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ABSTRACT

This two and a half year-long critical ethnography considers "the cultural productions of the ESL student" (Levinson, Foley, & Holland, 1996) at a multilingual, multiethnic high school in Hawai‘i. Specifically, it considers two broadly competing cultural productions of ESL in the high school context, an official, school-sanctioned cultural production, and an oppositional "generation 1.5" ESL student cultural production. The former is examined through national and state educational and language policies aimed at ESL students, ESL program organization, intra-institutional relationships, curriculum, and instructional practices. The generation 1.5, or long-term, US-educated learners of ESL (Harklau, Losey, & Siegal, 1999), cultural productions are considered through analysis of an array of situated social practices these students take up in ESL classrooms that are both indexical of their resistance and that work to make the ESL program precisely what it is these students claim to be resisting: a slowed down, low-prestige, academically inconsequential program.

Six primary "performance strike" (Shor, 1992) practices are considered in microanalytic detail: not bringing books to class, not doing classwork, starting late and finishing early, resisting and reproducing "FOBeing," bargaining, and "Worksheet Syndrome." As well, four "defensive teaching" (McNeil, 1986) accommodations are similarly analysed: study hall, floating deadlines, alternative assignments, and test preparation. These practices are considered with respect to how they serve as socializing resources for newcomer and other non-generation-1.5 ESL students as well as teachers.

The study is broadly situated within a social practice theoretical framework, and draws specifically on communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) and language
socialization (Schiefflin & Ochs, 1996; Ochs, 1996; Duff, 2002, 2003). A central point is that as the ESL teachers and students are agents multiply situated in historical, political, and social contexts, the cultural productions of ESL are not simply one-way, top-down phenomena, nor are they mere reflections of negative societal valuations about immigrants, bi- and multilingualism, and non-native Englishes. Rather, they are jointly constructed by teachers and students in the social practices of everyday classroom life. In these terms, the study highlights the situated, contingent, multidirectional socialization processes that occur among teachers and students, and how these can affect L2 teaching and learning.
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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Prologue

Wednesday, 8.05 AM.

As a catamaran loaded with red-eyed newlyweds glides past the sheer cliffs of Kaua‘i’s spectacular Na Pali coast, a family clambers over the stark, moon-like terrain of Hawai‘i’s Kilauea to glimpse the molten flow as it reaches the sea.

As vacationers in Lana‘i prepare for 18 holes at Manele, hotel workers in Waikīkī stock their carts of housekeeping supplies with stacks of freshly laundered towels.

As longboarders at Mākaha patiently await the next set of a west-side wrap, a Maui-based crew of a whale-watching cruise loads the last trays of afternoon pupu into the ship’s galley.

As workers at Kaho‘olawe begin the day clearing military detritus from the US Navy’s long tenure of the island, the jarring clang of a school bell shatters the quiet of a cool Hawai‘i morning.

Wednesday. 8.05 AM.

I made my way through the stands of rainbow eucalyptus and coral shower trees that bordered the parking lot of Tradewinds High School, moving through students clutching cinnamon rolls and half-eaten plates of Spam and eggs as they hurried out of the cafeteria.

Voices surged as I neared the library, where throngs of Local adolescents wrapped up games of Texas Hold ‘Em, cranked up tunes blasting through CD player
headphones, and procrastinated with last-minute calls on their cell phones. A heavy-set Local boy dribbled milk onto the walkway as I passed by, spelling F-U-C-K, a lactose-inscribed epithet that would curiously remain etched in the concrete for the duration of my research.

I headed into the center of the small campus, where most of the nondescript 1950s-style concrete buildings were located, passing several airy courtyards where more students were packing up and heading for class.

I was struck by the similarity of boys’ and girls’ attire: girls in tight tank tops, low-rise jeans, platform slippers, with cellphones in hand or tucked snugly into back pockets; boys in board shorts or baggy pants that sagged precariously below hips, loose t-shirts advertising local surf shops or with Pidgin-derived slogans such as “Pilau mout” and “Eh, boddah yu!,” and slippers or expensive sneakers.

I was suddenly overcome by a wave of long-forgotten insecurities: of looking wrong, of dressing wrong, of being inadequate in some profoundly incomprehensible way; once all-too-familiar feelings that stemmed from the perception of being continually evaluated by standards that would never be fully revealed, in an environment where acceptance and belonging are of such importance.

I shook off the uncertainty and placed around my neck the lanyard that secured my official school ID.

