). These

modes have “functional grammars – the metalanguages that describe and explain patterns of meaning [such as] Linguistic Design, Visual Design, Audio Design, Gestural Design, Spatial Design, and Multimodal Design” (p. 78). These six modes of meaning have increased in importance in every aspect of society, for example, visual meanings are found in page layout design and screen format; audio meanings are found in sound effects and music; gestural meanings are found in dance and body language; spatial meanings are found in architectural spaces and environmental spaces, and multimodal meanings combine multiple modes in unique and attention-getting ways.

According to the New London Group (1996), texts are designed through a process of decisions, in which some items are included and some are excluded. The pedagogy of multiliteracies, like the continua of biliteracy model (Hornberger & Skilton-Sylvester, 2000), conceptualized a critical metalanguage in which decisions about design are incorporated into all texts. Students acquire practice in using metalanguage in designing texts in a pedagogy of multiliteracies.

The New London Group conceptualized pedagogy as a combination of four key aspects: situated practice, overt instruction, critical framing, and transformed practice. The first aspect, situated practice, accounts for the guidance of the teacher in scaffolding control of the grammar of design, and support the learners’ “critical understanding” and “ability to critique a system” (New London Group, 1996, p. 85). The second aspect, overt instruction, is defined by “the use of metalanguages” and includes scaffolded learning activities and “focus the learner on the important features of their experiences” (p. 86). The third aspect, critical framing, has an objective of assisting learners to make sense of something already learned by re-positioning it in another discourse. Finally, the fourth aspect, transformed

practice is “to re-create a discourse by engaging in it for our own real purposes” (p. 87). In transformed practice, the learner has to “juxtapose and integrate...two different discourses, or social identities” (p. 87).

Smagorinsky, Cook, and Reed (2005) described how a student’s rendering of an architectural text, imbued with his unique personal meaning and identity, was interpreted by his teacher as challenging the traditional rules of design. In addition to the tensions between the teacher’s meaning and student’s meaning, tensions also existed between the “broader cultures” in which the teacher and student participated. In Fairclough’s (1989) model, the tensions referred to would be situated in layer three, the “social conditions of production and interpretation,” or context. The architectural text was inextricably embedded within the social and intellectual processes the individuals used in the creation of the text. This layer entailed the social interaction between the teacher and student. Furthermore, the processes of production were embedded within the larger social contexts of production and interpretation, namely the state standards of architectural design.

Summary

As outlined in the preceding section, the work of many respected literacy scholars and researchers has established an impressive foundation in the major theoretical issues in literacy to guide future research. Key concepts such as language socialization, language acquisition, and language learning have been defined and demonstrated through extensive and significant research. Research on identity in second language learning has shown that learners’ investments are directly connected to the continuing creation of their social identities.

The major tensions in literacy have exerted widespread influence on interdisciplinary research such as the work by Mignolo (1995/2003) and others. However, more research is still needed concerning students' involvement in literacy and many other semiotic practices and how teachers can understand and integrate their students' literacy practices within their classroom instruction. In other words, how can teachers 'think in a culturally diverse way'?

The purpose of this case study was to show how design thinking and production thinking helped students take on the identities of designers and creators of texts. This study promised to describe how the teacher conceptualized design thinking as well as how the students participated and assumed literate identities. This study sought to describe how thinking as designers and producers of written and oral texts connected ELLs' varied literacies, and other semiotic practices, with the school's print-based literacy.

Second Language Writing Theory and Pedagogy

The development of theory and research in second language writing has mimicked the trends and shifts in writing theory and research (Raimes, 1991). According to Raimes (1991), the major trends in L2 writing theory and research have been aligned with four theoretical foci. The first focus, current-traditional rhetoric, emphasized form and was based on structural linguistics which said that the purpose of writing was to support the oral development of language. The second focus, the process approach, emphasized the writer and emerged alongside the notion of communicative competence. The third focus, the genre approach, emphasized writing for specific disciplines. The fourth focus, the social constructionist approach, emphasized explicit instruction.

Current-traditional Rhetoric

Current-traditional rhetoric (Ferris & Hedgcock, 1998) was based on traditional rhetorical modes such as narration, description, exposition, and argumentation.

According to Raimes (1991), this method was limited to one or two drafts, errors were corrected by consulting grammar handbooks, and topics were based on literature.

However, in the 1970s, research began to focus how teachers could help students write better (Raimes, 1991).

The Process Approach

The process approach in L1 writing research (Graves, 1983; Calkins, 1986) had a significant influence both on L1 and L2 writing pedagogy. Zamel's (1983) research demonstrated the goals of this approach to understand how L2 writers engaged in the composing process, thus reversing the focus on grammar and error. Zamel (1983) found that, although there may be differences in the products due to culture, the processes of writing in L2 are similar to the processes of writing in L1.

However, the process approach has received criticism for charges that it privileges mainstream literacy practices (Delpit, 1988; Vollmer, 2000) and fails to prepare ELLs for the type of writing required in college (Stapleton, 2002; Zhu, 2001). Despite criticism; however, those who favor process writing argue that it helps ELLs discover important aspects of their lives and identities (Hubbard & Shorey, 2003; Van Sluys, 2003).

The Genre Approach

In the genre approach (Swales, 1990; Parks, 2001), instruction is facilitated through the collection of writing task requirements and models from specific disciplines and teaching these models by means of explicit instruction (Ferris & Hedgcock, 1998).

However, Luke (1996) argued that the social and cultural costs of genre-based pedagogies put them in danger of reproducing the “status and privilege of a particular field of disciplinary knowledge” (p. 334).

Sociocultural Theory and Writing

Sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978; Bakhtin, 1986; Wersch, 1991) has shown that the “student learns to write by working with a more knowledgeable person...through a kind of apprenticeship” (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996, p. 242). L2 research has examined how the writer behaves in social interactions that foster linguistic development (Leki, 1995; de Guerrero & Villamil, 2000; Maguire & Graves, 2001).

De Guerrero and Villamil (2002) used a microgenetic approach in their study of two male Spanish-speaking college students engaged in peer collaboration during revision. De Guerrero and Villamil (2002) noted the minute changes in the sequence of the pair’s interactions, and described the reader’s actions as containing “intentionality, task regulation, meaning, and affective involvement,” while the writer’s actions were interpreted as including: “openness to receiving help, willingness to consider suggestions, and no resistance to being helped” (p.17).

De Guerrero & Villamil (2000) noted that the actions of the two discourse partners in the zone of proximal development indicated mutual benefit through collaboration. The writer included most of the revisions brought up during the session and even made further revisions. The researchers concluded that the microgenetic approach deserves further use due to its ability to combine instruction and writing development. In addition, the approach revealed results that could not be shown when the focus is on products alone. De Guerrero and Villamil (2000) concluded that synchronous

behavior benefits writers during revision and the intersubjectivity displayed by the two partners demonstrated that peer scaffolding benefits both partners' writing development.

The Social Constructionist Approach

According to the social constructionist theorists, linguistic capital is needed for linguistically and culturally diverse learners to recognize and utilize codes for academic success (Leki, 1992; Hyland, 1998; Brammer, 2002; Vollmer, 2000). Culturally and linguistically diverse students' syntax or rhetorical style, influenced by L1 or African American Vernacular English (AAVE), has repercussions when students complete academic tasks (Brammer, 2002; Leki, 1992; Ferris, 1995; Hyland, 1998). According to Brammer (2002), students can acquire linguistic capital through explicit instruction that helps them to adopt strategies such as learning how to set up an individual error analysis checklist or models the types of supporting arguments that are recognized in academic discourse (Brammer, 2002).

Explicit instruction is featured as a part of other approaches for culturally and linguistically diverse students (Brammer, 2002; de Guerrero & Villamil, 2000; Goldstein, 2002; Zhu, 2001). In peer interactions in dyads, the teacher provided explicit instruction during grammar minilessons (de Guerrero & Villamil, 2000). The teacher's explicit instruction scaffolded a student as he wrote a play about the negotiation of his linguistic identity (Goldstein, 2002). In addition, providing explicit instruction in metacognitive strategies to improve argumentation skills satisfies the need for more focus on structure and organization of ideas in essays (Zhu, 2001; Brammer, 2002).

Taking a social constructionist approach, Vollmer (2000) was critical of the writing process approach used in two high school L2 classrooms noting that this

approach did not help students acquire and utilize linguistic capital for academic success. Vollmer's analysis of students' texts and interview data generated understandings of how the students positioned themselves discursively and also how the classroom discourses positioned them.

Vollmer discovered four points of tension that weakened the goals of the process writing approach in high school L2 classroom contexts. The first tension identified was 'monologic' involvement in learning, that is, the discussions in class did not provide space for multiple perspectives. The teacher was the source of knowledge with students reproducing the knowledge in discussions. The second tension was the 'disconnect' between the student-centered pedagogy and the teacher's demands. The goals of student-centered writing process were in conflict with the teacher-directed nature of assessments resulting in little investment by the students' in writing.

The third tension was the contradiction between the implicit privileging of individual expression against the explicit valuing of the social processes of creating texts within peer groups. According to Vollmer (2000), this mixing of methods occurred without regard to "audience and discourse community in the construction of a text" (p. 262). The fourth tension resulted from Vollmer's investigation of the teachers' instructional beliefs and how these beliefs were acted out in classroom discourse. In her conclusion, Vollmer (2000) called for writing researchers and teachers to "develop an analysis of the contested nature of identities in composition classrooms, and the ways in which they are constructed or resisted through textual practices" (p. 264).

The Reading-Writing Relationship

As Ferris and Hedgcock (1998) noted, second language literacy acquisition in theory “involves a more complex interaction of skills and knowledge than it does in L1 literacy acquisition” (p. 31). Cummins (1981) distinguished between social language, or interpersonal communication skills, and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP), noting that language in social contexts is more contextualized, and thus its acquisition is facilitated. According to the Interdependence Hypothesis (Cummins, 1981), a Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP) exists in all languages and allows for the interlinguistic transfer of literate skills and actions, but that learners must have a threshold level of L2 proficiency for the transfer of skills and knowledge to occur.

Research on bilingual literacy has shown that learners understand the relationship between their L1 and L2 (Goldman, Reyes, & Varnhagen; 1984; Edelsky, 1982; Rubin & Carlan, 2005). Goldman, Reyes, and Varnhagen (1984) demonstrated that learners transferred L1 comprehension skills to their reading comprehension in L2. Edelsky (1982) showed that bilingual students transferred writing strategies across two languages. Rubin and Carlan (2005) showed that bilingual children “used their knowledge of words, sounds, and spelling patterns in both languages to convey their meaning” and as their writing developed, it reflected “understanding of the similarities and differences between Spanish and English” (p. 737).

Reading Constructs Meaning

According to Ruddell and Unrau (1994), reading is “a meaning-construction process” and readers build theories and test hypotheses throughout the act of reading (p. 996-997). The sociocognitive model of reading emphasizes the importance of the

classroom context as well as for all individuals who comprise the context (Ruddell & Unrau, 1994). The construction of meaning is the goal of reading and “readers construct meanings not only of printed manuscripts but also of events, speech, and behaviors as they ‘read’ gestures, images, symbols, signs, and signals that are embedded in a social and cultural environment” (p. 997).

Since the act of reading is driven by the need to search out meaning, both “oral and written language development, which affect the thinking process, contribute directly to the development of reading ability” (p. 997). As mentioned above, readers ‘read’ meanings in texts and texts are not just print-based but may have fixed images, like picture books, or moving images, like computer screens. As Ruddell and Unrau (1994) noted, “texts are constantly reinvented as readers construct different understandings for them...meanings are dynamic, not static, as individuals, texts, and contexts change and interact” (p. 997).

Summary

Influenced by writing research and theory in English, second language writing research has benefited from process writing and sociocultural theory to frame new research questions concerning how language learning occurs through social interaction. A key result of this research has been the recognition of the need to understand diversity in written expression as well as in instructional needs. There has been some research in culturally and linguistically diverse students’ unsanctioned writing (Moje, 2000; Weinstein, 2002) and Latino visual discourse (Cowan, 2003; Grady, 2002), but these studies have been limited to a narrow population of students or in contexts outside the classroom. There are many questions in this area that remain unanswered and we have

much to learn about the rich backgrounds that culturally and linguistically diverse students bring with them to school.

This research sought to understand how the culturally and linguistically diverse adolescents' rich backgrounds with their multiple semiotic practices might be taken into account in the design and production of their written and oral texts. This study promised to describe, through teacher interviews, the understandings and expectations that the teacher used to facilitate literacy practices in the after-school program. In addition, this research promised to portray through participant observations, how the teacher implemented her understandings and expectations as she executed her instructional design and how the students participated in the creation of their texts.

The Socio-Historical Context

The migration of large numbers of people due to globalization is a phenomenon that has significant consequences for the future of economic, social, political, and educational structures (Suárez-Orozco, 2000; Suárez-Orozco & Páez, 2002; Trueba, 2004; Murillo, 2002). The effects of the global economy can be seen in changes such as greater mobility of the workforce, replacement of jobs in manufacturing with information and service jobs, and new regions that cater to cultural products such as tourist or retirement centers (Murillo, 2002). In recent years, areas of the United States that have previously not experienced immigration have begun to do so (Hamann, Wortham, & Murillo, 2002). This trend has caused more immediate consequences for education than for any other area of society (Moll & Ruiz, 2002; Suárez-Orozco, 2001).

Suárez-Orozco (2001) defined globalization as “processes of change...that result in the deterritorialization of important economic, social, and cultural practices from their

traditional moorings in that nation's state" (p. 347). The response of various nations to globalization ranges from exaggerated displays of power, hyper-presence, to exaggerated displays of disregard, hyper-absence. According to Suárez-Orozco, hyper-presence is exemplified by the border between Mexico and the United States, which ranks at the top of the list of the most globalized region in the world, while hyper-absence is characterized by the huge cash flow to countries where those in charge pay little or no heed to this practice.

Three causes are cited for making this phenomenon different from other periods of change, namely, market forces that ignore borders, information technologies, and "unprecedented new patterns of immigration" (Suárez-Orozco, 2001, p. 349). Suárez-Orozco (2001) identified two key features that describe immigration into the United States during the last three decades: first, the size was enormous, for example during the 1990s, immigration rose by more than thirty percent, and second, the countries of origin changed from Europe to Asia and Latin America.

The globalization of capital, responsible for the large migration of people and children, is an important element of this phenomenon (Suárez-Orozco, 2001). To understand the consequences of this trend necessitates knowledge of the social and historical issues that have played a role in the past as well as in the present context (Takaki, 1993). An accurate picture of the social-historical context of diversity in education includes a summary of the most salient issues that have constrained instructional conditions for ELLs. One key issue that affects disabling conditions for minorities involves cultural models and how they become established (Gee, 1990/1996; Smedley, 1999). A second issue involves how cultural models operate in the social

adaptation of minorities to school, which Ogbu (1991) theorized in his research. A third issue addresses how oppressive practices have been contested in the past (Donato, 1997). A fourth issue illuminates some misconceptions that construct monolithic images of culturally and linguistically diverse youth (Zentella, 2005).

An Oppressive Cultural Model

Perhaps the major issue that affects conditions for minorities, including language and literacy teaching, involves cultural models and how they become established (Gee, 1990/1996). According to Gee (1989a), “the meanings of most words...are “cultural models, that is, simplified depictions of reality that involve prototypical objects and events” (p. 140). In a diverse society like the U.S., Ogbu (1991) theorized, both dominant and minority groups have distinct cultural models, that is, “respective understandings of how their society or any particular domain or institution works and their respective understandings of their places in that working order” (p. 7).

Historically in the United States, the dominant cultural model constructed race not only to sort people by physical characteristics, but also to deny social equity in a systematized manner (Smedley, 1999). In this construction, the possession of land was esteemed as the premier class of ownership equated to personal worth and wealth. In colonial America, the notion of natural rights was defined as the possession of land in common; however, natural rights were superseded by civil rights, defined as the intention to settle, develop the land, and indicate this intention by constructing a fence to demarcate the land. According to Smedley, colonizers of the new land promoted the cultural model that those who lived simply on the land without altering it were said to

have natural rights; however, these natural rights were of a lower status than the practical, and hence superior, civil rights of the colonizers.

According to Gee (1990/1996), people cannot critique their own cultural models, acquired in their primary Discourse, unless they acquire a secondary Discourse. During the decades following World War II, Americans may have begun to critique their cultural models, according to Smedley (1999), who theorized that the Nazi human rights abuses during World War II may have caused people in the United States to reflect on the mistreatment of groups in their own country and thus may have led to the judicial dismantling of segregation.

The Cultural Ecological Paradigm

Anthropologist John Ogbu differentiated between involuntary immigration, defined as entrance into a country through force or colonization, and voluntary immigration, or moving to another country to improve one's economic opportunities. Rather than taking the student out of context, Ogbu approached the analysis of the school failure of minorities using the cultural ecological paradigm that studies the relationship between culture and context. Ogbu (1991) stated that minorities acquired an identity that immobilized their school achievement because "they do not see their social identity as merely different...but rather as oppositional to the social identity of the dominant group members" (p. 16).

Ogbu's research has received considerable criticism for its limitations in accounting for minority achievement (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Trueba, 2004). Trueba (2004) characterized Ogbu's research as an "alternative theoretical approach to deficit theories" (p. 93). According to Ladson-Billings (1995), Ogbu's work is "ahistorical and

limited” in its analysis of minority achievement (p. 468). Trueba (2004) added that it did not account for the achievement of those “who are exposed to the same oppressive societal factors” (p. 113). Repression and exploitation may generate emotions and other internal resources needed for academic achievement (Trueba, 2004). Moreover, other careers may be seen as having greater potential for economic success (Trueba, 2004). To better understand minority achievement, there is a need for an inclusive model of achievement that can explain agency (Trueba, 2004; McKay & Wong, 1996).

A Forgotten Struggle

A popular misconception that continues to persist is that minority parents are indifferent to their children’s education (Delgado-Gaitan, 1990; Donato, 1997; Jiménez, 2004). However, state and national civil rights cases, such as the *Lau v. Nichols* case, are proof that disputes this belief (Nieto, 2000). In the *Lau v. Nichols* case of 1974, the Supreme Court’s ruling stated that equality of resources was not equal education if instruction was conducted in a language the students did not understand and, therefore, students’ civil rights were being violated. As Nieto (2000) stated, the Court’s decision prompted the federal government to issue guidelines for compliance with the Court’s ruling called “The Lau Remedies” that directs schools in the methods of identification, assessment and instruction for language minority students.

However, even in the decades before the *Lau* decision, Mexican American parents were contesting unequal treatment in schools. Donato (1997) chronicled a fifteen-year-long confrontation during the 1960s and 1970s between Mexican American parents and white residents of Brownfield, California. The battle in Brownfield involved segregation

that occurred both within schools in the practice of tracking and across schools in segregation (Donato, 1997).

In the era before the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision of 1954 overturning segregation, Mexican American children were constructed as low-skilled workers, their success in school equated with assimilation (Donato, 1997). Donato described how migrant workers were treated as if they were farm machinery. The availability of Mexican American labor was exploited by the agricultural economy, and the educational system ignored attendance for Mexican American students. A folk model was constructed in schools that Mexican American parents lacked the cultural support to effectively socialize their children for academic success.

During the 1960s, the problem of school segregation was ignored, until Mexican American parents protested. The school board began discussion, but Whites issued threats, such as the withdrawal of White-majority schools from the district (Donato, 1997). In the discussion of desegregation plans, Mexican American parents voiced concerns for the safety and treatment of their children in White-majority schools, while White parents were against the long bus trips, but did not fear mistreatment of their children. The struggle ended with the adoption of the bare minimum desegregation plan that removed the White-majority schools from the desegregation plan.

Monoliths and Misconceptions

Misconceptions about culturally and linguistically diverse youth are prevalent because both they and their families are characterized as stereotypical and monolithic (Zentella, 2005). For example, a common misconception is that all Latinos speak Spanish (Suárez-Orozco & Pérez, 2002; Zentella, 2005). However the term Latino includes those

people who are “native Spanish, native Portuguese and native English speakers, foreign born, U.S. born, and those whose families never crossed over a border but, rather, experienced the border crossing over them as a result of 19th century U.S. imperial expansion” (Cowan, 2003, p. 9). In 1848, the war with Mexico ended with the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, the U.S. annexed Mexican land with the result that the border crossed over Mexicans, forcing them to choose between their cultural identity and the land they owned (Takaki, 1993).

Gender, Immigration, and Teaching

During the early twentieth century, immigrant girls seldom graduated from high school and few pursued higher education because poor immigrant families saw their sons as the more likely to profit from the investment of funds for education (Seller, 1994). In Covello’s (1968) study of Italian immigrants, one mother reported that she sacrificed to provide both a high school and college education for her daughter only to be discouraged when she was not able to secure a teaching position. While the U.S. has experienced an increase in Asian and Latina immigration in recent years, like the early twentieth century, many girls still encountered difficulties in schools. However, unlike the earlier half of the century, more women with educated backgrounds were among the immigrants and some were prompted by personal hopes and their parents’ dreams of educational achievement (Seller, 1994).

Summary

The phenomenon of globalization brought on by markets whose borders are blurred by the free-flow of capital and information technologies has significant educational consequences. Culturally and linguistically diverse students are at the center

of this phenomenon. The theory of cultural models, their development and operation in students' social adaptation to school critically frames diverse students' context. To counter misconceptions that construct parents as unconcerned in their children's education, social-historical research such as Donato's (1997) has shown that oppressive practices have been contested in the past.

Multimodal texts wherein meaning is made in a variety of modes is one of the direct results of information technologies. One of the major goals of this research was to show how multimodal texts were used to support ELLs' literacies. In addition, this study sought to demonstrate and how a Latina teacher incorporated ideas and language about the design of multimodal texts into an after-school program. The overall goal of this study was to contribute some new understandings about how literacy pedagogy in culturally diverse contexts might connect students' varied literacy, and other semiotic practices, with the school's print-based literacy.

Culturally Responsive Pedagogy

Three major scholars have defined cultural responsiveness as the major ingredient necessary for the school success of culturally and linguistically diverse students (Au, 1993; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Gay, 2002). A common theme emerged through a comparison of these three definitions. Au (1993), referred to culturally responsive instruction as "instruction consistent with the values of students' own cultures and aimed at improving academic learning" (p. 13). Gay (2002) defined culturally responsive teaching as "using the cultural characteristics, experiences, and perspectives of ethnically diverse students as conduits for teaching them more effectively" (p. 106). According to Ladson-Billings (1992), culturally relevant teaching "is designed not merely to fit the school culture to the students' culture but

also to use student culture as the basis for helping students understand themselves and others, structure social interactions, and conceptualize knowledge” (p. 314). The common element in each of these definitions is the notion that starting with the students’ cultures is the way to be culturally responsive, not the other way around.

According to Bailey and Pransky (2005), today’s educational trend of ‘one-size-fits-all-skills’ pedagogy claims to be the best approach for all students based on the mainstream belief that everyone learns in essentially the same way. However, research has shown that learning is a process embedded within culture (Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1991). Within the many cultural contexts in which students learn, there are diverse perspectives, practices, histories, and goals (Freire, 2003; Nieto, 2000; Au, 1993). However, as de Castell and Luke (1983/1988) noted, the typical response to growth in school diversity has been to strengthen the one-size-fits-all-skills standard.

Many students come to school with linguistic patterns that often differ from those of their teachers (Heath, 1983; Au, 1980). Moreover, teachers do not “see” their culturally diverse students’ literacies (Moje, 2000, 2002; Weinstein, 2002; Rubinstein-Avila, 2004; Godina, 2004). Furthermore, as Bailey and Pransky (2005) noted, it is ironic that the “one-size-fits-all-skills” orientation to education may further this “cultural blindness” and obstruct caring educators from becoming culturally responsive teachers.

Several factors that help ELLs achieve success in school have been identified (Cummins, 1986; Moll, 1988; Jiménez, 2000). One of the key criteria that fosters ELLs’ achievement is their interactions with teachers in school (Cummins, 1986; Helmar-Salasoo, Bronner and Bonissone, 2002). Moll (1988) outlined four findings that described the qualities of exemplary teachers of culturally and linguistically diverse students: first, their disposition,

instructional practices, and outcomes differed from the dominant school practices; second, their instruction was flexible; third, they challenged students with high-level reading and writing; and fourth, they provided student choice and independence.

Teachers who establish positive classroom contexts for ELLs promote students' cultural identities and give students constant opportunities to discover pride in their ethnic, cultural, and social identities (Ferdman, 1990; Jiménez, 2000; Lucas, Henze & Donato, 1990; McKay & Wong, 1996; Yau & Jiménez, 2003). Too often teachers do not see their ELLs' literacies (Moje, 2000, 2002; Weinstein, 2002; Rubinstein-Avila, 2004; Godina, 2004). However, exemplary teachers are involved in learning more about their culturally and linguistically diverse students (McCarthy, Garcia, Velasquez, Lin, & Guo, 2004; Helmar-Salasoo, Bronner and Bonissone (2002).

Teachers need to understand the role L1 plays in literacy learning (Jiménez, 1997). However, beyond understanding the role of L1, exemplary teachers of culturally and linguistically diverse students value the students' L1 and encourage its use (Helmar-Salasoo, Bronner and Bonissone, 2002; McCarthy et al, 2004; Cummins, 1986). Bilingual students should be recognized as having dual language abilities (Jiménez, 2001). Although English may be the common language in schools, students should be encouraged to make connections between their L1 and the content area they are studying (McCarthy et al, 2004).

Exemplary teachers encourage parent and community involvement in school activities (Lee & Croninger, 1994; Riojas-Cortez, Flores, Smith, & Clark, 2003). Latino families have been criticized for being indifferent to their children's education (Delgado-Gaitan, 1990; Jiménez, 2004), but when invited to participate in literacy events, Latino parents express interest (Riojas-Cortez, Flores, Smith and Clark, 2003). In their study,

Riojas-Cortez, Flores, Smith and Clark (2003) invited families to participate in storytelling sessions in school and learned that the families' literacy traditions could be connected to school literacy.

Exemplary teachers and schools challenge students with high-level reading and writing (Cazden, 2002; Helmar-Salasoo, Bronner & Bonissone, 2002; Lucas, Henze & Donato, 1990; Pradl, 2002). Cazden's (2002) descriptive study of the Puente project provided a glimpse of instruction, texts being read, writing assignment was to shadow professional people and write a newspaper article. As Cazden (2002) noted, although the language of Puente is English, the use of Spanish, even in classes, "is another form of cultural validation, even for those students who know it only as the language of their grandparents" (p. 510).

Exemplary educators demonstrate willingness to go beyond deficit thinking and encourage students' giftedness (Garcia & Guerra, 2004; Ford & Grantham, 2003; Helmar-Salasoo, Bronner, and Bonissone, 2002). Exemplary teachers treat culturally and linguistically diverse students as intelligent and competent learners (Garcia & Guerra, 2004; Ford & Grantham, 2003; Helmar-Salasoo, Bronner, and Bonissone, 2002; McCarthy et al, 2004). Furthermore, they offer students options and independence (Helmar-Salasoo, Bronner, and Bonissone, 2002; Pradl, 2002).

Research has found that teachers need information on how to address the needs of ELLs (O'Byrne, 2001; McCarthy et al, 2004; Gunderson, 2000). According to O'Byrne (2001), secondary English teachers "need professional development to relate their instructional and assessment practices to what is known about L2 acquisition" (p. 441). In addition, teachers need to know about culture and include it in their writing instruction (McCarthy et al, 2004). Jiménez (1997) found that there were three important things

teachers could do that would meet ELLs' needs: first, offer cognitive strategy instruction; second, provide activities based on culturally familiar text; and third, give multiple opportunities to improve reading fluency.

Cummins (1986) outlined four areas that can be used to identify educators' commitment to the success of minority students: first, promoting students' linguistic and cultural gifts; second, inviting parent and community participation; third, implementing a constructivist approach to instruction that fosters dialogue and builds strategies for collaborative and independent learning; finally, promoting advocacy beliefs toward assessment. Lucas, Henze, and Donato (1990) found that successful high schools for language minority students were identified by five criteria: first, supporting students' identities; second, maintaining high expectations; third, providing guidance for future goals; fourth, involving parents; and fifth, supporting school-based and community-based student activities for language minority students.

Summary

One of the most well researched areas in education has been the area of culturally responsive pedagogy. Three scholars in the field have defined the common theme of this key theory, namely that starting with the students' cultures is the way for teachers to be culturally responsive. However, in times of strong growth in diversity, one-size-fits-all instructional practices have predominated. Today's educational context does not differ from this pattern. Yet, several studies have shown that exceptional culturally responsive teachers, programs, and schools exist and are paradigms for equity in education, although these tend to be outside the realm of public school education.

The aim of this research was to provide specific and detailed understandings, through participant observations, of how a culturally responsive teacher helped students learn through analysis and discussion, thus gaining meta-cognitive and meta-linguistic abilities. In addition, this research sought to demonstrate, through both participant observations and interviews with the teacher and students, that students represent meaning in a variety of multimodal texts, which support their literacy learning in school.

Multimodality and Critical Literacy

The notion of multiliteracies conceptualizes the ability to interpret and design messages that involve multiple and varied modes of meaning and to explain the various patterns of their grammars, or metalanguages. According to the New London Group (1996), the design of texts entails decisions accomplished through social interaction. The pedagogy of multiliteracies, like the continua of biliteracy model (Hornberger & Skilton-Sylvester, 2000), conceptualized a metalanguage in which decisions about design are incorporated into all texts. Students acquire metalanguage through practice in the design and production of texts.

Multimodality

According to Kress (2003), mode is a “culturally and socially fashioned resource for representation and communication” (p. 45). Modes have regular patterns, or organized systems of features that originate in past cultural meaning-making practices. Kress (2003) called these regular patterns a “grammar and syntax” (p. 45). Modes such as music, dance, speech, action, and gesture are called ‘time-based modes’ whereas visual images are spatial or ‘space-based modes.’ The logic of time and the logic of space specify how

elements are distributed and this relationship of elements is a “resource for meaning (Kress, 2003, p. 45).

According to Kress (2003), some modes are a mixture of two logics, for example gesture, which is spatial and involves movement, and writing, which is based on sound, but has taken on spatial features such as bullet points and tint blocks. According to Kress, “mixed logics are...a feature of multimodal texts, that is, texts made up of elements of modes which are based on different logics” (p. 46).

Through art, students generate intellectual visions of themselves as artists and rehearse the procedures implicit in their creations (Heath, 2004). According to Heath (2004), students make metacognitive investments in their own creativity and employ reflection on past performances or creations as well as anticipation about future performances or creations. As Heath (2004) noted, learning in art depends on observation, analysis, and critique for use in later mental imaging and the artist learns that “casting the self forward” may improve future performances (p. 340). Thus, involvement in the arts benefits the artist in terms of metacognition, use of strategies, literacy, and identity construction.

Drawing and creating art are literate acts (Albers & Murphy; 2000; Cowan, 2003; Grady, 2002). However, art produced in the context of school is identified by particular literacy practices and distinguished from art produced outside of the mainstream (Barton & Hamilton, 1998). Engagement in art embodies both personal and social goals and students are bounded by roles and practices (Grady, 2002). In addition, the objects that students create reproduce ideological contexts (Cowan, 2003). Although the creators may

or may not share the same meanings represented in their creations, the objects themselves are a visual recognition of the artists' social and cultural identities (Grady, 2002).

Critical Literacy

Although 'critical' is a popular word in education, it often suffers from either too much or too little meaning (Lankshear, 1997). According to educator Paulo Freire (1995), critical practice is "dialogical practice" and "dialogue is a way of knowing" rather than only a way "to involve students in a particular task" (p. 379). Dialogue can be wedded to design in classroom lessons, curriculum, and broad educational programs with the use of the continua model of biliteracy (Hornberger and Skilton-Sylvester, 2000) as a guide.

Hornberger and Skilton-Sylvester's (2000) "continua model of biliteracy offers a framework in which to situate research, teaching, and language planning in linguistically diverse settings" (p. 96). The model conceptualizes the tensions between school-based literacies and vernacular literacies. Through its focus on "power weighting," it shows how the literary end of the continua is privileged over the vernacular end, such as writing growth over oral growth (Hornberger and Skilton-Sylvester, 2000).

In Skilton-Sylvester's research, a young Cambodian 11th grader who, after reading a multicultural text by an Asian woman writer, asked if she was the lone example of Asian women writers in English. Skilton-Sylvester (2000) noted that the multicultural text would be placed on both ends of the continua because "it opened a door for her to be a part of literary discourse in a new way" (p. 109). One of the least powerful elements of literacy is the vernacular, which is generally not included in school contexts (Hornberger and Skilton-Sylvester, 2000). Nevertheless, Skilton-Sylvester learned that students "framed as 'non-

writers' in schooling contexts" were accomplished at composing letters and plays for family and friends.

According to Hornberger and Skilton-Sylvester (2000), the degree to which learners are able to utilize the literacies throughout the continua, determines their biliteracy outcomes. Because their intention was to promote reflection and give agency and voice to individuals and discursive practices, Hornberger & Skilton-Sylvester (2000) concluded that "the inclusion of learners' voice and agency is the only ethically acceptable solution when it comes to educating a linguistically and culturally diverse learner population" (p. 118).

Summary

Decisions about design are incorporated into all texts through the use of discourse that students acquire through practice in the design and production of texts. For example, bilingual students make an important design decision when they choose the language in which to write their texts. In this study, I planned to show how decisions were reached about the discourse of the texts, and the extent to which the teacher scaffolded students' understandings about audience and language. I sought to understand how the teacher's explicit, or overt instruction used discourse to scaffold learning activities in the play production.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the literacy events in which the students and their bilingual teacher engaged and to examine the texts of 7th grade ELLs. Within the after-school program, I observed the literacy events in which the students and teacher engaged, interviewed the teacher and students, collected samples of the students'

texts, and videotaped a performance by the students. I selected a naturalistic case study design as my methodology.

This research promised to move the field forward by developing a theory of design in literacy instruction for culturally and linguistically diverse students, taking into account the importance of the two key roles: the teacher as designer of the context and the students as designers of texts. This research intended to describe the teacher's knowledge of culturally and linguistically diverse youths' rich backgrounds and literacy practices that they bring to school. In addition, this research sought to learn more about the knowledge culturally and linguistically diverse youth bring to their role as designers of texts.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In this chapter, I present the methodology of this naturalistic case study, the purpose of which was to explore what happened when 7th grade Latino/a ELLs and their Latina teacher produced a play in the context of an after school program and to determine the relationship between the participants' discourse practices and their performance. In addition, I sought to describe the characteristics of the performance and to find out if the participants validated their performance, and if so, how.

This chapter contains five sections. Section one, the Outline of the Study, contains the theoretical framework, the research questions, and the criteria for a quality case study. Section two, Participant Selection and Consent, describes the sampling and consent procedures followed in this study. Section three, Data Collection, describes the types of data collected for the study, as well as the plan for collection and management of the data. Section four, Data Analysis, describes the three methods of data analysis used in this study, namely Discourse Analysis (Gee, 2005), the three characteristics of multimodal literacy, and Grounded Theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Section five, the Plan to Ensure Credibility, describes triangulation, the role of the researcher, the presentation of the case, and the plan to ensure trustworthiness.

Outline of the Study

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework, as Merriam (1998) stated, is the epistemological stance through which the researcher approaches the study. The framework contains the conceptual tools that allow the researcher to design the methodology to answer the research questions. This naturalistic case study employed as its theoretical framework the literacy-as-social-practices perspectives of the new literacy studies (Gee, 1996; Street, 1995, 2005b; Lankshear, 1997; Lankshear & Knobel, 2003) as well as communities of practice theory (Wenger, 1998).

The literacy-as-social-practices perspectives of the new literacy studies challenged the traditional definition of literacy as the ability to read and write. According to the new literacy studies, texts can be read in a variety of ways, and the ability to read any given text involves many other factors besides simple decoding (Gee, 1996). According to Gee, these factors are related to the experiences people have in becoming socialized into a particular Discourse. Discourses with an upper case “D” involve language and other things individuals use in their ways of talking, thinking, acting, feeling, believing, and dressing that help others recognize them and what they are doing. Since the ability to read a text in a certain way depends on a person’s socialization into a specific Discourse, literacy practices are impossible to isolate from the other practices involved in Discourses, namely ways of talking, interacting, valuing and believing.

To distinguish language from the other practices involved in Discourses, it is identified as discourse with a little “d.” As Gee (2005) stated, “language is used ‘on site’ to enact activities and identities. But activities and identities are rarely ever enacted

through language alone” (p. 7). Because language and, therefore, literacy practices are impossible to isolate from the other practices involved in Discourses, “literacy is seen as a set of discourse practices, that is, as ways of using language and making sense both in speech and writing” (Gee, 1989d, p. 39).

In addition to the literacy-as-social-practices perspectives of the new literacy studies (Gee, 1996; Street, 1995, 2005b; Lankshear, 1997; Lankshear & Knobel, 2003), this naturalistic case study was also framed by communities of practice theory (Wenger, 1998). Community of practice theory in educational contexts conceptualizes participants’ joint contributions to learning through meaning, practice, and identity. Within communities of practice, the purpose for learning involves integrating oneself into the community’s shared practices, which involves representing oneself through new identities.

In communities of practice theory, there are three modes of belonging: engagement, imagination, and alignment. The first mode of belonging, engagement, is defined as active participation in the meaning making of a community. Active participation in the meaning making of an educational community means providing chances for students to take control of their own learning, Wenger stated “in the production of sharable artifacts” (p. 184).

The second mode of belonging is imagination, or conceptualizing a history of a community’s meanings. In educational settings, imagination means helping students understand who they are in the social-historical context, which cannot be worked out in isolation from others. According to Wenger (1998), imagination recruits the ability to look at situations through a different lens.

The third mode of belonging is alignment, a process that results in coordination of action and recruits the ability to organize different perspectives. Alignment relies on people with multiple memberships who are uniquely adept at “finding ways of being that can encompass multiple, conflicting perspectives in the course of addressing significant issues” (Wenger, 1998, p. 175). Framed by both the literacy-as-social-practices perspectives and community of practice theory, with emphasis on the three modes of belonging, the participants’ contributions to learning in the play production were conceptualized through meaning, practice, and identity.

Research Questions

The research questions for this case were based on an issue that arises when teachers notice the many ways in which adolescent ELLs use literacy in both their L1 and L2. Literacy, Gee (1989d) stated, “is seen as a set of discourse practices, that is, as ways of using language and making sense both in speech and writing” (p. 39). Since literacy is understood as a set of discourse practices, the issue in this case was how to describe and understand the participants’ engagement with literacy practices; and to explain their perceptions in order to facilitate culturally responsive pedagogy to support academic learning.

Based on this issue, the research questions for this case study were constructed as follows:

1. What happens when a group of 7th grade Latino/a ELLs and their Latina teacher produce a play in an after-school program during the final six weeks of the school year?

- a. What is the relationship between the participants' discourse practices and their performance?
2. What are the characteristics of the performances?
 - a. Do the participants validate their performance? If so, how?

The answers to these questions promised to develop a picture of the participants' engagement with literacy practices in an after-school context and to suggest ways to move the field forward by contributing to the development of a Design for Performance Learning that is culturally responsive and supports academic learning.