“VOLUNTEER,” the plastic card proclaimed in bold red and white letters, the school colors of the Tradewinds Navigators. Above this was my name, a photo of myself stamped with the official school seal, and my school ID number.

I was official. I belonged.
I continued through the school grounds, passing several large, hand-painted banners proclaiming this Tradewinds’ Homecoming Week, toward SPEW, the unfortunate student acronym for the cluster of permanent “temporary portable” classrooms in which Special Education, ESLL, and World Languages were located on the margins of campus.

Volunteer. It was an odd designation, one that simultaneously evoked the compulsion that institutions such as public high schools have for labeling practices, as well as these labels’ frequently staggering inadequacy. “Volunteer” captured only one aspect of my presence at Tradewinds, and even then, not completely, for while I was helping in classes as an instructional aide free of charge, I was certainly getting something in return. But I was comfortable with the label, indeed, preferred it to something like RESEARCHER or OBSERVER. It had a certain magnanimous, humanitarian air, which was much more preferable to anything hinting at lab-coat panopticism. It also justified (and was required for) my presence on school grounds, earning me nods from passing faculty, and as expected, averted looks from many students. It was also sufficiently different from the full- and part-time teachers’ FACULTY/STAFF ID cards that it captured my unique status at the school: an adult, but not a Teacher; an authority figure, perhaps, but not an Authority. At least, that was what I hoped.

Passing the Administration Building, I could hear snippets of Pidgin, or Hawai‘i Creole, and standardized English from students hurrying to beat the tardy bell:
“Eh, wachu did las nait? Ai wen weit fo yu!”

“Yu gaiz nomo dakain – hat reit – in PE yestadei?”

“Hey, that’s my backpack, dumbass!”

“Get saiens homwrk? Ai laik si.”

“Who took my Shilo Pa disc!?”

“He’s a hottie, but damn, so lolo. Shutz.”

“Tita, brah! Yu go aut wit Keani, shi gon lik yu!”

As I neared SPEW, there was a gradual yet noticeable change. English and Pidgin were replaced by Cantonese, Korean, and Marshallese. The standard student attire I encountered earlier was less noticeable now amid groups of students in flared acid-washed jeans and cargo pants, t-shirts adorned with incomprehensible slogans: “26 MONITA,” “RESEARCH ON@TOUCH JEANS! SHRTIVAL,” “TACTICR ERTR JWPSNTRT,” and “SENSIBILITY!” A group of Chuukese boys lounged by the SPEW doorway, thick sweatshirts half-on half-off over white tank tops. Nearby, several Chuukese girls passed a small packet of lime-flavored Kool-aid drink mix around, green-stained fingers dabbing at the powder that then disappeared into green-stained mouths. A group of Samoan students farther away laughed as they hurled a volleyball at each other, which a small group of Marshallese girls nearby ignored. Across from them, three Korean girls teased a newcomer Korean boy about his new orange- and blond-streaked hairstyle; just beyond them, several Chinese students crowded around a friend playing Tetris on her electronic bilingual dictionary, squealing with delight at an apparent high score.
As the seconds until the tardy bell slid by, students continued to head for their classrooms. In some groups, students reluctantly moved toward SPEW, while their friends went in opposite directions. I hear "Eh, where you going?" called out to an ESL student I know who has spent his entire school career in Hawai‘i schools. "Just... class," he mumbled evasively as he shouldered his way toward SPEW, his Local friends headed in the opposite direction.

I climbed the steps to the ESL wing of SPEW, passing through a gauntlet of Vietnamese B-boy wannabes, and came to a growing group of noisy students gathered outside Ms. Cheney’s ESL classroom. Romeo, a 15-year-old boy from the Northern Marianas shouted “Whassap, Boo!” into my face, as two Pohnpeian girls pounded on the door and bellowed for the teacher. No answer. The door was locked.

Just then, Ms. Meredith, a part-time temporary teacher (PTT) ran out of the ESL program coordinator’s classroom down the hall with a set of keys. The tardy bell clanged as she opened the door and flipped on the lights, and the students surged into the room laughing and shouting that they were late: mass detention, a referral for Ms. Cheney!