Case Study Criteria

According to Yin (2003), there are five criteria that guide researchers in the construction of an exemplary case study. The first of these criteria is significance, that is, the case must be about a phenomenon that has not been investigated in depth in the past. I conducted a search of dissertation abstracts using the key words *adolescent English language learners* and *after school program*, which yielded 9 dissertations since 1997. Another search using the key words *after school program*, *middle school*, and *ELLs* yielded 15 dissertations since 1999. Substituting the key word *Latino* for *ELLs* generated 35 dissertations. However, using the key words *drama*, *play*, or *performance*, *adolescent ELLs*, and *after school program* produced no results. As a result of this search, this case study promised to yield significant findings because it concerned a phenomenon that had not been investigated in depth in the past.

Yin's second criterion is that the case must be complete. A complete case should reflect effort to collect as much of the relevant evidence as possible. I accomplished this by conducting interviews with each of the participants, including all 13 actors and the

teacher. I collected written reflective responses from 11 of the 13 actors. To demonstrate completeness of the description, I conducted observations of 20 out of 23 of the rehearsals as well as observations of the classroom interaction. I recorded a videotape of the performance, and the data on the videotape was transferred to a digital videodisk. I also wrote a fieldwork journal throughout the course of the study.

Yin's third criterion states that the case must be approached through the consideration of alternative perspectives. To consider the alternative perspectives, I interviewed all 13 actors. Out of the total of 13 actors, 11 completed reflective responses. To follow Yin's third criterion, I included the alternative perspectives of the participants who were critical.

The fourth of Yin's (2003) criteria for an exemplary case measures a study by its presentation of a thorough and accurate description of the evidence. To present a thorough and accurate description of the evidence so that readers might reach their own independent judgments regarding the merits of the findings, I included detailed descriptions of the observations from three representative sections of the rehearsals: the beginning, or Rising Action; the middle, or Turning Point; and the end, or Resolution. Within each section, I presented a detailed description of the specific context essential to understanding the participants' discourse practices. For the Discourse Analysis, I analyzed the oral texts of all 14 participants (13 students and the teacher), and the written texts of 11 out of 13 students (two students did not submit reflective responses).

To determine the characteristics of the performance, I created three characteristics, which described the context in detail: the contextual characteristic, the intertextual characteristic, and the social characteristic. The contextual characteristic

described the literacy events that aroused the actors' awareness of the sociohistorical context as well as the literacy events that aroused their awareness of the contemporary context. The sociohistorical context is the events that occur in the chronological period in which the historical novel *Esperanza Rising* is set. The contemporary context is the present-day events that occur in the world outside the play *Esperanza Renace*, and are related to the chronological period in which *Esperanza Rising* is set. This period touches on the history of Mexican immigration to the United States. The intertextual characteristic described how participants drew from various elements of the modes of meaning to produce a unique multimodal text. The intertextual characteristic also described events that initiated actors into the Mexican performance Discourse. The social characteristic was divided into two levels. The level one social characteristic described the literacy events through which several Latina adolescents constructed cultural meanings. In addition, the level two social characteristic described the literacy events through which the Latino/a adolescents and the Latina teacher constructed cultural meanings and knowledge in the production of the play.

Finally, according to Yin's fifth criterion, the researcher must engage the reader with the contribution of a well-written case. To engage the reader with the contribution of a well-written case, I followed the order of the four research questions. First, I presented a three-part narrative to contextualize the Discourse Analysis. Second, I presented the Discourse Analysis of the participants' written and oral texts. Third, I presented the findings of the characteristics of the performance. Fourth, I presented the findings concerning how the actors validated their performance in their written texts and how one actor validated the performance in both his written and oral texts. Finally, I concluded the

report of the findings with a narrative to demonstrate how the actors validated their performance in their self-directed rehearsal on day 20, immediately prior to their final performance.

Participant Selection and Consent

Purposeful Sampling

As Patton (2002) noted, purposeful sampling “consists of information-rich cases that manifest the phenomenon of interest” (p. 234). Purposeful sampling (Patton, 2002; Miles & Huberman, 1994) was used to select a bilingual Latina teacher who used after-school play productions to help her Latino/a students construct a social context that supported their literacy practices. The two reasons for the selection of the teacher for this study were grounded in the theory of culturally responsive instruction (Au, 1993). First, as a native Spanish speaker, the teacher’s cultural and linguistic background identified her as someone who reflected the phenomenon of interest. Second, knowledge of the former play production and that it was part of the after-school program aroused interest in the kinds of practices used in that context.

Purposeful sampling (Patton, 2002; Miles & Huberman, 1994) was used to select all 13 students who participated in the play production in the after-school program. Although a total of 13 students performed during the rehearsals, the teacher added one boy (Carlos) to the play in the final rehearsal. Since Carlos rehearsed only one day, he was not selected as one of the 13 students who participated in the play production for three to six weeks. The students who participated and who were selected (3 boys and 10 girls) were all Latino/a. The Latina teacher was from Central America, and one student was from South America. The remaining 12 students were of Mexican or Mexican-

American heritage. The average age of the 7th grade students was 13, except for one who was fifteen. The 13 students and the teacher made up the after-school play production. This after-school play production was selected because it was an information-rich case, which would provide the best information to answer the research questions (Patton, 2002; Merriam, 1998; Creswell, 2003).

Student Assent

Before fieldwork began, all student participants were given an assent form that ensured that their anonymity would be maintained throughout the course of the study and that they would be referred to in the study report by pseudonyms (Seidman, 1998). The assent forms were distributed to students on the first day and were collected beginning on the second day and throughout the study. All assent forms were collected by the last day of the study. A copy of the student assent form appears in Appendix A.

Parental Consent

The parental consent form explained the purpose of the study, the topic of the interviews, the use of interview and textual data, permission for copies of texts to be reproduced, and the students' right to withdraw from the study at any time during the study. The parental consent form was translated into Spanish. The parental consent forms were distributed to students on the first day and they were collected beginning on the second day and throughout the study. All parental consent forms were collected before the final performance. Copies of the parental consent forms in both English and Spanish appear in Appendix A.

Teacher Consent

The teacher consent form explained the purpose of the study, the topic of the interviews, the use of interview data, and the teacher's right to withdraw from the study at any time during the study. The teacher consent form was given to the teacher on the first day of the study and collected on the same day. A copy of the teacher consent form appears in Appendix A.

Every aspect of this study was conducted in accordance with IRB policies and procedures and as approved by the IRB.

Data Collection

Data Sources

The process of data collection in this naturalistic case study entailed gathering data from several sources, although the major source of data collection was observations and field notes (Merriam, 1998; Patton, 2002). The goal in this case study was to construct an accurate and clear portrayal of the literacy events in which 7th grade ELLs and their teacher were engaged. As a first step toward this goal, data analysis began on the first day in the field. On the first day in the field and each of the days thereafter, field notes were recorded by hand, transcribed daily and saved in computer files labeled by date. A hard copy of the transcribed field notes was kept in a binder. The interviews were transcribed and saved in computer files labeled by date. In addition to observations, data were collected from the following sources: semi-structured interviews with the teacher and the students; and documents in the form of students' academic texts. Data were collected over the course of a six-week period of fieldwork. The following is a list of the data collected in this case study:

- 1) Observations of the participants' interactions were written in field notes. Field notes were recorded both in the classroom and in the after-school program. The original plan called for observations of classroom interaction, which I believed had to be made since the play production was connected to the students' final grade in the classroom. Since the play production might be connected to the students' final grade in the classroom, I observed the participants' interactions in both the classroom and the after-school context, although the research questions addressed the after-school play production.
- 2) Five semi-structured interviews with the teacher were tape-recorded. The tapes were transcribed into computer files and labeled by date.
- 3) The students' reflective responses were collected after the play. The original plan stated that the "students' academic texts: e.g. essays, notebooks and journals" would be collected. My intention was to collect any written text related to the play production. The teacher called these evaluations reflection journals. I changed the name to reflective responses to indicate that they were written only once. Collecting the students' reflective responses on their participation in the play was in keeping with the original plan.
- 4) 1-2 semi-structured interviews with all 13 ELLs were tape-recorded. The tapes were transcribed into computer files and labeled by date.
- 5) A DVD of the students' final performance of the play for the parents was made. The original plan called for a videotaped dramatic performance. The final performance of the play was videotaped and then transferred to a digital videodisk format.

- 6) A fieldwork journal reflecting my thoughts during the data collection period was written throughout the data collection period.

Data were collected according to the following plan: first, observations of the participants' interactions in both the after-school program and the classroom were written in field notes and transcribed into computer files labeled by date. These files were then copied and pasted into Ethnograph before being analyzed. Second, a series of five semi-structured interviews with the teacher were taped using a tape recorder. One interview took place at the beginning of fieldwork, two in the middle, and one at the end of the fieldwork. The interviews with Mrs. R. were transcribed into computer files and labeled by date before being analyzed. Third, 1-2 semi-structured interviews were tape-recorded with each of the 13 students who participated in the play production. One student, Luis, was interviewed only once after the performance and the interview was tape-recorded at his home. The student interviews were transcribed into computer files and labeled by date before being analyzed.

Fourth, I videotaped the final performance of the play and the data on the videotape was copied to a digital videodisk (DVD) format. Fifth, copies of the students' written reflective responses were made and the original documents returned to the teacher. Sixth, a fieldwork journal of reflections during the data collection process was written throughout the data collection period. The fieldwork journal was transcribed into a computer file to maintain a record of reflections during the data collection period. The fieldwork journal supported the holistic aims of this case study research because it reflected the researcher's ideas, thoughts, or concerns during fieldwork (Merriam, 1998).

Fieldwork

The first day of data collection was April 5th and the last day was May 25th for a total of 6 weeks. The total number of days for the play production was 23, of which I observed 20. Two days were missed due to teaching commitments and one day due to a previously scheduled doctor's appointment. The after-school program met every afternoon from 2:00 p.m. until 4:00 p.m., and included two Saturdays. The student interviews were conducted either in the library adjoining the classroom, in the teacher's office, in the cafeteria, or, in one case, at the student's home in the parents' presence. The interviews with the teacher were conducted before or after the rehearsals. The field notes were transcribed on the evening of the day on which they were collected.

Teacher Interviews

Five semi-structured interviews (Merriam, 1998) with the teacher, also known as Mrs. R., were conducted according to the following plan: 2 at the beginning, 2 in the middle, and 1 after the final performance. All of the interviews were tape-recorded and each one was approximately thirty minutes in length. The tapes were transcribed, labeled by date, and saved in computer files. The transcripts were printed and a hard copy was shown to the teacher to verify the accuracy of the information in the transcripts through the process of member checking (Stake, 1995). The teacher made no corrections or additions to the transcripts. The questions used in the semi-structured interviews with the teacher appear in Appendix B.

Data Collected from Students

Two types of data were collected from the students: tape-recorded interviews and written reflective responses generated in class the Monday after the final performance of

the play, which took place on a Saturday. Pseudonyms were used to identify the students' documents and interviews throughout the study.

Documents

The documents collected from the students provided evidence of their varied literacy practices (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). The documents collected from the students consisted of their written reflective responses generated in the classroom on the last regular school day of the year, which was the Monday following the final performance on Saturday. Copies of the students' reflective responses were made the same day they were written and the originals were returned to the teacher.

Interviews

Semi-structured interviews, Merriam (1998) explained, are "a mix of more and less structured questions" (p. 74). In the semi-structured interviews, an interview protocol was used to gather the students' responses to structured questions, whereas information specific to each student's situation was explored more deeply using open-ended questions. As Merriam noted, the semi-structured interview is in keeping with the assumption in qualitative research that individual actors experience events in different ways.

1-2 semi-structured interviews were conducted with each of the 13 students during fieldwork, except for one student (Luis), who was interviewed only once after the final performance. Luis's interview took place at his home. Each of the other students was interviewed at the mid-point and again near the end of the study. Even though the students had received an explanation about the purpose of the study when the student consent forms were disseminated before fieldwork began, the purpose of the interview

and the procedure to be used was briefly restated for each student before the first interview was taped. When taping began, each student was greeted and asked to state his or her name. Then questions from the semi-structured interview protocol were asked to ascertain the student's views of the literacy events in which they participated. Questions applicable to the student's particular character or context were interspersed among the structured questions of the student-interview protocol.

The tapes were completely transcribed before the final rehearsal. The transcripts of the interviews were shown to the students so that the students could verify the accuracy of the information in the transcripts through the process of member checking (Stake, 1995). The students made no corrections or additions to the transcripts. When not in use during rehearsals, the tape recorder and tapes were stored in the teacher's locked office. The questions used in the semi-structured interview protocol for the students appear in Appendix C.

Data Collection Matrix

Qualitative researchers benefit from the creation of a data matrix prior to fieldwork (Miles & Huberman, 1994). A data matrix was created to display the research questions, the data collected, and the methods used to analyze the data. The data matrix appears in Appendix D.

Character Chart

A character chart was created as an organizational tool to display the actors and the characters they played. This graphic organizer was designed as an aid for readers of the study. The character chart appears in Appendix E.

Data Management

Data management is defined as the procedures required for the organization of the collection, storage and retrieval of data (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Procedures for data management have three clear results: first, superior data and ease of retrieval; second, an account of the exact analysis that has been completed; and third, preservation of data and analyses after research (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The following is a list of the data records that were maintained in this study: a) raw field notes, b) audio tapes, c) a digital videodisk of the final performance, d) students' written reflective responses, e) processed data in computer files, f) coded data, g) code book, h) memos, i) data displays, j) chronological log of data collection, k) a fieldwork journal, and l) an index of all of the material.

The data records were managed as follows in this study:

- 1) Raw field notes were written in steno notebooks and dated.
- 2) Student interviews were transcribed, dated, and stored in computer files by date and student's name. The teacher's interviews were transcribed, dated, and stored in computer files by date.
- 3) The data recorded on the videotape of the class performance was transferred to a digital video format.
- 4) A binder was maintained to store a hard copy of the observations for reference in the analysis.
- 5) A principal binder was maintained to store the following documents: the script of the play, copies of the students' written reflective responses, the codebook, the chronological log of fieldwork, the fieldwork journal, the

data matrix, the consent forms and an index of all the material in the data collection.

Data Analysis

Introduction

Analysis is a system of transforming field notes, interviews, and artifacts into findings (Dyson & Genishi, 2005). Three forms of analysis were used in this case study: Discourse Analysis (Gee, 2005), the three characteristics of multimodal literacy, which were derived from the three features Cowan (2003, 2005) used to analyze Latino visual discourse, and Grounded Theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

Discourse Analysis

I used Discourse Analysis (Gee, 2005) to analyze the actors' reflective responses and the written transcriptions of the participants' interviews. Discourse Analysis uses the property of language known as reflexivity, in which, Gee stated, "language always simultaneously reflects and constructs the situation or context in which it is used" (p. 97). Language, used to perform activities and identities, is known as discourse with a little "d;" however, little "d" discourse is generally accompanied by "big D" Discourses. "Big D" Discourses involve language and other things people use in their ways of talking, thinking, acting, feeling, believing, and dressing that help others recognize them and what they are doing or building.

First, I transcribed all the interviews word-for-word and arranged them in stanzas. Next, I read and re-read the written transcriptions, and the reflective responses, always keeping in mind Gee's (2005) heuristic about how the participants were using language to "build identities and activities and recognize identities and activities" others were

constructing around them (p. 10). By reading all the transcriptions, I began to get a feel for the images, motifs, or patterns that seemed to be repeated. After reading all the transcriptions multiple times, I felt I was ready to use one of the six tools of inquiry, situated meanings, which can lead to Discourse models. First, I read the transcriptions again to identify the images and patterns, that is, the situated meanings the participants assembled on the spot. I compiled a list by writing down each situated meaning and the pseudonym of the person who used it. Next, I put these situated meanings back together in groups based on common themes, or overarching categories, such as having many duties and responsibilities, helpful strategies, the frustration and complexity involved, and the impact on affect. Then I arranged the situated meanings within the groups based on their common features, which are subordinate to the broader categories, such as being serious, memorizing, talking louder, working hard, helping others, changing things, and improving.

After the situated meanings were arranged in groups, I asked myself the question “what theory do the participants hold that makes them use just these particular meanings?” The answer to this question allowed me to formulate the Discourse models, that is, the participants’ theories, or explanations of the values connected to their experiences. Discourse models explain the situated meanings words have in a particular context. Discourse models, Gee (2005) stated, “flow from our experiences and social positions in the world” (p. 88). In addition, Discourse models project our views about what is moral and what actions are possible in order to alleviate social problems. Discourse models mediate between individual interactions on a local level and Discourses on a global level. Discourses are one of the six tools of inquiry used in

Discourse Analysis, which include “situated meanings, social languages, Discourse models, intertextuality, Discourses, and Conversations” (p. 110).

After I formulated the Discourse models, I wrote up the analysis of two of them. In my analysis, I used the following four tools of inquiry: intertextuality, Conversations, social languages, and Discourses to describe how the participants constructed activities and identities and recognized the activities and identities that others were constructing through their discourse. Using intertextuality helped me show how one text alluded to, or cross-referenced another text, that is, field notes or another interview. Using Conversations helped me analyze how a text alluded to themes or debates extant in society in general. Using social languages allowed me to show how particular participants used certain varieties of language for certain purposes. The fourth tool, Discourses allowed me to analyze how the participants discursively positioned themselves, others, and me. It allowed me to show how the participants combined language and other things to perform and recognize certain identities. Discourse Analysis allowed me to answer the first research question, that is, what is the relationship between the participants’ discourse practices and their performance.

Three Characteristics of Multimodal Literacy

To analyze the performance, with its complex multimodal grammar, I created three characteristics from the features Cowan (2003, 2005) drew on to analyze Latino visual discourse: the contextual, the intertextual, and the social features. I used these three characteristics to analyze the multimodal grammar of the play as a situated, dynamic performance. First, the contextual characteristic described the sociohistorical context as well as the contemporary social context in which the play was situated. Second, the

intertextual characteristic described how the participants drew from various modes of meaning to produce a unique multimodal text. In addition, the intertextual characteristic described events that initiated actors into the Mexican performance Discourse. Third, the social characteristic described the literacy events on two levels. The level one social characteristic described a unique literacy event in which several Latina adolescents constructed meanings. This event occurred after school, but was connected to an assignment for class. The level two social characteristic described the literacy events in which the Latino/a adolescents and the Latina teacher constructed knowledge and meanings in the play production.

The Contextual Characteristic

Cowan (2003, 2005) analyzed Latino visual discourse using the contextual feature, which describes the existence of icons and the visual literacy events in which the Latino adolescents' responsiveness to the icons developed. In this study, the contextual characteristic described the literacy events that caused the Latino/a adolescents to become aware of the play's sociohistorical context. In addition, the contextual characteristic described the literacy events that caused the Latino/a adolescents to become more aware of the contemporary context of the play. When, for example, only 5 of the 12 students who normally participated in rehearsals appeared on day 4, Mario noticed and referred to the absences asking the teacher, "How many people didn't come to school?"

The Intertextual Characteristic

Cowan (2003, 2005) analyzed Latino visual discourse using the intertextual feature, which revealed how Latino adolescents relied on recognizable icons to generate new visual texts with meanings others familiar with such icons could read. In addition,

Cowan's intertextual feature described how the Latino adolescents were initiated into the cultural knowledge the icons represented and used their knowledge to read the icons.

In this case study, the intertextual characteristic described how the participants drew from various multimodal meanings to produce a unique multimodal text. The intertextual characteristic also explained how the Latino/a adolescents were initiated into the cultural knowledge represented in the Mexican performance Discourse. In the play, the modes of meaning were linguistic (the script) and visual (paintings, costumes and props, a videotape of a former group's play), audio (a music CD, sound effects), gestural (the stamp of a foot, a downward-pointed finger, body language), spatial (the physical environment where rehearsals were held), and multimodal, or a combination of two or more modes of meaning (The New London Group, 1996).

The Social Characteristic

Cowan's (2003, 2005) social feature described the visual literacy events in which the Latino adolescents created, exhibited, and exchanged their drawings. In this case study, the social characteristic described literacy events in which two different groups participated. The level one social characteristic described a unique literacy event in which several Latina adolescents constructed meanings. This event occurred after school, but was connected to an assignment for class. The level two characteristic described the literacy events in which the Latino/a adolescents and the Latina teacher constructed knowledge and meanings in the play production. Since I wanted to identify the events in terms of their causal conditions, their context, and the strategies through which they were managed, I analyzed these literacy events using Grounded Theory (Glaser & Strauss,

1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990), and nested them within the level two social characteristic.

Grounded Theory

To analyze the literacy events in which the actors and the teacher participated, I used Grounded Theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Grounded Theory involves the analytic processes of open coding and axial coding.

Open Coding

Strauss and Corbin (1990) defined open coding as “the process of breaking down, examining, comparing, conceptualizing, and categorizing data” (p. 61). Open coding is an “analytic process by which concepts are identified and developed in terms of their properties and dimensions” (p. 74). This analytic process entails asking questions about the nature of the data in a process known as constant comparison. After copying and pasting the transcribed field notes from Word documents into Ethnograph, I read the data over and over, constantly questioning what each bit of data represented, comparing each bit of data with other bits, and ultimately assigning a name to each separate phenomenon. I eliminated several codes, which named phenomena that had already been given names. This process resulted in a codebook of 67 codes to describe the entire set of observations. Using these codes, I then began the process of axial coding.

Axial Coding

According to Strauss and Corbin (1990), axial coding is a process in which data are recombined in new ways. Recombining data in new ways, Strauss and Corbin explained, means “*making connections between a category and its subcategories*” (p. 97 [italics in original]). The focus of axial coding is to identify a category in terms of the following features: its causal conditions, its context, strategies through which it is

managed, and the results of those strategies. These features are known as subcategories because of their relationship to the category, or phenomenon. How these subcategories relate to their categories is known as the paradigm model.

In axial coding, I identified categories by looking for their causes, and considering the specific context as well as the strategies used to manage the category and the results of those strategies. These features were identified as subcategories of the phenomenon. I identified how these subcategories related to their category, which is known as the paradigm model. I established categories for sequences of actions, for example on day 11, I identified the category “Layering Coaching and Repetition.”

Plan to Insure Credibility

Triangulation

Triangulation is the confirmation of research findings through the use of different forms of evidence (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Stake, 1995). To understand the relationship between the participants’ discourse practices and their performance, three forms of evidence were used: observations, semi-structured interviews with the students, and the students’ written reflective responses. The purpose of including three forms of evidence was to understand the relationship of different types of inquiry to different contexts. Different forms of evidence, as Patton (2002) stated, can yield different results because different types of inquiry are sensitive to different contexts. “Understanding the inconsistencies in findings across different kinds of data,” Patton stated, can assist in understanding the connection between the research design and the phenomenon of interest (p. 556).

Understanding the relationship between the Latino/a adolescents' discourse practices and their performance promised to be useful in moving the field forward by contributing to the development of a theory of performance learning that is culturally responsive and supports academic learning. In addition, I believed the findings might offer suggestions for further research on after-school performance learning for Latino/a ELLs.

Role of the Researcher

As Stake (1995) noted, the case study researcher can play different roles. In the role of observer, Stake noted, the researcher catches the experience of being in the setting, records it in detail, and reconstructs the setting with naturalistic description so that readers are able to experience an equivalent level of understanding. A reconstruction of the setting respects the emic tradition, Stake noted, and reflects the participants' perspectives and world. "By respecting the details of that world," Dyson (1997) stated, writers make the lives and worlds of other people more easily reached (p. 169). Respecting the participants' world, Dyson stated, means paying attention to portraying the participants' actions as a descriptive account of events. A descriptive account of events, Merriam (1998) stated, means rendering an interpretation of the context that enables readers to establish their own connection to the setting.

Interpretation involves creating associations between and among the details. As Stake (1995) noted, constructivist perspectives state that, despite the impossibility of determining reality outside of experiencing it firsthand, the role of the researcher is to construct accurate understandings based on the reality that the researcher has come to understand through her own thinking processes. Interpretation always involves particular biases, which are the result of Discourses.

Freedom from bias is impossible to achieve (Patton, 2002). I tried to monitor bias through the use of open-ended questions in the interviews, transcribing interviews word for word, including alternative perspectives, member checks, and writing a fieldwork journal.

Presentation of the Case

As Merriam (1998) stated, presenting the case involves deciding “how much concrete description to include as opposed to analysis and interpretation and how to integrate one with the other so that the narrative remains interesting and informative” (p. 234). Furthermore, Merriam stated, the goal should be to provide a balanced case study report consisting of particular description, general description, and interpretive commentary. Particular description consists of direct quotes and narratives drawn from observations. According to Merriam, general description is necessary to verify “patterns of distribution,” that is, to make connections across the data to help the reader decide if “the vignettes and quotes are typical of the data as a whole” (p. 235). Interpretive commentary, as Merriam stated, gives meaning to the data so that the reader can understand the relevant points that lead to the author’s conclusions.

To follow Merriam’s guidelines in presenting this naturalistic case study, I devoted approximately two-sixths of the final report to particular description in the opening and closing narratives. I devoted one-half of the report to interpretive, or analytical commentary in the Discourse Analysis and the analysis of the characteristics of the performance. I also devoted one-sixth of the report to general description that drew from the Discourse Analysis to determine whether the students validated their performance.

Trustworthiness

The concept of trustworthiness is the assurance provided to consumers of research that they can rely on a study for accuracy (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). To establish a case study's accuracy, Merriam (1998) stated, a researcher must exert effort to produce a study that is both valid and reliable. Validity and reliability in qualitative research, Merriam stated, means the study was conducted according to ethical principles. In this case study, ethical principles were used to present and collect the consent documents, to conduct the interviews, to record observations, to store the data, to analyze the documents, to write the report, and to base the conclusions on the data.

Wolcott (1994) stated that validity could be considered the major strength of qualitative research. With the goal of producing a valid study, Wolcott (1994) offered several points to guide qualitative researchers: a) listen much more than talk, b) aim for accuracy in field notes, c) start the writing early, d) provide detailed description, e) report completely, f) be honest, g) obtain feedback, h) aim for balance, and write truthfully.

To assure a study's trustworthiness, Merriam (1998) stated, it is important to include an explanation of how efforts were made to ensure that the results were "consistent with the data collected" (p. 206). This is the researcher's guarantee that the study has been conducted according to rigorous procedures, as Merriam stated, and that the "findings match reality" (p. 201). In order to match the findings with reality, I used Wolcott's guide for producing a valid study.

To follow Wolcott's (1994) guide for producing a valid study, I followed nine steps. First, I attempted to ask a greater number of information questions to elicit the

participants' perspectives. Second, I aimed for detailed description in field notes. Third, I transcribed field notes and interviews daily. Fourth, I provided detailed narratives in the final report to contextualize the Discourse Analysis. Fifth, I reported the events as they occurred with many quotations. I also included participants' interviews and reflective responses. Sixth, I was straightforward about all aspects of the study, even citing mistakes, such as asking a yes/no question instead of an open-ended question. Seventh, I offered member checks to verify the interviews with the participants. Eighth, I aimed for balance between description and analysis. Finally, I reported the truth about what happened in the case.

Qualitative research, Merriam (1998) stated, attempts to understand the world from the perspectives of those who live in it. Researchers understand that readers will judge the trustworthiness of their work, and therefore, they must have standards and rigorous methods.

Credibility is a question of addressing whether or not a rigorous, systematic method of inquiry has been followed. Lincoln and Guba (1985) observed that the researcher-as-instrument insures reliability by means of preparation. As Merriam (1998) noted, reliability is not whether the results can be replicated, but "whether the results are consistent with the data collected" (p. 206).

External validity in qualitative case study, Merriam (1998) stated, is unlike external validity in quantitative research. Qualitative case study is selected not for its power to produce generalizations, but for its ability to understand the particular. A case is chosen so that the researcher can present the particular in depth, not "what is generally true of the many" (p. 208). Studying the particular "in depth" means that a case is studied

for how it functions, or operates. Readers reach conclusions through “vicarious experience,” Stake (1995) noted, in other words, through their own private understandings.

Conclusion

The purpose of this naturalistic case study was to explore what happened when 7th grade Latino/a ELLs and their Latina teacher produced a play in an after-school program and to determine the relationship between the participants’ discourse practices and their performance. In addition, the aim was to describe the characteristics of the performances and to find out if the participants validated their performance, and if so, how. This design was created to explore this unique case in depth. The answers to these questions promised to move the field forward by developing a model of after-school performance learning that might support ELLs’ academic engagement and knowledge.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Introduction

In this chapter, I present the results of a naturalistic case study, the purpose of which was to explore what happened when 7th grade Latino/a ELLs and their Latina teacher produced a play in the context of an after-school program and to determine the relationship between the participants' discourse practices and their performance. In addition, I sought to describe the characteristics of the performances and to find out if the participants validated their performance, and if so, how.

I organized the chapter into four sections. In the first section, I tell the story of the play production. The total number of days for the play production was 23, of which I observed 20. The story has three sections, Rising Action: Days 1 to 9, Turning Point: Days 10 to 17, and Resolution: Days 18 to 20. Within each section, I have selected one or two days that I consider pivotal to understanding the context of the participants' discourse practices. I selected days 7 and 8 to illustrate relationships and teamwork in the context of the rising action. I selected these two days because by day 7, all of the main characters' roles had been cast. In addition, on both days, the rehearsals were conducted on the stage, offering a picture of how things transpired in that context. I selected days 10 and 12 to portray conflict and change in the context of the turning point. These two days represented the middle of the action, when challenges arose, including a student who

sought to get into the play, and the need to use other rehearsal sites. Lastly, I selected day 19, to depict seriousness in the context of the resolution.

In the second section of this chapter, I present the findings of the Discourse Analysis. The Discourse Analysis revealed the existence of seven Discourse models. From these seven, I selected Discourse models 1 and 2 for the report, because I believed they best represented the Discourse of the play, that is, they were most salient in this Discourse's ways of thinking, feeling, valuing, believing, and acting. The two Discourse models I selected were the Discourse model of being responsible, and the Discourse model of playing around. I present the findings of the Discourse Analysis of each of these two Discourse models in the second section of this chapter. In addition, I included the respective data for each of the two Discourse models on Tables 1 and 2, following the report of each Discourse model. Finally, I included the data for the remaining five Discourse models on Tables 3 through 7 in Appendix F.

In the third section, I present my analysis of the characteristics of the performances. In the fourth section, I present my analysis of the actors' validation of the final performance and invalidation of their performances during the rehearsals. Lastly, I summarize the findings presented in these four sections in this chapter's conclusion.

The Story of the Play Production

I developed the story of the play production using field notes, or observations, which I transcribed from steno books daily during fieldwork, typed into Word documents, labeled, and saved by date. I read the data in these Word documents again and again and selected the rehearsals that best represented the story of the play production as it unfolded during fieldwork. After reading the data repeatedly, the plot of the play production became

transparent. I divided the plot into three distinct sections: the Rising Action, the Turning Point and the Resolution. To begin this chapter, I tell the story of the play production. However, before telling the story, I provide some context in three areas: first, the origin of the play *Esperanza Renace* [Esperanza Reborn]; second, a report of what the teacher said about the vote to do the play; and third, a brief synopsis of the novel *Esperanza Rising* (Muñoz-Ryan, 2000) on which the play was based.

For two years, the 7th grade ELLs adapted novels read in class and turned them into scripts, which they modified and rehearsed in the after school program. Then, at the end of six weeks of rehearsals, the ELLs performed the plays for their parents. One of the former ELLs had written a script for a play entitled *Esperanza Renace* [Esperanza Reborn] adapted from the final chapter of the novel *Esperanza Rising* (Muñoz-Ryan, 2000), and each succeeding year the participants modified his script.

The Vote

In the fifth and final teacher interview, I learned how the play came to exist through a voting process Mrs. R. initiated. I did not observe the actual vote because it occurred before the first day of fieldwork. The fifth interview with the teacher occurred after the actors wrote their reflective responses about the final performance, the only writing they did concerning the play production. In their responses, a majority of the actors validated the final performance and invalidated their performances during the rehearsals. I asked the teacher about her reaction to this disparity and she responded by telling me that the students voted to participate in the play rather than take a final exam in the class.

Explaining how she proposed the play, Mrs. R. said, “I gave them a choice. Do you want to do a final exam on *Esperanza*, comprehensive? Or do you want to do a play? And

everybody said, ‘we want a play.’” Mrs. R. emphasized the students’ preference saying, “they chose their destiny. This is what they wanted to do. I gave two choices. We had a vote.” Voting for the play was voting to comply with Mrs. R.’s authority and rules. Through the vote, Mrs. R. constructed the play as a binary, that is, complying with her authority or risk dismissal and imitating her models or risk failure. Mrs. R. said she gave the four boys and one girl she dismissed from the play two or three opportunities, but “they decided they did not want to act.” “Act” was Mrs. R.’s situated meaning assembled on the spot, which meant, “Comply with my rules.” The teacher’s situated meaning in the word *act* alluded to Diana’s situated meaning in item 5 (Table 1), “you have to act.” In her words, Diana positioned herself as aware of the expectations that Mrs. R. set up, namely that acting meant complying with Mrs. R.’s rules. Mrs. R.’s construction of the play as a binary involved her in the construction of the discourses.

On Day 6 in the classroom, the teacher held up a stack of permission letters that had been sent home and returned to her. She read the letter that informed parents about the after-school activity and asked them to sign and return it to the teacher. The teacher referred to this letter in the fifth and final interview saying, “So there was an agreement. It was verbal and a contract where the parents signed.” In Mrs. R.’s view, the students were responsible for abiding by the terms of the contract, and if they did not, their failure was their own fault. Equity was ensured, Mrs. R. explained, by creating enough parts for all her classes in the second presentation. A few students who were dismissed from the play, or chose not to participate in the play were in the second presentation.

In the fifth interview, Mrs. R. suddenly performed a speech in which she addressed me as one of the dismissed students saying, “This is what you chose for your final grade.

It's not that I want to have you or I don't want to have you, this is your grade. Do I want you to get a hundred? Yes, I do want you to get a hundred. Am I going to compromise with you and do what you want to do? No." Positioned as a deviant student by the teacher's second-person mode of address, I sensed that she was performing a strict teacher identity for my benefit. Later in the interview, Mrs. R. offered a completely different performance as a diligent learner saying, "As the years go by, if I had been able to proceed with this it will get better and better and better because I learned how to accommodate certain situations better than I did last year."

As the audience, I experienced a shift in orientation to each of the teacher's performances. Moreover, I imagined Mrs. R. also experienced a shift as she responded to the ways she was positioned by my performance. As Conquergood (1991) stated, "performance-centered research takes as both its subject matter and method the experiencing body situated in time, place, and history" (p. 187). The performance paradigm privileges embodied experience and can also make the researcher interpreted as a "displaced, somewhat awkward reader of texts," (p. 188). Throughout the fieldwork process, I sensed that not only was I reading texts, others were reading and interpreting my performance as a text. Although I strove to cultivate a researcher Discourse in the field by dressing casually and sitting with the ELLs in the classroom and cafeteria, one day in the cafeteria I was caught off guard standing (a typical teacher pose). A smiling Asian ELL teasingly warned the others that there was "a teacher" present. I automatically denied his discursive positioning saying, "I'm not a teacher," explaining that I was an unpaid researcher and, pointed to my steno pad as proof that I was an observer. Then, as if negotiating my identity he declared, "You're half a teacher!" Based on this incident and

others, I surmised Mrs. R. had announced my arrival and my identity beforehand and used it as a reason to exhort the ELLs to be on their best behavior.

In performance-centered research, Conquergood (1991) stated, the power dynamic changes when the researcher moves from a detached observer to a co-performer role. One of the first entries in my fieldwork journal concerned the “palpable sensation” I felt of being distrusted. I surmised that the context of the nationwide debate over the Sensenbrenner Bill in Congress and 377 Latino/a students absent from school were reasons why Luis did not seem to like me. When I said hello and smiled, his response was not friendly, and I wondered how I would be able to get him to trust me. His girlfriend Diana also responded coolly to my greeting. Then, halfway through my interview with Diana, she began to critique the play’s appropriation of her after-school autonomy, and I realized that their coolness to me at the beginning was that they considered my presence as one of the reasons for Mrs. R.’s plan to put on a play. As Conquergood explained, the highly nuanced social dramas of life achieve meaning through performance and ethnographers must be co-performers to make sense of those embodied meanings. The participants used language and embodied actions to draw me into a highly nuanced social drama about the meaning of the play.

A Summary of the Novel

Esperanza Rising (Muñoz-Ryan, 2000) recounts the story of Esperanza Ortega, the author’s grandmother, who left Mexico just as the Great Depression struck. Esperanza’s father was a wealthy landowner in Mexico, and Esperanza had few worries and many servants. One servant who worked for Señor Ortega was Miguel, a young man the same age as Esperanza. One day Esperanza told Miguel the disparity in their status

precluded any close relationship. However, Esperanza's life took a turn when her father was killed and her home destroyed. She had to leave her injured grandmother behind and move to the United States where she became an agricultural worker. Despite almost insurmountable barriers, Esperanza started over in California where she found inspiration in others who shared the same struggles and in the various symbols infused with the values and beliefs of her father and grandmother. In the end, Esperanza's former arrogance was replaced with strength and compassion. The actors' pseudonyms and the characters they portrayed are arranged in a graphic organizer, which appears in Appendix E.

Rising Action: Days 1 to 9

I arrived on the first day during the final minutes of class. Each day the after-school program began when students met in the cafeteria for attendance and snacks before going to the gym or classrooms for activities. The teacher, Mrs. R., told me she always walked to the cafeteria to meet the students who were in the play production group and walk with them to the classroom. The group walked together talking and laughing. After a brief meeting in the classroom, the group either conducted the rehearsal there or returned to the cafeteria to rehearse.

On the Stage: Day 7

Obtaining the stage for rehearsals always seemed to present a problem, but the participants seized any available opportunity to use it. On day seven, while Mrs. R. set up the narrator's microphone, the actors talked and laughed on stage. Suddenly, Mrs. R. said, "We need to start!" Having assigned stage-crew tasks, such as moving chairs, to the boys, Mrs. R. said, "Luis, I'm going to ask you to handle the curtains." In response, Luis

complained loudly, “I don’t want to handle the curtains!” Despite his complaint, he took a position behind the curtains next to the ropes. With the curtains closed for the introductions and everyone in place, Luis produced a loud belch. “Please don’t do that,” Mrs. R. stated, “It’s in poor taste. Please don’t waste any more time.” Then Mrs. R. addressed the two girls standing in front of the curtains saying, “Please begin.”

Laura recited the introduction in English and, when she was finished, Mario commented saying, “You got to talk loud.” Lena, who had to recite the introduction in Spanish, moved the microphone around to determine the most effective position. Her eyes rolled upward as she tried to recall the next word. The familiar phrases came quickly, but there were frequent pauses. Mrs. R. told her to repeat and Lena asked, “¿Otra vez, Miss?” [Again?]. Lena repeated her part, but Mrs. R. still disapproved, shaking her head. Lena complained, “Miss, no puedo.” [I can’t]. “You’re going to have to practice more at home,” Mrs. R. said.

“Curtains!” Mrs. R. said, and Eva (Esperanza I) entered, expressing disbelief about her missing money, suspiciously vanished along with Miguel. Mrs. R. asked for more gestures and moved offstage saying she wanted to test if the actors’ voices were loud enough to be heard from where the audience would sit. Mario (Alfonso) entered and said his lines, but Mrs. R. heard noises and asked, “Who’s in the back fooling around? You need to be behind the curtain.” She moved the actors to the front of the stage so they could be seen and heard better. Mario repeated his entrance with a relaxed stroll. “Walk firmly,” Mrs. R. said. Mario repeated the lines and actions. “Is that better?” he asked. Mrs. R. did not respond.