Ms. Cheney’s small, stuffy classroom, like many others at Tradewinds, had been recently painted and was well-appointed, with 40 desks in good condition, working ceiling and floor fans, whiteboards, an iMac, and a 30” monitor and VCR. SPEW was the latest set of buildings to have undergone a multi-year, campus-wide renovation project, leaving the Industrial Arts and English Buildings across campus, where paint was peeling, jalousies were jammed open, and metal equipment was rusting after years of exposure to the wind and salt air, as the only facilities at Tradewinds in obvious need of repairs.
As the students settled noisily into their seats, Ms. Meredith opened the windows that let in the cool northeasterly trades and wondered aloud where Ms. Cheney was. I didn’t know. A second PTT, Ms. Langdon, arrived. She didn’t know either. However, now of all times, the class was actually quieting down of its own accord. Ms. Meredith looked at me and shrugged, then made her way to the front of the classroom. She grabbed a newish ESL conversation book that I hadn’t seen before from a pile in a newly opened box in the corner and returned to the back of the classroom as the students waited.

She was sick, it was apparent. Her eyes were red and she was clutching a Kleenex, and sounded froggy, congested. “I don’t know what to do,” she said, quickly thumbing through the textbook, clearly feeling the pressure to come up with a lesson in a matter of seconds. “I don’t either,” I replied, looking around, hoping Ms. Cheney would arrive, and suddenly concerned that she hadn’t. Although both of us had been in this class the past week, neither one of us knew what, if anything, Ms. Cheney had planned for today.

“You wanna teach, Mr. Talmy?” Ms. Meredith asked, continuing to search through the textbook. “Um, not particularly,” I replied, with a sudden pang of guilt. Although I had had several years of ESL and EFL teaching experience, none of it had been in a high school classroom, and none of it certainly had been with a group this large or this diverse: 35 assembled teenagers from 15 different language backgrounds, a wide range of first and second language (L1 and L2) proficiencies, and dramatically different formal educational experiences. I also had had several years of graduate education concerning teaching and learning second languages, but it had been oriented to adult populations, particularly university international students, and on an abstracted, internal,
second-language-learning process that had little to do with what Mr. Anderson, the ESLL coordinator at Tradewinds, called, with obvious relish, “the real world” of his ESLL program. Despite my experience and education, I had to agree with Mr. Anderson: I was overwhelmingly unprepared to teach a group such as this. My respect for high school ESL teachers, which had fast-developed during my early observations at Tradewinds as I saw them contend daily with remarkably challenging circumstances – from resistant students to little administrative or institutional support, from large class-sizes to the pressures brought on by the *No Child Left Behind* accountability framework, from an unbelievable number of responsibilities beyond classroom teaching to attempting to understand let alone meet the diverse learning needs of a stunningly heterogeneous population – that respect now came to me in particularly immediate and personal terms as I faltered before Ms. Meredith.

She sighed, undoubtedly expecting my answer, and stopped at a page in the textbook. A map activity. Describing objects in rooms, intended for students to practice prepositions of location. A typical ESL activity, one I’ve taught dozens of times myself without a thought. However, we both looked around the large class and no doubt wondered together what relevance the construction “The chair is near the table” would have for them. But that was a concern that would have to wait, probably not for the first time either.

Ms. Meredith made a mental note, took a deep breath, and muttered in irritation, “winging it” as she made her way to the front. “Okay, everyone, get out a piece of paper! We’re going to make maps of our houses and describe where things in them are!” she shouted. “Miss, I don’t live in a house!” retorted a Korean American boy who had spent
his entire formal schooling in ESLL, with practiced ease. “Okay, apartments, houses, whatever you live in,” said Ms. Meredith. She provided a model on the board, drawing a floor plan with a TV, table, chairs, and plants, and enumerated some sample sentences, which she also wrote on the board. When she was finished, she told the class, “Okay, write a sentence describing where things are in your apartment using the prepositions we used last time we did the map activity.” “We already did that!” shouted another student, this one a Filipina girl who had been in the US for five years. Ms. Meredith ignored her and wrote another sample sentence on the board: “The TV is in the corner.” “Write 10 sentences,” she decided quickly. “And include two prepositions in each one. 20 points!”

“This is stupid,” a handful of Chuukese girls grumbled among themselves: each had spent between four and eight years in US schools in Guam or the Northern Marianas.

“Welcome to ESL!” yelled a Chinese boy who had lived in the US for two years to a small cluster of recently-arrived girls from Hong Kong.

But miraculously, the students got to work. It took some cajoling from me to get the Chuukese boys going, but finally, they were sitting quietly, at least for a few minutes, struggling to write a sentence. Their acquiescence was surely due, at least in part, to Bitty’s* absence as he was in detention today; he had apparently started a fist-fight in a Life Sciences J class yesterday, campus security had been called, and he had been removed from class. Still, Bitty managed to appear at the door of this class later during the period, to taunt a friend.

Soon after Ms. Meredith had given her instructions, three new students were brought in to be “LASed” by Ms. Langdon, the second PTT, in the back of the classroom, that is, to be tested using the ESLL program’s placement test, the Language Assessment
Scales, a time- and labor-intensive procedure. Over much of the remainder of the class, the test would be administered by Ms. Langdon using an LAS audio-recording meant to assess students’ aural/oral abilities; the students in the class, however, would wind up “helping,” providing answers in loud unison as they had all been similarly tested, multiple times, and knew the answers: “Does Mrs. Marzipan have relatives in Hong Kong?” “Yes!” they all shouted. Indeed, there was a not-so-subtle student “grapevine” where LAS test prompts and answers were well-known. In fact, on all the ESLL teachers’ whiteboards was the writing prompt for the “essay” portion of the LAS test: “The most beautiful place I’ve ever visited…”. This prompt remained visible somewhere in every ESLL classroom for most of the school year.

Most students stopped working on the exercise on prepositions of location within 10 minutes and ended up spending the remainder of the class hanging out, talking, playing tic-tac-toe, text-messaging, or sleeping. The knowledgeable ones didn’t draw attention to themselves. Those who did received extra attention from Ms. Meredith or from me.

Mid-way through the class period, I found a Chuukese girl writing a rap in her L1 on the computer in the back of the room. I asked her if she would translate; she laughed, seemed surprised, shy, but apparently more because the rap was written in Chuukese than about what it contained, as she translated the introduction into English in a loud, booming voice: “Here’s a shout out to all you Wannabe Virgins! Even though we all know that’s not what you are!”

Fifteen minutes before class ended, Ms. Cheney arrived, clearly tired. She had had a meeting with a counselor and the police about a student who had threatened to “put
a cap" in a classmate yesterday. Forgot to tell Ms. Meredith. She now looked over the shoulders of several students who had already packed up their belongings and were waiting for the bell to ring. “What did you do today?” she asked. “Maps,” came the reply. “Again?” asked Ms. Cheney. “Yup.” Ms. Cheney, nodded, muttered “good review,” then moved to her desk and opened her gradebook. She made a notation.

Minutes later, the bell rang.

Another ESLL class had come to completion.

As the last of the students jostled their way out the door, Ms. Cheney asked Ms. Meredith for the page number in the textbook that she had used for today’s “lesson.” Ms. Meredith gave it to her and Ms. Cheney flipped to the page, studied it for a moment, and nodded. She then turned to greet the early arrivals for the following class, as they made their way inside.

The bell signaling the end of passing period rang.

It was time for next period (ELA21Xfn: 229-265).

**Introduction**

This study is a critical ethnography in the English for Second Language Learners (ESLL) program of Tradewinds High School, a multilingual, multiethnic, public high school in an urbanized area of Hawai‘i.¹ Comparatively little research in second language (L2) studies has been undertaken in high school English as a second language

---

¹ The names of the high school, teachers, staff, students, and courses in this study have been changed to protect participants’ confidentiality, just as the locality remains unnamed. Please note that students selected their own pseudonyms, unless denoted at first mention with an asterisk (*). See Chapter 5.
settings (Duff, 2002; Faltis, 1999; Faltis & Arias, 1993; Faltis & Hudelson, 1994; Harklau, 1994a; Harklau, Siegal, & Losey, 1999; Johnson, 1996; McKay & Wong, 1996; Ruiz de Velasco, Fix, & Clewell, 2000; Valdés, 2001), even less with the population that is the focus of this study, long-term, US-educated learners of ESL, or "generation 1.5" (G1.5) ESL students (Bennett, Kadooka, Menacker, Skarin, Talmy, & Winn, 2000; Ferris, Kennedy, & Senna, 2004; Freeman, Freeman, & Mercuri, 2002; Harklau, 2000; Harklau, Losey, & Siegal, 1999; Rumbaut & Ima, 1988; Thonus, 2003), and even less about the central phenomenon that is the topic of this study: ESL students' classroom resistance to learning ESL (Duff, 2002; Norton, 2001; Siegal, 1994, 1996; Talmy, 2004a).