Tania (Ramona, also known as Mamá, Esperanza's mother) entered and said her lines. "Curtains," called Mrs. R. when Tania had finished. She directed the boys to be ready to move the chairs onstage for the next scene. Sitting down on a chair behind the podium, the narrator began to read, but Mrs. R. told him he had to stand. She also said the curtains should only be opened halfway. Uttering her question in a monotone, Eva (Esperanza I) entered, and then listened as Mrs. R. modeled the question's rising intonation. Eva and Lisa (Josefina) could not be heard, so the chairs were rearranged to face the audience. In a monotone, Lisa (Josefina) predicted the reason for Mario's (Alfonso's) arrival and her concern about her children, "Serán los bebés!" [It must be the children!]. Mrs. R. explained how to portray haste as Lisa exited.

With a leisurely gait and a smile, Eva (Esperanza I) ambled towards Mario (Alfonso), saying her lines in a monotone, and Mrs. R. chided her, "You're worried about your Mom. Don't walk so casually." Eva and Mario listened as Mrs. R. exaggerated the accented final syllables in the question "¿Le pasó algo a mamá?" [Did something happen to Mother?] They repeated their lines and then Mario took Eva's elbow and led her off stage. Next, the narrator announced, "A bus from Los Angeles has arrived." At these words, Luis (Miguel) entered the stage, stretching his arms to show his fatigue and smoothing his rumpled shirt.

Chiding some actors, Mrs. R. said, "Don't play with these microphones. Let's do it from the beginning." They had not rehearsed the complete play, so the request seemed to suggest that Mrs. R. wanted to perfect the first half before moving to the latter half of the play. The rehearsal began again and Mrs. R. talked to Eva (Esperanza I), "Walk

straight, secure, firm.” Mario and Tania said their lines, but Mrs. R. targeted Eva for help, modeling the ideal intonation. The scene ended with the call, “Curtains!”

Eva (Esperanza I) and Lisa (Josefina) re-enacted their scene, Lisa still reciting her question in a monotone. “It’s a question,” explained Mrs. R., and she directed Lisa (Josefina) to turn her body to look in Mario’s (Alfonso’s) direction, and then to turn back to Eva. In order to help her understand how to express worry, Mrs. R. translated the line into English: “Something must have happened to the children!” Then, Mrs. R. turned and addressed all the actors in a loud voice, “Guys, you’re actors and actresses. You have to fake it,” she said. Turning back to Lisa, she urged her to move quickly towards Mario as she exited saying, “You have to look at him.” “I am looking at him,” Lisa insisted. Trying to make the play’s context real for her, Mrs. R. said, “That’s your husband, you know.” Lisa’s facial expression registered protest over Mrs. R’s suggestion that Mario was her “husband” and she complained with indignation in her voice, “Miss!” Mrs. R. replied, “Do you want to do this part or what?” Lisa responded, “Yes,” and Mrs. R. replied in an even tone, “Then do it.”

Eva (Esperanza I) said her line, but Mrs. R. expressed dissatisfaction saying, “No, no. You need to do this...” demonstrating the action of simultaneously walking and saying the words. Eva copied this and Mrs. R. validated her actions saying, “That was much better. You need to be firmer.” Mario (Alfonso) said his lines and Eva said hers very quietly. Mrs. R. modeled it in a loud voice and Eva repeated it much louder than before. Next, Mrs. R. told Mario, “Look at her,” and Mario replied (in almost the same way Lisa had responded just a few lines previously), “That’s what I’m doing.” All the actors looked at the teacher and Diana peered around from behind the curtain. Mrs. R.

simply said, “Curtains,” and the boys moved the three chairs out for the bus station scene. “The chairs must be on the left side,” she added.

The boys only had a few seconds to move the chairs into position before Mrs. R. announced, “Curtains!” They opened and Mario (Alfonso), Linda (Hortensia), and Eva (Esperanza I) were sitting on the chairs. Roberto (the narrator), who was supposed to narrate their arrival at the station, was silent. In an even tone, Mrs. R. said, “You need to be saying something by now.” Roberto read the lines describing their arrival at the bus station. Then, Mrs. R. (as she had been doing all along) announced, “A bus from Los Angeles has arrived.” Luis entered, acting tired and travel-worn, smoothing his rumpled shirt. Mario and Luis greeted one another like brothers, raising their forearms, clasping each other’s elevated hand, and pushing their shoulders against one another.

The bus station scene portrayed Miguel’s return from Mexico where he had gone to rescue Abuelita and reunite her with Esperanza, her granddaughter, and Ramona (Mamá), her daughter (played by Tania). In order to finance his trip, Miguel (played by Luis) had taken Esperanza’s money. Mrs. R. modeled how Luis (Miguel) should reassuringly pat Linda’s (Hortensia) arm. Eva (Esperanza I) entered and stamped her foot, demanding her “stolen” money from Luis. Mrs. R. showed Luis how to act shocked at Eva’s aggressive demand. “You need to back up. Don’t be nice,” she explained. Luis repeated the line “Por lo menos, saludame primero” [At least say hello first]. Then he asked the teacher, “Like that Mrs. R?” “I always see you doing this,” Mrs. R. said and modeled an outstretched pointed finger, “why can’t you do it today?” Demonstrating the gesture, she said the line, “Wait and the fruit will fall into your hand.” Luis said the line and gestured by pointing his finger at Eva. “Exactly,” said Mrs. R. Next, Luis escorted

Patricia (Abuelita) onto the stage, but the teacher said his action was too soon and he had to wait for his cue, which was Eva's line "¿Qué miro? ¿Es un fantasma? Debe ser un fantasma!" [What do I see? Is it a ghost? It must be a ghost!].

When Ramona, Esperanza's mother, became a farm worker, she was not accustomed to the harsh working conditions in the fields and contracted Valley Fever. The play depicted how Abuelita was reunited with Ramona as she convalesced from her illness. "Curtains," announced Mrs. R., and when they opened, Luis (who also played the doctor for a few days) sat facing Tania (Ramona) on the left side of the stage. Patricia (Abuelita) and the other characters stood on the right. The narrator began reading about the keepsake pebbles in Abuelita's pocket. Mrs. R. had to prompt Nina (Isabel) with her lines. Roberto, the narrator, lost his place in the script and Mrs. R. sounded impatient as she said, "Come on, please," while walking over to the podium and showing him the place. Then the group walked over to greet the convalescing patient, Tania (Ramona, Mamá), whose back was toward them. Patricia (Abuelita) tapped Tania gently on the back indicating her arrival and a surprised and amused Tania cheerily asked, "¿Mamá, eres tú?" [Mother, is that you?].

Patricia (Abuelita) stumbled over her lines. Mrs. R. muttered with irritation, "I know the whole play and they still don't know it." Luis, who played two roles, Miguel and the doctor, sat facing Tania as the doctor. He said his lengthy series of lines explaining about Valley Fever and Roberto, the narrator, laughed at his difficulty. All of a sudden, Eva blurted out, "We skipped *la manta*," referring to the blanket scene, in which Esperanza proudly shows Abuelita her newly finished blanket. The narrator, who

was supposed to keep everyone on track with his narration, suddenly realized his error, exclaiming “Ah, my god.”

Mrs. R. ignored the error and simply said, “Okay, the chairs need to be moved away. Come on, guys. Those curtains need to be closed, boys.” Next, in the rising scene, Diana played the role of Esperanza II, (the teacher had told me that Diana asked to play the role and the teacher cast her after day 1). As Diana (Esperanza II) and Luis (Miguel) entered the stage, the teacher reminded Diana, “When you get past the curtains, talk.” Then she said, “Now let’s do it again. It’s not done right.” Meanwhile, the actors on the left hand side of the stage were quiet and serious, watching the action. The play called for Luis to look at Eva with *escepticismo* [skepticism]. Mrs. R. tried to help Luis produce the appropriate perplexed expression and said “Are you for real?”- a question Miguel might ask as he looked suspiciously at Esperanza.

The narrator read and tapped the microphone to imitate the sound of the earth’s heartbeat. As Diana and Luis walked off together, Mrs. R. smiled with amusement that they were girlfriend and boyfriend. “Those two!” she mused. Next, the narrator announced “Hoy es el cumpleaños de Esperanza” [Today is Esperanza’s birthday]. After telling Diana (Esperanza II) and Nina (Isabel), who faced the line of actors, to stand to the side so the line could be seen, Mrs. R. moved into the cafeteria to observe the singing of *Las Mañanitas*, a traditional Mexican birthday song, and to see if she could hear the actors.

Next, as Patricia (Abuelita), worked on a knitted quilt, she recalled the symbolic significance of the mountains and valleys in her knitting pattern for Diana (Esperanza II) and Nina (Isabel). Nina could not remember her lines and received a prompt and some

help on how to direct the lines to Diana. Then, Diana said the last lines of the play, “Isabel, nunca temas empezar de nuevo” [Never be afraid to start over]. Diana stood as she said the lines, addressing the first half, “nunca temas,” to Isabel, and turning, addressed the second half, “empezar de nuevo,” to the audience. When she turned to the audience, Diana held up her arms and said “empezar de nuevo,” rolling her eyes upward as if bored. Diana’s phrase brought the play to a close. Leaving her position in the cafeteria, Mrs. R. walked towards the stage saying, “We don’t have anymore time. Nina, you need to review those lines.”

An Audience: Day 8

On day 8, several Latina students, who attended another after-school activity, were invited by Mrs. R. and showed up at the rehearsal. They sat at the cafeteria tables in silence to watch the rehearsal on stage. Mrs. R. introduced the Latinas to the cast saying they were acting as the parents, and asked them to listen for any noises such as backstage voices or chairs being moved. Mario approached me and said smiling with a twinkle in his eye, “I don’t want these girls here. I’m shy.” When I asked him if he would feel shy when his parents were in the audience, he replied, “I know my parents.” Then he returned to the stage and both he and his brother, Luis, jumped onto the stage and sat with the other actors.

A lot of talk and laughter ensued among the actors as Mrs. R. attempted to straighten out the microphone system. Mario’s microphone reverberated as he spoke into it, eliciting laughter from the other actors. A large pile of papers and trash littered the center of the stage and Mrs. R. called out in a loud voice, “Luis, I need some help,” asking if there was a broom. Luis pointed to the back of the stage and ran in that direction. He returned

with a push broom and started sweeping the stage, assisted by Diana who picked up large ragged sheets of newsprint.

Most of the actors were sitting in the wings, ready to make their entrances. Mario and some of the girls sat on the right and Eva sat on the left. Roberto and Mrs. R. finally had the microphone system set up when Mario put his microphone on his CD player projecting music into the cafeteria. Mrs. R. said, "Please don't get me in trouble because then we have to cancel this stuff. I need your cooperation."

Laura, who was ready to recite the English introduction, asked, "Can I start now?" Mrs. R. handed her a microphone and said, "You need to use this." Laura read the introduction recounting the story of Esperanza and the misfortunes that befell her, including her struggle to survive as a farm worker. Taking the microphone from Laura, Lena began to recite the Spanish introduction, but she slouched and held the microphone in a vertical position, which distorted her words. Mrs. R. opened the curtains and reached out to take the microphone saying, "You have to hold the mike like this," positioning the microphone in a horizontal position.

Lena tried again. Holding the microphone in a horizontal position, with her paper resting on it, Lena's posture was straighter and her pronunciation was clearer. When she finished, she laid the mike on the stage and walked to the back of the stage. The curtains opened and Roberto, the narrator, suddenly said, "Hey, give me the microphone." Laura and Lena started to leave the stage to go into the cafeteria, but Mrs. R. said, "Girls, we're practicing as if we have parents. You have to go back there," meaning that they had to sit in the wings with the other actors. Laura and Lena were friends who seemed to purposely avoid a lot of social interaction with the other actors.

Meanwhile, the boys made some noises and Mrs. R. scolded them saying, “Boys! Stop it, please. Stop!” She told them to close the curtains and made Lena repeat the last line of the introduction. Then she called for the curtains to reopen. The narrator, Roberto, walked on stage and said his lines: “Miguel es el unico que pudo hacer esto. De eso no hay duda!” [Miguel is the only one who could have done this. Of this, there is no doubt!]. Mrs. R. asked him to repeat it. Roberto held the microphone and walked across the stage, swinging the mike cable in front of him, making a swishing noise like the wind. After his lines, Roberto went back to the podium to read the narrator’s part.

Alone on stage, Eva (Esperanza I), said her line, but Mrs. R. stated, “You did two things wrong. What was number 1? Number 1 was you were supposed to follow the X’s.” She pointed with her foot to the taped X marks on the stage. “Number 2, you’re talking. You need to look at the audience.” Mrs. R. began modeling Esperanza’s lines. Suddenly, from behind the curtains, some of the actors said, “Hey, Miss,” and pointed out that the lines Mrs. R. was modeling were not the correct lines. Mrs. R. waved her hand, in an exasperated way. “Whatever you’re going to say, I don’t have the script. Let’s not waste any more time!”

Mrs. R. continued to describe how Esperanza was supposed to act saying, “Don’t laugh!” She wanted Eva (Esperanza I) to act in an angry, defiant way. She demonstrated gestures saying, “You go like this,” and “Attitude! You can be a girl with attitude!!” As Eva took her position to repeat the scene, Mrs. R. added, “If you don’t do it perfectly, we can’t do it!” As Eva entered saying her lines, Mrs. R. gestured with her fingers pressed together as if she were pulling a smile off her face.

Next, Mario (Alfonso) entered and said his lines. Mrs. R. responded, “Very good, but louder.” Mario complained, “No puedo, maestra” [I can’t, teacher]. In order to make it seem easier, Mrs. R. compared his lines to a simple apology saying, “You can say, ‘siento mucho,’ [I’m very sorry].” She added, “You better feel it, otherwise you can’t act.” Then, Mrs. R. noticed Tania (Mamá) missed her cue saying, “Helloooo?? Tania entered and addressed Eva (Esperanza I), suggesting a possible reason for Miguel’s taking Esperanza’s money. Directing her, Mrs. R. said, “Come around to Esperanza and turn around. You’re upset. Don’t smile.” She showed Tania how to say the lines, and then, in a louder voice, announced the end of the scene with the word “Curtains!”

Using the scene change to make a general announcement to the actors sitting in the wings, in a loud voice Mrs. R. said, “Even walking has to be done properly.” Then Roberto, the narrator asked: “Can I go now Mrs.?” Mrs. R. said, “Curtains,” and turned to the Latinas in the audience: “Can you hear the chairs?” She referred to the boys’ moving of the two chairs for the next scene. Then, turning toward the narrator, she said, “Repeat that. Louder!” The narrator repeated. “Yes!” said Mrs. R., “can you do it with a little more emphasis?”

Lisa (Josefina) sat on the right, with Eva (Esperanza I) on the left. Lisa reached out and patted Eva’s arm in a consoling manner saying, “No te preocupes” [Don’t worry]. Mrs. R. told Lisa to lean a little more toward Eva and say the line louder. Eva repeated the line. Meanwhile, Mario (Alfonso), who was supposed to wait on the left, sat down on a chair next to the student who was pulling the curtains. Instantly, Mrs. R. said, “No, you can’t be sitting there!”

The action continued with Lisa (Josefina) walking toward the left where Mario (Alfonso) stood. Mrs. R. corrected Lisa saying, “You did it before he (the narrator) said it! What is this mess? No, no, no. You need a little more action and drama.” Next, Mario entered and addressed Eva (Esperanza I), but forgot several of his lines. Chiding him, Mrs. R. said, “There is no reason for you to forget lines, Mario.” “It’s too long,” Mario complained. “You need to take pages home to study,” countered Mrs. R. Mario repeated his lines. “I don’t see the heart. That’s ‘talk,’ we need to ‘act,’” Mrs. R. explained. Then she cued the stage crew to close the curtains.

Scolding Mario and Luis for not doing their stage-crew jobs, Mrs. R. said, “Everybody’s sitting. These chairs are supposed to be moved.” Turning to the Latinas, Mrs. R. asked, “Did you hear the chairs?” Then the curtains opened and someone could be seen running across the stage. Again turning to the Latinas, Mrs. R. asked, “Did you see her running?” Mario, Linda, and Eva sat on three chairs, but Mrs. R. listened to the narrator’s lines explaining that the three arrived at the bus station and sat on a bench. Mrs. R. disagreed with their sitting down on the ‘bench,’ and told the three students: “Actually that’s wrong. The line says that you’re arriving-you’re already sitting.”

Stamping her foot, Mrs. R. said, “Stop! We’re going to look like fools in front of the parents!” Then Mrs. R. made the actors repeat the scene beginning with the opening of the curtains and the three actors walking toward the bench at the bus station. They sat down on the chairs. Mrs. R. said: “Now the action matches the narrator’s words!” Mrs. R. went over and showed Roberto, the narrator, how to say lines and stand at the podium. He repeated the lines. Mrs. R. said, “That’s much better. Louder. You have to bring the mike right in front of your face. That’s when you hear the thump.” Then she said, “Come

on Linda” (Hortensia). The teacher demonstrated how to look at Luis (Miguel). She said: “You’re going to walk like that?” She imitated Linda’s walking, which was casual and slow, not like a concerned mother, who has not seen her son in a long, long time. Mrs. R. explained to Linda: “You have not seen him for a year!”

Luis (Miguel) swaggered toward the center of the stage, his loose, unfastened black Fila athletic shoes making a thumping noise on the wooden floor. Mario (Alfonso) rose from the bench and greeted his ‘son’ in an uninterested monotone “Hola, hijo! Cuanto me alegre de verte! [Hello, son! How happy I am to see you!]. Mario said the lines as if they were declarative, not exclamatory. In contrast, Linda (Hortensia), who rose next, greeted her ‘son’ Luis (Miguel) with a broad smile. Next, Luis said his lines to Linda and then to Eva (Esperanza) without expression, and Mrs. R.’s face registered irritation and impatience. She turned around and walked toward the tables where the Latinas were sitting and watching the play. She pointed to the Latinas and said in a loud voice: “They’re parents today! Slapping the cafeteria table, she said, “Do you really call this acting? Sorry! This is not going to cut it! You know what I’m saying?”

Standing on stage among the other actors, Luis repeated Mrs. R.’s last phrase in a low voice: “You know what I’m saying?” Then he said, “I don’t care.” With emphasis on the word “do,” Mrs. R. said, “I do care. You have it or you don’t. You have to care.” The students listened silently. No one spoke for several seconds. Then Luis broke the silence with the question: “Can we start now?” There was a brief two-to-three-second pause, and then the rehearsal continued.

The exchange between Luis and Mrs. R. seemed to affect the actors by making them try harder to follow Mrs. R.’s directions. Eva (Esperanza I) recited her lines with

greater emphasis and emotion. Roberto narrated that Esperanza “abraza” [embraces] Abuelita, and Eva (Esperanza I) and Patricia (Abuelita) did so. Following their reunion, Abuelita was introduced to the other characters. As they shook hands, each actor stepped backward into the outer circle so that each character that addressed Abuelita in turn could be seen by the audience.

Next, Nina (Isabel, a young girl) entered skipping toward the group, but Mrs. R. was dissatisfied. She took Nina by the hand and together they returned to Nina’s original position. Then they both skipped in hand-in-hand saying Nina’s line. All the students laughed, including Mrs. R. and Luis. This interaction seemed to relieve some of the tension caused by the earlier disagreement between Luis and Mrs. R. Next, Mrs. R. directed Patricia (Abuelita) to wait for the narrator to say the line “she takes stones out of her pocket” before pretending to give them to Nina. Then the group of actors walked over to where Tania (Ramona, Esperanza’s mother) sat.

Calling for the scene’s repetition, Mrs. R. said, “Narrator, let’s do it again.” The group went back to its original position and Patricia called out “Josefina’s first!” showing her knowledge of the script, which called for Lisa’s character to begin the introduction scene with her entrance. Lisa (Josefina) entered from the center back of the stage. Next, Linda (Hortensia) introduced the characters. When the introductions had been made, the group walked over to where Tania (Mamá) sat. Luis (the doctor) and Tania (Mamá) sat on chairs facing each other, and the characters expressed happiness at seeing Mamá in such good health.

Nina (Isabel) came skipping in from the left. Roberto, the narrator, called out that the scene was wrong and the script differed. But Mrs. R. disagreed with his assertion

saying, “We’re done with that.” Nevertheless, she went over to the podium to check the script. “No, look,” Roberto said, reading the lines to her. Mrs. R. read the script and agreed saying, “The script is wrong. You’re right.” Mrs. R. verified the narrator’s correct interpretation of the script by pointing to the narrator and saying, “Okay, say what you’re supposed to say.”

Roberto repeated his part and Mrs. R. sent Nina (Isabel) to come in from the right. Although some of the actors were still dissatisfied and there was some grumbling, the complaints died down, and the scene proceeded. Patricia (Abuelita) said her lines, memorized but mumbled. Mrs. R. directed Luis, who was also acting in the role of the doctor, telling him how to greet Patricia (Abuelita) with a firm handshake. Luis (the doctor) gave the report on Valley Fever, Mamá’s condition.

Next, in the rising scene, the role of Esperanza changed and was played by Diana. Luis, now Miguel, and Diana (Esperanza II) entered very slowly. Looking on, Mario acted like a director, issuing a blunt command to his brother saying, “Acuéstate tú” [Lie down]. Luis (Miguel) lay down on the stage. Diana (Esperanza II) explained that, with patience, he would be able to hear the promised sound—the earth’s heartbeat. Then, Roberto tapped the microphone to simulate the heartbeat: thump, thump, thump, thump. Diana twirled around Luis like a phoenix bird, wearing a green skirt and green t-shirt.

Mario announced the end of the scene. “Curtains!” he said. He jumped off the stage and came over to the cafeteria table where I was sitting and sat next to me. Wearing a tank top, he tossed his t-shirt around in his hands while he watched the action on the stage. The curtains opened and someone ran across the stage. Mrs. R. asked the audience of Latinas, “Did you see someone running?” Patricia (Abuelita), Nina (Isabel), and Diana

(Esperanza II) sat on chairs. Patricia was pretending to knit and Mrs. R. directed her how to show her expertise saying, “Like if you were blind.” Nina (Isabel) experienced trouble enunciating her line: “Las puntadas mias estan todas torcidas!” [My stitches are all twisted!]. The narrator described Esperanza’s actions. Diana (Esperanza II) turned first to Nina, saying, “Isabel, never be afraid,” and then turned to the audience and said, “to start over.”

Still sitting next to me on the table, Mario turned to me and asked, “Do you think we’re doing okay?” Just as I said “yes,” the curtains opened to the cast lined up across the stage and Mario flew off the cafeteria table and jumped up onto the stage with his t-shirt waving around. He took his place in the line and one of the actors (no one was assigned to this job until the end, so each day a different actor said the names) announced in both languages: “Vamos a presentar los participantes. Now we will present the participants.” The first actor’s name was called and the actor walked to the center of the stage.

Mrs. R. stood on the cafeteria floor and said to the actor: “You can’t walk like that.” Each actor walked to the center of the stage and announced the role they played. Lena did not announce her part, which was the introduction in Spanish, but instead verified its title with Mrs. R.: “¿Introducción? Bueno.” At the end, Mrs. R. told the student from the beginning ESOL class who was pulling the curtains to walk in the center of the stage, say “curtains” and take a bow. All the actors and Mrs. R. clapped for him. He smiled. Then they all joined hands and Mrs. R. called out, “One, two, three,” and they swung their arms up together and brought them down and bowed.

“Let’s go back to the classroom,” Mrs. R. announced. The actors and the audience left the cafeteria. Linda and some of the other girls were last, and walked along smiling

and laughing as they sang the Spanish vowel sounds with an echo: “ah...ah, ey...ey, ee...ee, oh...oh, oo...oo.”

Back in the classroom, some of the actors picked up their backpacks and other belongings and left right away. Lena, Laura, and Patricia stood together in a group and read Diana’s two posters that she did in advance of the deadline date. One of the posters was entitled “Mrs. R’s work made me tired” and there were sleeping yellow Tweety birds wrapped in blue blankets in all four corners of both posters. The posters were a synthesis of the books they read and the projects they did all year. The girls looked at the posters and then they asked Mrs. R. if they could take some books home. Mrs. R. said okay, but they had to write their names and the book title on the board. The girls then went over to the counter and found the books they wanted and wrote the titles on the board under their names.

The Turning Point: Days 10 to 17

On days ten and twelve, securing the stage was impossible. On day ten, there was a teachers’ meeting in the cafeteria. On day twelve, there was another teachers’ meeting, followed by another group’s prior reservation, which forced the *Esperanza Renace* group to alter its plans. Therefore, on days ten and twelve, the rehearsals took place in different contexts, which had a noticeable effect on the participants’ discourse practices.

Disagreement: Day 10

On day ten, when the group met, the air conditioning had been turned off in the classroom, so Mrs. R. asked, “How many want to do it outside?” The vote was unanimous in favor of fresh air, so the rehearsal moved to the sidewalk in the cool shadow of the building.

As the rehearsals advanced, Mrs. R. added validation to the layers of coaching and repetition to entice the actors to imitate her intonation, and the actors competed for Mrs. R.'s validation. After Eva (Esperanza I) angrily stamped her foot as she said, "No puedo creer lo!" [I don't believe it!], Mrs. R. told her to repeat it. "Again?" Eva asked with surprise. When Eva repeated the line, Mrs. R. stated her approval with a loud, emphatic "Yes!" Next, Mario (Alfonso) entered and Mrs. R. critiqued his walk saying, "You have to be firm. Walk straight, firm." Mario repeated his entrance, and seeking the same validation Eva had received, asked eagerly, "Like this?" However, Mrs. R. just repeated her last word, "firm." From this exchange, it appeared Mrs. R. did not validate a gesture or intonation unless it met with her standards. Next, Eva mumbled her lines and Mrs. R. said, "This is for real. Firm walk. Back again. Loud." Eva repeated the action, and this time Mrs. R. validated Eva's actions saying, "Yes!"

On his cue, "A bus from Los Angeles has arrived," Luis (Miguel) entered, stretching and yawning as if he had just awakened from a nap. In a parody of Mrs. R.'s frequent requests for repetition, Mario (Alfonso) said, "Re-do it." Mario's discourse practice seemed to be a signal to his brother to engage in more of these discourse practices because then Mario (the father, Alfonso) and Luis (the son, Miguel) enacted a parody of their characters' greeting saying, "What's up, man?" "You guys are wasting time," Mrs. R. said, with a note of irritation in her voice. In addition, she observed Luis's use of a script and warned him, "You're going to have to memorize those lines."

As soon as his lack of memorization was mentioned, Luis's playfulness ended and frustration surfaced as he began a series of complaints. First Luis blamed his brother, "I don't have a paper. He threw it away!" But Mrs. R. ignored Luis's comment and turned

to the next scene, the group introduction. It seemed that Luis's relationship with his girlfriend, Diana, was not going smoothly and as they entered, Mrs. R. critiqued their actions saying, "You guys need to look at each other. You're not even looking at each other." Suddenly, Luis physically forced her to look at him by pulling her arm, but Mrs. R. instantly reprimanded him saying, "Ladies are delicate and sophisticated. They're soft." In response, Luis complained again saying, "She can't even look at me." Luis's despondency and frustration seemed to be influenced by what he viewed as Diana's slight. Finally, in response to the group's lackluster singing in *Las Mañanitas*, a traditional Mexican birthday song, Mrs. R. called for a recitation of the lyrics, but once again Luis complained, "I don't even know the song."

Mrs. R. announced they would skip the final scene and rehearse the entire play a second time. She gave the actors a minute to get into their places before saying, "One, two, three, curtains!" With accusatory words fixing the culpability for Esperanza's stolen money on Miguel, Roberto (the narrator) made his entrance. In the original script, Roberto's line was part of the narration, but Mrs. R. told him he would have a walk-on part. She modeled a raised index finger that fell and firmly pointed toward the floor. While she modeled, noises could be heard, which she censured saying, "You guys need to stop it." Accompanied by the pointing gesture, the words "Miguel era el unico que pudo hacer esto. De eso, no hay duda!" [Miguel was the only one who could have done this. Of this, there is no doubt] assumed greater power and meaning. Finally, Mrs. R. offered Roberto additional advice saying, "Talk to the audience." When the rehearsal ended, Mrs. R. told the actors to prepare for their bows saying, "Everybody in line. In

line, guys, please. Your feet are not in line with the shoes. Trust me, your parents are going to say, ‘look at that line.’” But Luis disagreed. “No, they’re not,” he said.

A Decisive Event: Day 12

Day twelve was a Thursday, and the stage was reserved for the theater group. Dividers partitioned the cafeteria in two, and the *Esperanza Renace* rehearsal occurred in the second room. The *Esperanza Renace* actors perched on circular seats attached to a long cafeteria table facing a wall. The talk and laughter reverberated in the large high-ceilinged area. Eva (Esperanza I) was absent, so Mrs. R. asked Diana if she would play the part, but she refused. Then she called Luis and said, “I need to speak to you.” Next, she sent Mario to the other end of the table for making noise, and he obeyed because he had seen her talk to Luis.

An alliance between Mrs. R. and Luis seemed apparent from previous events, such as on day eight, when the stage was littered with trash and she had called on Luis saying, “Luis, I need your help.” I had seen the teacher in numerous phone conversations with parents in her office. (Once she told me she had spoken to all thirty-eight students’ parents at least once). I had also witnessed a conversation in the cafeteria between Mrs. R. and Diana and overheard Mrs. R. talking about someone saying, “Do you think she’s doing this...” but that was all I heard. It seemed as though relationships with special understandings existed between certain actors such as Luis, Diana, and the teacher. In addition, Luis consistently refused to be interviewed during the study. He only agreed after I asked the teacher for his father’s phone number and set up an appointment to meet at his home for an interview, which occurred in the presence of his parents and brother. When I asked if he was a director, he glanced first at his brother before answering “yes.”

Lena and Laura stood side-by-side in the area in front of the wall to present the bilingual introduction. Lena recited her introduction in Spanish. Her long ponytail was pulled forward over her left shoulder, and she had a habit of smoothing the ponytail with her fingers. After Lena, Laura was supposed to recite; however, Mrs. R. was arguing with the narrator saying, “Listen to me, Roberto. No excuses. You need to be ready.” Then Laura recited the introduction in English. Laura was dressed in a dark t-shirt, jeans, white sneakers, and large hoop earrings, and held a white t-shirt inscribed with glitter that spelled “Army Girl.” As Laura’s part ended, Mrs. R. repeated her warning to Roberto saying, “If you don’t do it, I’m going to go back to the classroom. No whining.” Laura parodied Mrs. R. saying, “No whining.” Mrs. R.’s face registered displeasure, and she unplugged the compact disk player to signal her displeasure. Laura repeated the introduction, followed by Lena who hesitated over some lines, at which point Mrs. R. said, “Help each other, please.”

Next, Patricia’s (Abuelita) off-stage question, “¿Esperanza, tu recuerdes la historia del fénix?” [Do you remember the story of the phoenix?] was answered by Mrs. R. substituting for the absent Eva saying, “Sí, recuerdo” [Yes, I remember]. Then Laura entered as the understudy for Eva (Esperanza I). Mrs. R. had told me of Mario’s crush on Laura, and one day I saw Laura and other girls reading a note written on a desk saying, “Mario likes Laura and Laura likes Mario and I should not laugh at my boyfriend.” Upon reading the note, Laura’s expression registered displeasure. As an understudy for Eva (Esperanza I), she would have to face Mario. Laura held her script high to cover her face, and Mario entered, addressing her with an exaggerated guttural growl, “Esperanza!” Mrs. R. looked at him with a shocked and appalled expression, but Mario protested, “You told

me to act, didn't you?" Mrs. R. replied in an even tone, "You're being silly. I'm sick of it."

Laura (playing Esperanza I for Eva who was late) and Lisa (Josefina) rehearsed the fruit-sorting scene, while Mario (Alfonso) waited for his cue. Mario said his lines looking directly at Laura, trying to make eye contact, but Laura covered her face with the script. Next, Mario held his hand to his ear signaling that he could not hear Roberto's reading. Then he strutted over to greet Luis, who encouraged him saying, "Do it again! Do it again!" But Mrs. R. intervened saying, "That's enough, guys."

Previously, Mrs. R. had shown the actors how to position themselves in the group scene in which Patricia (Abuelita) was introduced. Mario (Alfonso) took one firm step into the center of the circle, shook hands with Patricia (Abuelita) as he said his line, and then stepped back into the outer circle so the audience could see the other actors. Mrs. R. directed Luis to position himself in order to allow the audience to see the others and summed up in a general comment saying, "What I'm saying, you use common sense. He's blocking the view of the audience." Diana (Esperanza II) looked on, waiting for her cue in the rising scene. Mrs. R. encouraged Diana to take her time saying, "Slowly, slowly." With a tone of deep sarcasm in his voice, Luis added, "Slow. Didn't you get that part?" In Luis's question, we seem to hear the voices of teachers, and others, whose patronizing discourse practices often include questions such as "didn't you get that?" Luis's command, "slow," seemed to echo these patronizing discourse practices. Ignoring Luis's sarcasm, Diana finished the scene. Extending her hand to help Luis up, they exited and went back to the table to talk.

After *Las Mañanitas*, Mrs. R. called for a second rehearsal saying, “Just now this was a disaster. Can we have a real rehearsal and real acting? Let’s leave the fooling around.” After Laura’s introduction, she repeated, “No more fooling around.” In her introduction, Lena stroked her long dark ponytail. Suddenly, Luis blurted out loudly “Stop touching your hair!” Silence fell over the group. No one had heard such a clear and direct comment from an actor before. Mrs. R. broke the silence with a quiet warning, “You’re going to be doing this [touching your hair] in the performance.”

Eva (Esperanza I) arrived just in time for rehearsal two. Patricia (Abuelita) asked if she remembered the story of the phoenix, a mythical bird that is consumed by fire and rises out of its own ashes. The phoenix is a central symbol of the play and, like the phoenix; Esperanza is seen as rising from the ashes of a tragic fire that destroyed her home to a new life. Upon hearing Patricia’s query about the story of the phoenix, Eva replied, “Sí, Abuelita. Yo recuerdo” [Yes, grandmother. I remember]. Roberto (the narrator) entered and accused Miguel of stealing Esperanza’s money. Mrs. R. modeled his angry gesture—a firm arm ending in a downward-pointed finger. The incriminating words and gesture explained the reason for Esperanza’s anger. As Muñoz-Ryan (2000) wrote, Esperanza was angry with Miguel for taking “what was not his” (p. 234). This anger was alluded to in Mrs. R.’s prologue prior to the final performance.

Next, Eva was directed to move downstage so Mario would have to walk towards her and the audience would hear him. Tania (Mamá) was absent, so Lena acted as her understudy. Then, however, Roberto missed his cue and Luis complained, “He can’t talk loud enough.” Luis put his head on the cafeteria table in a discouraged way and Mrs. R. looked over at him suddenly announcing, “I’m going to write all the mistakes on this

script.” When Mrs. R. said she would note mistakes, Luis raised his head, looking up with renewed interest. As I mentioned earlier, I suspected Luis had an “understanding” with the teacher—an alliance—and, under the terms of this alliance, he would act as the director when the teacher gave him a signal. When she said she was going to take notes, Luis suddenly raised his head, and changed his actions. He began directing the other actors. When Mrs. R. announced she was going to be an observer, both Mario and Luis’s roles changed. Mario began to announce the cues for the curtains (previously one of Mrs. R.’s jobs), and Luis directed the actors to start acting or stop misbehaving.

With a sudden change in his role, Mario announced, “Curtains, please!” With the imaginary curtains closed, his verbal cue told the actors to place three chairs on the stage for the bus station scene. Mario also assumed the role of director and told Roberto to read louder. Roberto raised his voice so he could be heard. Then, Mario pointed to Mrs. R. to remind her to announce, “A bus from Los Angeles has arrived.”

Luis (Miguel) had to react to other characters in certain ways to convey the correct meaning. Because Mario and Luis were brothers, their actions did not require much analysis. However, as Linda (his “mother”) ebulliently greeted him, he learned how to act comfortable and not to withdraw as she pinched his cheek in a gesture of affection. He also learned to recoil in amused surprise at Eva’s (Esperanza I) emotional words and angry stamp of her foot. To explain the reason for using her funds, Luis disappeared, returning with Patricia (Abuelita) on his arm. In the introduction scene, Mario extended his arm and shook Patricia’s hand with a serious demeanor. Patricia and Eva greeted Lena (Mamá), but had to wait for Roberto who missed his cue. As Roberto narrated, several of the actors shouted in unison, “Louder!” Luis noticed Roberto’s lack of

attention and said, “Roberto, stop!” In the rising scene, Diana and Luis had to wait for Roberto and Luis had to cue him saying, “Roberto, go!” After Luis’s cue, Robert moved farther away from the group and his loudness diminished.

After rehearsing the bows, Mrs. R. said, “Now everybody sit down very quietly.” The actors faced her and listened. “Number one,” Mrs. R. said, “in the middle of the play, there were thirty-seven mistakes ’cause you didn’t pay attention. Thirty-seven mistakes in half a play! Number two; there was noise and talking. What’s going on here?”

As she read the list, the actors remained quiet and listened. There was no emotion on their faces. Mrs. R. went on. “We can’t afford to do this. The problem is the same mistakes since the first week. They haven’t been corrected since day one. I don’t want to be embarrassed. There is fighting, talking, pushing throughout. Making funny sounds. Roberto has to be told, ‘Roberto, go!’ Everybody was talking when Laura was announcing. No one paid attention to her. There are too many mistakes. It’s ‘I do what I want or I’m going to quit. If I can’t do what I want to do, then I’m going to quit.’”

In closing, Mrs. R. stated the goal was to eliminate errors, “Maybe ten mistakes tomorrow. On Monday, no mistakes.” Then, she proposed, “Anyone who wants to leave, should just...” However, she did not finish because Diana blurted out, “Stay home.” As soon as she heard Diana’s words, Mrs. R. asked, “You guys want to quit? All who want to quit stand up.” Laura stood up. Luis saw her and instantly said, “Sit down,” but Mrs. R. saw her too and said, “You’re out!” With that, everyone returned to the classroom. Laura seemed shocked and went to the water fountain where Patricia, Lisa, and Lena met to console her. In an attempt to make sense of things, Patricia told Laura her older sister said the same thing had happened in the play she was in two years earlier.

Resolution: Days 18 to 20

Each of the last three rehearsals was a unique event because the after-school program had ended a week earlier. On day eighteen, the rehearsal was held on stage behind the closed curtain during class time. Students were eating lunch in the cafeteria, so the noise level was high. Day nineteen was the dress rehearsal and the students stayed after school to rehearse the play on stage. Day twenty was the day of the performance for the parents, and the actors eagerly took advantage of a sudden windfall of free time to rehearse on their own one last time. I selected day 19 for this case study because of the seriousness the actors demonstrated in the dress rehearsal.

Seriousness: Day 19

The atmosphere on the stage radiated a sense of quiet importance as day 19, the dress rehearsal, began. After *Esperanza Renace*, Mrs. R. had planned another presentation called *People's of the World*. Unlike the play, *Esperanza Renace*, the *Peoples of the World* was a series of vignettes, in which the participants, mostly beginner-level ELLs, wore ethnic costumes and read scripts describing various countries. On day 19, the participants in the *Peoples of the World* presentation filled the seats in the cafeteria, acting as an audience for the *Esperanza Renace* production. When the play finished, the actors exchanged places and became the audience for the *Peoples of the World* presentation.