The comparative lack of ESL research in K-12 settings is troubling if only because public schools in the US over the past decade have seen dramatic increases in the number of ESL students in their classrooms. In the academic year 1999-2000, for example, 4.4 million K-12 public school students were classified as "limited English proficient" (LEP), the US Department of Education's prescribed term for this population (Kindler, 2002). In the state of Hawai‘i, the number of LEP students has more than doubled since 1989 to nearly 16,000 students, approximately 9% of the state's 2002-2003 public school enrollment (Office of the Superintendent, 2003). Of particular concern among this population are secondary ESL students, that is, those in high school, grades 9-

---

2 I reluctantly add to the general terminological clumsiness in the field of second language studies by distinguishing "ESL" from "L2 English" (second language English). "ESL" is a loaded term, with many referents: programs, budgets, instructional approaches, identity, etc. For added precision, I use "L2 English" when referring to the linguistic system of English that speakers of other languages may attempt to learn. Thus, "ESL" can include the learning of L2 English, but is not solely comprised by it. Additionally, "ESL" is distinct from "ESLL," which is the name of the state-wide ESL program in Hawai‘i. Reference to the ESL students in the Tradewinds High School ESLL program will thus be to "ESLL students."

3 See Chapter 2 for a discussion about the problematics of the label "generation 1.5."
12. As a number of studies have indicated, the secondary ESL population is among the most “at-risk” adolescent populations in the country, with school “drop-out” and “push-out” rates among them extraordinarily high (Advocates for Children & The New York Immigration Coalition, 2002; Orfield, Losen, Wald, & Swanson, 2004; Ruiz de Velasco & Fix, 2002; Ruiz de Velasco et al., 2000; Spaulding, Carolino, & Amen, 2004; The Public Advocate for the City of New York & Advocates for Children, 2002; Valdés, 2001). These rates range from twice the national average for selected groups in the US (Ruiz de Velasco et al., 2000), to a staggering 75% of all ESL students at one large urban school in Canada (Watt & Roessingh, 2001). In addition, it has been estimated that 20% of secondary ESL students have missed at least two years of formal schooling, while 27% are acknowledged to be enrolled in grade levels at least two years below age/grade-level norms (Fleischman & Hopstock, 1993). Secondary ESL students also tend to be concentrated in high-poverty, urban schools that frequently lack teachers with backgrounds in ESL or bilingual education or appropriate ESL/bilingual instructional materials (Development Associates, 2003), and in these settings, are more often than not isolated from their L1 English speaking peers (see, e.g., Ruiz de Velasco et al., 2000).

The comparative lack of L2 research concerning G1.5 ESL students is also troubling, since long-term ESL learners are an increasing proportion of secondary ESL students (Fleischman & Hopstock, 1993; Freeman et al., 2002; Harklau, Siegal et al., 1999; Ruiz de Velasco et al., 2000). These students have been consistently represented as having unique L2 learning needs (Bennett et al., 2000; Blanton, 1999; Chiang & Schmida, 1999; Ferris et al., 2004; Freeman et al., 2002; Frodesen & Starna, 1999; Harklau, Siegal et al., 1999; Hartman & Tarone, 1999; Leki, 1999; Muchinsky &
Tangren, 1999; Rodby, 1999; Ruiz de Velasco et al., 2000; Talmy, 2001a), which are substantially different from those of a normative "international student" archetype that pervades much of the L2 research and educational literature (cf. Harklau, Siegal et al., 1999; Leung, Harris, & Rampton, 1997; Nayar, 1997; Thesen, 1997). These differing needs have been described as primarily related to struggles with L2 English academic print literacies, which, as Faltis & Wolfe (1999, pp. 275-276) argue, may be because G1.5 ESL students have "not receive[d] any kind of instructional support in their native language, or because the instructional support they received was of very low quality" (cf., e.g., August & Hakuta, 1997; Baker, 2001; Baker & Prys Jones, 1998; Crawford, 1997, 1998a, 1998b, 2004; Cummins, 1979, 1981, 1986, 2000; Delpit, 1998; Garcia, 1997; Ovando, 2003; Ovando & Collier, 1998; Phillipson, 1988, 1992; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000a, 2000b; Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 1994). These students have also been represented as having high degrees of L2 English oracy, as well as negative valuations of ESL programs. There may be a host of reasons for this, including a possible belief among these students that because they can speak the L2, they do not need ESL services; histories of participation in ESL programs that increasingly have not been relevant to nor met their (L2) learning needs; a developing realization that ESL lacks the cultural, linguistic, and symbolic capital they need or desire (Bourdieu, 1991; Norton, 2000; Norton & Toohey, 2002; Norton Peirce, 1995a); and/or perhaps because of their sustained exposure to linguist discourses circulating in US schools and society that denigrate bi- and multilingualism, ESL, and immigrants in favor of assimilation, English monolingualism, and linguistic nationalism.
In terms of student resistance, the comparative lack of research in L2 studies concerning this topic may be due to a number of disciplinary circumstances, including predominant theoretical influences from linguistics and psychology, a concomitant interest in learning rather than learners (see, e.g., Ellis, 2001; Kramsch, 2000; Larsen-Freeman, 2001), a corresponding influence of structuralist approaches in the field (see, e.g., McKay & Wong, 1996; Norton, 2000; Norton Peirce, 1995a; Pavlenko, 2002; Pennycook, 1990, 2001), and a general, though certainly not absolute, tendency in L2 studies toward researching populations that are more readily available to university researchers (i.e., adult international students matriculated in universities and university L2 programs) than, for example, language minority adolescents enrolled in low-prestige L2 programs in compulsory school settings (see, e.g., Duff, 2002; Faltis, 1999; Harklau, Siegal et al., 1999; Lagemann, 2002; McKay & Wong, 1996; Ruiz de Velasco et al., 2000).

Lantolf & Pavlenko (2001) have questioned the lack of research on student resistance in L2 studies, arguing that it implies a perception of student homogeneity: on the one hand, that learners in a given classroom are there volitionally or are oriented in similar ways to language learning, and on the other, that L2 students either have no agency or that it is so constrained it can be taken for granted (also see, Ellis, 2001; McKay & Wong, 1996). In terms of volition, adults may in fact choose whether to learn an L2, but this may not be the case for adolescents studying ESL in compulsory settings.4

---

4 Adults can also be “required” to study an L2, e.g., college students who have to meet a language requirement, or international students who are required to take ESL classes before or during matriculation. However, this form of requirement is fundamentally different from the one compelling immigrant primary, intermediate, and high school students to enroll in ESL classes. While university requirements are mandatory, a university education itself is not; however, students who are under 18 years of age are required by law to attend school, and within these compulsory settings, to comply with school (and/or state and/or federal) policies (cf. Pavlenko, 2002; Weis, 1985, note 37, pp. 190-191).
In fact, Lantolf & Pavlenko (2001, p. 146) maintain that calling people who inhabit second language classrooms “learners” may frequently be a misnomer. As McKay & Wong (1996) note, despite the innumerable, important contributions of psycholinguistic research in L2 studies, one central question [has remained] unanswered: Why do some learners, in some contexts, draw upon every available strategy to make themselves understood and to progress in the target language, while in other contexts they do not? Why, as many teachers may have noted to their frustration, do some learners seem to act counter-productively, using strategies that subvert or oppose the language performance expectations of the situation rather than fulfill them? This question—so crucial to the eventual development of successful pedagogy—cannot begin to be answered without paying scrupulous attention to the social context of language learning, and without radically redefining the second-language learner” (p. 578).

Indeed, with the increase in the number of adolescent language minority students studying for longer periods of time in compulsory, low-prestige “remedial” ESL classrooms, the potential for the sorts of oppositional behaviors McKay & Wong (1996) allude to above, and that are variously referenced in Bennett et al. (2000), Duff (2000), Harklau, Losey, et al. (1999), Kadooka (2001), Johnson (1996), McKay & Wong (1996), Talmy (2001a; 2004a), among others, may be more the norm than the goal-oriented, volitional language learning frequently presumed in many studies of L2 learning. For these reasons, among others, this study joins an alternative, post-structuralist L2 research tradition that, like its psycholinguistic and social psychological forebears, has yielded a rich, and increasingly well-developed research literature. This is a research tradition that
not only situates learning and learners in social contexts, but implicates those contexts in learning, linking macro social, cultural, historical, and political processes to the micropolitics of everyday (classroom) life. It conceives of identity, agency, and “investment” (Norton Peirce, 1995a) as central to any learning endeavor, and thus employs a conception of learners as complex social beings, as people, who “actively engage in constructing the terms and conditions of their own learning” (Lantolf & Pavlenko, 2001, p. 145), yet who do so in social environments characterized by often dramatic power asymmetries that enable and constrain the way those “terms and conditions” can be constructed (cf. Giddens, 1979).