The dress rehearsal for *Esperanza Renace* was held first. After Jazmin and Lena recited the introductions, Roberto entered, blaming Miguel for stealing Esperanza's savings. In her long, yellow dress, Eva strode across the stage and punctuated her line with an angry stamp of her foot. Roberto, the narrator, stood straight at the podium in his

formal black shirt and black pants. Mario (Alfonso) stood onstage in his loose khaki pants, matching long-sleeved khaki shirt, and sneakers. Obviously tense and experiencing trouble with his lines, Mario wiped his hand over his face in anxiety. Although he faltered slightly, he recovered and ended with his line: “No se, vamonos” [I don’t know. Let’s go] and, taking Eva’s (Esperanza I) arm, they exited to the left. The curtains closed.

When the curtains reopened, Mario, Linda, and Eva filed out in a single line and sat down on the three metal chairs—the bus station bench. Roberto narrated the description of Miguel’s arrival on the bus from Los Angeles. Standing where the audience was sitting in the cafeteria, Mrs. R. criticized the lack of loudness saying, “I need to hear you from here.” She told Roberto, “Read the last part again.” Luis (Miguel) entered as Roberto described, stretching and yawning as if he had just awakened. Luis’s blue long-sleeved shirt and black baggy pants were disheveled. Playing the role of Luis’s ‘father,’ Mario (Alfonso) was the first to greet Luis. Mario clasped hands with his ‘son,’ Luis (Miguel) in a show of deep affection.

Playing the role of Miguel’s ‘mother,’ Linda (Hortensia) was the second to rise from the bench to greet Luis. She did not pinch his cheek as she usually did, but instead just patted both her hands on his arms. Finally, the third person to rise from the bench and greet Luis was Eva (Esperanza I), who stamped her foot and demanded the money that he allegedly had stolen from her. Dissatisfied with the level of anger Eva enacted, Mrs. R. told her to repeat the lines. Following her repetition, Eva asked, “Is that better?” Mrs. R. replied, “Don’t smile.”

Telling Eva (Esperanza I) that he had something better than money for her, Luis (Miguel) returned to the wings. When he reentered, Luis was escorting Patricia

(Abuelita). Although Abuelita's face was familiar, Esperanza could not believe her eyes. She thought Abuelita was a ghost. When Patricia and Eva hugged, they laughed and Mrs. R. admonished them, "Listen! No laughing. No time for joking."

Mario (Alfonso) greeted Patricia (Abuelita) and immediately asked Mrs. R., "Is that good?" Mrs. R. made him repeat. He expressed discouragement and frustration and muttered, "Can't do nothin', man!" Mario repeated his line "Que gusta de verle." And he asked Mrs. R., "Is that better?" Waiting impatiently to say her lines, Linda (Hortensia) turned to Mrs. R. and asked, "Can I go now?" She said her lines in a loud, clear voice and gave a firm handshake.

Then Lisa (Josefina) and Carlos (Juan) were introduced to the group. Eva (Esperanza I) asked Lisa where her mother was and Lisa told her. Linda (Hortensia) had to introduce Lisa and Ramón to Patricia (Abuelita). Linda was clearly the actor with the most confidence. Her words were loud and distinct, and she used her hands to gesture as she introduced Lisa and Ramón to Patricia saying, "Abuelita, te presento a Juan y Josefina" [Grandmother, I present to you Juan and Josefina].

Carlos, who played Juan (Josefina's husband), was a new recruit and only had one line. Mrs. R. had recruited Carlos at the last minute to play the role of Juan, Josefina's husband. His single line was to greet Patricia (Abuelita) with the words, "Mucho gusto en conocerla, Señora" [Pleased to meet you]. As soon as he finished this line, Mrs. R. tried to correct him, but Linda disagreed, explaining that the line had been changed from the original script. Linda went on to say that they had been rehearsing with the changed line. She went on to describe how Mrs. R. had confused the lines that had been rewritten. To

conclude, Linda corrected Mrs. R. saying, “Miss, only ‘mucho gusto, señora!’” Linda’s clarification stood undisputed.

Next, Nina (Isabel) ran out with a big smile and a bunch of flowers to present to Patricia (Abuelita). When she said her line, “Hola, Abuelita, he oído hablar mucho de usted” [I have heard a lot about you], Mrs. R. said to Nina, “No, no. Go back!” Luis tried to buoy her confidence saying, “Loud! You gotta do it loud!” Nina re-entered and repeated her line. Luis looked at her and whispered in an encouraging voice, “Fuerte!” [Loud].

Lisa (Josefina, Juan’s wife) gave Carlos (Juan) a tap on the arm with her hand as a signal that the scene was over and he had to exit to his right. The group split into two. Lisa, Carlos, Mario and Linda exited, while Patricia, Luis, and Eva approached Tania (Mamá) and Jazmin (now the doctor) who sat on chairs on the left. Luis expressed annoyance because he expected to hear the narration explaining the action as the group approached Tania. He said loudly, “Come on, Roberto!”

Patricia (Abuelita) called to Tania, “Ramona!” Sitting in a chair with her back toward Patricia, Tania (Ramona) did not expect to hear Abuelita, expecting Esperanza instead. Without turning around, she asked, “¿Esperanza, eres tú?” [Is it you, Esperanza?]. Patricia answered, “No, Ramona, soy yo, Abuelita!” [No, it’s me, Abuelita]. Tania (Ramona) rose and turned around, unable to believe her eyes. Incredulity and surprise in her voice, Tania greeted Patricia (Abuelita), “Mamá, eres tú!” [Mamá, it is you!]. The girls hugged and clasped each other’s hands as they looked into each other’s eyes, smiling. There was reassurance in Patricia’s confirmation, “Sí, soy yo, hija. Ya vine” [Yes, it’s me, daughter, I just came back].

When Tania asked Patricia how she was able to come, Patricia recounted, in a lengthy explanation, all the threats to her successful escape and the events that led to her safe return. Patricia said her lines rapidly and without hesitation. She asked Tania about her health and Tania introduced the doctor to explain the causes of her condition.

Jazmin (the Doctor) began her lines, but Mrs. R. interrupted her saying, “Stop.” Addressing some of the students, she asked, “Can you guys be quiet?” Luis added, “Shut up!” But Mrs. R. cautioned him not to say that, saying “ah-ah-ah.” Jazmin started her lines again and said her part rapidly. Luis, Patricia, and Tania listened and looked at her with surprise on their faces. They whispered to each other, surprised that she had the lines memorized because Jazmin had been unprepared for previous rehearsals.

The group turned around to watch as Nina (Isabel) skipped in from the right. Anticipating Nina’s line, Mrs. R. said it aloud before Nina did, but the actors laughed quietly, some even repeating Mrs. R.’s incorrect word “baile.” Mrs. R. smiled too. Then, skipping toward the group, Nina repeated the line: “Oh, Esperanza, el corazon me baila!” [My heart is dancing]. Eva (Esperanza I) assured Nina that she felt the same way, “el mio tambien” [Mine too]. Next, Eva ran off stage and returned with the blanket to show Patricia (Abuelita). Patricia admired its size in a loud, clear voice saying, “Oh Esperanza, con esa manta puedes cubrir dos camas” [With that blanket you can cover two beds]. The curtains closed.

When the curtains opened again, Roberto read that several days before her birthday, Esperanza and Miguel were taking a walk in the mountains. Diana (Esperanza II) and Luis (Miguel) entered hand in hand. Luis looked into Diana’s eyes as they entered and she looked up at him and reminded him of what happened one day in the mountains

back in Mexico: “Miguel, do you remember that if you lie down in the grass and stay very quiet, you can hear the heartbeat of the earth?”

Roberto narrated that Miguel looked at her with skepticism. Luis raised a single dark eyebrow and pursed his lips in a doubtful smile. As if to humor her, though, he lay down and inquired, with feigned naïveté, “Ocurida pronto, Esperanza?” [Will it happen soon?]. Diana (Esperanza II) answered with the same proverb Luis (Miguel) had used earlier, but this time she advised him to be patient saying, “Aguántate tantito y la fruta caerá en tu mano” [Wait a little and the fruit will fall into your hand].

The narrator tapped the microphone five times to simulate the earth’s heartbeat. While Roberto narrated, Diana enacted the scene. Lying on the ground near Miguel, Esperanza began to feel as if she were rising. Following the narration, Diana rose and raised her arms slowly up and down like a phoenix. “Stop running!” Luis abruptly called to some students backstage. Mrs. R. pulled the curtains back and said, “You really need to stop!”

Next, the curtains opened to a line of actors ready for *Las Mañanitas*. Diana and Nina stood facing the line. Swaying from side to side and holding gift bags for Esperanza, the actors sang the traditional birthday song. Unlike previous days, the actors did not bump one another. At the end of the line, Roberto, Mario, and Carlos stood still and did not sway, but maintained a serious demeanor. At the end of the song, the actors approached Esperanza and said happy birthday. The ELLs in the audience watched intently.

In the last scene, Patricia had to say her line twice because Roberto forgot to listen for the cue. When Diana said her lines without much expression, Mrs. R. asked, “Is this

what you're going to do tomorrow?" The curtains closed. When they opened, the cast was assembled in a line, ready for their bows. Jazmin announced, "Next we're going to present the participants. A continuación vamos a presentar los participantes." As they took their bows, some of the actors smiled and laughed, but Luis bowed in a serious way. So did Tania. One of the last to bow, Mario glanced toward Mrs. R., always hopeful for some sign of validation.

Discourse Analysis

In this section, I present the report of the Discourse Analysis. I used Discourse Analysis (Gee, 2005) to analyze the written transcriptions of the participants' interviews and the actors' reflective responses. I used Gee's heuristic to determine which areas of reality the participants were using their language to construct. In addition to the seven building tasks, there are six tools of inquiry used to analyze "how people build identities and activities and recognize identities and activities that others are building around them" (p. 10). I used one of these six tools of inquiry, situated meanings, because they can lead to Discourse models, which mediate between the interactional work people do in carrying out the seven building tasks and Discourses as they function "to create the complex patterns of institutions and cultures across societies and history" (p. 71).

First, I transcribed the interviews word-for-word and arranged them in stanzas. Next, I read and re-read the stanzas, keeping Gee's (2005) heuristic in mind and asking myself how both the participants and I were using language to construct and recognize identities and activities in our conversations. I repeated the same process with the reflective responses and noticed how the actors' performances in their written texts differed from their oral texts. Through the visual process of reading and re-reading, I

began to notice images, motifs, and patterns that were repeated. At that point, I felt I was ready to use one of the six tools of inquiry, situated meanings, which can lead to Discourse models. First, I read all of the transcriptions again to identify the images and patterns, that is, the situated meanings the participants assembled on the spot. I compiled a list by writing down each situated meaning and the pseudonym of the person who used it. Next, I put these situated meanings back together in groups based on common themes, or overarching categories, such as having many duties and responsibilities, helpful strategies, the frustration and complexity involved, and the impact on affect. Then I arranged the situated meanings within the groups based on their common features, which are subordinate to the broader categories, such as being serious, memorizing, talking louder, working hard, helping others, changing things, and improving.

After the situated meanings were arranged in groups, I asked myself the question “what theory do the participants hold that makes them use just these particular meanings?” The answer to this question allowed me to formulate the Discourse models, that is, the participants’ theories, or explanations of the values connected to their experiences. Discourse models explain the situated meanings words have in a particular context. Discourse models “flow from our experiences and social positions in the world” (p. 88). In addition, Discourse models project our perspectives about what is moral and what actions are possible in order to solve social problems. Discourse models mediate between individual interactions on a local level and Discourses on a global level. Discourses are one of the six tools of inquiry used in Discourse Analysis, which include “situated meanings, social languages, Discourse models, intertextuality, Discourses, and Conversations” (p. 110).

After I formulated the Discourse models, I wrote up the analysis of two of them. In my analysis, I used four tools of inquiry: intertextuality, Conversations, social languages, and Discourses to describe how the participants constructed activities and identities and recognized the activities and identities that others were constructing through their discourse. For example, using intertextuality helped me demonstrate how one text alluded to, or cross-referenced another text, such as the narrative, or another participant's words. Using Conversations helped me analyze how a text alluded to themes or debates extant in society in general. Using social languages allowed me to show how particular participants used certain varieties of language for certain purposes. The fourth tool, Discourses allowed me to analyze how the participants discursively positioned themselves and others in their written and oral texts. It allowed me to show how the participants combined language and other things to perform and recognize certain identities. Discourse Analysis allowed me to answer the first research question, that is, to understand the relationship between the participants' discourse practices and their performance.

The Discourse Analysis revealed the existence of seven Discourse models. From these seven, I selected Discourse models 1 and 2 for the report because I believed they best represented the Discourse of the play, that is, they were most salient in this Discourse's ways of thinking, feeling, valuing, believing, and acting. The two Discourse models selected were the Discourse model of being responsible, and the Discourse model of playing around. These two Discourse models revealed the teacher's involvement in the construction of the discourses. In the following section, I present the findings of the Discourse Analysis of these two Discourse models. In addition, I included the respective

data for each of the two Discourse models on Tables 1 and 2. These tables follow the report of each Discourse model. Finally, I included the data for the remaining six Discourse models on Tables 3 through 7 in Appendix F.

Although the total number of actors in the performance was 13, only 12 participated in the play production. The last actor, Ramón, was added to the play during the dress rehearsal. However, even though Ramón did not participate in rehearsals and interviews, both he and his parents signed the appropriate assent and consent forms.

Discourse Model 1: Being Responsible

The Discourse Analysis revealed that all 13 actors in the play operated with the Discourse model of being responsible (Table 1). This Discourse model held that being responsible for taking a proper approach to the play was reflected in ten rules: acting (intonation, gestures, etc.), attitude, memorization, practice, rate of speech, volume and posture, perfection, extra work, costumes, helping others, and making changes to improve the play. These ten rules represented the standards in the Discourse of the play.

The first rule of Discourse model one was being responsible for acting, that is, using effective intonation, facial expressions, and gestures. Being responsible for acting explained Eva's situated meaning in item 1 on Table 1, "To act more and to be serious, to say something to make something serious." Eva portrayed herself as responsible and as someone who followed Mrs. R.'s directions. Eva privileged the sign systems of intonation, facial expressions, and gestures used to express anger and defiance. Eva's words alluded to Mrs. R.'s directions on day 8 when she warned Eva, "Don't laugh!" They also referred to Mrs. R.'s words on day 2, "You can't smile. You're supposed to be upset, with an attitude." On day 7, Mrs. R. said, "I want action. I want drama," and on

day 8 she said, “You go like this,” and demonstrated the dramatic gestures Eva was supposed to use.

The second rule of Discourse model one was being responsible for one’s attitude—taking Mrs. R.’s directions seriously—which explained the situated meanings Lisa assembled in her interview. In two situated meanings in item 2, “get serious,” and item 3, “they really got serious,” Lisa positioned herself as responsible and as someone who followed Mrs. R.’s directions. Lisa’s words alluded to Mrs. R.’s words on day 7 when Lisa’s facial expression registered protest over Mrs. R.’s suggestion that Mario was her “husband” and she indignantly protested, “Miss!” Mrs. R. replied, “Do you want to do this part or what?” Lisa responded, “Yes,” and Mrs. R. said in an even tone, “Then do it.”

Lisa treated responsibility for her attitude as significant by naming it (and studying) as the top two ways to improve the play. Lisa connected improving the play with having a good attitude, that is, learning to accept criticism and follow directions. Lisa’s words alluded to Mrs. R.’s instructions on day 8 when Mrs. R. told Lisa that she must follow the narrator’s reading saying, “You did it before he (the narrator) said it! What is this mess? No, no, no. You need a little more action and drama.” In item 3, “they really got serious,” Lisa treated the previous group’s attitude as significant by emphasizing it with the word *really*. She connected the previous group’s success to their attitude. By using the pronoun *they*, Lisa emphasized that the actors in the previous play behaved well and accepted Mrs. R.’s direction, both signs of taking the play seriously, and implied that the current actors were less like them. Lisa’s implication was that the

success of the performance depended on the actors' attitude, that is, accepting Mrs. R.'s directions and criticism without protest.

Being responsible for one's attitude, or taking the play seriously, also explained Diana's situated meaning in item 4, "acting and attitude," which she assembled in her interview. Diana positioned herself as fully aware of Mrs. R.'s rules and as someone who followed her instructions. The word *attitude* alluded to Mrs. R.'s encouragement to Eva on day 8 when she said, "Attitude! You can be a girl with attitude!!" In Diana's situated meaning in item 4, "acting and attitude," Diana treated both acting and attitude as equally important in being responsible by joining the two with the conjunction *and*. In Diana's situated meaning in item 5, "you have to act," Diana positioned herself as aware of the expectations that Mrs. R. set up, namely that acting meant complying with Mrs. R.'s rules. Diana's words alluded to Mrs. R.'s words in interview 5, in which she said that those who were dismissed "decided they did not want to act."

The third rule of Discourse model one was being responsible for memorization. Being responsible for memorization explained Mario's situated meaning in item 6, "I had to memorize all of my parts of the play," and item 7, "you memorize your parts, and then memorize what to say and where to stand on the stage, and then you act." In item 6, Mario used the personal pronoun *I* to position himself as having accomplished a lot in the daunting memorization task. Mario positioned himself as responsible, and someone who tried hard to carry out Mrs. R.'s assigned tasks. Mario treated the responsibility of memorization as significant by focusing on the discrete tasks: the scenes, lines, and positions on stage. Mario privileged actors' knowledge by describing the tasks in the simple, organized way. Mario's words alluded to day 3 (the Saturday morning rehearsal)

when he read his lines from the script, claiming he could not remember them. Mrs. R. stated, “I need to know within the next two or three rehearsals so someone will have time to memorize the lines.” Mario’s words also alluded to day 8 when he forgot several of his lines, and Mrs. R. chided him saying, “There is no reason for you to forget lines, Mario.” “It’s too long,” he complained, but Mrs. R. insisted, “You need to take pages home to study.”

Patricia positioned herself as facing dual responsibilities, acting and memorization, in the situated meaning she assembled in her interview in item 8, “to know how to act and remember the lines.” Patricia’s words alluded to Mrs. R.’s words on day 3, when she explained, “This is action. This is drama.” On day 3, Mrs. R. stressed her belief in the importance of memorization, which suggested greater fluency and expression, “Because you’re reading, you’re not acting.” On day 3, Mrs. R. invited Patricia’s sister to the rehearsal and, at one point, asked her to demonstrate how to say Patricia’s lines with expression. Patricia watched her sister, and self-consciously repeated her lines with more expression.

Eva and Diana also positioned themselves as responsible for memorization, and emphasized the responsibility with the words *have to*. Eva assembled two situated meanings in her interview in item 9, “they have to learn the lines” and item 10, “they have to study everyday.” Eva positioned herself as responsible, and as someone who followed Mrs. R.’s expectations that the actors study their lines at home. Eva implied that the others had the same responsibility by using the pronoun *they*. Eva’s words alluded to Mrs. R.’s directions to the actors, such as her advice to Lena on day 7, “You’re going to have to practice more at home.” Eva’s words also alluded to Mrs. R.’s words to Nina on

day 7, “You need to review those lines,” and to Mario on day 8, “You need to take pages home to study.”

Diana also positioned herself as responsible for memorization, and emphasized the obligation with the words *have to* in her situated meaning in item 11, “You have to memorize it,” which she assembled in her interview. After the performance, Diana assembled another situated meaning in item 12, “we had to memorize the parts of the play.” In this situated meaning in her reflective response, Diana positioned the actors as equally responsible, emphasizing their collective responsibility by using the pronoun *we*. Diana’s emphasis on shared responsibility alluded to Mrs. R.’s words at the end of day 3, when she complimented the actors’ for their work, and emphasized the importance of memorization for everyone, “Papers need to disappear. Scripts need to disappear. No more reading.” Diana’s situated meanings also alluded to Mrs. R.’s words on day 10 when Luis played around and Mrs. R. observed him using a script and warned him, “You’re going to have to memorize those lines.”

The fourth rule of Discourse model one was being responsible for practice. Being responsible for practice explained Lisa’s situated meaning in item 13, “They practiced their parts and acted too.” Lisa positioned herself as someone who was aware of and followed the rules Mrs. R. referred to in the video. Lisa’s words alluded to Mrs. R.’s words on day 1 when Eva laughed nervously when she was told she had to repeat her lines. Mrs. R. warned the entire group saying, “There’s going to be hours and hours of work until it looks like the video.” Mrs. R. made the video, a symbol of the former group’s effort, relevant to the group’s responsibility to practice.

Being responsible for practice explained the two situated meanings Lisa assembled in her interview in item 14, “study their parts” and item 15, “when it’s real.” Lisa portrayed herself as responsible, and as someone who valued Mrs. R.’s directions. Lisa connected achieving realism in a performance with practice, implying that practice resulted in a more fluent multimodal text and meaningful performance. Lisa’s words alluded to the day 7 rehearsal and Mrs. R.’s explanation of Lisa’s intonation, “It’s a question.” The teacher directed Lisa (Josefina) to turn her body to look in Mario’s (Alfonso’s) direction, and then turn back to Eva. To help Lisa understand how to use intonation to express worry, Mrs. R. translated the line into English: “Something must have happened to the children!” Then, she turned and spoke to all the actors in a loud voice, “Guys, you’re actors and actresses. You have to fake it.” Lisa, however, was not able to “fake” something she did not comprehend. To Lisa, practice involved “studying,” that is, comprehending the correct emotions and combining the elements of the modes of meaning to create a “real” performance.

Being responsible for practice explained Roberto’s situated meaning in his reflective response in item 16, “I did prepare 4 it.” Being responsible for practice also explained Laura’s situated meaning in her reflective response in item 17, “I did rehearse.” Both Roberto and Laura positioned themselves as responsible actors who complied with Mrs. R.’s rules by using the emphatic *did* to emphasize their participation and effort. By using the emphatic *did*, Roberto and Laura resisted how Mrs. R. and the actors discursively positioned them during the rehearsals. These two situated meanings revealed both Roberto and Laura’s resistance of the way others had discursively constructed them

and used the Discourse model of being responsible to position themselves as in compliance with the rules.

Mrs. R.'s discursive positioning of Roberto as uncommitted (e.g. on day 7) was reproduced in the way the actors positioned him. Finally, on day 12, their actions culminated, and as Roberto narrated, several of the actors shouted in unison, "Louder!" Then, Luis noticed Roberto's lack of attention and said, "Roberto, stop!" In the rising scene, Luis had to cue him shouting, "Roberto, go!" After Luis's cue, Roberto demonstrated his assessment of the situation as hopeless, demonstrating his resistance by moving farther away from the group, which diminished his volume even further. In one of the early rehearsals, Roberto also performed his assessment of the play as an unpromising activity by sitting apart from the group. He explained his resistance to the play because, as he stated, "I don't like to work with people, I just like to be by myself." His resistances existed in relationship with how he was positioned not only in the play, but also in "the intertwining of multiple sociocultural forces" elsewhere at school, at home, and in his neighborhood (Cammarota, 2004). In his interview, Roberto talked proudly about how one of his teachers praised a picture he drew for her. He also expressed his goals of being either a rapper or a wrestler. When I praised his poster, Roberto's eyes lit up and he talked about how he liked to do unique things in his writing, such as substituting the number for the word *four*.

The fifth rule of Discourse model one was being responsible for rate of speech, volume, and posture. Rate of speech was important to Lena, whose role in the play was to recite the introduction in Spanish. Lena assembled two situated meanings in her interview in item 18, "to talk slowly" and item 19, "to read slowly." She positioned herself as

conscientious and as someone who followed Mrs. R.'s expectations as well as her parents' directions. Lena's words alluded to Mrs. R.'s warning on day 5 "slow down, please." They also alluded to Mrs. R.'s directions on day 7. In that rehearsal, Mrs. R. shook her head disapprovingly and advised Lena, "You're going to have to practice more at home." Lena said she practiced for her parents and sister at home and they told her she needed "to read slowly." Lena made speaking slowly relevant to the audience's ability to understand the words.

Volume was important to two students: Diana and Patricia. Diana assembled the situated meaning in item 20, "to talk louder," in her interview. Diana treated increasing volume as significant by listing it first in Mrs. R.'s goals for the play. Diana positioned herself as aware of Mrs. R.'s goals and responsible for following them. Patricia assembled another situated meaning in her reflective response in item 21, "to talk loud so everybody could hear us." Patricia connected increasing volume to the audience's need to hear the dialog. Patricia positioned herself as conscientious and aware of the audience. These two examples alluded to Mrs. R.'s words on day 8 when the Latina audience was present and Mrs. R. focused on volume. On that day, Mrs. R. told Mario, "Very good, but louder." Mrs. R. also turned to the narrator and said, "Repeat that. Louder!" A few minutes later, Mrs. R. said, "That's much better. Louder."

Posture was important to Lena, who assembled the situated meaning in her reflective response in item 22, "to stand up straight and look at the parents." Lena treated posture as significant by rating it, and eye contact, as the two key qualities she learned to use in order to properly address the audience. For Lena, focus was also an issue, and Discourse model 1 explained Lena's situated meaning in her reflective response in item

23, “I had to focus on what I was doing.” Lena treated focus, or concentration, as significant in what she learned to master in acting by listing it among the top three things she learned in the play. This alluded to Lena’s habit of stroking her long dark ponytail while she was reciting. On day 12, Luis blurted out suddenly, “Stop touching your hair!” From that day forward, Lena never touched her hair again.

The sixth rule of Discourse model one was being responsible for perfection. Being responsible for perfection explained Patricia’s situated meaning assembled in her reflective response in item 24, “we couldn’t do mistakes on that day.” Patricia portrayed herself as responsible, and as someone who was aware of and shared Mrs. R.’s goals. Patricia treated the actors’ responsibility for the play’s success by repeating the pronoun *we*. She connected the play’s success to the actors’ responsibility to strive for perfection. One of the social goods in contention was the acceptance of Mrs. R.’s expectations, which were mediated by the video. Patricia’s words alluded to Mrs. R.’s words on days 2, 8 and 12. On day 2, Mrs. R. emphasized that if her expectations were not met, the result would be catastrophic, “You don’t understand that when you perform this has to be perfect. We will embarrass ourselves.” On day 8, she exhorted Eva, “If you don’t do it perfectly, we can’t do it!” Again on day 12, she reiterated the idea of perfection, “Maybe ten mistakes tomorrow. On Monday, no mistakes.”

The seventh rule of Discourse model one was being responsible for extra work. Being responsible for extra work explained Lena’s situated meaning in her reflective response in item 25, “Saturdays I needed to come to school to practice” Lena positioned herself as responsible by letting her parents know about her mandatory attendance at extra Saturday rehearsals. She treated this knowledge as significant for her parents to

know because of their responsibility for her safety and transportation by using the plural form Saturdays. It did not matter that, as it turned out, there was only 1 Saturday rehearsal in addition to the final performance for the parents.

Being responsible for extra work explained two situated meanings Jazmin assembled in her reflective response in item 26, “We had to stay from 2:00 to around 4:00” and in item 27, “We had to do a lot of work” Jazmin positioned herself and the other actors as collectively responsible for the work involved in the play production, and emphasized this collective responsibility by using the pronoun *we*. Being responsible for extra work also explained Patricia’s situated meaning in her reflective response in item 28, “that day we had to be early.” Patricia connected the required early arrival time on the day of the play to the unplanned final rehearsal the actors carried out without the teacher.

The eighth rule of Discourse model one was being responsible for costumes. This rule explained Mario’s situated meaning assembled in his reflective response in item 29, “I had to go to work with my uncle so I could buy my pants.” Mario portrayed himself as a responsible actor and as someone who worked hard to fulfill Mrs. R.’s instructions to obtain the appropriate costume. He also portrayed himself as creative for solving the problem of purchasing the pants for his farm worker costume. Mario’s words alluded to Mrs. R.’s words on day 4 when the costume rules were first mentioned. Mrs. R. said “Farm clothing. This is 1924. Guys, don’t wear sneakers.” On day 5, Mrs. R. repeated the rule, “You’re supposed to be campesinos” [country folk]. On day 6, Mrs. R. ended the rehearsal with the rule, “You have to bring the clothes a week before.” Mario followed the rule and wore his loose khaki pants and matching shirt proudly at the dress rehearsal.

Being responsible for costumes explained Patricia's situated meaning in item 30, "We had to dress up," which she assembled in her reflective response. Patricia portrayed herself as responsible for the special activities of a dramatic performance, and as someone who adopted Mrs. R.'s expectations. Rule number 8 explained Patricia's situated meaning in her interview in item 31, "Abuelita has to dress with a long dress with long sleeves. And it has to be all black because she is rich, so she has to be elegant." Patricia privileged Mrs. R.'s discourse practice of using the character's name to address actors by pausing after saying "it's" and restarting her description with her character's name. She privileged Mrs. R.'s style of description by using many of Mrs. R.'s exact words from the costume description on day 5, such as the word *elegant*. Patricia's words alluded to day 5 when Mrs. R. said, "Abuelita is an elegant woman, a woman of money: a black dress, loose dress."

The ninth rule of Discourse model one was being responsible for helping others. This rule explained two situated meanings Luis assembled in his interview in item 32, "try not to make Eva laugh, so she'll be serious," and item 33, "helping them not to laugh." Luis positioned himself as responsible and as someone who cooperated to support other actors' performances. In item 32, Luis made his behavior relevant to Eva's ability to act. In item 33, "helping them not to laugh," Luis made his behavior relevant to the other actors' attitudes and behavior. Luis positioned himself as responsible for the other actors' correct attitude and behavior. In treating his behavior as responsible, Luis implied that one social good at stake in the play was his reputation as having a significant influence on the performance.

Luis's words alluded to Mrs. R.'s warnings to Eva on days 2 and 8 when she said, "You can't smile" and "Don't laugh!" Luis's words also alluded to Mrs. R.'s request for help on day 8, to which he readily reacted by retrieving a broom and cleaning up the stage. However, later on day 8, a crisis occurred when Mrs. R. pointed to the audience and demanded that Luis perform as if the other students were the parents. When Luis said, "I don't care," Mrs. R. demanded cooperation saying, "You have to care." In this performance, Mrs. R. clearly confronted Luis with her expectation to commit himself to her accuracy-based approach. In the pause between her words and Luis's response, power shifted. In his response "Can we start now?" By using the pronoun *we*, Luis positioned himself as a leader who had more power than the teacher. Luis denied the teacher's power and implied the actors were waiting for her to stop her performance, which was recognized as a disruption of the rehearsal. Luis did not own or care about Mrs. R.'s approach, nor did he perceive the student audience as parents, but as part of the teacher's manipulation.

Repression may generate emotions and other internal resources needed for academic achievement (Trueba, 2004). As Cammarota (2004) stated, race and gender shape whether Latinos/as "perceive education as oppressive or useful in resisting oppression" (p. 53). Gender shaped both the actors' perceptions of Mrs. R.'s approach as oppressive or useful in resisting oppression, and their resulting performances. Whereas Luis perceived Mrs. R.'s approach to the play as oppressive, and played around, Jazmin perceived Mrs. R.'s approach as useful in resisting the oppression she experienced in school. As Cammarota stated, Latinos/as' diverse responses to education are leveraged by the differential treatment Latinos and Latinas receive both in schools and in society. In an

interview, Mario told me he and Luis had been in another middle school the previous year. In her conversations with me, Mrs. R. seemed to construct the boys in a certain way in order to explain their behavior and her tolerance of it.

Early in the fieldwork, Mrs. R. stressed her close relationship with the students' parents, saying that she had talked to all of them during the year. Mrs. R. emphasized her concern about Mario and Luis because of their school history, saying they were "at risk" for involvement in gang activities outside of school. Then, in the context of the reflective responses in the fifth interview, Mrs. R. emphasized her concern about how Jazmin's classmates treated her, which seemed to be a justification for giving Jazmin a key part in the play. As explained earlier in the section on the vote, Mrs. R. said she gave the four boys and one girl she dismissed from the play two or three opportunities, but "they decided they did not want to act," which meant, "comply with my rules." Only in the context of the reflective responses did Mrs. R. suggest that it was Laura's fault that she dropped out.

Luis perceived Mrs. R.'s approach as oppressive because it discursively constructed him as deficient. Later, in the context of the play's success, Luis critiqued Mrs. R.'s performance during the rehearsal in his reflective response. Luis implied that Mrs. R.'s prediction that the play was and would turn out to be a "mess" had no connection to his belief about the play's outcome. On day 10, for instance, when Mrs. R. said, "Trust me, your parents are going to say, 'look at that line,'" Luis disagreed saying, "No, they're not." Luis was critical of the teachers' words because he construed them as a manipulation of his self-confidence in his parents' regard for him. Moreover, in his response "can we start now?" in the crisis on day 8, Luis suggested the binary's

intractability, namely that as long as the teacher continued her approach, the discourse practice of playing around would continue.

The ninth rule of Discourse model one, helping others, explained five situated meanings other actors assembled in their reflective responses. Four of these involved helping others with their lines. In Lena's situated meaning in item 34, "I needed to tell her; she was my partner," Lena positioned herself as responsible for helping Jazmin if she forgot a line. Lena's words alluded to Mrs. R.'s advice on day 12 when she faltered over a line and Mrs. R. told Laura, her partner at the time, "Help each other, please."

Diana and Luis assembled three situated meanings about helping Mario with his memorization. Diana assembled two situated meanings in her reflective response in item 35 "I helped others by helping them with their lines" and item 36 "By helping him to memorize his lines," Diana positioned herself as responsible and as someone who believed in and followed Mrs. R.'s rules. Diana's situated meanings alluded to Mrs. R.'s words on day 8 when Mario forgot several lines. After Mrs. R. scolded him, he whined, "It's too long," but Mrs. R. countered, "You need to take pages home to study."

Luis assembled a situated meaning similar to Diana's in his reflective response in item 37, "I helped Mario at home and at school." Luis positioned himself as the responsible older brother, and as someone who adhered to the rules. Luis's situated meaning alluded to Mrs. R.'s words on day 3, the Saturday morning rehearsal, when Mrs. R. warned them, "Because you're reading, you're not acting." Between Saturday and Monday, Mario seemed to have studied at home with Luis's help, because on day 4 when Mario remembered his line, Mrs. R. validated his memorization saying, "That deserves a reward!"

The ninth rule of Discourse model one was helping others and in her reflective response, Lena assembled the situated meaning in item 38, “I helped Mrs. R.” While other actors assembled situated meanings about helping each other, Lena assembled a situated meaning about helping Mrs. R. Lena positioned herself as responsible and as someone who was willing to help Mrs. R. by understudying for those who were absent. Lena’s words alluded to day 12 when she substituted for the absent Nina who played the role of Isabel. Lena enacted a respectful relationship with the teacher by referring to her by her title “Mrs. R.”

Finally, the tenth rule of Discourse model one had two parts: being responsible for making changes and being responsible for improvement. Being responsible for making changes explained several situated meanings the actors assembled in their reflective responses. Nina’s situated meaning in item 39, “they had to change a lot of things” was similar to Diana’s situated meaning in item 40, “we changed a lot of things.” Both girls enacted the activity of recognizing that change was one of the main beliefs in the Discourse of the play. The two situated meanings differed in that Nina positioned herself as less involved than Diana by using the pronoun *they*, whereas Diana used the pronoun *we*. Nina may have felt less involved because she had a minor role and she was absent a lot because she reportedly had to baby-sit for her siblings.

Similarly, in her reflective response in item 41, Nina assembled the situated meaning, “they had to change students because one didn’t want to do it.” This was similar to the situated meaning Lena assembled in her reflective response in item 42, “we changed some parts.” Although both girls treated the changes in actors’ roles as significant, Nina positioned herself as less involved, rather than an active participant by

using the pronoun *they*. On the other hand, Lena, like Diana had in item 40, positioned herself as an active participant by using the pronoun *we*. Again, Nina's frequent absences might have accounted for her feeling of being less involved. On day 12, for example, Lena substituted for Nina. Furthermore, Lena treated changes in parts as significant because her partner Laura was replaced after day 12, which was approximately half way through the play. These examples demonstrated that each actor's discourse reflected his or her particular embodied experiences.

Diana used change as a motif in her reflective response. In her situated meaning in item 43, "*Esperanza Rising* was changed," Diana treated the changes in the novel as significant in the play. Diana's words alluded to the author's note about the changes that occurred in the novel, namely changing the ranch's name and Esperanza's age. Diana mentioned that the author's grandmother was already married when she immigrated to the United States. Diana's words also alluded to Mrs. R.'s description of these changes in her prologue to the play on the day of the performance. Diana positioned herself as someone who listened to and valued both the novel and Mrs. R.'s knowledge of the novel displayed in her prologue.

Also in her reflective response, Diana assembled the situated meaning in item 44, "we had to change the part of the blanket." Diana treated the requirement of matching the blanket's description in the script to the actual prop as significant, counting it as the second most important change after the modification of the Esperanza role. Diana positioned herself as a responsible actor, and as someone who understood and valued Mrs. R.'s rule about the blanket. On day 11, Diana brought in a knitted blanket to use as a prop. While the group walked to the cafeteria to practice, Mrs. R. examined the blanket's

size and said, “We’re changing the line to say it covers your bed.” In the script, the line read that the blanket was “big enough to cover two beds.” Mrs. R. said that the change was necessary because in the previous play, the audience laughed at the obvious difference between the description of the blanket’s size and the actual blanket displayed on stage.

“Being responsible for improvement” was the second part of the tenth rule of Discourse model one. Being responsible for improvement explained two situated meanings Diana assembled in her interview in item 45, “to come out right” and item 46, “to be better than last year’s.” In item 45, Diana positioned herself as someone who was well aware of Mrs. R.’s expectation of accuracy. Diana’s words alluded to Mrs. R.’s words on day 8, “If you don’t do it perfectly, we can’t do it!” Diana’s words also alluded to day 8 when the bus station scene had to be repeated until Mrs. R. said, “Now the action matches the narrator’s words!” In item 46, Diana also positioned herself as someone who was aware that the rules were mediated by the video. Diana’s words alluded to day 11, when Mrs. R. explained that a change in the script was necessary to make the words match the prop so the audience would not laugh.

Being responsible for improvement also explained Linda’s situated meaning assembled in her interview in item 47, “I’m trying to do better.” Linda positioned herself as someone who knew Mrs. R. wanted accuracy and was confident because she won more praise than the others. Linda’s words alluded to day 11, when the teacher asked Luis, “I can hear her (Linda), why can’t I hear you?” Jealous of Linda for winning Mrs. R.’s praise, Mario remarked, “She has a big mouth.” Being responsible for improvement also explained Patricia’s situated meaning assembled in her reflective response in item

48, “We had to improve a lot.” Like item 46, Patricia positioned herself as aware of Mrs. R.’s expectations and that the rules were mediated by the video. Patricia’s situated meaning alluded to Mrs. R.’s words on day 6 when she responded to Patricia’s question “Is that good?” with “Yes, and you are going to have to make it better and better!” Diana, Linda, and Patricia portrayed themselves as diligent actors who knew what Mrs. R. wanted and tried to comply with her rules. All three girls treated improvement as significant by referring to the video by which they measured their performance. Their words alluded to Mrs. R.’s words on day 9, in which the video was used as a source for critique. “I don’t see action, the words are better than the action. We can see the errors they made.”

Summary and Critique

All thirteen actors used the Discourse model of being responsible to recognize and explain their practices, making it the most salient of the seven Discourse models. Like all Discourse models, it was grounded in the actors’ experiences in the play production. Also like all Discourse models, it helped the actors organize their thoughts about their obligations, such as memorization, attitude, and so forth, so they would be ready to participate in the play production. In conclusion, the Discourse model of being responsible was a particularly complex and well-organized mental model that existed in the actors’ words and actions.