In this respect, then, in addition to “radically redefining the second language learner,” and examining how they “actively construct the terms and conditions of their own learning,” a central consideration in this study is of the multiple social contexts of the ESLL program at Tradewinds. Although the comparatively few studies on K-12 ESL in L2 studies have overwhelmingly asserted the stigmatized, marginal status of ESL programs in the wider school and social contexts (see, e.g., Duff, 2002; Harklau, 1994a; McKay & Wong, 1996; Valdés, 2001), this study examines in detail how this occurs, which is to say, how social contexts, teachers, learners, and learners’ various “investments” in L2 learning interact, intersect, and are fundamentally implicated in the cultural productions of ESLL at Tradewinds High School.

**Significance of the study**

This study addresses a number of notable gaps in the literature, examining a setting, a population, and a particular phenomenon that have received comparatively little
attention to date in L2 studies, and doing so from an emergent L2 research tradition that reconsceptualizes language and (L2) learning as social practice.

Situated as it is in a social practice theoretic, this study necessarily augments its (critical) ethnographically-drawn conclusions with microanalysis of teacher-student and student-student classroom interaction in order to meet the various mandates of not just social practice theory, but also critical ethnography, critical discourse analysis, and more generally, critical applied linguistics. Broadly speaking, I interpret these mandates to centrally concern how larger macro processes and micro-level phenomena are mutually informing, how they are constituted by and constitutive of each other, how social structure is locally instantiated, resisted, transformed, and reproduced in the details of everyday classroom life.

In terms of the setting, as mentioned above, many of the L2 studies that concern K-12 ESL programs have asserted the relative status of ESL in the wider social hierarchy: as stigmatized, marginal, and remedial; “a ‘dummy’ program” (McKay & Wong, p. 586; also see Duff, 2002; Faltis & Wolfe, 1999; Harklau, 1994a, 2000; Johnson, 1996; Kadooka, 2001; Valdés, 2001). This study comes to similar conclusions, but shows how it is actually accomplished in the classrooms of one high school ESL program in early 21st century Hawai'i. That is, I examine central processes by which this marginalization occurs, ranging from consideration of the “linguicist” (Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 1994, *inter alia*) and assimilationist historical and contemporary language and educational policy contexts in Hawai'i and the US (Chapter 6), to the “structural productions” (Eisenhart, 1996; Nespor, 1990) of ESLL in the Tradewinds ESLL program (Chapter 7), which conceptualize and position ESLL students as cultural and linguistic
Others, to students' oppositional responses to these positionings (Chapter 9), to teachers' accommodations of these responses in classroom curriculum and instruction (Chapter 10).

In terms of population, this study offers important insights into a G1.5 student demographic that is growing in middle schools, high schools, community colleges, and four-year universities throughout the US. It moves beyond what I call a "length of residence" orientation implied by the label "generation 1.5" itself and the "in-between" metaphor that has to date dominated representations of these students (with notable exceptions, e.g., Harklau, Siegal, et al., 1999) and takes a more relational approach that incorporates Rampton's important (1990) "expertise, affiliation, inheritance" framework, focusing in particular with these students on linguistic expertise and affiliations (Chapter 2). This study also endeavors to characterize these students in terms of what they can do in the L2 (i.e., high oral/aural proficiency), rather than just in terms of what they cannot (i.e., read/write well in the L2), seeing how they draw on the extensive range of (L1 and L2) communicative resources available to them to index and perform their differences from other, "non-G1.5" students (Chapters 8-10).

In terms of "resistance," this study moves beyond modernist distinctions of "opposition" vs. "resistance" to see resistance in relational terms (Barth, 1969), as indexes or performances of difference, that is, in terms of social practice (Chapter 3; Chapters 8-10). It examines in detail two predominant, yet competing cultural productions of ESLL in the Tradewinds ESLL classes, that of the "official," or school-sanctioned cultural productions, and that of the G1.5 students' oppositional cultural productions of ESLL. In this respect, it addresses key questions in (L2) language
socialization research, particularly concerning the contingency and bidirectionality of socialization processes, and investigates cultural and social reproduction not only from a macro-level perspective as has so often been the case, but also from the micro-level of classroom instructional practice and interaction.

**Background and motivation for the study**

My initial interests in student resistance stem from my own experiences as a language learner, as well as research I undertook earlier in my graduate school career.

As an undergraduate, I had had the distinct pleasure of studying Spanish with that rare sort of teacher that one eventually wants to become; the classes were so good, the instruction so effective, the experience so personally rewarding, that, in fact, I actually began tutoring English at a local community center as a result. I learned Spanish, and I became a language teacher because of this experience.