However, as Gee (2005) stated, Discourse models are not just mental models that exist in people’s words and actions, they also exist in print and media. The Discourse model of being responsible existed in the video of the previous play as well as the participants’ words and actions. Brandt and Clinton (2002) proposed that a study of

literacy-in-action would trace the history of objects in a setting to see if the people in a particular context adopted them or not. In the play production, the video was such an object, and the actors adopted it as one of their tools, along with the script. The video represented a set of conventions, or rules, the explanations of which the actors described in the Discourse model of being responsible. As Gee (2005) stated, Discourse models mediate between the local level of interaction and the level of institutions. The Discourse model of being responsible mediated between the local level of interaction (the actors' discourse practices) and Discourses as they created and wove a complex culture across the history of the play production.

The Discourse model of being responsible mediated between the teacher's discourse practices and Discourses of school and society. In the fifth interview, I asked Mrs. R. what she thought the students learned from the play, and she responded, "I think that what they learned with this play is a little bit of responsibility, future responsibility." Being "committed to do something in the future," she stated involves, "responsibility, learning, memorizing." Mrs. R. conferred commitment and perfection if the actors performed according to the rules.

Mrs. R.'s involvement in the construction of the discourses was evident in the actors' performances in their interviews. Just as the Asian student recognized something about my performance when he said, "You're half a teacher," the actors wanted me to recognize their identities of commitment in their interviews, and therefore gave performances they believed I would accept. All the actors were aware of their performances. For example, Tania used formal social language, and Roberto was reluctant to critique the teacher's approach. Diana was also reluctant to be critical at first, but after a

period in which she must have observed and assessed my fieldwork performance, she finally trusted me enough to reveal her critical views about the play. The teacher's accuracy-based instructional discourse did not create an authorized space for critical perspectives, but instead created its own resistance. By creating a space for critical perspectives, the play would have been equitable and the actors' performances would have demonstrated ownership.

Performances are multimediated, as Leander and Rowe (2006) stated, and offer many divergent literate practices and identities. The participants' multimediated performances offered many diverse literacy practices and identities; however the interpretation of their performances was inadequate because, "interpretations fail to bring to life the experience of performances as embodied, rapidly moving, affectively charged, evolving acts that often escape prediction and structure" (Leander and Rowe, p. 431). On day 7, I noticed Diana rolling her eyes in a way that expressed a critical view of the play's closing proverb that Mexican-American immigrants should "never fear to start over." Diana's gestures and facial expression were clues to the critical textual interpretation she was making and an example of the embodied engagement and identity offered by her performance. Unfortunately, the instructional discourse did not validate the actors' critical perspectives by making space for them in the play production.

As Leander and Rowe (2006) stated, multimediated performances generate affect and identities in actors and audience alike, such as the emotions and identities generated in Diana's performance. Diana's performance, as well as others', offered the promise of understanding more than the meanings contained in print and visual texts. Unfortunately, the methodological approach I took in this case study was based on visual

representational logic, and therefore was inadequate for interpreting the dynamic embodied performances. Discourse, as Conquergood (1991) stated, “is not always and exclusively verbal: issues and attitudes are expressed and contested in dance, music, gesture, food, ritual artifact, symbolic action, as well as words” (p. 189). In this study, I made the mistake of researchers who “privilege words over other channels of meaning” (p. 189). As Leander and Rowe stated, visual representational logic is limited to understanding print and visual texts, and although such an analysis can be instructive, it can also fail to demonstrate, “how a performance creates effects for performers and audience members” (p. 431). McLuhan (1962) explained this limitation of the visual by stating “the phonetic alphabet reduced the use of all the senses at once, which is oral speech, to a merely visual code” (p. 45). Visual logic shaped both the teacher’s pedagogy and my methodology.

Table 1

The Discourse model of being responsible

Situated Meanings

1. To act more and to be serious, to say something to make something serious.
 2. Get serious
 3. They really got serious.
 4. Acting and attitude.
 5. You have to act.
 6. I had to memorize all of my parts of the play.
 7. You memorize your parts and then memorize what to say and where to stand on the stage, and then you act.
 8. To know how to act and remember the lines.
 9. They have to learn the lines.
 10. They have to study everyday.
 11. You have to memorize it.
 12. We had to memorize the parts of the play.
 13. They practiced their parts and acted too.
 14. Study their parts.
 15. When it's real
 16. I did prepare 4 it.
 17. I did rehearse.
 18. To talk slowly.
 19. To read slowly.
 20. To talk louder.
 21. To talk loud so everybody could hear us.
 22. To stand up straight and look at the parents
 23. To focus on what I was doing.
 24. We couldn't do mistakes on that day.
 25. Saturdays I needed to come to school to practice.
-

Used by Luis, Diana, Patricia, Laura, Mario, Lena, Lisa, Roberto, Nina, Linda, Eva, Jazmin, and Tania.

Table 1 (continued)

The Discourse model of being responsible

Situated Meanings

26. We had to stay from 2:00 to around 4:00.
27. We had to do a lot of work.
28. That day we had to be early.
29. I had to go to work with my uncle so I could buy my pants.
30. We had to dress up.
31. Abuelita has to dress with a long dress with long sleeves.
And it has to be all black because she is rich, so she has
to be elegant.
32. Try not to make Eva laugh, so she'll be serious.
33. Helping them not to laugh.
34. I needed to tell her; she was my partner.
35. I helped others by helping them with their lines.
36. By helping him to memorize his lines.
37. I helped Mario at home and at school.
38. I helped Mrs. R.
39. They had to change a lot of things.
40. We changed a lot of things.
41. They had to change students because one didn't want to do it.
42. We changed some parts.
43. *Esperanza Rising* was changed.
44. We had to change the part of the blanket.
45. To come out right.
46. To be better than last year's.
47. We had to improve a lot.
48. I'm trying to do better.

Discourse Model 2: Playing Around

The Discourse Analysis revealed that 11 of the 13 actors in the play operated with the Discourse model of playing around. The analysis revealed a difference between the Discourse model of playing around that affected espoused beliefs and the Discourse model of playing around that affected actual actions and practices. The Discourse model that affected espoused beliefs held that playing around was acting contrary to Mrs. R.'s expectations, and that this misbehavior had severe consequences for the play and its participants. The Discourse model of playing around that affected actions and practices held that causing a target—the teacher or a peer—to react was entertaining. Playing around was a game that involved teasing the teacher or peers and gauging their reaction. Playing around was constructed in relationship with the teacher's expectations and became an unmanageable binary.

The Discourse model of playing around that affected espoused beliefs held that playing around was behaving contrary to Mrs. R.'s expectations and had dire consequences for the play and the participants. This Discourse model represented Mrs. R.'s interest, which was to involve all the students in a presentation in the after-school program. In the fifth interview, the teacher told me she had offered the students a choice between participating in the play and taking a final examination in class. She said the students had voted to participate in the presentations, which meant rehearsing everyday after school. In the classroom on day 16, Mrs. R. reminded the ESOL class that those students who were not in the *Esperanza Renace* production were required to participate

in the second presentation entitled *Peoples of the World* and that they were required to attend rehearsals after school.

Tania assembled the situated meaning (Table 2, item 1) “they don’t behave well,” in her interview. Tania positioned herself as responsible and critical of the other actors, whom she positioned as different from her by using the pronoun *they*. Tania positioned herself as critical of the practice of playing around by using formal social language in the adverb *well* to enact the activity of judging the behavior as having a negative effect on the play’s outcome.

Patricia assembled the situated meaning in item 2 in her interview, “the attitudes of the kids are bad.” Patricia positioned herself as aware of and troubled by the other actors’ approach to the play. Using informal social language to refer to the actors as *kids*, Patricia distanced herself from them and positioned herself as an outsider, and therefore as someone who did not operate with this Discourse model. Patricia positioned the actors’ attitudes as at fault, implying that Discourses in the context of school and society influenced them in a negative way. Patricia’s words allude to the Conversation about the resistances that shape the orientations to school of many poor urban adolescents who doubt society will accept them even if they demonstrate success in school settings (Ogbu, 1991; Gee, 2003; Cammarota, 2004).

The situated meanings of Patricia, Diana, and Eva suggested that playing around was considered a normal part of school. Diana assembled the situated meaning in item 3, “people play around,” in the context of a conversation about the changes in the role of Esperanza. Diana told me that the day before my arrival, the role belonged to her, but Mrs. R. took the role away from her and gave it to Eva. At that point, I arrived and saw

Eva playing the role. By the second day of fieldwork, however, Diana had won back a portion of the Esperanza role, which from that day forward, the two girls shared. Diana assembled the situated meaning “people play around” to describe why she lost the role and had to appeal to Mrs. R. to have her part restored. Diana conveyed a perspective that that’s just the way things worked in the play. She portrayed herself as less culpable by using the word *people*, implying that the practice of playing around was the normal procedure everywhere and she learned it through observing similar situations in school.

Eva assembled the situated meaning in item 4, “sometimes they play, but then we do the right thing.” Eva positioned herself as uncomfortable with those who misbehaved by using the pronoun *we* to show her association with the correctly behaving group, and *they* to disassociate herself from the misbehaving group. Eva mitigated the misbehaving group’s culpability by using the word *sometimes*. In addition, she used the conjunction *but* to position her group as winning the struggle against the practice of playing around. Like Patricia’s, Eva’s words allude to the Conversation about the resistances that shape the orientations to school of many poor urban adolescents who doubt society will accept them even if they are successful in school settings (Ogbu, 1991; Gee, 2003; Cammarota, 2004). All four girls Tania, Patricia, Diana, and Eva, portrayed the practice of playing around as normal and positioned others as guilty of engaging in it, not themselves.

Jazmin assembled the situated meaning in item 5, “he plays with you” to explain why one of the boys was no longer in the play. Jazmin positioned the boy as engaging in playing around by teasing students. Jazmin also assembled the situated meaning in item 6, “I got kicked out” in her interview to describe the result of an accusation that she threw things on the bus, which barred her attendance in after-school. Later, this caused her to

ask Mrs. R. for a ride home so she could participate in the play. Jazmin positioned herself as a victim because she claimed the charge was based on hearsay in the situated meaning in item 7 “that wasn’t me.” Jazmin’s words alluded to Luis’s situated meaning in item 8, “they took them out of the play for playing around too much.” Jazmin and Luis both positioned themselves as aware that the punishment for engaging in the game of playing around, or playing, was exclusion. Both positioned adults as exercising authority by evaluating who was guilty and physically removing those who engaged in the practice of playing around.

Luis also assembled the following situated meanings to define playing around in item 9, “Just doing whatever you want to do, and not listen to the teacher, and just messing around.” Compared with the relative ambiguity of the first and last phrases, the second phrase’s meaning was softened by placing it between the other two. Luis softened the first and last phrases further by using the word *just* in front of them to minimize the seriousness of this practice. Luis positioned himself as skilled at recognizing and describing the practice by providing three synonyms for it.

The Discourse model of playing around that affected actual actions and practices explained six related situated meanings. Luis assembled the first of these related situated meanings in his reflective response in item 10, “she got mad because we were not doing anything right.” In this post-performance context, Luis treated the irony of Mrs. R.’s dire predictions in light of the successful performance as significant. In addition, Luis enacted a distant and comparatively disrespectful relationship with Mrs. R. by using the pronoun *she* instead of her title. Luis disconfirmed Mrs. R.’s claim to know about the actors’ abilities by exaggerating her criticism with the words “we were not doing anything right.”

Luis positioned Mrs. R.'s reaction to the actors' attitude and actions as unjustifiable in the context of the successful play because the actors had to have been doing something right for the play to turn out as well as it did.

Luis's words alluded to his comment, which I observed on day 10. On that day, as the rehearsal was ending, Mrs. R. criticized the actors' line for the bow saying, "Trust me, your parents are going to say, 'look at that line.'" But Luis disagreed. "No, they're not." Instead of accepting the intention behind Mrs. R.'s criticism, namely to motivate the actors to form a straight line, Luis construed her words as a manipulation because they disconfirmed his self-confidence in parental regard.

Mario assembled the second of these six related situated meanings in his reflective response in item 11, "Mrs. R said that the play was going to be a mess because we were being bad and talked back to her." Mario constructed his discourse using the teacher's reported speech. In this post-performance context, Mario treated the irony of Mrs. R.'s predictions in light of the successful performance as significant. Mario disconfirmed Mrs. R.'s claim to know because her prediction regarding the outcome of the play was clouded by her reaction to the actors' misbehavior. In other words, Mario portrayed Mrs. R. as having lost the game. Mrs. R.'s reported speech contained the word *mess*, which alluded to the actual word *mess* used on day 8 in Mrs. R.'s question "What is this mess?" However, unlike Luis, Mario enacted a respectful relationship with the teacher by referring to her by her title "Mrs. R."

Roberto assembled the third of these six related situated meanings in item 12, "when you say, 'do this, do this' really strict and stuff, I don't know, I misbehave," in his interview. Roberto positioned himself as a hostile outsider, and as someone who did not

accept direction very well. Roberto mitigated his reaction with the self-absolving phrase “I don’t know.” Roberto reacted to criticism such as on day 8 when Mrs. R. asked him to repeat his lines; Roberto walked across the stage, swinging the microphone cable in front of him, making a swishing noise like the wind. In his situated meaning above Roberto privileged the beliefs and values of the Discourse model of playing around which affected actual actions and practices.

Nina assembled the fourth of these six related situated meanings in her reflective response in item 13, “the participation was kind of good because we were talking, playing around.” Nina named the practice of playing around as the cause of the unacceptable performances during the rehearsals. Nina used the adjective *kind of* to minimize the acceptability of the actors’ performances. Like Luis, Mario, and Lisa, Nina positioned herself as a member of the group engaged in playing around by using the pronoun *we*.

Lisa assembled the fifth of these six related situated meanings in her reflective response in item 14, “Mrs. R was mad at us because we were talking and playing around.” In this post-performance context, Lisa connected Mrs. R.’s reaction to the actors’ misbehavior during rehearsals. Lisa positioned herself as a member of the group responsible for causing Mrs. R.’s reaction by using the pronoun *we*. Like Mario, Lisa enacted a respectful relationship with the teacher by using the title “Mrs. R.”

Laura assembled the last of these six related situated meanings in her interview in item 15, “they’re just making Mrs. R scream.” In the post-exit context of her interview, Laura connected Mrs. R.’s reaction to the actors’ misbehavior during rehearsals. Laura’s connection was similar to those of Lisa and Mario. In addition, like Lisa and Mario, Laura enacted a respectful relationship with the teacher using the title, “Mrs. R.”

However, unlike Lisa and Mario, Laura positioned herself as critical of the other actors' behavior. Laura treated the other actors as responsible for causing Mrs. R.'s impatience. Laura also conveyed a perspective on the social good of the actors' reputations. She dismissed their practice of playing around as a childish and petty game by minimizing it using the word *just*.

Laura assembled three other situated meanings in her post-exit interview. The first one in item 16, "it was not only me doing all the stuff," alluded to the Discourse of the play, which was caught up in conflict, the source of which was the teacher's creation of the binary. Laura privileged her knowledge of social Discourses recognizing that others held the same Discourse model of playing around that affected actions and practices. Laura positioned herself as unfairly punished and indignant that others were not punished for their misbehavior. One social good in contention in Laura's discourse is her reputation as a responsible actor in the play. Laura critiqued the instructional discourse as inherently unjust by implying that her reputation suffered while others who played around suffered no consequences. She implied that Mrs. R.'s involvement in the construction of the discourses was culpable for the play's inherent injustice. Laura's words alluded to the events on day 12. In the narrative, it was clear that Laura intended to quit, but in her post-exit interview, Laura expressed regret about leaving the play.

Laura assembled the second situated meaning in item 17, "they aren't putting a hundred percent into it." Laura positioned herself as critical of the Discourse of playing around and as a non-member by using *they* to distance herself. Laura privileged the Discourse model of being responsible for extra work, using it to critique this Discourse. Laura assembled a third situated meaning in her interview in item 18, "if they would do

it without playing and all that stuff it would be easier.” Once more, Laura positioned herself as critical and a non-member by using *they* to distance herself from the social Discourse of playing around. Laura’s discourse reflected a new critical Discourse with values and beliefs opposed to the social Discourse of playing around.

Diana used change as a motif in her reflective response, in which she assembled the situated meaning in item 19, “What I would change would be playing around.” In the context of her post-performance reflective response, Diana positioned herself as having learned from her experience. Diana said in her interview that she was the original Esperanza, but was replaced by Eva because she did not follow Mrs. R.’s directions. Diana implied that she changed and had to appeal to Mrs. R. to share the role with Eva. This alluded to another situated meaning in her reflective response (Table 6, item 3), “Mrs. R changed us and we did a good job.” Diana treated the teacher with respect by using her title and validated her decision to divide the role so that both girls could have a part, which allowed them to be successful.

Summary and Critique

Eleven of the thirteen actors used the Discourse model of playing around to recognize and explain their practices, making it one of the two most salient Discourse models. Like the other six Discourse models, it was grounded in the actors’ experiences in their communities and was a particularly complex mental model that existed in the actors’ words and actions.

Five significant findings emerged from the Discourse analysis. First, playing around was constructed in relationship with the teacher’s expectations and became an unmanageable binary. Second, playing around was the performance of resistance, which

meant that the “text” of the play became the context of the performance text. Thinking about the world as performance, Conquergood (1991) states, helps us see how performances simultaneously reproduce and resist power. Third, playing around was considered a normal practice that existed as a regular part of school. Fourth, playing around was blamed on social Discourses. Fifth, the warning that playing around would ruin the play turned out to be a red herring as playing around and the play’s outcome had no connection. In other words, because playing around and the play’s outcome had no connection, the actors’ culpability for playing around was mitigated or entirely erased in advance.

As Gee (2005) stated, Discourse models emerge from social positions. The Discourse model of playing around emerged from the way the teacher discursively positioned the students. From the start, the teacher was involved in the construction of the discourses through coercing the actors’ participation and enforcing her expectation of accuracy. Modeling represented accuracy and became a source of mockery, such as on day 10 when Mario initiated playing around through a parody of the teacher’s repetition requests telling Luis to “re-do it.” In addition to this example, the crisis on day 8 also revealed that the actors did not own the play, nor did they care about the teacher’s expectations. The discourse practice of playing around was constructed in relationship with the teacher’s expectations, which it mocked and resisted.

Not only did the instructional discourse create its own resistance, but it also reproduced power. In addition to the shifts of power in Luis and Mario’s performances with Mrs. R., their performances with the girls reproduced power. Two examples of power were Luis’s command to Lena, “don’t touch your hair!” and Mario’s solicitation of Laura with

the guttural cry of “Esperanza!” Mario’s (and Mrs. R.’s actions) seem to have been the most likely reason why Laura stood up later in the rehearsal when Mrs. R. asked, “Who wants to quit?” Ironically, instead of producing equity, which Mrs. R. espoused as one of her goals in the fifth interview, her involvement in the construction of the discourses produced inequity. Instead of helping the actors acquire knowledge of how to give or take criticism, the teacher was involved in the reproduction of power.

The teacher’s involvement in the construction of the discourses was caused by her approach to the play, which involved power. As discussed above, this power was enacted on day 12 when Laura covered her face revealing her concern and anticipation that Mario would enact a distasteful performance. When he did, Mrs. R. reacted with shock and scolded him. But in a shift of power, which mocked the teacher, Mario took control saying, “You told me to act, didn’t you?” Mrs. R. and Laura’s performances differed because Laura viewed the teacher’s performance as hopeless against the discourse practice of playing around, whereas Mrs. R. believed she was in control of the situation. One way Mrs. R. demonstrated that she believed she was in control was by giving Mario and Luis power as directors. She seemed to act as though giving the boys’ power emphasized her control because she demonstrated this power by telling them when and where they would begin their work as directors. Through her actions and their underlying beliefs, Mrs. R.’s approach to the play involved her in the construction of the discourses.

Through her actions, the teacher also demonstrated her belief that if people solicited favors, they displayed ownership and commitment. For example, when Diana was dismissed for not following directions, she solicited Mrs. R. and arranged to share the role of Esperanza with Eva. In addition, Jazmin solicited Mrs. R. behind the scenes

for a ride home and a part in the play. Mrs. R. also attempted to enact power and display her commitment by soliciting parents' help by threatening to dismiss students from the play for misbehavior, or to explain a dismissal. When Luis replaced Javier, I noticed Mrs. R. talking on the phone explaining the change to Javier's parent.

However, Mrs. R.'s performance created effects for the audience, namely that her solicitation of the parents was really an enactment of powerlessness and hopelessness in eliminating the discourse practice of playing around that she was involved in creating. Mario wrote about Mrs. R.'s solicitation in his reflective response: "Mrs. R. worried because we kept talking and weren't practicing. She called my parents and the whole class went outside because she got tired of our talking." Mario recognized the actors' performance as a lack of ownership and constructed it in relationship with the teacher's expectations. Mario recognized that this construction became an intractable binary, which Mrs. R. was powerless to solve and therefore needed to solicit his parents' help. When Mario and Luis were positioned as leaders, their misbehavior tapered off. It seemed that the two boys used their performances to position themselves as privileged.

In addition, one of the social Discourses at work in the play production was the discourse of gender roles. As Cammarota (2004) stated, a gender shift in the last 20 years has accounted for Latinas' steady rise in high school and college graduation rates while Latinos' success rates have declined. As Cammarota stated, Latinas use academic success to negotiate their identity and resist social constructions that position them as inferior to males. They may also simultaneously conform to and resist social norms through silent persistence as a form of countering social inequity. While the Latinas in the play generally

displayed conformist resistances, Mario and Luis used the more overt discourse practice of playing around to resist the Latinas' conformist resistances.

After she left the play, Laura constructed herself through a new critical discourse, which critiqued both the instructional and the playing around discourses and imagined an easier, more equitable way of participating in the performance community. Laura constructed a social justice orientation in her reflective response, describing an equitable performance community involving discourses in which valued all actors, included all voices, and privileged no single individual. On the day she left, Laura carried her "Army Girl" t-shirt, which seemed to be visible evidence of her determination to prove them wrong by graduating and enlisting in the military (her plans revealed in her interview). Although proving them wrong, or transformational resistance, Cammarota (2004) stated, works best to change individuals, reflection on repressive situations in addition to the inner perspectives can encourage students to take up transformational resistance that challenges social inequities. Repression, Trueba (2004) stated, may generate emotions and other internal resources needed for academic achievement. Through their writing, both Laura and Diana constructed social justice orientations and challenged the social inequities in their performance community.

Table 2

The Discourse model of playing around

Situated Meanings

1. They don't behave well.
 2. The attitudes of the kids are bad.
 3. People play around.
 4. Sometimes they play, but then we do the right thing.
 5. He plays with you.
 6. I got kicked out.
 7. That wasn't me.
 8. They took them out of the play for playing too much.
 9. Just doing whatever you want to do, and not listen to the teacher, and just messing around.
 10. She got mad because we were not doing anything right.
 11. Mrs. R. said that the play was going to be a mess because we were being bad and talked back to her.
 12. When you say, 'do this, do this' really strict and stuff, I don't know, I misbehave.
 13. The participation was kind of good because we were talking, playing around.
 14. Mrs. R. was mad at us because we were talking and playing around.
 15. They're just making Mrs. R scream.
 16. It was not only me doing all the stuff.
 17. They aren't putting a hundred percent into it.
 18. If they would do it without playing and all that stuff, it would be easier.
 19. What I would change would be playing around.
-

Used by Luis, Tania, Lisa, Patricia, Diana, Eva, Mario, Laura, Nina, Jazmin, and Roberto.

Characteristics of the Performances

As Conquergood (1991) stated, performance ethnography considers both its subject and method to be embodied experience “situated in time, place, and history” (p. 187). As the researcher and co-participant, I was situated within the social drama of meaningful rituals situated in a specific time and place and having a specific history. In this section, I describe the characteristics of these situated performances. These three characteristics were created based on three features Cowan (2003) used to analyze Latino visual discourse: the contextual, the intertextual, and the social features. With these three features, I created three characteristics to analyze the multimodal grammar of the play as a dynamic, situated performance, with a particular history. The contextual characteristic describes the literacy events that aroused the Latino/a actors’ awareness of the sociohistorical context and the literacy events that aroused their awareness of the contemporary social context in which the play took place. The intertextual characteristic describes how the actors drew from the elements of the modes of meaning to produce a unique multimodal text. In addition, the intertextual characteristic explains how the Latino/a actors were initiated into the cultural knowledge represented in the Mexican performance Discourse.

The social feature Cowan (2005) used describes the visual literacy events within a group of Latino/a adolescents in which drawings were made and exchanged. In this study, the social characteristic describes both a literacy event in which several Latina adolescents participated and the literacy events of the play production in which the Latina teacher and the Latino/a adolescents participated.

I distinguished between the practices in the visual literacy event and the practices in the play production's literacy events using Grounded Theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990), and nested the report of the analysis within the social characteristic derived from Cowan's social feature. The level one social characteristic describes a visual literacy event through which the Latina adolescents constructed identities and displayed membership in their group. The level two social characteristic describes the literacy events through which the teacher and the actors constructed knowledge in the context of the rehearsals.

In the following section, I report the analysis of the characteristics of the play, beginning with the contextual characteristic, followed by the intertextual characteristic, and ending with the social characteristic.

The Contextual Characteristic

The Sociohistorical Context

In the contextual feature Cowan (2005) described the existence of icons and the visual literacy events that stimulated the Latino adolescents' responsiveness to the icons. In this study, the contextual characteristic describes the literacy events that stimulated the Latino/a adolescents' awareness of the sociohistorical context as well as their awareness of the contemporary social context in which the play was situated. I observed three literacy events that aroused the Latino/a adolescents' awareness of the sociohistorical context.

On days 4, 5, and 9, Mrs. R. explained the importance of costumes in conveying the poverty of Mexican farm workers in the 1920s and 30s by providing some information on the sociohistorical context. The first of the three literacy events that

aroused the Latino/a adolescents' awareness of the historical context occurred on day 4, when a video of the previous class's performance was shown for the first time, and Mrs. R. drew the actors' attention to the sociohistorical context by referring to the actors' costumes, "You saw the farm clothing. This is 1924."

Mrs. R. encouraged the actors to bring in costumes that accurately portrayed the plain clothing of the 1930s' farm workers. She made it clear that sneakers or attire representing the 21st century were not appropriate saying, "This is 1924. Guys, don't wear sneakers." Mrs. R. emphasized that poor Mexican farm workers often wore second hand clothing several sizes too large for their undernourished bodies. Mrs. R. also emphasized that many farm workers did not have enough money to buy shoes and told the actors that their costumes should include, "sandals and no shoes."

The second event occurred on day 5. On that day, rather than showing the video, Mrs. R. simply explained the sociohistorical context saying, "*Esperanza Rising* is about country farmers in 1924, 1930. It takes place in the dust of the desert and is about poverty. You're not working in an office. You're supposed to be campesinos, not pants down to there, like Cantinflas." Cantinflas was the name of the legendary comic Mrs. R. referred to as the Charlie Chaplin of the Mexican cinema. Her reference to Cantinflas generated laughter among the actors. However, Mrs. R. used the reference to Cantinflas to underscore the idea that the actors' costumes were not supposed to reflect the clown's comedy, but the farm workers' dignity.

To describe the farm workers' attire, Mrs. R. brought out the painting of the barefoot Esperanza floating over the fields in a plain, loose fitting, ankle-length dress. "Tell me if you know what scene this is," she asked and confirmed their response, "Yes,

when she's floating up in the air." Mrs. R. emphasized that 21st century dresses were inappropriate, but rather they should be large and shabby, describing them as "big, old stuff." She suggested that the actors ask their parents if they had any old clothes.

The actors' awareness of the sociohistorical context was stimulated further on day 5 when Mrs. R. announced each character's name and described his or her appropriate costume with a single word or brief phrase. "Mamá: conservative. Abuelita is an elegant woman, a woman of money: a black dress, loose dress. Isabel is a country girl without shoes, hopping around (Mrs. R. demonstrated by waving her arms about). Narrator: you need to dress up." Mrs. R. characterized Spanish and Latin American grandmothers' Discourses, represented by the custom of carrying lace handkerchiefs in their sleeves. She said that this custom reminded her of the character of Abuelita in the novel. In order to create awareness of the sociohistorical context, Mrs. R. used several opportunities to contrast the wealthy Mexican landowner Discourses with the Mexican American farm worker Discourses in California during the 1920s and 30s.

Certain kinds of apparel also reminded the actors about familiar Discourses. On day 14, Patricia brought in her costume, the long, loose-fitting black dress. She also brought in a large black suit jacket. After examining the jacket, Luis tried it on and swaggered around, sliding across the floor in the style of the *pachuco* character in the Latino play *Zoot Suit*. Some years before I learned the term *pachuco* from Latino students, but I had never seen anyone enact the *pachuco* character as Luis and Mario did on day 14. In their actions, I recognized the historical context the other Latino students had described and guessed that the black jacket probably reminded Luis and Mario of the *pachuco* character popularized in movies, such as the film version of the play *Zoot Suit*. In Mario and Luis's almost all-male

class that day, a Latino student told the teacher “You don’t watch the kind of movies I do” in response to the teacher’s question about why the boys did not act more respectful, that is, more in keeping with what she explained was their heritage.

Later that day, during the rehearsal of the song *Las Mañanitas*, Mario tucked in his T-shirt and put on the jacket. With his hands in his pockets, he pushed the suit jacket back to reveal his T-shirt, and leaned back in the characteristic stance of the *pachuco* character. These events showed that sociohistorical Discourses were recognized through articles of clothing in both Mrs. R.’s and the actors’ experiences. Their performances gave the actors the opportunity to act out what they valued as their heritage.

The Contemporary Context

The contextual characteristic describes the literacy events that aroused the Latino/a adolescents’ awareness of the contemporary social context. On day 4, the top news story everywhere was the nationwide marches protesting a controversial immigration reform bill being debated in the Senate. More than three hundred students were absent from school, and only 5 of the 12 students who regularly attended the after-school program came to the rehearsal that afternoon. Only Mario referred to the absences asking, “How many people didn’t come to school?” Although no one spoke about the issue directly, the news bore a striking similarity to the sociohistorical context of *Esperanza Rising* described in the author’s notes.

In the author’s notes, Muñoz-Ryan (2000) related stories her grandmother told her about the struggles Mexican immigrants and Mexican Americans faced in the United States during the economic turmoil of the Great Depression. This catastrophic economic downturn began to affect the nation in 1929. In March of that year, the Deportation Act

became a law driven by the belief that rising unemployment was caused by Mexicans. During the next six years, almost half a million Mexicans, many of whom were born in the United States, and therefore citizens, were deported. As Muñoz-Ryan stated, some historians put the figure closer to a million.

With the exception of Mario, none of the participants referred to the contemporary context during the rehearsals. However, in her reflective response, Diana alluded to Muñoz-Ryan's discussion of the Deportation Act of 1929 saying, "What I liked about the play was that we learned a lot of things like in Los Angeles, immigration would take you even if you were born here in those times." Diana's words demonstrated that she juxtaposed Discourses of immigration legislation in order to understand, critique and reflect on them, noting that they spoke to one another across history.

The Intertextual Characteristic

The intertextual characteristic describes the modes of meaning multimodal designers draw from to create their texts. The intertextual characteristic also describes events that initiate actors into the Mexican performance Discourse. The modes of meaning were linguistic (spoken and written language), visual (paintings, costumes and props, a video of a former group's play), audio (a traditional song, sound effects), gestural (the stamp of a foot, a downward-pointed finger, body language), spatial (the meanings of positions on the stage, the physical arrangement), and multimodal, or a combination of two or more modes of meaning (The New London Group, 1996).

Designing Meaning

The actors drew from the elements of the six modes of meaning to project an emotion or to create a mood, that is, to design meaning. For example, linguistic design

includes spoken and written language and visual modes of meaning and the actors drew from elements of visual design in paintings, scripts, props, costumes, and the former group's video. On day 1, Mrs. R. propped the large painting of Esperanza against a table in the front of the classroom. The painting depicted the dark-haired, barefoot Esperanza wearing a yellow dress and floating above the fields. Drawing meaning from this painting, Mrs. R. showed Eva how to rotate in a spiraling motion, her arms extended like wings. Eva watched and tried to duplicate Mrs. R.'s movements, but she was having trouble projecting the feeling of flying. Mrs. R. described the feeling saying, "Like when you think you're dizzy. You're dreaming." Eva watched and tried again, but it was difficult to pull off what Mrs. R. wanted.

On the day of the performance, the audience was positioned to draw meaning from the multimodal design in Mrs. R.'s words and the visual discourse in a special painting. Mrs. R.'s prologue and the special painting positioned the parents and other family members to stir their memories of home. Mrs. R. drew the audience's attention to the enormous oil painting of Esperanza's Mexican home, *El Rancho de las Rosas*, situated in the center of the stage. With vibrant hues of green and red, the huge expressionistic painting was the only piece of scenery on stage, with the exception of the rising Esperanza painting propped against the podium. Drawing from the meaning encoded in the painting's visual discourse, Mrs. R. described the underlying narrative of Esperanza's former idyllic life before it was disrupted by misfortune. Mrs. R. also drew meaning from the way the painting came to exist. She explained how the painting was originally sketched by a Latino youth, and then finished by another artist whose help Mrs. R. enlisted. The audience of parents and grandparents was captivated by these

extemporaneous recollections, confirming the power of oral performance, which as Ong (1982) stated, depends on memory systems.

The actors drew from many elements of linguistic design to create meaning, e.g. delivery, vocabulary, metaphor, and information structures. Delivery, which included intonation, stress, rhythm, and accent, were important elements. However, information structures and vocabulary were also significant in the construction of meaning. In one of Eva's practice readings early in the play production, the words *sacrificio que hice* were written on the board. These words caused considerable confusion because of Spanish's pronoun-drop feature and the fact that the Spanish word *que* can be translated into English as both *what* and *that*. Eva paused after the phrase *con tanto sacrificio* [with all the hard work], and made the next phrase, *que hice*, a question [what does he do?] using rising intonation. In the script, however, the phrase was an exclamation [with all the hard work that I do!], as Mrs. R. explained by writing it on the board.

The actors drew from audio modes of meaning to create meaning in the sound Roberto tapped into the microphone to mimic the heartbeat of the earth. Patricia and Eva also drew from elements of audio and linguistic modes of meaning to create meaning in the flashback and signal that the play was transporting the audience back to the past. On day 11, Patricia practiced the line offstage for the first time, and Mrs. R. encouraged her to put a lot of expression into it saying, "You have to say it nicely. Like very sexy."

After the introductions, several seconds of silence communicated audio meanings, emphasizing the suspense of the upcoming scenes. After a minute, the silence was broken and the voice of Abuelita, Esperanza's grandmother, was heard through the microphone. In this flashback, Abuelita asked if Esperanza remembered the story of the phoenix, a

bird that rose from its own ashes and Esperanza answered yes, she did. Drawing from elements of linguistic modes of meaning to narrate the mythological story, Abuelita reminded Esperanza that they were like the metaphorical phoenix rising from the ashes to be reborn into a new existence. Drawing from elements of audio modes of meaning, the girls' voices seemed to emerge from the distant past to project the feeling that historic events were about to unfold once again. By modifying the script to include the flashback, the participants drew from elements of linguistic modes of meaning in the design element of global coherence, that is, the historical fiction genre. The participants established themselves as multimodal text designers by combining elements of the six modes of meaning to create an interesting, dynamic production.

The actors drew from elements of spatial modes of meaning in stage positions, which affected other modes of meaning. For example, when the group of actors was introduced to the newly arrived Abuelita, they formed a large circle. Arranged in the circle, the actors were introduced individually. As each actor stepped into the center, he or she greeted Abuelita, and then took a step back into the circle to give the audience an unobstructed view of the next actor to step forward.

The actors drew from elements of gestural modes of meaning in facial expressions (e.g. a raised eyebrow), body language (the stamp of a foot), and movement (skipping onto the stage, or hurrying off stage). To create multimodal meanings, they combined gestural and linguistic meanings in dynamic ways, such as Eva's irritated stamp of her foot on the second syllable 'puedo' in the sentence "No puedo creerlo!" [I can't believe it!]. When Miguel arrived, Eva impatiently stamped her foot again on the second syllable

of the word, 'trajiste,' in the question "Trajiste lo que me robaste?" [Did you bring back what you stole from me?].

After the flashback, the curtain opened, and Roberto (the narrator) entered from the right, dressed in a black dress shirt and black trousers. Drawing on gestural modes of meaning, he raised an index finger and traced a downward arc, ending at the floor. His gesture emphasized the declaration of Miguel's guilt: "De eso, no hay duda!" [Of this, there is no doubt!]. Roberto's multimodal meaning connected the theme of anger announced in Mrs. R.'s prologue to Eva's words, helping to create the play's conflict.

Being Initiated

The intertextual characteristic describes more than how designers draw from the elements of the modes of meaning to design their texts. The intertextual characteristic also describes events that initiated the actors into the Mexican performance Discourse. With its concentration of complex gestures and movements, the rising scene initiated the actors into one of the most important aspects of the Mexican performance Discourse: the *danza indígena*, or indigenous ritual dance. I was familiar with the indigenous ritual dance, having read a vivid account in Rodriguez's autobiography, *Always Running, La vida loca: Gang days in L.A.* (Rodriguez, 1993). So when I saw the circular patterns enacted in the rising scene on day 1, I instantly recognized its similarity to the dance Rodriguez described. As I learned through more reading, the indigenous ritual dance was introduced as a folkloric element of the 1970's renaissance of Chicano/a pride, the Teatro Campesino (Broyles-Gonzalez, 1994). Just as the rising scene's ritual dance initiated me, it also initiated the actors into this central element of the Mexican performance Discourse.

On day 1, while Mrs. R. coached Eva about which gestures to use to convey the theme of transformation through the ritual dance, the other actors looked on, observing how she performed the complex gestural modes of meaning. Their observations initiated them into the play in which gestures were indispensable in conveying meaning and helped them understand their significance. As the rehearsals progressed, they drew on this knowledge of gestures to create their characters using appropriate gestures, movements, and facial expressions.

The intertextual characteristic not only describes how the actors drew from the elements of the modes of meaning, but also describes how they were initiated into the Mexican performance Discourse. Being initiated into the Mexican performance Discourse was a team-building, self-affirming cultural event. For, as McLuhan (1964) stated, whereas print isolates, oral performance connects, involving people in a process of building consensus on performance rules and organization, which supports the community's memory and preserves its practices.

The Social Characteristic

Cowan's (2005) social feature described the visual literacy events in which the Latino adolescents created, exhibited, and exchanged their drawings. In this case study, the social characteristic described literacy events in which two different groups participated. The level one social characteristic described a unique literacy event in which several Latina adolescents constructed meanings. This event occurred after school, but was connected to an assignment for class. The level two characteristic described the literacy events in which the Latino/a adolescents and the Latina teacher constructed knowledge and meanings in the play production. Since I wanted to identify the events in

terms of their context and the strategies through which they were managed, I analyzed these literacy events using Grounded Theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990), and nested them within the level two social characteristic.

The Level One Social Characteristic

This characteristic describes a literacy event in which the Latina adolescents constructed identities.

Cartoon characters were popular among the Latina adolescents. Diana was noticeably devoted to the Tweety bird character and had several different Tweety bird t-shirts that she wore often. One depicted a large Tweety bird below her name in red script, while another was black with a shiny gold Tweety bird. A third one depicted Tweety bird wearing a cowboy hat surrounded by the words “Everyone loves a cowgirl.” On the last day of school, Diana spent several minutes tracing a Tweety bird from a book of line drawings of the character (Field notes, 5/06). The actions and personality of this iconic character combine charm, innocence, and savvy in a survivor who prevails despite the threats of the adversarial cat, Sylvester.

In their ESOL class, the students had a final poster presentation, which was due one week before the performance. The assignment was to create a summary of what the students had learned all year. These posters were to be used as wall decorations in the auditorium on the day of the performance. Diana created two posters, submitting them one month before the due date. Affixed to each of the four corners, and in other places on the posters, was the image of a sleeping yellow Tweety bird covered with a light blue blanket. In the poster’s titles: “I’m tired of Mrs. R’s class” and “Mrs. R’s work made me tired,” Diana positioned herself as Tweety bird by using the pronoun *I* and connecting it

with the word *tired* to the sleeping cartoon character. By using active voice in one title and passive voice in the other, Diana drew on the element of transitivity in linguistic design, that is, active and passive voice. On her posters, Diana pasted computer-generated written texts, describing the novels the class had read and topics researched, including an African country, and health issues. She also wrote about the vocabulary and grammar the class had studied. Diana outlined these written texts with glitter. Mrs. R. used the posters as models of exemplary work to remind students of the poster's due date.

Lisa and Laura shared their plans for their poster designs in their interviews. Their designs borrowed elements that Diana had used, in particular the use of cartoon characters. Lisa described her poster design as including "four pictures in the corners of Winnie the Pooh." Laura also mentioned plans to include cartoon images in her poster saying that she would use glitter and pictures of Hello Kitty. Lisa also described the texts she planned to write saying, "I'm going to type in the computer at home."

According to Maguire and Graves (2001), "Bakhtin's (1986) concept of *speaking personality* offers a means of conceptualizing children's biliteracy as socioculturally mediated activities and social interactions" (p. 561 [italics in original]). Maguire and Graves explored "the relationship between L2 writing and identity construction" in a study of three primary school girls' written texts and discovered "a subtle indication of the girls' social identity, bonds of friendship, and membership in this social network was the little clouds they drew around the titles of their journal entries" (p. 575). This research confirmed the findings in Maguire and Graves' study and demonstrated that the cartoon characters and the glitter were signs of the girls' social identity, friendship, and membership in the group. Each girl chose a different cartoon character to distinguish her

identity while at the same time connecting with the group through the elements of visual design. The slight difference between the primary-school-aged students' practices in Maguire and Graves' study and the middle-school-aged adolescents' practices can be explained as the construction of a more well-developed, unique identity (Erikson, 1968).

These practices occurred because one student, Diana, initiated them by submitting her posters early, which attracted considerable attention. The posters' early completion facilitated the literacy practice of design sharing. After the rehearsal on day 8, the actors returned to the classroom to pick up their belongings before leaving. Most left right away, but Lena, Laura, and Patricia stood together in a group and read Diana's two posters, which counted as one of the final grades in the class. The girls looked at Diana's posters and talked about them before asking Mrs. R. if they could take some books home. Receiving permission, the girls went to the counter, made their selections, and returned to the board to write the titles under their names. Diana was a literacy leader because her literacy practices influenced other students' literacy practices in significant ways.

The Level Two Social Characteristic

This characteristic describes the literacy events through which Mrs. R. and the actors constructed cultural meanings and knowledge.

According to Vygotsky (1978), higher mental functions originate in relationships between individuals and, through a sequence of events; this interpersonal process eventually becomes an intrapersonal process. Vygotsky's study of these interpsychological processes, Wertsch (1991) stated, involved describing "the interaction of the adult-child dyad" (p. 46). The teacher-actor dyads in the rehearsals reflected interpsychological processes. The teacher-actor interactions, as well as the interactions

between the actors, illustrated Vygotsky's (1978) theory that learning "creates the zone of proximal development; that is, learning awakens a variety of internal developmental processes that are able to operate only when the child is interacting with people in his environment and in cooperation with his peers" (p. 90).

On day 1, Mrs. R. positioned herself as a model for the novice actor, Eva, who played Esperanza. The rising scene was a scene of little dialogue, but many gestures and movements. Eva's learning was mediated through Mrs. R.'s instructions and gestures, as the other actors watched. Vygotsky's model, as Rogoff (1990) asserted, "resembles apprenticeship, in which a novice works closely with an expert in joint problem solving in the zone of proximal development" (p. 141). As Eva adjusted her performance based on Mrs. R.'s repeated modeling, the cognitive work was shared between them—the actor delivering the line and Mrs. R. advising her on how to improve. Through a gradual process that took place over many rehearsals, Mrs. R. ceded the role to the actor and assumed the position of audience. Palinczar and Brown (1984) referred to this social "context of instruction" as "situations where a novice...carries out simple aspects of the task while observing and learning from an expert, who serves as a model for higher level involvement" (p. 123).

Watching Eva and Mrs. R. on day 1, the actors experienced a preview of future practices. Learning contexts in the first stage of the play seemed to be arranged, as Gee (2003) stated, "so that earlier cases lead to generalizations that are fruitful for later cases" (p. 137). By observing Eva and Mrs. R. as they enacted a process of modeling and repetition, Mario appropriated cultural resources. One of these resources was the task of memorization, which he differentiated into three areas: memorization of the "parts"

(scenes), what “to say” in the script (lines), and “where to stand” (positions). As Mario progressed gradually from observation to practice, he progressed from legitimate peripheral participation, as Lave and Wenger (1991) stated, to full participation. His full participation was evident in one of the final rehearsals.

As the final performance approached, Mario’s seriousness and engagement became increasingly apparent. One of the most unusual rehearsals was day 18 because it took place during class time. Other students were eating lunch in the cafeteria and the curtains on stage did not block the noise. Before Luis even realized he had missed the cue to announce the arrival of the bus from Los Angeles, Mario said the line, filling in for his brother. Not only was Mario alert and aware of the cues, but he also expressed enjoyment. In opening the rehearsal, Mrs. R. announced there would only be one more rehearsal the next day, and Mario asked, with disappointment in his voice, “Why not today?”

Modeling. Modeling was the primary strategy the teacher used to scaffold the actors’ knowledge of how to project emotion by combining two or more elements of the modes of meaning, such as the elements of linguistic design (delivery, intonation, rhythm), and the elements of gestural design (facial expressions, body language). In the scene at the fruit-sorting job, both Eva’s (Esperanza I) question and Lisa’s (Josefina) exclamation required rising intonation to convey their worry about the imminent danger to their families, signaled by Mario’s (Alfonso) sudden appearance. However, Eva’s falling intonation prompted Mrs. R. to model an exaggerated rising intonation, which Eva repeated. After Mario delivered his line and Eva countered with hers, Mrs. R. was still dissatisfied with Eva’s intonation. With exaggerated intonation, Mrs. R. modeled the

staccato rhythm and rising intonation in the question “Para que quiere que vaya yo?” [Why do you want me to go?]. Eva repeated the question and Mario followed with his line, delivered in an expressionless tone. Employing the same procedure she had used with Eva, Mrs. R. modeled the intonation Mario needed to use and he repeated it.

Mario’s participation in this event was, as Palincsar and Brown (1984) stated, “first as a spectator, then as a novice responsible for very little of the actual work” (p. 123). After Mario observed the interaction between Eva and Mrs. R., it was his turn to act, changing from a spectator to a novice. Not only did Mario change from a spectator to a novice, but also his participation expanded in other ways over the course of rehearsals. For example, by assigning responsibility for the placement of chairs (props) to Mario and his brother, Luis, Mrs. R. scaffolded their awareness of the cues early on in the rehearsals and later, in the twelfth rehearsal, Mario announced the curtain cues—an advanced thinking role—while the teacher assumed the role of the audience. Luis’s role also expanded and he gradually he assumed the unofficial role of deputy director. For example, on day 12, Luis directed the actors, while Mrs. R. noted the features that needed improvement.

The role of parody. Parody was a response to authority. Mrs. R. exercised authority in various ways. One of these ways occurred during the first 6 rehearsals when Mrs. R. used the term *cutoff day* to describe her power to remove an actor from the play. Mrs. R. also used the term to motivate the actors to invest in the play by following the rules. Mrs. R. drew meaning from the actors’ behavior and on day 1, when Eva (Esperanza) demonstrated her investment by scolding Javier (Miguel) for misbehavior, there were consequences. On day 6, Luis replaced him. On day 2, Diana was allowed to

share the role of Esperanza with Eva. Diana told me she originally played the part, but was replaced by Eva when she did not follow Mrs. R.'s directions.

Some of the actors engaged in the practice they called playing around, or playing. As the Discourse analysis revealed, this practice was a game that involved teasing peers, or authority figures and gauging their reactions. The Discourse model of playing around that affected actions and practices held that causing targets—adults or peers—to react was entertaining.

One of the ways the actors engaged in the practice of playing around was through parody. On day 1, the girls introduced two examples of parody. On that day, Eva played the role of Esperanza in the rising scene, the scene assigned to Diana on day 2. Diana told me that she was the original Esperanza, but Mrs. R. replaced her for not following Mrs. R.'s instructions. So Diana had to ask Mrs. R. if she could have a part in the play. On day 2, Diana played Esperanza in the rising scene.

To begin the rising scene rehearsal, Eva (Esperanza) lay down on the carpeted classroom floor and looked up at the ceiling. As Eva looked up at the ceiling, Roberto narrated in Spanish explaining that Esperanza was “looking at the clouds.” As soon as Roberto said, “looking at the clouds,” Linda (Hortensia), and several other girls who had been watching the interaction, repeated Eva’s line from the play, the extremely sarcastic utterance, “Uh-huh.” They repeated it in unison, with a tone so sarcastic that it was impossible not to recognize its origin. The girls smiled and giggled with obvious pleasure at their ingenuity in adding their voices to Eva’s as their utterances came into contact, or interanimated each other (Wertsch, 1991, p. 54).

Parody had an underlying aspect of aggression. For example, on day 1, Mrs. R. directed Eva to close her eyes in order to project more emotion in the ritual dance saying, “Like when you think...you’re dizzy. You’re dreaming.” As soon as Eva closed her eyes, Diana stepped toward Eva to offer assistance. Diana borrowed Mrs. R.’s word “dizzy,” and began to guide Eva in a circle saying with a broad smile, “I’ll make you feel dizzy!” As soon as Diana said this, the other girls giggled. They guessed Diana’s speech genre “from the very first words” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 79). “In each utterance,” Bakhtin (1981) stated, we “sense the speaker’s *speech plan* or *speech will*” (p. 77 [italics in original]). Eva was seriously following Mrs. R.’s rules, but Diana’s speech plan revealed that she was playing around. Since Eva had replaced Diana, Diana’s playing around by offering to make Eva feel dizzy was somewhat aggressive behavior

In his narration on day 10, Roberto described the bus station scene prior to Miguel’s arrival. Next, Mrs. R. announced, “A bus from Los Angeles has arrived,” and Luis (Miguel) entered the stage area, stretching his arms as if he had just awakened. Waiting to greet Miguel, Mario (Alfonso) disrupted the seriousness with the command, “Re-do it,” a parodic re-voicing of Mrs. R.’s typical request for repetition. Then, in a parody of the welcome between ‘father’ (Alfonso) and ‘son’ (Miguel), the real-life brothers, Mario and Luis, greeted each other with a hearty handshake and the words, “What’s up, man?” In the context of the serious rehearsal, the boys’ greeting was playing around.

On day 12, when Laura was substituting for Eva, Mario played around to try to make her react by swaggering as he entered the stage area, exaggerating his steps and physical presence. His brother Luis encouraged him with a parodic re-voicing of Mrs.

R.'s request for repetition saying, "Do it again! Do it again!" Both boys engaged in playing around by trying to cause a reaction. If Mrs. R. scolded them, perhaps Laura would react to them.

The way in which the actors used parody and the practice of playing around was similar in some ways to the Mexican concept of *relajo*. Although *relajo* is defined in various ways, its quality as "a disruptive group cheekiness" (Broyles-Gonzalez, 1994, pp. 28-29) best defines it in this case. *Relajo* is cheekiness and the way the actors used parody was irreverent and mocking. Understanding *relajo* is important to understanding "the Mexican popular culture of laughter" (p. 30). A vital element of the Mexican popular performance Discourse, *relajo* uses parody and other techniques to express opposition to authority. This oppositional relationship to authority is linked to Bakhtin's (1984) notion of the carnivalesque, which "conceptualizes laughter as a patently oppositional tool of the popular masses" (p. 30). *Relajo* is cheekiness or mockery and so was the actors' discourse practice of parody or playing around with language.

What would your character think? In order for the actors to use the correct elements of the gestural modes of meaning, Mrs. R. had to work in their *zone of proximal development* (Vygotsky, 1978) and help them imagine how their characters would think. For example, Lisa and Eva were enacting the fruit-sorting scene, when Lisa delivered her line, "Seran los bebés!" [It must be the children] with a declarative tone, rather than the expected exclamatory intonation. Also, she did not exit in a hurried manner. Mrs. R. realized that modeling alone had not proven helpful in scaffolding Lisa's internalization of the correct emotion to project through her intonation and movements. Mrs. R.'s recognition of Lisa's failure to project the correct elements of the gestural modes of

meaning was a *triggering event* (Palincsar and Brown, 1984), which signaled a comprehension failure requiring clearing up through “active processing strategies” (p. 118).

Mrs. R.’s strategy to scaffold Lisa’s comprehension was designed to encourage her to project worry. Mrs. R. explained that Lisa’s character, Josefina, was imagining the purpose behind Mario’s (Alfonso’s) sudden visit, namely to inform her about her children. Mrs. R. explained how to express the appropriate level concern saying, “You’re like wondering ‘why is he there?’” When Mrs. R. explained what Josefina would think, it encouraged Lisa to think the same way and project the appropriate concern by adopting the correct elements of the gestural modes of meaning. The interaction between Mrs. R. and the actor demonstrated that the strategy of imagining what your character would think enabled the actors to combine the elements of linguistic and gestural modes of meaning to project emotion.

Symbols of participation. Every community of practice, Wenger (1998) stated, “produces abstractions, tools, symbols, stories, terms, and concepts that reify something of that practice in a congealed form” (p. 59). The video represented the negotiated set of performance conventions, that is, it reified the community’s rules into a concrete form. The community built consensus around this common set of conventions when Mrs. R. critiqued the former group’s costumes and gestures in the videotaped performance. On day 9, Mrs. R. announced they would use a forty-minute delay caused by a teachers’ meeting to watch the video. Mrs. R. stood next to the television and told the actors to notice the costumes and action. Five of the actors had already seen the video on day 4 and they led the laughter at

the incongruity of Abuelita's short contemporary-style dress compared to the plain, loose-fitting farm dress worn by the girl who played Esperanza.

On day 4, the video was used as the model for imitation, but on day 9, it was also used as a source for critique. "I don't see action," Mrs. R. stated, "the words are better than the action. We can see the errors they made." Luis agreed saying, "That's all messed up!" This event showed that the actors adopted the video as one of their two important tools in the play production. The video reified the performance community's set of conventions, which the actors described in the Discourse model of being responsible. The video began as the community's set of conventions on day 1, as Mrs. R. referred to Eva's rising scene gestures saying, "She needs to do it again." Eva laughed nervously and Mrs. R. capitalized on her laughter saying, "There's going to be hours and hours of work until it looks like the video."

Acting in a certain way. According to Bourdieu (1977), the conditions that constitute a particular class, produce *habitus*, a set of dispositions. These dispositions guide individuals to act in certain ways and are acquired through inculcation in childhood. The Latina teacher, guided by a certain set of dispositions tried to inculcate these dispositions in the actors during the play production. This set of dispositions included linguistic and social capital, such as the language of social introductions, or Mrs. R.'s request to Luis on day 7, "Please don't do that. It's in poor taste." In addition to linguistic and social capital, other dispositions included posture, walking with a firm gait, and bowing. This set of dispositions guided the participants to act and speak in certain ways.

As Bourdieu (1991) stated, dispositions are acquired through the childhood process of inculcation, which makes differences comprising arbitrary cultural limits (e.g. masculine and feminine) seem natural. For example, one of the dispositions Mrs. R. tried to inculcate was the differentiation of male and female roles in assigning the boys to move the chairs. The disposition that “ladies are delicate and sophisticated; they’re soft,” was meant to guide Luis to act with care and respect toward Diana. Another disposition, “girls are sophisticated,” encouraged the girls to adopt the disposition to act without using physical behavior toward each other (Field notes, 5/06).

Summary

The level two social characteristic describes the literacy events in which the actors participated during the play production. The analysis of these literacy events revealed five findings. First, actors became more proficient by observing peers as well as from their own experiences. Second, modeling was the principal strategy to promote the actors’ appropriation of new cultural resources, such as the elements of linguistic and gestural modes of meaning. Third, parody was related to the practice of *relajo*, a vital element of the Mexican oral performance Discourse. Fourth, Mrs. R. scaffolded the actors as they learned to read the actions of other actors to be able to project meaning into their performance. Fifth, a set of dispositions, including linguistic and social capital, guided the participants to act and speak in certain ways.

Validation/Invalidation

Mrs. R. assigned the actors to write a reflective response on the Monday following the final performance and wrote a list of questions on the board to serve as a guide for the responses. The list consisted of 7 questions: your participation in the play—

rehearsal and performance, how long did you work on preparing for it, how was the play in your opinion, what did you learn, how did you help others, your parents' cooperation, and would you have changed something?

Of the 13 actors, 11 completed a written text. Of these 11, 9 validated the final performance. One actor, Luis, also validated the final performance in his oral text. Luis refused to be interviewed during the period of fieldwork, but agreed to a post-performance interview after I telephoned his father and requested one.

These findings are presented in two parts: part one describes the actors' validation of the final performance in their written texts and, in the case of Luis, his validation of the final performance in both his written and oral texts. In part one, validation occurred in the post-performance context of positive parental regard. Part two describes the actors' invalidation of their rehearsal performances. In part two, the actors' invalidation of their rehearsal performances displayed their moral principles.

Validation of the Final Performance

Validation of the final performance was revealed in the post-performance context of positive parental regard. Nine of the eleven actors who wrote reflective responses validated the final performance. In her reflective response, Diana validated not only her performance, but also Eva's saying, "We did a good job." In her text, Diana put an evaluative model to use, recognizing that successful performances are the result of collaboration and teamwork. She admitted that her successful performance depended on others, and validated Mrs. R.'s decision to split the role of Esperanza. Diana cited the challenge of portraying the ritual dance in the rising scene saying, "the difficulty I had was when I was supposed to float up in the air to the sky." She validated the final

performance in terms of its improvement saying the “play was better than 2 years ago.”

Despite the struggle brought on by change Diana validated the performance saying, “We still did a good job.”

In the prologue to the performance, Mrs. R. referred to the author’s note, in which Muñoz-Ryan described the differences between the real events in her family’s history and the novel. Diana alluded to these texts in a reference to the Deportation Act of 1929 noting, “What I liked about the play was that we learned a lot of things like in Los Angeles, immigration would take you even if you were born here in those times.” The relevance of the sociohistorical context to her contemporary context revealed the significance this genre had on Diana. Diana validated her performance by constructing her character as a person who valued taking on personal challenges, learned to make improvements, and collaborate with others for the holistic aims of the project.

Lisa validated her performance in her reflective response by proudly claiming the character Josefina as her project from the initial stages of the play stating, “I was Josefina first.” Lisa put an evaluative model to use with improvement as the key criterion for measuring success. For example, she admitted following directions was difficult stating, “For me it was hard to do it well,” but in the context of positive parental regard she validated her final performance saying, “Today it was easy for me.” Like the other actors, she thought of the project as teamwork, saying the play “was easy because we were working hard, and we tried our best.” She validated the final performance by realizing they all struggled to make the performance successful.

Lena validated her performance in her reflective response in the context of parental regard stating, “My parents liked the play” and “in my opinion the play was

good.” Following these lines, Lena listed a number of struggles she had to overcome: learning to focus, stand up straight, keep her hands behind her back, and look at the audience. In experiencing these personal struggles, she realized they were intertwined with other actors’ struggles and saw everyone as committed. In the last two lines, she put to use an evaluative model that values commitment saying the play was perfect because of two actions: first, all the actors were prompt, and second, if they left the play, they were replaced, suggesting that the play was more important than any individual.

In her reflective response, Patricia validated the actors’ level of accuracy in the final performance stating, “we did learn all the lines.” Like Diana, Luis, and others, Patricia’s use of the first person plural pronoun revealed that she considered the performance a team effort. Patricia put an evaluative model to use stating “we had to improve a lot” to convey a perspective that improvement was a social good measured by the progress the group made given their positions at the start. Patricia opened her text with “we had to improve a lot” revealing the instructional discourse she appropriated. She also said that the reason they had high standards (“we had to do it very good”) was because they could not have errors in the final performance (“so we couldn’t do mistakes on that day”). In her text, we can hear the instructional discourse (“it has to be perfect”).

Although Nina began her reflective response with an invalidation of the actors’ performances during the rehearsals, she validated the final performance stating, “The performance was great.” Nina blamed the instructional discourse for the difficulty of the rehearsals stating that “the rehearsal was hard because they had to change a lot of things.” Then she qualified her statement, admitting there were a few mistakes, and reappraised her validation saying, “We were good in the performance.” Nina restated her affirmation

saying, “The play in my opinion was good,” but the effort put into the play (“we were trying our hardest”) raised the quality of the “good” rating. She also cited “change,” such as replacing students who did not want to participate as the reason the rehearsal was hard.

Linda validated the group’s accuracy in the final performance stating, “We did everything good.” She also validated the selection of the character she played saying, “I did like that character.” Jazmin validated the play’s re-creation of the novel saying, “*Esperanza Rising* was a very cool play.”

Luis validated the final performance in both his oral and written texts. In his oral text, he validated the final performance saying, “It was a good play,” and added “that we did,” with the first person plural pronoun reflecting his pride in the group’s production. Not only did Luis validate the actors’ individual efforts on their projects—the characters—but he also attributed their efforts to the overall success of the project as a whole. He validated his performance by saying that he helped other actors memorize, act, not laugh and be serious. When I asked him if he thought the play only occurred because of the specific teacher, Luis answered with three “no’s,” to validate the agency and integrity of the actors’ work.

In his written text, Luis validated the performance twice. He started out with a general validation: “the performance was good.” Then, he disputed Mrs. R.’s doubts and validated the group: “she said that we were not going to do good, but we did.” According to Luis, he learned two things on the day of the presentation, first, “everyone was nervous,” and second, “at the end, everybody did good.” Luis used the first person plural pronoun ‘we’ to include everyone in his validation of the performance, demonstrating that he considered the performance a team effort.

In his interview, Mario validated the play production by repeating three times that acting was “fun.” Mario was the only actor to use the word *fun* to describe the performance community. He also validated the performance in the final rehearsal, politely requesting the others to be quiet saying, “Por favor, silencio.” In his reflective response, Mario validated the final performance, contrasting his personal commitment to his character with Mrs. R.’s belief that the play would be a mess. To demonstrate his commitment, Mario validated his individual performance in his eight-line narrative about earning money to purchase his costume. Like Lena and Lisa, Mario cited his parents’ opinions as validation of the performance, saying that his parents liked the play and his citation for winning the award for caring.

Invalidation of the Rehearsal Performances

In this section, I present my analysis of the actors’ invalidation of their rehearsal performances. In his reflective response Luis wrote, “at the end, everybody did good.” With the words “at the end,” Luis invalidated the rehearsal performances, implying that playing around did not occur in the context of the final performance because parents would disapprove. Luis also invalidated the rehearsal performances stating that the actors performed well for their parents, but not for Mrs. R. His words alluded to day 10 when he disagreed with Mrs. R.’s warning that the parents would critique the performance. Luis predicted that his parents would not criticize the final performance because on that day, playing around, which was constructed in relationship with Mrs. R.’s expectations would be lifted. Luis’s words allude to Mario’s statement “I know my parents,” which expressed Mario’s assurance that his parents would validate his performance.

Nina began her reflective response by invalidating the actors' performances during the rehearsals, minimizing their quality with the words "kind of." Nina used "playing around" and "we were talking" to account for the performances' low quality. Nina included herself in the group's resistance by using the pronoun *we*. Nina connected the teacher's instructional discourse with the resistance stating, "the rehearsal was hard because they had to change a lot of things," and "they had to change students because one didn't want to do it." Nina distanced herself from the problems created by the instructional discourse by using the pronoun *they*. Nina empathized with the teacher for facing the daunting task of fixing the problems she created through the construction of the discourses. In the words "one didn't want to do it," Nina distanced herself from Laura by constructing Laura's performance as not caring about the play, when Laura actually did care about it, but not in the way the others were doing it.

Laura invalidated not only her performance, but also those of the teacher and other actors during the rehearsals in her reflective response stating, "Mrs. R was too bossy, and well, I got mad at her because it was not only me doing all the stuff." Laura recognized her resistance ("I got mad") as constructed in relationship with the teacher's expectations ("Mrs. R was too bossy"). Laura blamed the instructional discourse and the teacher's performance for its effect on her. Laura recognized her performance as linked to feelings of anger because of how she believed the instructional discourse positioned her. Laura blamed the instructional discourse and interpreted her standing up when the teacher asked for volunteers to leave as an act of resistance stating, "I quit when I was in the play because Mrs. R. was too bossy." Like many Latino/a adolescents, Laura performed assessments of education in her resistances (Camarota, 2004). Despite quitting the play,

in her interview Laura expressed regret about leaving the play. On Laura's last day in the play, she carried a white t-shirt with "Army girl" written on it in glitter. Laura told me her brother was a Marine, and her dream was to join the military. Her plan was to "go to high school. Then go to all of college. Then go to the army."

Resistance among Latino/a adolescents influences a variety of orientations to schooling from high achievement to dropping out (Cammarota, 2004). Laura evaluated the instructional discourse as hopeless because it ignored Mario's offensive behavior, which was part of the discourse of playing around. She expressed her resistance by dropping out, although in her interview she stated that she wanted to be in the play, but implied only if it were more equitable. Mario and Luis were from a different class and although Luis had a girlfriend (Diana), Mario found it difficult to make friends because the rest of the Latinas were afraid to be associated with him, possibly due to his clothes and behavior. While Laura quit, Roberto expressed resistance by physically moving away from the group. In her reflective response, Laura invalidated all the participants' performances, and positioned Mrs. R.'s discourse practices in collusion with the actors' discourse practices by saying, "it was not only me doing all the stuff."

Patricia addressed how both context and resistance shaped the play. Patricia invalidated the random locations in which the rehearsals occurred as well as the actors' rehearsal performances saying, "The things I would change about our play would be the place and the way some characters were." Diana invalidated the actors' rehearsal performances by stating that what she would change in future play productions would be the playing around. Tania invalidated the actors' rehearsal performances by describing them using formal language saying they did not behave "well."

Mario invalidated the actors' performances stating "we were being bad and talked back," and "we would not follow her instructions." Mario connected the actors' performances to the instructional discourse saying, "three days after the play began, Mrs. R. worried because we were talking and weren't practicing. She called my parents and the whole class went outside because she got tired of our talking." In their reflective responses, Mario and the other actors invalidated their rehearsal performances and displayed their honesty and moral principles.

Conclusion

In exploring what happened when 7th grade Latino/a adolescents and their Latina teacher produced a play in an after-school program, I learned that the play was a performance community mediated by a set of discourse practices and tools, including a script and a video. Literacy, Gee (1989d) stated, "is seen as a set of discourse practices, that is, as ways of using language and making sense both in speech and writing" (p. 39). A major outcome of this performance community's negotiations was a common set of rules represented in a video of the previous group's performance. The video represented the play's memory system, a guide on which oral performance relies (Ong, 1982). The video's history and the participants' social practices framed their interactions, which Latour (1993) referred to as *localizing moves*, a notion that includes objects and practices to extend the literacy-as-social-practices perspective. The video's history and the participants' practices in adopting it as one of their tools connected the participants to the previous performance community, transporting meanings and values and converting local practices into meanings important in other contexts (Brandt and Clinton, 2002).

A major outcome of this performance community's negotiations was a common set of rules represented in a video of the previous group's performance. The video represented the play's memory system, a guide on which oral performance relies (Ong, 1982). The video's history and the participants' social practices framed their interactions, which Latour (1993) referred to as *localizing moves*, a notion that includes objects and practices to extend the literacy-as-social-practices perspective. The video's history and the participants' practices in adopting it as one of their tools connected the participants to the previous performance community, transporting meanings and values and converting local practices into meanings important in other contexts (Brandt and Clinton, 2002).

In exploring the relationship between the actors' discourse practices and their performance, three significant findings emerged. First, all 13 actors used the Discourse model of being responsible, and 11 of the 13 actors used the Discourse model of playing around to recognize and explain their practices. These two Discourse models were the most salient of the seven Discourse models revealed in the Discourse analysis. Second, playing around was constructed in relationship with the teacher's expectations and became an unmanageable binary. Third, after leaving the play, one actor constructed herself through a new critical discourse, which created new meanings by critiquing both the instructional discourse and the discourse of playing around.

I explored the characteristics of the performance: the contextual, the intertextual, and the social characteristics, and reached three findings. First, in the contextual characteristic, the findings revealed that in the performance community, one of the actors realized that Discourses of immigration in the historical context of the novel spoke to Discourses of immigration in the current historical context. This means that the Discourses

of immigration portrayed in the novel's historical context, which Muñoz-Ryan described in the author's note, were evoked and mirrored by the Discourses of immigration in the current historical context. For example, Diana wrote, "What I liked about the play was that we learned a lot of things like in Los Angeles, immigration would take you even if you were born here in those times." In other words, the play was personally meaningful to her because the Deportation Act of 1929 resonated with her experience of the nationwide protests over the Sensenbrenner Bill under debate in Congress during the course of the play production. Diana's recognition validated the play as an activity that broadened her Discourse maps.

Nevertheless, the teacher missed or ignored many opportunities for critical analysis. For example, one rehearsal depicted a critical textual interpretation Diana apparently made, but the teacher missed or ignored. On day 7, Diana limply raised her arms as she said the words "nunca temas" [never be afraid], and on the rejoinder "empezar de nuevo" [to start over], rolled her eyes as if disgusted. Diana's performance caused me to wonder if she was being critical of Mrs. R.'s accuracy-based approach and its emphasis on repetition, or if she was being critical of the notion that, despite their oppression, immigrants should be content knowing that they can always start over again. Or perhaps Diana was being critical of both. The only time Mrs. R. hinted at being critical was in her performance in front of the parents.

Second, in the intertextual characteristic, which describes the modes of meaning designers draw from to create their texts, the findings revealed that the actors drew from the elements of the modes of meaning to project an emotion or to create a mood, that is, to design meaning. For instance, by drawing on the elements of both audio and linguistic

modes of meaning, the participants designed meaning in the flashback, which signaled that the play was transporting the audience to another historical context. By combining elements of the modes of meaning in dynamic ways the actors established themselves as multimodal text designers. The intertextual characteristic also describes events that initiate actors into the Mexican performance Discourse. One important event borrowed from this Discourse was the *danza indígena*, or ritual indigenous dance. This dance initiated the actors into the Mexican performance Discourse, which was later revealed in an embodied allusion to the Latino zoot suit Discourse.

Third, in the level one social characteristic, the findings revealed that after reading Diana's posters, three other girls discussed and used cartoon characters' icons and glitter as signs of their social identity and affiliation. In the level two social characteristic three findings were revealed. First, Mrs. R. emphasized accuracy and modeling was the primary strategy used, but when modeling did not prove effective, she used meaning to explain what the character would think. Meaning proved to be more successful. Second, parody was a response to the instructional discourse. In the sense that it was a response to authority, parody was similar to the practice of *relajo*, a vital element of the Mexican popular performance Discourse. Third, Mrs. R. used a set of dispositions and attempted to instill the dispositions in the actors.

In determining whether the actors validated the final performance, I learned that 9 of the 11 actors who wrote reflective responses validated the final performance in their reflective responses. Most of them validated their final performance by how their parents constructed them as a result of their participation. In addition, one actor validated the final performance in his post-performance interview. In their reflective responses, the

actors put an evaluative Discourse model to use, and rated their performance highly in the areas of responsibility, improvement and teamwork. The actors rated teamwork as equal to their individual effort. In addition to effort, the actors made knowledge of the conventions relevant to their successful performance.

The third of Yin's (2003) five criteria for quality case studies states that the case must be approached through the consideration of alternative perspectives. Three of the thirteen actors were critical of the instructional discourse. In her post-exit interview, Laura was critical of the teacher's involvement in the construction of the discourses. Laura admitted that she really wanted to be in the play, but suggested she was unable to because of the play's inequity. In her reflective response, Laura directly critiqued the teacher's injustice in punishing her when other actors were also to blame. An equitable performance community would be characterized by a caring instructional discourse in which actors have at least an equal share of the control, are valued, have their voices heard, and are treated fairly. In their interviews, Roberto and Diana saw their participation as coerced by the vote. Diana identified it as an infringement on her right to choose other after-school activities. In their reflective responses, Roberto, Diana, Laura and others were critical and blamed Mrs. R. for her involvement in the construction of the discourses, while at the same time validating their group and individual efforts.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

In this chapter, I present the conclusions, implications, and educational significance of a naturalistic case study the purpose of which was to explore what happened when 7th grade Latino/a ELLs and their Latina teacher produced a play in the context of an after-school program and to determine the relationship between the participants' discourse practices and their performance. In addition, I sought to describe the characteristics of the performance and to find out if the participants validated their performances, and if so, how.

The conclusions address these research questions, which were based on the main issue in the case. This issue was how to describe and understand the participants' engagement with literacy practices and to explain their perceptions in order to facilitate culturally responsive pedagogy to support academic learning. I organized the conclusions into four sections: Limitations of Discourse, Limitations of the Visual World, Multimodal Text Designers, and a Design for Performance Learning. Following the conclusions, I present the implications for administrators, teachers, and researchers, as well as offer some suggestions for further research. Lastly, I present the educational significance of the study.

Limitations of Discourse

In exploring what happened when 7th grade Latino/a adolescents and their Latina teacher produced a play in an after-school program, I learned that the teacher was involved in the construction of the discourses. One of these discourses, playing around, was constructed in relationship with the teacher's expectations and became an intractable binary. Framed by communities of practice theory (Wenger, 1998), this naturalistic case study conceptualized the participants' contributions to learning through meaning, practice, and identity. Through their discourse, the participants made meaningful contributions to learning, and as Wenger stated, the historical and social context structured and gave meaning to their activity. However, discourse is inadequate for reaching understandings of identity in practice because, as Wenger asserted, an identity in practice is not "discursive or reflective," but rather "a lived experience of participation in specific communities" (p. 151). Moreover, Conquergood (1991) stated, discourse "is not always and exclusively verbal: Issues and attitudes are expressed and contested in dance, music, gesture, food, ritual artifact, symbolic action, as well as words" (p. 189). Since I did not consider this definition of discourse, the methodology I employed did not allow me to collect, analyze and reach findings on the participants' contributions to learning through identity in practice.

The experience of being a researcher created the sense of being both audience and performer simultaneously. Moreover, experiencing the "world as performance" while trying to see and capture the "world as text" taught me that performances contain much more than mere words. As Leander and Rowe (2006) stated, representational logic misses

“much of how a performance creates effects for performers and audience alike” (p. 431). To my chagrin, I learned as Conquergood (1991) stated, that it is a mistake for a researcher to “privilege words over other channels of meaning” (p. 189). McLuhan (1964) predicted my mistake of privileging words in his theory that each medium introduces a change of scale that shapes our relationships and behavior. The mistakes both the teacher and I made were the result of a medium that had extended our visual sense into the social world, amplified its speed and power, and separated it from the other senses. Furthermore, although I considered the historical and social context to be significant aspects of this case study, Conquergood stated that cultural performances are not only “investigated historically within their political contexts, they are profoundly deliberative occasions” (p. 189). While the methodology I selected for this case study allowed me to collect, analyze, and reach findings on a large amount of discourse, it did not allow me to collect, analyze, and reach findings concerning how the performances created effects for the actors’ and the audience.

Despite the fact that the methodology I employed was limited and was unable to reach understandings of the performances as embodied experience, it was sufficient for answering the research question, namely what is the relationship of the participants’ discourse practices to their performance. The findings demonstrated that the teacher was involved in the construction of the discourses. This was apparent in the first interview when she explained her accuracy-based approach with the words, “My expectations are very high for this performance. I want to see something really, really perfect.” Then she added, “I like perfection.” In the same interview, she expressed doubts about the actors’ abilities to achieve her standards of perfection saying, “maybe I am expecting too much

from this group.” The teacher’s involvement in the construction of the discourses was apparent in the actors’ performances. For example, Patricia used the words “it has to be perfect,” and Mario expressed discouragement and frustration on day 19, when he asked for and did not receive validation and muttered, “Can’t do nothin’, man!” The relationship between the teacher’s and actors’ discourse demonstrates Bakhtin’s (1986) notion that “thoughts are born and shaped in the process of interaction and struggle with others’ thought, and this cannot but be reflected in the forms that verbally express our thought as well” (p. 92).

The teacher positioned the actors as having voted to participate and therefore as having voted to comply with her growing list of expectations as the play progressed. One of these involved demonstrating a committed identity. On day 8, Mrs. R. forcefully slapped the cafeteria table while she told Luis, “You have to care.” Luis seemed shocked by her performance and the new expectation she introduced. He paused for several seconds and coolly responded, “Can we start now?” In the pause, power seemed to shift and in his response, Luis positioned himself as having more control and composure. Luis took power by using the pronoun *we*, implying that he and the actors were waiting for Mrs. R. to stop her performance, which disrupted the rehearsal. The participants’ performances created effects for me, and I had a sense as the researcher and an audience member that the drama acted out on stage was meant for my benefit. I had a sense that this drama was a “play within a play” as in *Hamlet*. As Conquergood (1991) stated, “Social dramas must be acted out and rituals performed in order to be meaningful” (p. 187). In addition he stated, “the ethnographer must be a co-performer in order to

understand those embodied meanings” (p. 187). I surmised that since the performances created effects for me, they were certainly creating effects for the other participants.

Literacy performances, as Leander and Rowe (2006) stated, provide rich opportunities for learning because of “their enactments of embodied affect” (p. 433). Laura was among the principal participants involved in these enactments. However, my methodology did not allow me to collect, analyze, and reach findings concerning these enactments or their effects on both the actors and the audience alike. The methodology only allowed me to study discourse, which is only one part of the complex “interplay of performance codes” as Conquergood (1991) called the six modes of meaning (p. 189). Despite this flaw, the methodology I selected allowed me to collect, analyze, and reach findings on a large amount of discourse. The findings demonstrated that after she left the play, Laura constructed herself through a new critical discourse. This critical discourse created new meanings by critiquing all the discourses, in particular the social Discourse represented in the discourse practice of playing around because it was not fully committed to the play production. This critical discourse also portrayed Mrs. R. as overly authoritarian and hopeless because of her involvement in creating her own resistance and her powerlessness in overcoming it.

Laura’s critical discourse was put to use as an evaluative Discourse model to judge each participant’s performance, even her own. The words “Mrs. R was too bossy, and well, I got mad at her because it was not only me doing all the stuff,” recognized playing around as a discourse of resistance constructed in relationship with the teacher’s expectations and performance. In addition, Laura recognized her own playing around as a performance linked to feelings of frustration, anger and aggression because of the

instructional discourse's control and inequity. Laura's new critical discourse recognized and critiqued all the discourses as responsible for causing the difficulties both she and the entire performance community experienced in the play production. Her new critical discourse created meanings that might help teachers change instructional discourses and design performance communities to prevent these types of conflict.

Summary

Exploring what happened when 7th grade Latino/a adolescents and their Latina teacher produced a play in an after-school program resulted in four major findings. First, the teacher was involved in the construction of the discourses. One of the discourses, playing around, was constructed in relationship with the teacher's expectations and became an unmanageable binary. Second, after leaving the play, one of the actors constructed herself through a new critical discourse, which functioned to critique all of the discourses in the play. Third, one of the actors represented herself through a new literate discourse, which recognized that Discourses of immigration legislation speak to one another across history. Finally, although it was adequate for answering the research questions, the methodology I used in this case study did not allow me to collect, analyze, and reach findings concerning how the performances created effects for the actors' and the audience.

The principal goal of schools, Gee (1996) stated, should be to provide opportunities for students to juxtapose diverse Discourses so that they can understand, critique and reflect on them. Most schools do not offer such opportunities, and in this after-school performance community, the teacher wasted many opportunities to help the actors juxtapose and critique Discourses. The opportunity to critically analyze the novel

was missed or completely ignored both in the after-school play production and in the classroom. In fact, although most of the actors had read the novel earlier in the year in the high-beginning ESOL class, Mario and Luis had not read the novel because they were in the intermediate class, in which different novels were read. Thus, the novel was completely disconnected from the play, and the teacher did not plan for classroom activities that would have enhanced the students' background knowledge. The teacher missed opportunities for critical analysis due to the absence of big ideas, or unifying themes, such as revolution, justice, or immigration.

Although the teacher missed opportunities to include critical analysis, the actors took advantage of the available opportunities to be critical in their reflective responses and in their rehearsal performances. For example, Diana's performance was critical when she looked disgusted while saying the line "never fear to start over."

Diana was the only actor who juxtaposed Discourses of immigration in her reflective response, perhaps because of a connection she made to Mrs. R.'s performance in front of the parents on the day of the play. In her prologue, Mrs. R. was critical in her reference to the author's note in the novel, saying that there was a lot of anger in the play and, in a ironic manner suggested that the audience would understand the reasons for that anger. Mrs. R.'s performance seemed to have an effect on Diana because Diana made a connection to the Deportation Act of 1929, which Muñoz-Ryan explained in the author's note at the end of the novel. Perhaps Diana connected Mrs. R.'s prologue to something she said in class earlier in the year when the class studied the novel. In any case, Diana wrote about the Deportation Act of 1929 in her reflective response. However, despite the

critical tone of Mrs. R.'s speech to the parents before the final performance, she did not include critical discussion during the rehearsals.

While a critical tone was part of the teacher's performance in the play, during the rehearsals the teacher created her own resistance, which was constructed in relationship with her expectations. She expected that the actors demonstrate compliance, which was "caring" about the play. The reason for the teacher's approach was finally revealed in her performance in front of the parents on the day of the play when she presented the award for caring Mario had received in the school's Community of Caring class. The teacher benefited from this presentation because in the context of the parents seeing their children performing in a play in school, the teacher was almost completely assured that the parents would recognize her as a caring teacher. In fact, Mario wrote about his parents' approval of the teacher in his reflective response, "They liked the play and when I got the diploma for caring."

The findings demonstrated the idea that Discourses are inherently unreflective and uncritical. The teacher valued the actors' representing themselves through a caring identity but only in terms of superficial compliance with her approach. The instructional discourse illustrated the disadvantages of coerced participation, especially in after-school programs. Furthermore, the findings demonstrated that reflective and critical consciousness of discourses is necessary in planning for culturally responsive after-school performance communities.

In the next three sections, I present two analyses of the play and a theory in which I describe the three components of culturally responsive performance learning. In the first section, I present an analysis of the play as a clash between the visual world of print and

the multi-sensory world of the spoken word. In the second section, I present an analysis of how the actors established themselves as multimodal text designers. In the last section, I present a theory called the Design for Performance Learning, which was based on the findings of the Discourse analysis. In this theoretical blueprint, I describe the components that are necessary to incorporate reflective and critical consciousness of discourses into after-school performance communities.

Limitations of the Visual World

The clash between the teacher's accuracy-based approach (even her validation—"exactly!"—was accuracy-based) and the actors' highly participational approach represented the clash between what McLuhan called the "eye world" and the "ear world." The teacher's construction of the play as an information-dense hot medium demonstrated the notion that her consciousness had been shaped by the structure of the visual world of print. As Ong (1982) stated, technologies "are not mere exterior aids but also interior transformations of consciousness" (p. 82). While the teacher's consciousness had been shaped by the visual world of print that separates the senses, the actors' consciousness had been shaped by the spoken word that utilizes all the senses at once. Under the teacher's control, the play was what McLuhan (1964) called a "highly developed situation," that is, it was "low in opportunities of participation, and rigorous in its demands of specialist fragmentation" (p. 29). The multi-sensory world of the spoken word, McLuhan stated, finds hot media upsetting. Thus, the actors' multi-sensory, highly participational world found the play—a hot medium—unsettling and difficult. As McLuhan stated, cool cultures adapt through play, which "cools off the hot situations of

actual life by miming them” (p. 31). The actors’ cool multi-sensory world tried to make “sense” of the print world’s neutrality, coldness and “non-sense.”

While in the world-as-text approach to the play, action and reaction were separate parts of a binary, in the world-as-performance approach, action and reaction occurred simultaneously. Shaped by hot media (print, movies), the teacher’s approach to the play had a high degree of information and a “cool,” or low degree of participation. The actors were responsible for combining a lot of decontextualized, fragmented information by memorizing and trying to follow models. In contrast, shaped by a variety of cool electric media (TV, video, computers), the actors’ approach to the play reflected a low degree of information and a “hot,” or high degree of participation.

According to McLuhan, media extend our bodies into the social world and amplify their speed and power. The words “the medium is the message,” summarized McLuhan’s (1964) theory that each medium introduces a change of scale that shapes our relationships and behavior. The medium of the phonetic alphabet amplified the visual world’s speed and power creating the “separateness of the individual, continuity of space and of time, and uniformity of codes” (McLuhan, 1964, p. 84). The history of Western literacy, McLuhan (1962) stated, is the story of how each of our media further removed us from “the magical world of the ear to the neutral visual world” (p. 18).

McLuhan believed the nexus of the age of print (the Gutenberg galaxy) and the electric age caused confusion, which called for an analysis of how media shape human environments. McLuhan (1962) stated that the source of this confusion—the introduction of new media—meant “new ratios among all of our senses” as the new media extended and amplified the senses (p. 41). For example, in the Gutenberg era, print extended and

amplified the visual sense with an increase in speed of communication. However, McLuhan stated, without the phonetic alphabet, the Gutenberg era would have been impossible. Long before the printing press, early forms of writing amplified the visual by storing oral meanings in pictographic forms. The phonetic alphabet separated the visual from the auditory, and sacrificed meaning to amplify the speed and power of the visual world. The technology of the phonetic alphabet, McLuhan stated, “reduced the use of all the senses at once, which is oral speech, to a merely visual code” (p. 45). The history of Western literacy documents an increasing separation of the senses, McLuhan stated, until the advent of electric media, which promise to restore us to the unified, multi-sensory, and participatory “magical world of the ear” (p. 18).

While McLuhan characterized the world of the spoken word as magical, Ong (1982) characterized it as profoundly spiritual and holy stating that “the interiorizing force of the oral word relates in a special way to the sacral, to the ultimate concerns of existence” (p. 74). Ong noted that the spoken word is central to the liturgy of many religions, especially Christianity, in which “God is thought of always as ‘speaking’ to human beings, not as writing to them” (p 75). As Ong stated, the sound of the spoken word originates inside our bodies and displays us to one another as conscious human beings, forming us into communities. Spoken discourse is unifying and spiritually uplifting; it unites our senses into a harmonious whole, and unifies people by breaking down barriers between speaker and listener. Whereas written discourse separates us from one another in time and space, spoken discourse unifies us by eliminating the barriers between performer and audience. By virtue of the re-ascendancy of the magical,

participatory world of the spoken word, harmony and balance is restored to our senses and discourse practices.

Summary

Both the teacher and I were shaped by the phonetic alphabet that extended our visual sense into the social world. The errors we made were caused by the fact that the medium of print had shaped our relationships and actions. As McLuhan stated, the visual world prefers separation of the senses, favoring accuracy and analysis in repose, while the auditory world utilizes all the senses at once. Whereas the teacher's approach was indeed oppressive, the methodology I selected for this study was guilty of the same mistake in judgment and represented, as Conquergood (1991) stated, the "flattening approach of text-positivism" (p. 189). As an alternative to text-positivism, the performance paradigm allows for new pedagogical and methodological approaches.

Multimodal Text Designers

The participants combined various elements of linguistic, visual, gestural, audio, and spatial modes of meaning to construct multimodal meanings. Multimodal meanings, as the New London Group (1996) stated, relate the five modes of meaning in dynamic ways. The actors established themselves as multimodal text designers by drawing from elements of the modes of meaning to create the play, a system of multimodal design. In order to describe the characteristics of the play as a system of multimodal design, I adapted Cowan's (2005) three features, which were used to describe Latino/a visual discourse, and created three characteristics: the contextual, the intertextual, and the social characteristics. In the following section, I present the conclusions using these three characteristics.

The contextual characteristic describes the literacy events that aroused the adolescents' awareness of both the sociohistorical context and the contemporary context of the play. The findings demonstrated that the adolescents' awareness of the sociohistorical context was aroused through the negotiation of meaning (Wenger, 1998). The negotiation of meaning describes the process of experience and engagement as being essentially meaningful, historical, dynamic, and contextual. By negotiating meaning using the video as a tool, the performance community developed a set of rules or conventions. This set of rules, revealed in the actors' discourses, constituted knowledge in the play production, that is, the Discourse of the play.

The contextual characteristic also describes the literacy events that aroused the adolescents' awareness of the contemporary social context. The findings revealed that the adolescents' awareness of the contemporary social context was aroused on day 4 when nationwide marches protesting a controversial immigration reform bill being debated in the Senate were related to the three hundred Latino/a absences from school. Only 5 actors attended the rehearsal that day. Although only one recognized the event in words on that day, one of the actors used her reflective response writing to recognize that through history, Discourses in the play spoke to one another. In this recognition, the actor validated the play's personalized approach to learning as culturally responsive pedagogy. This recognition alluded to Mrs. R.'s prologue on the day of the performance, a reference to the author's note in the novel *Esperanza Rising*.

The intertextual characteristic describes the modes of meaning multimodal designers draw from to create their texts. The actors drew from the elements of the modes of meaning to project an emotion or to create a mood, that is, to design meaning. For

instance, the actors drew from elements of audio modes of meaning to design meaning in the flashback and signal that the play was transporting the audience to an earlier period in history. In the prologue, the teacher drew from elements of audio, visual and gestural modes of meaning to convey the image of anger. The actors repeated the image of anger three times by drawing from the same elements of the modes of meaning to create the play's conflict and theme. By linking multiple images and combining modes of meaning, the participants established themselves as multimodal text designers.

The intertextual characteristic also describes events that initiated actors into the Mexican performance Discourse. On the first day, the *danza indígena*, or ritual indigenous dance initiated the actors, and me, into this Discourse. The complex gestures and movements evoked a description of a similar dance in Rodriguez's autobiography, *Always Running, La vida loca: Gang days in L.A.* (Rodriguez, 1993). Just as the rising scene's ritual dance initiated me, it also initiated the actors into the Mexican performance Discourse. Mario and Luis demonstrated their recognition of the Mexican performance Discourse on day 14 when they donned a black jacket and swaggered around, sliding across the floor in the style of the *pachuco* character. In the boys' actions, I recognized the sociohistorical context other Latino students had described and guessed that the black jacket must have reminded the two boys of the *pachuco* character. These events demonstrated that sociohistorical Discourses were recognized and enacted through articles of clothing and elements of gestural modes of meaning.

The level one social characteristic describes a visual discourse literacy event through which the Latina adolescents constructed identities. The findings described a literacy event in which the Latina adolescents planned and created their poster designs in

order to affiliate with the group. The level one characteristic revealed that one student was a literacy leader who initiated literacy practices, which other students imitated and modified to construct their identities.

The level two social characteristic describes the multimodal literacy events through which the teacher and actors constructed cultural meanings and knowledge. The findings revealed that the sociocultural context was structured to support learning through a process of repeated modeling. In this process, increased control and leadership were ceded to the actors, and the teacher played the role of the audience. As one actor progressed from an apprentice to a full participant, his seriousness and engagement became increasingly apparent.

In keeping with her focus on accuracy, modeling was the primary strategy Mrs. R. used to scaffold the actors' knowledge of how to project emotion by combining two or more elements of the modes of meaning. However, modeling often resulted in no improvement in the actors' projection of meaning. When Mrs. R. finally realized modeling was not enough, she used meaning as a secondary strategy to explain what the actor's character would think. Although the teacher used it as a secondary strategy, meaning was more effective than modeling and encouraged the actor to think like her character and project the appropriate emotion. In interaction with the students, the teacher adjusted her technique to focus more on comprehension of the characters' affect to ensure the actors' combining the elements of multimodal design to project the correct meaning.

Parody was a response to the teacher's authority. One of many ways Mrs. R. exercised authority in her language was through the term *cutoff day*, which she used to describe her power to remove an actor from the play. Certain students (e.g. Diana, Mario,

Laura) used parody and others (e.g. Lena) did not. Sometimes parody was aggressive and designed to cause a reaction. Parody and the practice of playing around were similar to *relajo*, the vital element of the Mexican popular performance Discourse. Broyles-Gonzalez (1994) defined *relajo* as “disruptive group cheekiness,” which uses parody and other techniques to express opposition to authority.

The findings revealed that Mrs. R.’s strategy of working in the actors’ *zone of proximal development* (Vygotsky, 1978) and helping them imagine what their characters would think enabled the actors to combine the elements of linguistic and gestural modes of meaning to project emotion. The findings also revealed that Mrs. R. was guided by a specific set of dispositions, which she tried to inculcate in the actors during the play production. This set of dispositions included linguistic and social capital, including the adoption of gender-specific ways of acting.

Summary

In this after-school performance community, the actors established themselves as multimodal text designers by drawing from elements of the modes of meaning to create the play, a system of multimodal design. By creating three characteristics, I was able to describe in detail a context in which Latino/a adolescents’ multiliteracies were validated. In describing the details of this context, I learned how much there was to say, and how much there is still to know about how Latino/a adolescents assume literate identities and join larger communities both inside and outside of school. I used the findings to develop a Design for Performance Learning, which describes how an after-school performance community might look if the goal were to provide more opportunities for students to juxtapose and critique Discourses.

A Design for Performance Learning

In this naturalistic case study of an after-school performance community, the findings revealed that playing around was constructed in relationship with the teacher's expectations and became an intractable binary. The actors constructed themselves through literate discourses and validated their performance by putting an evaluative Discourse model to use in their reflective responses. With this evaluative Discourse model, they rated their performance based on three key elements: responsibility, history, and teamwork. These three elements serve as a blueprint for a Design for Performance Learning that is culturally responsive and supports academic learning.

Responsibility

As the first element in the Design for Performance Learning, responsibility deserves teachers' special attention. Teachers are entrusted with the responsibility of constructing culturally responsive instructional discourses in their work with Latino/a adolescents. As the findings in this naturalistic case study demonstrated, instructional discourses must be caring, reflective, and critical; however, caring is the most significant because it is profoundly intertwined with the other three. First, teachers must be caring in order to recognize how instructional discourses are fundamentally involved in creating resistance and reproducing power. With caring, teachers might be able to construct instructional discourses that are reflective and critical. Second, teachers must be reflective in order to realize that performances create effects for actors and audiences alike. As the findings demonstrated, Discourses are inherently unreflective and uncritical. Critical reflection can be used during play productions to allow all voices to be heard as well as to evaluate the final production in order to improve future projects.

Critical literacy allows multiple voices to be heard and is an inherent part of a reflective and caring instructional discourse. Critical literacy asks questions, such as why Esperanza and other Mexicans were forced to move, or why the novel is a tale of riches to rags, or why there are multiple meanings of the phrase “never be afraid to start over.” This proverb has important meanings, not only in the context of immigration, but also in the context of education at the nexus of the electric world and the world of print. All of us, including teachers have been shaped by the visual world of print. However, teachers have been shaped more than most, and may be subconsciously afraid of the re-ascendancy of the auditory world and the retreat of the hegemonic power of the world of print. Teachers may be intimidated by the multi-sensory auditory world, which has increasingly eclipsed the long-dominant visual world. Teachers have been shaped by the visual world, which separates and isolates, and blinds them to the participatory, multi-sensory world and its discourse practices.

Giving students control of their own learning would demonstrate that teachers could be critical of the flattening approach of the visual world. Control of learning, as Wenger (1998) stated, is engagement “in the production of sharable artifacts” (p. 184). To produce sharable artifacts means that students create and perform in plays about their own lives, which they might juxtapose with the novels they have read. Caring, reflective, and critical teachers will construct instructional discourses that support culturally responsive after-school environments in which Latino/a adolescents can create sharable artifacts through creative playwriting and performing using digital video technology.

History

As the second element in the Design for Performance Learning, history is worthy of its position. History is significant because, as the findings demonstrated, the video mediated the history of the performance community's meanings. This means that it transported meanings and values from another context and framed the participants' interactions, converting their social practices into meanings. Conceptualizing a history of the community's meanings is imagination, the second mode of belonging in communities of practice theory. Imagination is global and means helping Latino/a adolescents identify who they are in the socio-historical context, which as Wenger (1998) stated, cannot be worked out in isolation.

In order to help Latino/a adolescents identify who they are in the socio-historical context, teachers must be both knowledgeable and bold. Teachers must become more knowledgeable about Latino/a adolescents' cultures and multiliteracies. For example, if the teacher had been more knowledgeable about the rich Mexican oral performance tradition when the actors recognized these discourses on day 14 by mimicking the *pachuco* character, the teacher might have been able to help them make connections so they could compare discourses and articulate how certain discourse practices create certain experiences. By doing so, the teacher would have validated the Latinos/as multiliteracies, not erased them.

In addition, teachers must be bold in the face of the powerful political implications of validating the multi-sensory auditory world over the visual world of print. However, knowledge supports boldness by offering a clear rationale. To produce sharable digital artifacts means that students create and perform in plays about their own lives,

which might be juxtaposed with a text they have read earlier or in conjunction with the performance project. Caring, reflective, and critical teachers construct instructional discourses that support culturally responsive after-school environments in which Latino/a adolescents create sharable digital artifacts through creative playwriting and performing using digital video technology.

Teamwork

As the third element in the Design for Performance Learning, teamwork merits particular attention. Teamwork was significant because it was part of an evaluative Discourse model the actors put to use to rate their performance and assess the play production after it ended. In this evaluative Discourse model, the actors recognized collaboration as responsible for their successful performance. Some credited Mrs. R. for their success and recognized her decisions as supportive of their goals. Some also validated the help they gave their fellow actors. Almost all of the actors used the pronoun *we* to validate the collective work of the entire performance community. As the findings demonstrated, helping was considered a function of teamwork.

Teamwork resembles alignment in communities of practice theory. As Wenger (1998) stated, alignment is “finding ways of being that can encompass multiple, conflicting perspectives in the course of addressing significant issues,” and results in coordination of action (p. 175). Teamwork employs the ability to manage conflicting perspectives during a performance project. Teamwork manages conflicting perspectives by providing a space for actors to be critical throughout the process, not only by writing reflective responses at the end of the project. Play productions might be facilitated if they utilize the capability to coordinate different perspectives, such as those of Laura or Lena who did not operate with

the Discourse model of playing around, and others. By using conferences, planning sessions, as well as writing, performance communities might discover the key to the process of teamwork. By being reflective and critical throughout the process, members would display ownership that results in coordination of action.

Teamwork in a play production would also use the capability to coordinate the diverse skills and perspectives of multiple teachers in the play production. The findings demonstrated the difficulty of directing a performance community without the benefit of teamwork, because as Wenger (1998) stated, alignment cannot be accomplished in isolation.

Summary

Responsibility, history, and teamwork serve as a three-part pedagogical blueprint for a Design for Performance Learning. The three elements in this design were drawn from the Discourse Analysis, and explain the participants' perceptions and describe their engagement with literacy in the play production. The Design for Performance Learning describes a culturally responsive context in which Latino/a adolescents' multiliteracies are validated and supported rather than erased. Finally, the Design for Performance Learning promises that there is a lot more to learn about how Latino/a adolescents assume literate identities and join the larger communities both inside and outside of school.

Implications

This naturalistic case study of an after-school performance community revealed several important findings, which have significant implications for implementing and researching after-school performance learning projects. I divided these implications into

three parts: implications for administrators, implications for teachers, and implications for researchers.

Implications for Administrators

To make after-school performance activities culturally responsive for Latino/a adolescents, administrators are centrally positioned as leaders to support the Design for Performance Learning. This three-part blueprint of responsibility, history, and teamwork explains how 7th grade Latino/a adolescents described their engagement with literacy in this after-school performance community. Educational leaders might use this blueprint as a guide for planning or evaluating educators' proposals for after-school literacy programs for Latino/a adolescents.

The critical part of this blueprint is that it calls on educational leaders' knowledge and acceptance of the literacy-as-social-practices perspective. According to this perspective, a community's literacy practices are associated with the participants' beliefs about, and the meaning they draw from their environment (Heath, 1983; Gee, 1996). As Gee (1996) stated, "what matters is not literacy as some decontextualized ability to write or read, but the social practices into which people are apprenticed as part of a social group" (p. 57). As the findings in this case study demonstrated, the Discourse of the play emerged out of consensus about what constituted knowledge in the play. Being responsible involved the actors' knowledge of and adherence to the community's rules, or conventions. The findings demonstrated that this after-school context was uniquely positioned to support the Latino/a adolescents' literacy practices.

Teamwork recruits administrators' capacity to provide leadership that supports diverse communities' literacy practices within their schools. The findings suggest two

ways administrators can provide this kind of leadership. One way to provide leadership is by promoting after-school performance projects. Teamwork positions administrators as leaders whose responsibility is to provide knowledge and support, which the Design for Performance Learning provides. Another important way to support after-school performance projects is to increase opportunities for audiences. The findings confirmed the significant role of audience in Latino/a adolescents' engagement with literacy practices. The findings suggest that increasing the variety of audiences in after-school performance projects can support academic learning. As educational leaders, administrators can demonstrate support for after-school performance projects by allowing communities to perform in in-school venues. Administrators can also demonstrate support for after-school performance projects by attending performances and encouraging other administrators and staff to do so. This kind of supportive leadership validates rather than erases Latino/a adolescents' multiliteracies.

Implications for Teachers

In this naturalistic case study of an after-school performance community, the main issue in the case was how to describe and understand the participants' engagement with literacy practices and to explain their perceptions in order to facilitate culturally responsive pedagogy to support academic learning. For their part, teachers and other practitioners may recognize particular features of this case that resonate with their own experiences.

The findings confirmed the notion that instructional discourses must be caring, reflective, critical, knowledgeable, bold, and collaborative in order for after-school performance communities to be successful and culturally responsive. The findings

suggest four ways to promote engagement, that is, to give students control of their own learning. First, to make the performance community less conflict-driven, I recommend a voluntary approach for after-school performance activities. Second, in keeping with the voluntary approach, Latino/a adolescents should be allowed to write their own plays about topics in which they are interested. Third, digital video technology is essential to record rehearsals and a laptop to view the results. By viewing the rehearsals, actors can be in control of their own learning by negotiating standards through discussion, writing, and planning progress of the performance. Edited performances, recorded on digital videodisks can serve as guides for later rehearsals and future performance communities. Finally, performance communities can be more equitable if they employ reflective journals throughout the process, not only as responses at the end of the production.

In his study, Cowan (2003) contemplated how teachers might connect Latino visual discourse with mainstream school-based literacy practices, if Latino visual discourse were valued as a system of literacy. During the course of this study, I began to wonder how teachers might connect performance literacy practices with school-based literacy practices if the Latino/a adolescents' multiliteracies were valued.

Performance projects are culturally responsive and can support academic learning because they construct contexts that are powerful for helping Latino/a adolescents identify who they are in the socio-historical context. Latino/a adolescents can juxtapose Discourses and acquire new literate Discourses. In the upheaval of the contemporary social context with nationwide protests over controversial immigration legislation being debated, one actor was conscious that Discourses of immigration speak to one another across history. She wrote that juxtaposing Discourses was the main reason for validating

her experience and the play's personalized approach to learning. As the findings demonstrated, culturally responsive after-school performance projects allow Latino/a adolescents to broaden their Discourse maps and validate their multiliteracies.

Implications for Researchers

The findings confirmed the significant role of audience in the Latino/a adolescents' engagement with literacy practices, and suggest a variety of audiences in performance projects might support Latino/a adolescents' acquisition of new literate Discourses. One way to incorporate audiences might be to include the actors in the performance community themselves. This might be accomplished in two ways: first, by including focus groups in the design and second, by incorporating written journals throughout the research process.

Researchers might also examine the issue of gender and power in Latino/a adolescents' after-school performance communities. In the last two decades, Cammarota (2004) stated, a gender shift has accounted for Latinas' steady rise in high school and college graduation rates, while Latinos' rates have declined. Latinas often use academic success to negotiate their identity and resist social constructions that position them as inferior to males. In this study, for example, Laura's actions in holding the paper over her face might be interpreted as resisting Mario's construction of her as his girlfriend. As Cammarota stated, "young Latinas assess the role of education in their resistances" to determine whether education is "helpful or hopeless" (p. 53). Laura seemed to assess the teacher as hopeless against the unmanageable binary after the only response she made to Mario's perceived disrespect was a matter-of-fact "You're being silly. I'm sick of it."

Suggestions for Further Research

This case study suggests several ideas for further research on Latino/a adolescents' after-school performance projects. First, further research might explore how an after-school performance community of Latino/a adolescents creates and uses digital recordings to enhance their performance. Further research might construct questions that address Latino/a adolescents' identity in practice, which is not discursive, but "a lived experience of participation in specific communities" (Wenger, 1998, p. 151). Further research might consider Conquergood's (1991) definition of discourse as not only verbal, but also articulated and challenged in actions. By constructing questions and adopting a methodology conducive to studying actions and words, further research would not be blinded by the visual world and fail to sense "how a performance creates effects for performers and audience alike" (Leander and Rowe, 2006, p. 431).

Second, further research might employ either a quantitative or a mixed method design to study the effects of sharing Latino/a after-school-generated performances in an in-school context on Latino/a adolescents' engagement with academic learning and performance on tests of reading comprehension. Third, a longitudinal study of a Latino/a adolescent performance community might explore how the community's meanings change over a period of several years. Finally, further case study research might explore one or two individual Latino/a adolescents' engagement with literacy in both an after-school performance community and an in-school context. These ideas are just a few examples of research that might be undertaken to move knowledge forward in this area. This study suggests there is much more to learn about Latino/a adolescents' engagement with literacy, especially in after-school performance communities.

Educational Significance

The findings in this naturalistic case study of an after-school performance community revealed that the 7th grade Latino/a adolescents constructed themselves through literate discourses, and validated their performance. Moreover, one actor constructed herself through a new critical discourse, which functioned to create new meanings and new literacies. In addition, another actor juxtaposed diverse Discourses and recognized that Discourses spoke to one another across history. The Discourse analysis of the participants' reflective responses and oral interviews revealed that the participants operated with seven Discourse models. Several of these Discourse models were put to use by the actors as evaluative Discourse models to rate their performance. These models were used to develop a Design for Performance Learning. This Design for Performance Learning contains three elements: responsibility, history, and teamwork. These three elements serve as a pedagogical blueprint for performance learning that is culturally responsive and supports academic learning.

Implementing a Design for Performance Learning for Latino/a ELLs would involve incorporating technology through student-created digital videos of performances. These digital videos would serve as a memory system, a guide on which oral performance relies, and allow adolescent ELLs to design meanings by relating linguistic, visual, gestural, audio, spatial, and multimodal modes of meaning—the six modes of meaning—in dynamic ways. Through performance learning, the actors would draw on these six modes of meaning to create a complex system of multimodal design. Then, like the actors in *Esperanza Renace*, they would establish themselves as multimodal text designers.

The findings demonstrated the significant meaning Discourses impart to language and literacy in two ways: in making meaning, and in being critical. First, by transporting meanings and values embodied in the video and converting local practices into meanings important in other contexts, the play production reflected Gee's (1996) notion that "in Discourses, mind mixes with history and society; language mixes with bodies, things, and tools...as humans go about making and being made by meaning" (p. 190). Secondly, the findings demonstrated that Discourses are insulated from critique, and unable to critique themselves. In order to critique any Discourse, an individual must have acquired at least two Discourses, and must have learned, not acquired, "meta-level knowledge about both Discourses" (Gee, 1996, p. 145). To conclude, I suggest that culturally relevant pedagogy's goal include consciousness of Discourses to help teachers and students achieve self-knowledge and improve social relationships.

Finally, I learned why I struggled as a teacher, in spite of many good intentions, to make my instruction culturally responsive for my culturally and linguistically diverse adolescents. When we, as teachers, attempt to make our classrooms culturally responsive, we must always be conscious of Discourses and realize, as Gee (1996) stated, that language and literacy, at the very least, are meaningless without them. As one of the consequences of becoming familiar with this case study, readers might reach new understandings about Discourses and their importance in validating culturally and linguistically diverse students' multiliteracies.

References

- Albers, P. & Murphy, S. (2000). *Telling Pieces: Art as literacy in middle school classes*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Albright, J., Purohit, K., & Walsh, C. (2002). Louise Rosenblatt seeks QtAznBoi@aol.com for LTR: Using chat rooms in interdisciplinary middle school classrooms. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 45, 692-705.
- Alvermann, D.E., Hinchman, K.A., Moore, D.W., Phelps, S.F., & Waff, D.R. (Eds.). (1998). *Reconceptualizing the literacies in adolescents' lives*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Au, K.H. (1980). Participation structures in a reading lesson with Hawaiian children: Analysis of a culturally appropriate instructional event. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 11, 91-115.
- Au, K. H. (1993). *Literacy instruction in multicultural settings*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Au, K.H. & Blake, K.M. (2003). Cultural identity and learning to teach in a diverse community: Findings from a collective case study. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 54, 222-227.
- Au, K. H. & Jordan, C. (1981). Teaching reading to Hawaiian children: finding a culturally appropriate solution. In H.T. Trueba, G.P. Guthrie, & K.H. Au. (Eds.).

- Culture and the bilingual classroom: Studies in classroom ethnography* (pp. 139-152). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Au, K. H. & Mason, J.M. (1981). Social organizational factors in learning to read: The balance of rights hypothesis. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 17, 115-152.
- August, D. & Hakuta, K. (Eds.) (1997). *Improving school for language minority children: A research agenda*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Bailey, F. & Pransky, K. (2005). Are “Other People’s Children” constructivist learners too? *Theory into Practice*, 44, 19-27.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. (M. Holquist, Ed., C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1984). *Rabelais and his world*. (H. Iswolsky, Trans.). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays* (V. McGee, Trans.). Austin, TX: The University of Texas Press.
- Barsalou, L.W. (1999). Perceptual symbol systems. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 22, 577-660.
- Barton, D. & Hamilton, M. (1998). *Local literacies: Reading and writing in one community*. London: Routledge.
- Bell, G. M. (2004). Catching the light: A journey of the heart and mind, an adolescent’s acquisition of a second language. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65 (02), 383. (UMI No. 3123601)

- Black, R. W. (2005). Access and affiliation: The literacy and composition practices of English-language learners in an online fanfiction community. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 49, 118-128.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power* (G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brandt, D. & Clinton, K. (2002). Limits of the local: Expanding perspectives on literacy as a social practice. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 34, 337-356.
- Broyles-Gonzalez, Y. (1994). *El Teatro Campesino: Theater in the Chicano movement*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Calkins, L. (1986). *The art of teaching writing*. London and Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Cammarota, J. (2004). The gendered and racialized pathways of Latina and Latino youth: Different struggles, different resistances in the urban context. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 35, 53-74.
- Cazden, C.B. (2002). A descriptive study of six high school Puente classrooms. *Educational Policy*, 16, 496-521.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (1995). Color blindness and basket making are not the answers: Confronting the dilemmas of race, culture, and language diversity in teacher education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32, 493-522.

- Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). The multiple meanings of multicultural teacher education: A conceptual framework. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 30, 7-26.
- Conquergood, D. (1991). Rethinking ethnography: Towards a critical cultural politics. *Communication Monographs*, 58, 179-194.
- Cope, B. & Kalantsis, M. (2000). Introduction: Multiliteracies: The beginning of an idea. In B. Cope & M. Kalantsis (Eds.). *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures* (pp. 3-8). London: Routledge.
- Covello, L. (1968). The social background of the Italo-American school child: A study of the South Italian family mores and their effect on the school situation in Italy and America. Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill.
- Cowan, P. M. (2003). *Lowrider art: Latino visual literacy and border knowledge*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Cowan, P. M. (2005). Putting it out there: Revealing Latino discourse in the Hispanic Academic Summer Program for middle school students. In B. V. Street (Ed.). *Literacies across educational contexts: Mediating learning and teaching* (pp. 145-169). Philadelphia: Caslon Publishing.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among the five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting education success for language minority students. In *Schooling and language minority student: A theoretical framework* (pp. 3-49). Los Angeles: California State University Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.

- Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56, 18-36.
- De Castell, S., & Luke, A. (1983/1988). Defining “literacy” in North American schools. In E.R. Kintgen, B.M. Kroll, & M. Rose (Eds.). *Perspectives on literacy* (pp. 159-174). Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1990). *Literacy for empowerment: The role of parents in children’s education*. New York: The Falmer Press.
- Delpit, L. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people’s children. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58, 280-298.
- Dietrich, D. & Ralph, K.S. (1995). Crossing borders: Multicultural literature in the classroom. *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, 15, 1-8.
- Donato, R. (1997). *The other struggle for equal schools: Mexican Americans during the civil rights era*. Albany, NY: State University of New York.
- Dyson, A.H. (1997). Children out of bounds: The power of case studies in expanding visions of literacy development. In J. Flood, S.B. Heath, & D. Lapp (Eds.). *Handbook of research on teaching literacy through the communicative and visual arts* (pp. 167-180). New York: Simon & Schuster MacMillan.
- Edelsky, C. (1982). Writing in a bilingual program: The relation of L1 and L2 texts. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16, 211-228.
- Erikson, E.H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.

- Farr, M. & Barajas, E.D. (2005). Latinos and diversity in a global city: Language and identity at home, school, church, and work. In M. Farr (Ed.). *Latino language and literacy in ethnolinguistic Chicago* (pp. 3-32). Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- Faulkner, V. (2005). Adolescent literacies with the middle years of schooling-A case study of a year 8 homeroom. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 49, 108-117.
- Ferdman, B. (1990). Literacy and cultural identity. *Harvard Educational Review*, 60, 181-204.
- Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J.S. (1998). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ford, D.Y., & Grantham, T.C. (2003). Providing access for culturally diverse gifted students: From deficit to dynamic thinking. *Theory Into Practice*, 42, 217-225.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings (1972-1977)* (C. Gordon, L. Marshall, J. Mepham, & K. Soper, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1984). Truth and power. In P. Rabinow (Ed.). *The Foucault Reader* (pp. 51-75). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Freire, P. (1970/2003). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1995). A dialogue: Culture, language, and race. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65, 379-401.
- Fries, C. (1945). *Teaching and learning English as a second language*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

- García, S.B., & Guerra, P.L. (2004). Deconstructing deficit thinking: Working with educators to create more equitable learning environments. *Education and Urban Society, 36*, 150-168.
- Garmon, M.A. (2004). Changing preservice teachers' attitudes/beliefs about diversity: What are the critical factors? *Journal of Teacher Education, 55*, 201-213.
- Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*, 106-116.
- Gee, J. P. (1989a). What do English teachers teach? (or Why isn't the Pope a bachelor?). *Journal of Education, 171*, 135-146.
- Gee, J. P. (1989b). Literacy, discourse, and linguistics: Introduction. *Journal of Education, 171*, 5-17.
- Gee, J.P. (1989c). "Literariness," formalism, and sense making: The line and stanza structure of human thought. *Journal of Education, 171*, 61-74.
- Gee, J. P. (1989d). Orality and literacy: From The Savage Mind to Ways With Words. *Journal of Education, 171*, 39-60.
- Gee, J. P. (1989e). The Legacies of Literacy: From Plato to Freire through Harvey Graff. *Journal of Education, 171*, 147-176.
- Gee, J. P. (1990/1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Gee, J. P. (1999). The future of the social turn: Social minds and the new capitalism. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 32*, 61-68.
- Gee, J. P. (2003). *What video games have to teach us about learning and literacy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Gee, J. P. (2004). New times and new literacies: Themes for a changing world. In A. F. Ball & S. W. Freedman (Eds.). *Bakhtinian perspectives on language, literacy, and Learning* (pp. 279-306). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Gee, J. P. (2005). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. New York: Routledge.
- Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory; strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Godina, H. (2004). Contradictory literacy practices of Mexican-background students: An ethnography from the rural Midwest. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 28, 153-180.
- Goldman, S., Reyes, M., & Varnhagen, C. (1984). Understanding fables in first and second languages. *NABE Journal*, 8, 35-66.
- Goldstein, T. (2002). *No pain, no gain: Student playwriting as critical ethnographic language research*. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 59, 54-76.
- Goodman, Y.M. & Goodman, K.S. (1994). To err is human: Learning about language processes by analyzing miscues. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.). *Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading*, 4th edition (pp. 104-123). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Goody, J., & Watt, I. (1968/1988). The consequences of literacy. In E.R. Kintgen, B.M. Kroll, & M. Rose (Eds.). *Perspectives on literacy* (pp. 3-27). Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Grabe, W. & Kaplan, R.B. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing: An applied linguistic perspective*. New York: Longman.

- Grady, K. (2002). Lowrider art and Latino students in the rural Midwest. In Wortham, S., Murillo, E.G., Jr., & Hamann, E.T. (Eds.). *Education in the new Latino diaspora: Policy and the politics of Identity* (pp. 169-192). Westport, Connecticut: Ablex Publishing.
- Graff, H. (1981). *Literacy in history: An interdisciplinary research bibliography*. New York: Garland.
- Graff, H. J. (1982/1988). The legacies of literacy. In E.R. Kintgen, B.M. Kroll, & M. Rose (Eds.). *Perspectives on literacy* (pp. 82-94). Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Graves, D. (1983). *Writing: Teachers and children at work*. London and Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Gutiérrez, K. D. (2001). What's new in the English language arts: challenging policies and practices, y que? *Language Arts*, 78, 564-569.
- Gutiérrez, K., Baquedano-López, & Turner, M. G. (1997). Putting language back into language arts: When the radical middle meets the third space. *Language Arts*, 74, 368-378.
- Gutiérrez, K.D., & Stone, L.D. (2000). Synchronic and diachronic dimensions of social practice: An emerging methodology for cultural-historical perspectives on literacy learning. In C.D. Lee and P. Smagorinsky (Eds.). *Vygotskian perspectives on literacy research: Constructing meaning through collaborative inquiry* (pp. 150-164). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Guzzetti, B.J. & Gamboa, M. (2004). Zines for social justice: Adolescent girls writing on their own. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 39, 408-436.

- Halliday, M.A.K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of Language and meaning*. London: Edward Arnold Publishers.
- Hamann, E.T., Wortham, S., & Murillo, E.G., Jr. (2002). Education and policy in the new Latino diaspora. In Wortham, S., Murillo, E.G., Jr., & Hamann, E.T. (Eds.). *Education in the new Latino diaspora: Policy and the politics of Identity* (pp. 1-16). Westport, Connecticut: Ablex Publishing.
- Hansen-Thomas, H. H. (2005). Learning to use math discourse in a standards-based, reform-oriented middle school classroom: How Latina/o ELLs become socialized into the math community of practice. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 66 (07), 2469. (UMI No. 3183948)
- Harklau, L. (2000). From the “good kids” to the “worst”: Representations of English language learners across educational settings. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34, 35-67.
- Heath, S.B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Helmar-Selasoo, E., Bronner, S.J., & Bonissone, P.R. (2002). An effective teacher in a newcomers’ school. In J.A. Langer (Ed.). *Effective literacy instruction: Building successful reading and writing programs* (pp. 99-135). Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Hochtritt, L. J. (2004). Creating meaning and constructing identity through collaborative art practices among urban adolescents. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65 (06), 2062. (UMI No. 3135346)
- Hodgkinson, H. (2002). Demographics and teacher education: An overview. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53, 102-105.

- Hornberger, N.H. & Skilton-Sylvester, E. (2000). Revisiting the continua of biliteracy: International and critical perspectives. *Language and Education, 14*, 96- 122.
- Hubbard, R.S. & Shorey, V. (2003). Worlds beneath the words: Writing workshops with second language learners. *Language Arts, 81*, 52-61.
- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Jacob, E. (1992). Culture, Context, and Cognition. In M.D. LeCompte, W.L. Millroy, & J. Preissle (Eds.). *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Jiménez, R. T. (1997). The strategic reading abilities and potential of five low-literacy Latina/o readers in middle school. *Reading Research Quarterly, 32*, 224-243.
- Jiménez, R. T. (2000). Literacy and the identity development of Latina/o students. *American Educational Research Journal, 37*, 971-1000.
- Jiménez, R. T. (2001). “It’s a difference that changes us”: An alternative view of the language and literacy learning needs of Latina/o students. *The Reading Teacher, 54*, 736- 742.
- Johnson, L. (2002). “My eyes have been opened”: White teachers and racial awareness. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*, 153-167.
- Johnson, M. (2004). *A philosophy of second language acquisition*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kanno, Y. (2003). *Negotiating bilingual and bicultural identities: Japanese returnees betwixt two worlds*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Kaestle, C. F. (1985/1988). The history of literacy and the history of readers. In E.R. Kintgen, B.M. Kroll, & M. Rose (Eds.). *Perspectives on literacy* (pp. 95-126). Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.
- King, J. R. & O'Brien, D.G. (2002). Adolescents' multiliteracies and their teachers' needs to know: Toward a digital détente. In D. E. Alvermann (Ed.). *Adolescents and literacies in a digital world* (pp. 40-50). New York: Peter Lang.
- Kist, W. (2005). *New literacies in action: Teaching and learning in multiple media*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kramsch, C. (2000). Social discursive constructions of self in L2 learning. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.) *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 133-153). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. London: Longman.
- Kress, G.R. (2003). *Literacy in the new media age*. London: Routledge.
- Kress, G.R., & van Leeuwen, T. (1996). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design*. London: Routledge.
- Kress, G.R., & van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Multimodal Discourse: The modes and media of contemporary communication*. London: Arnold.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1992). Reading between the lines and beyond the pages: A culturally relevant approach to literacy teaching. *Theory into Practice*, 31, 312-320.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32, 465-491.

- Lam, W.S.E. (2000). L2 literacy and the design of the self: A case study of a teenager writing on the internet. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34, 457-482.
- Lankshear, C. (1997). *Changing literacies*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Lankshear, C. & Knobel, M. (2003). *New literacies: Changing knowledge and classroom learning*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Latour, B. (1993). *We have never been modern*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leander, K.M., & Rowe, D.W. (2006). Mapping literacy spaces in motion: A rhizomatic Analysis of a classroom literacy performance. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 41, 428-460.
- LeCompte, M.D., Preissle, J., and Tesch, R. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Lee, V.E., & Croninger, R.G. (1994). The relative importance of home and school in the development of literacy skills for middle-grade students. *American Journal of Education*, 102, 286-323.
- Leki, I. (1995). Coping strategies of ESL students in writing tasks across the curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 235-260.
- Leki, I. (2004). Meaning and development of academic literacy in a second language. In B. Huot, B. Stroble, C. Bazerman (Eds.). *Multiple literacies for the 21st century* (pp. 115-128). Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press.
- Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Long, M. H. (1997). Construct validity in SLA research: A response to Firth and Wagner. *Modern Language Journal*, 82, 357-371.
- Lucas, T., Henze, R. & Donato, R. (1990). Promoting the success of Latino language-minority students: An exploratory study of six high schools. *Harvard Educational Review*, 60, 315-340.
- Luke, A. (1996). Genres of power? Literacy education and the production of capital. In R. Hasan & G. Williams (Eds.). *Literacy in society* (pp. 308-338). Edinburgh Gate: Addison, Wesley, Longman.
- Maguire, M.H. and Graves, B. (2001). Speaking personalities in primary school children's L2 writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35, 561-593.
- Major, E.M. & Brock, C.H. (2003). Fostering positive dispositions toward diversity: Dialogical explorations of a moral dilemma. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 30, 7-26.
- Mansfield, N. (2000). *Subjectivity: Theories of the self from Freud to Haraway*. St. Leonards, NSW, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Maxwell, J.A. (1996). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- McCarthy, S.J. (1994). Authors, text, and talk: The internalization of dialogue from social interaction during writing. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 29, 201-231.
- McCarthy, S.J. (2001). Identity construction in elementary readers and writers. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 36, 122-151.

- McCarthy, S.J., López-Velásquez, A.M, García, G.E., Lin, S., & Guo, Y. (2004). Understanding writing contexts for English language learners. *Research in The Teaching of English, 38*, 351-394.
- McLuhan, M. (1962). *The Gutenberg galaxy: The making of typographic man*. Toronto, Canada: The University of Toronto Press.
- McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding media: The extensions of man*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Mignolo, W.D. (1995/2003). *The darker side of the Renaissance: Literacy, territoriality, and colonization*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Miles, M.B., and Huberman, M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook of methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Moje, E. B. (2000). “To be part of the story”: The literacy practices of gangsta adolescents. *Teachers College Record, 102*, 651-690.
- Moje, E.B., Collazo, T., Carrillo, R., & Marx, R.W. (2001). “Maestro, what is ‘quality’?”: Language, literacy, and discourse in project-based science. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38*, 469-498.
- Moje, E. B. (2002). Re-framing adolescent literacy research for new times: Studying youth as a resource. *Reading Research and Instruction, 41*, 211-228.
- Moll, L. C. (1988). Some key issues in teaching Latino students. *Language Arts, 65*, 465-472.

- Moll, L., Sáez, R., & Dworkin, J. (2001). Exploring biliteracy: Two student case examples of writing as a social practice. *Elementary School Journal, 101*, 435-449.
- Moore-Hart, M.A. (2002). Creating a pathway to multicultural education in urban communities: Real-life experiences for preservice teachers. *Reading Horizons, 42*, 139-173.
- Muñoz Ryan, P. (2000). *Esperanza rising*. New York: Scholastic.
- Murillo, E.G., Jr. (2002). How does it feel to be a problem?: “Disciplining” the transnational subject in the American south. In Wortham, S., Murillo, E.G., Jr., & Hamann, E.T. (Eds.). *Education in the new Latino diaspora: Policy and the politics of Identity* (pp. 215-240). Westport, Connecticut: Ablex Publishing.
- National Center for Education Statistics (2003). Language minority school-age children, elementary/secondary education. Retrieved November 11, 2005, from <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe>
- New London Group (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*, 60-92.
- Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. New York: Longman.
- Norton-Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*, 9-32.
- O’Byrne, B. (2001). Needed: A compass to navigate the multilingual English classroom. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 44*, 440-449.

- Ogbu, J. U. (1991). Immigrant and involuntary minorities in comparative perspective. In M.A. Gibson & J.U. Ogbu (Eds.). *Minority status and schooling: A comparative study of immigrant and involuntary minorities* (pp. 3-36). New York: Garland Publishing.
- Ong, W.J. (1982). *Orality and literacy: The technologizing of the word*. London: Routledge.
- Ortiz, F. (1940/1995). *Cuban counterpoint: Tobacco and sugar*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Palincsar, A.S., & Brown, A.L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction, 1*, 117-175.
- Parks, S. (2001). Moving from school to the workplace: Disciplinary innovation, border crossings, and the reshaping of a written genre. *Applied Linguistics, 22*, 405-438.
- Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Pradl, G.M. (2002). Linking instructional intervention and professional development: Using the ideas behind Puente High School English to inform educational policy. *Educational Policy, 16*, 522-546.
- Raimes, A. (1991). Out of the woods: Emerging traditions in the teaching of writing. *TESOL Quarterly, 25*, 407-30.
- Reyes, C.C. (2001). Language and literacy mediating school experience: An ethnographic case study of a high school Latina. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 62* (07), 2320. (UMI No. 3019420)

- Riojas-Cortez, M., Flores, B.B., Smith, H.L., & Clark, E.R. (2003). Cuéntame un cuento [Tell me a story]: bridging family literacy traditions with school literacy. *Language Arts, 81*, 62-71.
- Rodriguez, L. J. (1993). *Always running, La vida loca: Gang days in L.A.* Willimantic, CT: Curbstone Press.
- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: cognitive development in social context.* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rubinstein-Avila, E. (2001). From their points of view: Literacies among Latino immigrant students. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 62* (04), 1306. (UMI No. 3012932)
- Ruddell, R.B., & Unrau, N.J. (1994). Reading as a meaning-construction process: The reader, the text, and the teacher. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.). *Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading*, 4th edition (pp. 996-1056). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group (1994). Constructing literacy in classrooms: Literate action as social accomplishment. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.). *Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading*, 4th edition (pp. 124-154). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Scribner, S. & Cole, M. (1981/1988). Unpacking literacy. In E.R. Kintgen, B.M. Kroll, & M. Rose (Eds.). *Perspectives on literacy* (pp. 57-70). Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Seidman, I. (1998). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences.* New York: Teachers College Press.

- Seller, M.S. (1994). *Immigrant women*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.
- Short, D. J. (2000). Teacher discourse in social studies classrooms: How teachers promote academic literacy for English language learners. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61* (05), 1718. (UMI No. 9972030)
- Siegel, M. & Fernandez, S.L. (2000). Critical approaches to reading research. In M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson, & R.Barr (Eds.). *Handbook of Reading Research, Vol. 3* (pp. 141-152). Mahwah, N. J.: Erlbaum.
- Skinner, B.F. (1953). *Science and human behavior*. New York: Macmillan.
- Sleeter, C.E. (1996). *Multicultural education as social activism*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Sleeter, C.E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*, 94-106.
- Smagorinsky, P., Cook, L. S., & Reed, P. M. (2005). The construction of meaning and identity in the composition and reading of an architectural text. *Reading Research Quarterly, 40*, 70-88.
- Smedley, A. (1999). *Race in North America: Origin and evolution of a worldview*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Stake, R.E. (1994). Case Study: Composition and Performance. *The Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 122*, 31-44.
- Stake, R.E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Stapleton, P. (2002). Critiquing voice as a viable pedagogical tool in L2 writing: Returning the spotlight to ideas. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*, 177-190.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Street, B. V. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Street, B. V. (1995). *Social literacies: Critical approaches to literacy in development, ethnography and education*. London: Longman.
- Street, B. V. (2005a). Introduction: New literacy studies and literacies across educational contexts. In B. V. Street (Ed.). *Literacies across educational contexts: Mediating learning and teaching*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- Street, B. V. (2005b, December). *Literacy, 'technology' and multimodality: Implications for pedagogy and curriculum*. Plenary presentation at the 55th annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Miami, FL.
- Suárez-Orozco, M. M. (2001). Globalization, immigration, and education: The research agenda. *Harvard Educational Review, 71*, 345-365.
- Suárez-Orozco, M. M., & Páez, M. M. (2002). The research agenda. In M.M. Suárez-Orozco, & M.M. Páez (Eds.). *Latinos: Remaking America* (pp. 1-30). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

- Takaki, R. (1993). *A different mirror: A history of multicultural America*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
- Thompson, M. K. (2005). Intersecting literacies: Connecting culture, ethnicity and gender. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 66 (05), 1625. (UMI No. 3175520)
- Tiede, K. D. (1996). Appropriating the discourse of science: A case study of a grade eight science class. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 58 (06), 2041. (UMI No. NN19037)
- Trueba, H.T. (2004). *The new Americans: Immigrants and transnationals at work*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Van Kleeck, A. (2004). Fostering preliteracy development via storybook sharing interactions: The cultural context of mainstream family practices. In C.A. Stone, E.R.Silliman, F.J.Ehren & K.Apel (Eds.). *Handbook of Language and Literacy: Development and disorders* (pp.175-208). New York: Guilford Press.
- VanPatten, B. (1996). *Input processing and grammar instruction: Theory and research*. Norwood, N. J.: Ablex.
- Van Sluys, K. (2003). Writing and identity construction: A young author's life in transition. *Language Arts*, 80, 176-184.
- Vollmer, C. G. (2000). Classroom contexts for academic literacy: The intersection of language and writing development in secondary ESL classrooms. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62 (01), 106. (UMI No. 3002305)
- Viggiano, R. (2003). Cultural integration through storytelling in art and language: An action research project with junior high Latino immigrant students. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64 (05), 1591. (UMI No. 3091304)

- Vyas, S. (2004). Exploring bicultural identities of Asian high school students through the analytic window of a literature club. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 48, 12-23.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Warshauer, M., Knobel, M., & Stone, L. (2004). Technology and equity in schooling: Deconstructing the digital divide. *Educational Policy*, 18, 562-588.
- Weinstein, S. (2002). The writing on the wall: Attending to self-motivated student literacies. *English Education*, 35, 21-45.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wertsch, J.V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Willis, A. I. (1995). Reading the world of school literacy: Contextualizing the experience of a young African American male. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65, 30-49.
- Wolcott, H.F. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data: Description, analysis, and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ybarra, R.E. (2004). Writing as a hostile act: A reason for Latino students' resistance to learning. In R.E. Ybarra, & N. López (Eds.). *Creating alternative discourses in the education of Latinos and Latinas: A reader* (pp. 89-112). New York: Peter Lang.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Zamel, V. (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17, 165-187.
- Zentella, A. C. (2005). Perspectives on language and literacy in Latino families and communities. In A.C. Zentella (Ed.). *Building on strength: Language and literacy in Latino families and communities* (pp. 1-12). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Zhu, W. (2001). Performing argumentative writing in English: Difficulties, processes, and strategies. *TESL Canada Journal*, 19, 34-50.

Appendices

Appendix A: Consent/Assent Forms

Parental Consent Letter

Dear Parents or Guardians:

My name is Mary-Virginia Feger and I am a graduate student in the Department of Childhood Education at the University of South Florida. My academic advisor, Dr. Kathryn Laframboise, and I would like to include your child and his/her classmates in a study called: Literacy events in an ESOL class. This study is taking place only in the 7th grade ESOL class. For the purpose of this study, we need your permission. You are only invited to participate in this study.

As part of his/her regularly scheduled ESOL (English) program, your child will have the opportunity:

- To practice literacy events such as reading and writing.
- To discuss various types of writing and how they are used in different contexts.
- To use vocabulary to discuss the arrangement and design of his/her texts.
- To discuss the construction of his/her texts.
- To participate in a theatrical play with his/her classmates.

This study will occur in the following manner:

1. On the first day, there will be an informative meeting at which I will explain the consent form.
2. On the following day, I will be in the classroom to collect your consent forms.
3. During the next six weeks, there will be 10-12 students that will participate in the phase "text discussion." These students will meet with me in three short sessions that will be tape-recorded concerning their writing and literacy events in the ESOL class. The time needed for each interview is 30 minutes. The interview will take place before school in the ESOL classroom, or after school in the ESOL classroom. The total time for each student's participation in the interviews will be approximately 1 and one half hours.
4. In May, the whole class will participate in a dramatic phase that will be videotaped.
5. The total time for this study is nine weeks, from April through May.
6. The texts that your child shares will be copied but at no time will the name of your child appear on them.

Your child's participation in this study is completely voluntary and

- There are no known risks involved in this study. The benefits are that your child's writing and reading may improve.

Appendix A: (continued) Consent/Assent Forms

- Any child can decide not to participate in this study at time.
- Also, parents have the ability to decline permission for their child's participation at any time and for any reason.
- We will not identify your child, or your child's teachers, or the name of the school in any report.
- Only the author of the study, or the Institutional Review Board of USF and the personnel who represent USF are allowed to review these documents.
- The results of this study will be used as a report, in a journal article, or in a conference presentation.
- Pseudonyms will be used to replace any identifying information in all publications or public presentations.
- At no time will the name of your child, the teacher, or the school be used and the information obtained will not be part of your child's record or the records of the school.

If you want your child to participate in this study, please

- Read and sign the consent forms attached to this letter.
- Keep a copy of the form for yourself and send a signed copy to your child's ESOL class.
- Also, please read the letter to your child and have them sign the attached form.

By signing this form, you agree that

1. We have informed you of the study's purpose and
2. You are giving permission for your child to participate.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please feel free to contact Mary-Virginia Feger at (941) 586-9035.

PLEASE SIGN THE OFFICIAL PARENT CONSENT FORM AND RETURN IT TO THE ESOL CLASS on _____.

Sincerely,
Mary-Virginia Feger
Principal Investigator

Signature of Parent or guardian

date

Signature of Student

date

Appendix A: (continued) Parental Consent/Spanish

Formulario de Consentimiento para los Padres y sus Niños

Queridos Padres o Guardianes:

Me llamo Mary-Virginia Feger y soy una estudiante de postgrado del Departamento de Educación Infantil de la Universidad del Sur de la Florida. A mi consejera académica, la doctora K. Laframboise y yo nos gustaría incluir a su niño(a) junto con sus compañeros de clase en un estudio titulado: Los eventos alfabetizaciones en una clase de ESOL. Este estudio se está solamente en el séptimo grado de ESOL (inglés). Por el propósito de este estudio necesitamos su permiso.

Como parte de su clase regular programada de ESOL (inglés), su niño(a) tendrá la oportunidad:

- de practicar los eventos alfabetizaciones como lectura y escritura.
- de discutir los varios tipos de escritura y como se úsalos en contextos diferentes.
- de usar el vocabulario para discutir el arreglo y diseño de sus textos.
- de discutir la construcción de sus textos.

El estudio se llevará a cabo de la siguiente manera:

1. El primer día, habrá una reunión informativa donde entregaré el formulario de consentimiento.
2. El siguiente día, estaré en el salón de clase para recoger sus formularios de consentimiento.
3. Durante las próximas seis semanas, habrán entre 10 y 12 estudiantes que participaran en la fase “discusión de textos.” Estos alumnos se entrevistarán conmigo en tres sesiones cortas que se grabarán acerca de su escritura y los eventos alfabetizaciones de ESOL. El tiempo que se necesita para cada entrevista es 30 minutos. Las tres entrevistas se efectuarán antes de la escuela en el salón de ESOL, o después de la escuela en el salón de ESOL o durante el almuerzo. El tiempo total de la participación de cada estudiante en las entrevistas pudiera ser aproximadamente 1 y media horas.
4. En Mayo, toda la clase se participarán en la fase dramática que se grabará en un video.
5. El tiempo total de este estudio es un período de seis semanas, de Abril hasta Mayo.
6. Los textos que su niño(a) compartirá serán reproducidos pero en ningún momento el nombre de su niño(a) será nombrado.
7. Durante la clase, su niño(a) participará en las actividades diarias que la maestra ha planeado. Observaré y tomaré notas acerca de las actividades diarias.

Appendix A: (continued) Parental Consent/Spanish

La participación de su niño(a) en este estudio es completamente voluntaria, y

- No se conocen riesgos que este estudio pueda comprender, y los beneficios son que la habilidad de escritura y lectura de su niño(a) pueda mejorar.
- Elijir a participar o no participar en este estudio no afectará el nivel de aprendizaje de su niño(a).
- Ud. también tiene la libertad de retirar su permiso para la participación de su niño(a) en cualquier momento y por cualquier razón.
- Toda la información que se obtenga durante este estudio será mantenida confidencialmente.
- Solo el personal autorizado de la investigación o la Junta de Revisión Institucional de USF y el personal que representa a USF puede revisar nuestros documentos.
- Los resultados de este estudio podrían ser usados para un reporte, en un artículo en un periódico, o en una presentación en una conferencia.
- Se usarán seudónimos en lugar de cualquier información de identificación en todas las publicaciones o presentaciones públicas.
- El nombre del niño(a), de la maestra, y de la escuela no será revelado en ningún informe. En otras palabras, la información obtenida en este estudio no formará parte del archivo de la escuela.
- No hay una remuneración para la participación de su niño(a) en este estudio.

Si desea que su niño(a) participe en este estudio, por favor

- Lea y firme los formularios de consentimiento adjuntos a esta carta.
- Quédese con una copia del formulario para Ud. y mande una copia firmada a la clase de ESOL (inglés).
- Al firmar este formulario Ud. verifica que
 1. Le hemos informado sobre el estudio y su propósito.
 2. Ud. está permitiendo que su niño(a) participe.

Si tiene alguna pregunta o preocupación acerca de este estudio, usted puede contactar Mary-Virginia Feger al teléfono (941) 586-9035. Si tiene alguna pregunta acerca de sus derechos como participante en este estudio, usted puede contactar la Junta de Revisión Institucional (IRB) en la Universidad del Sur de la Florida (USF) al teléfono (813) 974-5638.

POR FAVOR FIRME EL FORMULARIO DE CONSENTIMIENTO OFICIAL Y DEVUELVALO A LA CLASE DE ESOL el _____.

Sinceramente,

Mary-Virginia Feger, Investigadora Principal

Firma del padre o guardián

fecha

Firma del estudiante

fecha

Informed Consent for an Adult
Social and Behavioral Sciences
University of South Florida

Title of research study: Literacy events in an ESOL classroom

Person in charge of study: Mary-Virginia Feger

Study Location: XXX Middle School

This form outlines the procedures involved in this study. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary.

Before your decision:

- After reading about the study, you will be asked to sign this consent form.
- If you have any questions, consult with the principal investigator, who is responsible for the study.
- Read this consent form in order to understand what this study involves.

Questions are welcomed:

- If, during the course of the study, you have any questions, ask the principal investigator to provide answers.

After you read this form, you can:

- This study is completely voluntary. If you want to participate in the study, you can indicate your approval by signing the consent form. Take your time to think about it. Remember, if you do not want to participate, you do not have to sign the form.

The purpose of this study:

- The purpose of this study is to provide a detailed portrait of the literacy events in which 7th grade English learners engage and interview participants about their views of literacy events and texts. You are being asked to participate because you are a bilingual teacher with the knowledge and disposition to be culturally responsive. For linguistically and culturally diverse students, teachers who are culturally responsive create positive contexts and provide changes for students to discover pride in their ethnicities, languages, and cultural identities.
- Your participation will begin in April, 2006 and conclude when school ends in May, 2006.
- Study visits will be 4 days per week for 4 hours each day. There will be a total of 27-29 visits to the classroom. In addition, the evening class performance will be videotaped.

What other choices do you have if you decide not to take part?

- If you decide not to take part in this study, that is okay. There are no other options available; therefore the study will not take place in your classroom.

How do you get started?

- If you decide to take part in this study, you will need to sign this consent form.

The procedures in this study:

- 3) The principal investigator will write participant observations of the literacy events in the classroom, and
- 4) You will be asked to participate in 3 interviews of 30 minutes each. These interviews can take place at your convenience either before school, after school, or at lunch. These interviews will be tape-recorded and transcribed. You will be given a copy of the transcriptions to review for accuracy.
- 5) 10-12 students will be asked to participate in interviews. These will not interrupt classroom instruction, but will be done before school, during lunch, or after school in the library, cafeteria, or classroom.
- 6) The class performance, which is held in the evening, will be videotaped.

Will you be paid for taking part in this study?

- There will be no payment for participation in this study.
- There will be no costs to you to participate in this study.

What are the potential benefits if you take part in this study?

- The benefit of taking part in this study is the opportunity for reflection and discussion about the multiliteracies of culturally diverse students.

What are the risks if you take part in this study?

There are very few risks to those who take part in this study. The risk to your confidentiality will be minimized by protecting your anonymity throughout the course of the study and in the study report. Your name, the students' names, the school's name, and the school district's name will not be used in the study report. Instead, they will be replaced with pseudonyms. The results will not become part of any personnel file or student record in the school, or in the school district.

In addition to the study report, the results may be used in articles, or in conference presentations. If so, your name or anything else that would let people know who you are will not be used.

If you decide not to take part in this study, there are no penalties of any kind. If you join the study and then later decide you want to stop, you may do so at any time by telling the principal investigator.

If you have any questions about this study, call Mary-Virginia Feger at (941) 586-9035.

If you have questions about your rights as a person who is taking part in a study, call USF Research Compliance at (813) 974-5638.

Consent to Take Part in this Research Study

Your decision is voluntary. If you want to take part in this study, you can sign below.

I freely give my consent to take part in this study. I understand that this is research. I have received a copy of this consent form.

Signature
of Person taking part in study

Printed Name
of Person taking part in study

Date

Statement of Person Obtaining Informed Consent

I have carefully explained to the person taking part in the study what he or she can expect. The person who is giving consent understands the information contained in this consent form and their participation is voluntary.

Signature of Investigator

Printed Name of Investigator

Date

Assent to Participate in Research

University of South Florida

Information for Individuals under the Age of 18 Who Are Being Asked To
Take Part in Research Studies

TITLE OF STUDY: Literacy events in an ESOL Class

WHY AM I BEING ASKED TO TAKE PART IN THIS RESEARCH?

You are being asked to take part in a research study about literacy events. You are being asked to take part in this research study because you are a 7th grade ESOL student in XXX Middle School. If you take part in this study, you will be one of about 10-12 students in this study.

WHO IS DOING THE STUDY?

The person in charge of this study is Mary-Virginia Feger of the University of South Florida. She is being guided in this research by Dr. Laframboise.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY?

By doing this study, we hope to learn about the writing and drawing that 7th grade English learners do.

WHERE IS THE STUDY GOING TO TAKE PLACE AND HOW LONG WILL IT LAST?

The study will take place at XXX Middle School. You will be asked to come to the classroom 3 times before or after school or to the library during your lunch time (whatever is convenient). Each of those visits will take about 30 minutes. The total amount of time you will be asked to volunteer for this study is one and one-half hours between April 5 and May 22, 2006.

WHAT WILL I BE ASKED TO DO?

I will ask you to share some of your writing or drawings with me. I will ask you some questions about your writing and drawings. I will ask you about how you learn about writing and drawing and how you share your ideas about writing and drawing with others.

You will be asked to talk about your writing or drawings and your answers will be tape-recorded. During the class, you will be participating in normal activities that the teacher has planned and I will observe. Later, in May, there will be a class performance in which you may participate. I will video tape the performance. The teacher's instruction is a part

of the normal activity in this class and I will observe how the normal activities of the classroom happen.

WHAT THINGS MIGHT HAPPEN THAT ARE NOT PLEASANT?

To the best of our knowledge, the things you will be doing will not harm you or cause you any additional unpleasant experience.

WILL SOMETHING GOOD HAPPEN IF I TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?

We cannot promise you that anything good will happen if you decide to take part in this study.

DO I HAVE TO TAKE PART IN THE STUDY?

You should talk with your parents or anyone else that you trust about taking part in this study. If you do not want to take part in the study, that is your decision. You should take part in this study because you really want to volunteer.

If you do not think you want to take part in this study, you should talk this over with your parents and decide together.

IF I DON'T WANT TO TAKE PART IN THE STUDY, WHAT WILL HAPPEN?

If you do not want to take part in the study, there are other choices. For example, you could continue to participate in the class and I would not ask you any questions. You would still benefit from the ESOL class just as you normally would when you participate every day.

WILL I RECEIVE ANY REWARDS FOR TAKING PART IN THE STUDY?

You will not receive any reward for taking part in this study.

WHO WILL SEE THE INFORMATION I GIVE?

Your information will be added to the information from other people taking part in the study so no one will know who you are.

No one, not even the people who are doing this study, will know that the information you give comes from you.

CAN I CHANGE MY MIND AND QUIT?

If you decide to take part in the study you still have the right to change your mind later. No one will think badly of you if you decide to quit. Also, the people who are running this study may need for you to stop. If this happens, they will tell you why.

WHAT IF I HAVE QUESTIONS?

You can ask questions about this study at any time. You can talk with your parents or other adults that you trust about this study. You can talk with the person who is asking you to volunteer. If you think of other questions later, you can ask them.

Assent to Participate

I understand what the person running this study is asking me to do. I have thought About this and agree to take part in this study.

Name of person agreeing to take part in the study

Date

Name of person providing information to subject

Date

Appendix B: Teacher Interview Questions

Teacher Interview #1

1. This is the third performance you've done with the 7th grade class. What are your objective/s for these performances?
2. What inspired you to develop the performance?
3. Are there any differences between the efforts of this year's students and the efforts of previous years' students?
4. At this point who is the top student in terms of reaching the objectives? What qualifies that student?
5. What are your major frustrations at this point?
6. What role do the parents play?
7. What has been the reaction of the students to the story of *Esperanza Rising*?
8. Often different students play different roles, the location of practice changes, or the script has been changed. How do these changes affect the plan?

Teacher Interview #2

1. Do you notice at some points they are different when they are involved in the play? Why is that?
2. What are you going to say to parents on day of the performance?

Teacher Interview #3

1. What is the first criterion for assessment?
2. What knowledge do they need to have?
3. What about working with others?
4. What defines self-control?
5. Do they support one another and what does that involve?
6. What about leadership?
7. What does a student need to do to be a leader?
8. Are they collaborating?
9. Do you think the students understand the purpose of the play?

Teacher Interview #4

1. Would you clarify what you mean by constructive?
2. Why do you emphasize the social aspect of presenting before other students?
3. Is that what you mean by constructive?
4. Is that what you mean by it, behavioral?

Teacher Interview #5

1. Who was Cantinflas?
2. Do you think teachers can make room for everybody to perform?

Appendix B (continued): Teacher Interview Questions

3. The kids who weren't successful, like one wrote, "I was in the first play, and you kicked me out," what can teachers do for those kinds of students who refuse to go along with the teacher's request? What can teachers do with those kinds of students?
4. The kids play around. What do you think the playing around is?
5. The group was basically all Mexican and they were all playing around. Their playing around was a tension between the teacher and them. Then towards the end, it changed. Right before the play, they got serious. In the dress rehearsal, the atmosphere was totally different.
6. What did they learn from the play?
7. Tell me about your interest in China.

Appendix C: Student Interview Questions

Student Interview #1

1. Why does the teacher care a lot about this performance?
2. Why do you try your best?
3. What does the teacher expect from you?
4. What do you tell your parents about this performance?
5. What makes the performance fun?
6. How long have you been at this school?
7. Where did you go to school before this?

Student Interview #2

1. What makes this performance different from things you do in other classes? In what ways?
2. Are your parents interested in your performance? If so, why?
3. What do you learn from participation in this performance?

Appendix D: Data Collection Matrix

Research question	Data collected	Data analysis
1. What happens when a group of 7 th grade Latino/a ELLs and their Latina teacher produce a play in an after-school program during the final six weeks of the school year?	*Observations	*Three Characteristics of Multimodal Literacy *Grounded Theory
1 a) What is the relationship between the participants' discourse practices and their performance?	*Student interviews *Teacher interviews *Reflective responses	*Discourse Analysis
2. What are the characteristics of the performances?	*Observations	*Three Characteristics of Multimodal Literacy *Discourse Analysis
2 a) Do the participants validate their performances? If so how?	*Reflective responses *Luis's interview	*Discourse Analysis

Appendix E: Character Chart

Pseudonym	Character Name	Description of Role
Laura	Introduction (in English)	Laura recited the introduction in English for the first 3 weeks of the rehearsals. Jazmin replaced her halfway through the 6-week rehearsal period.
Jazmin	Introduction (in English)	Jazmin recited the introduction for the final 3 weeks, including in the final performance. She replaced Laura 3 weeks into the 6-week rehearsal period.
Lena	Introduction (in Spanish)	Lena recited the Spanish translation of the introduction.
Roberto	Narrator	Roberto narrated the play. He was also given a walk-on line in the play's opening sequence.
Eva	Esperanza I	Eva and Diana shared the role of Esperanza. They are referred to in the case study by the Roman numerals <i>I</i> and <i>II</i> . Eva played the role of Esperanza I, which consisted of all the scenes up to the rising scene. Accustomed to being in charge as the ranch owner's daughter, Esperanza I is very angry with Miguel (the son of her former servant) and suspects him of disloyalty in taking her savings without her permission. Esperanza is unaware of Miguel's secret plan to return to Mexico to find and reunite Abuelita with her family in California.
Diana	Esperanza II	Esperanza II is the new Esperanza whose arrogance has been replaced with strength and compassion. By moving to California and starting over, she found inspiration in the struggles of the agricultural workers. She also found inspiration in the various proverbs and symbols infused with the values and beliefs of her father and grandmother. Diana plays Esperanza II from the rising scene until the end of the play.

Appendix E (continued): Character Chart

Pseudonym	Character Name	Description of Role
Mario	Alfonso	Alfonso is Hortensia's husband and Miguel's father. Alfonso and Hortensia are former servants of Esperanza's family. Out of work after the fire destroys the ranch, Alfonso decides to move to California where his brother, Juan, is a farm worker. Ramona, Esperanza's mother, asks if she and Esperanza can accompany Alfonso and his family to look for work in California.
Carlos	Juan	Juan is Alfonso's brother. He lives in California lives in California with his wife, Josefina, his daughter Isabel, and twin boys. Juan is a farm worker.
Lisa	Josefina	Josefina is Juan's wife and the mother of an 8-year-old daughter named Isabel, and 1-year-old twin boys. As an agricultural worker, she has a job sorting and packing fruit. When Esperanza arrives in California, she secures a job working with Josefina.
Patricia	Abuelita	Abuelita is Esperanza's wise, eccentric grandmother. She keeps stones in her pockets and gives them away as trinkets. She knits the zigzag mountain and valley pattern in her blankets, and uses the symbolic pattern to explain life's highs and lows. Abuelita is injured in the tragic fire, which demolishes the ranch. Unable to travel to California due to her injury, Abuelita stays behind in Mexico. Miguel initiates a plan to return there and escort Abuelita to California so the family can be reunited.
Tania	Ramona (Mamá)	Ramona is Esperanza's mother. While working in the fields, she contracts an illness called Valley Fever from microscopic dust spores. She is nursed back to health by the doctor. Miguel plans to strengthen Ramona's spirits by reuniting Abuelita with the family.

Appendix E (continued): Character Chart

<u>Pseudonym</u>	<u>Character Name</u>	<u>Description of Role</u>
Luis	Miguel	Miguel, Alfonso and Hortensia's son, worked for Esperanza's father. Miguel is the same age as Esperanza. One day in Mexico, Esperanza arrogantly told Miguel their status precluded any close relationship. Miguel was hurt, but remained silent. Later, when Esperanza's father is murdered and the ranch is destroyed, all of them, except Abuelita, move to California. Miguel proves his loyalty and love by reuniting Abuelita with the family.
Nina	Isabel	Isabel is Juan and Josefina's naïve 8-year-old daughter. As a farm worker's daughter, she is awestruck by stories of Esperanza's wealth. She is also intrigued by stories of Abuelita's eccentric habits of giving trinkets and sharing knowledge.
Linda	Hortensia	Hortensia is Alfonso's wife and Miguel's mother. She is like a mother to Esperanza and even saved her life when she was five. Hortensia goes to California with Esperanza and her mother after the ranch is destroyed and they are left with nothing.

Appendix F: Discourse Models

Table 3

The Discourse model of strategies

Situated Meanings

1. The teacher's just telling us how to act.
 2. She shows us how to act and what are going to be the steps, or how to do it.
 3. I didn't memorize it looking at the paper. I just memorized it without looking at the paper.
 4. I studied over and over.
 5. To read over and over and over and over again.
 6. I keep on reading it until it gets memorized.
 7. I keep on reading it and I turn it over.
 8. I tell her, "Let me practice the introduction."
 9. In front of my parents.
 10. The students that were in front like the moms and dads helped us.
-

Used by Patricia, Eva, Lena, Jazmin, and Linda.

Appendix F (continued): Discourse Models

Table 4

The Discourse model of the complexity of performing

Situated Meanings

1. For me it was hard.
 2. The difficulty I had was when I was supposed to float in the air up to the sky.
 3. First it was hard because we got to act.
 4. The rehearsal was hard.
 5. To do something quick, before the curtains open.
 6. It's hard to memorize a lot of different parts of a play.
 7. It was easy because we were working hard.
 8. It was an easy paper to do.
 9. Being Josefina is easy because I don't have that many lines to study.
 10. It was easy for me.
 11. I was cool at rehearsing.
 12. We couldn't concentrate on what we were doing.
 13. We were trying hard to do it right.
 14. We learned a lot of things.
-

Used by Lisa, Linda, Jazmin, Mario, Patricia, and Diana.

Appendix F (continued): Discourse Models

Table 5

The Discourse model of the emotional effect of performing

Situated Meanings

1. You think you're going to be embarrassed in front of all your parents, all the parents of the other kids.
 2. You are nervous when the people are looking at you.
 3. I was nervous like other people were too.
 4. The day of the presentation everybody was nervous.
 5. We all were nervous.
 6. Well, I'm not nervous.
 7. I'm feeling nervous, like kind of nervous.
 8. We're going to be in front of all the people.
 9. Nervous to go out in front of all the people.
-

Used by Lena, Patricia, Mario, Eva, Lisa, and Luis.

Appendix F (continued): Discourse Models

Table 6

The caring Discourse model

Situated Meanings

1. Mrs. R decided to take me home.
 2. Mrs. R takes me home, now it's good.
 2. She picked me to do this character.
 3. Mrs. R changed us and we did a good job.
 4. She wants our parents to be happy, and for us to be proud of ourselves.
 5. She wants us to get good grades and then perform for our parents.
 6. I'm proud of Mrs. R.
-

Used by Lisa, Jazmin, Diana, Linda, and Mario.

Appendix F (continued): Discourse Models

Table 7

The Discourse model of unwilling participation

Situated Meanings

1. They don't want to do it.
 2. Some of the people didn't want to do it.
 3. We couldn't have fun.
 4. I want to go play soccer.
 5. She's putting too much pressure on us.
 6. I can't play for the rest of the year.
 7. I don't really like acting.
 8. He wanted to quit.
 9. She did not want to do her part.
 10. I don't like to work with people.
-

Used by Laura, Diana, and Roberto.

About the Author

Mary-Virginia Feger received a Bachelor's Degree in English from the State University of New York College at Brockport in 1972 and M.Ed. in TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) from Temple University in 1976. During her Master's Degree program, she taught immigrants at a Philadelphia community center. After her degree, she taught Southeast Asian adults experiencing resettlement in the Philadelphia region. She also taught adult English language learners in New Jersey and Maryland before moving to Florida in 1983. In Florida, she taught secondary English, and then for over a decade taught adolescent English language learners before entering the Ph.D. program at the University of South Florida.

While in the Ph.D. program at the University of South Florida, Ms. Feger authored an article published in *Multicultural Education*. Also while a USF graduate student, Ms. Feger presented at a regional TESOL conference and collaborated with others in presenting at the National Reading Conference.