Not long after graduating, and intent on maintaining my Spanish, I enrolled at a university extension program in the city where I had grown up. Hopeful for a similar experience as I had had as an undergraduate, I was tremendously disappointed when on the second class session (the first had been spent conjugating a long list of verbs on a “placement test”), the teacher admitted he was a graduate student who had neither clue about nor interest in language teaching. He made a bargain with the class: we should “read the textbook” at home, but in class, we would “just talk.”

Four excruciating weeks later, fed-up and furious about the waste of time and tuition, I stopped attending class, accepted that my Spanish wouldn’t improve anyway, and resolutely turned my back on the “mid-term” and “final” exams, winding up with the
lowest (passing) grade of my undergraduate and graduate careers combined. To this day, it is a grade I am most proud of, although I must admit I wonder how I managed it having done not a single assignment, quiz, or exam during the class.

I endured a similar experience several years later at the same university, studying Japanese, with a wonderful sensei the first term, but someone who was untrained and decidedly more authoritarian in the second. It was in this second teacher’s class that a small group of students and I, most of whom had lived in Japan for some time, initiated a tacit, low-intensity revolt in the class, speaking English when we were not supposed to, forgetting homework and textbooks at home, sitting at the side of the room when we were supposed to be in front, creating one-minute dialogues when they were supposed to be twice that, skipping class, and so on. It was a refreshing if retrospectively embarrassing experience: I learned little Japanese that term, and instead wound up with the second lowest grade of my university career.

At the start of my doctoral studies, the Department of Second Language Studies at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa was approached by a local community college administrator concerned about an emergent population in the college’s ESL program: long-term, US-educated learners of ESL. This was a population that was notably different in terms of educational backgrounds, prior learning, academic preparation, and attitudes toward learning ESL than the usual international student population the college had traditionally served (and that I was accustomed to teaching myself). At the administrator’s invitation, a group of student researchers from the Department of Second Language Studies embarked on a year-long study at the community college (Bennett et al., 2000). Part of my contribution to that research inquiry took form in an interview
study among fourteen of the college's ESL teachers, counselors, and administrators (TCAs) (Talmy, 2001a, 2001b). Primary among my findings in that study was what I determined was a discourse among the TCAs about the G1.5 students in their classes, principally that these students engaged in a range of oppositional classroom behaviors and were much more negative about ESL than their international student classmates. Curiously, however, although TCAs represented these students as resistant in terms of classroom behavior, when it came to the G1.5 students' academic work, including their writing (which was overwhelmingly represented as poor), low motivation, cognitive deficit, semilingualism, and cultural and linguistic deprivation were invoked as explanations, with no consideration that these students' academic performance may have been the result of resistance as well. At the same time, my partner, Jo Ann Kadooka, was engaged in what was in many ways a pilot study-by-proxy for this research: she was researching a Hawai‘i high school ESLL program and her observations in many respects confirmed those of my own interview study. The final piece fell into place with the publication of Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL (Harklau, Losey et al., 1999) mid-way through the community college research, which overwhelmingly sounded on the same themes that both Jo Ann and I and the other community college researchers were encountering. From this confluence of events, it was a short step to conceiving of a study concerning the setting, population, and phenomenon that the dissertation below addresses.
Research questions

As is the norm in (critical) ethnography, the following research questions were posed, reformulated, and refined throughout the planning, fieldwork, analysis, and writing of this study (Anderson, 1989; Carspecken, 1996; Carspecken & Apple, 1992; Creswell, 1998; Erickson, 1986; Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983; Hatch, 2002; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Quantz, 1992; Thomas, 1993; Watson-Gegeo, 1988; Wolcott, 1995). They ranged from “grand-tour” questions (Spradley, 1980) to more specific, nuanced questions as fieldwork proceeded (see Chapter 5).

- What is the relative status of the ESL program at Tradewinds? What are the discourses of ESL there? Who and what contributes to these?

- What are the structural and official cultural productions of ESL at Tradewinds? How are they made manifest?

- What are students’ general responses to these cultural productions?

- How are long-term, US educated ESLL students accommodated by the ESLL program? What are these students’ responses to these cultural productions?

Once it became clear that long-term, US educated ESLL students’ resistance figured prominently in what was transpiring in the ESLL classes I was observing, I asked:

- How is these students’ resistance manifested in classrooms?

- What are student perspectives on resistance?

- What events, beliefs, attitudes, or policies shape student resistance? What are the relationships between L2 learning, identity, investment, and resistance?

- How do teachers contend with resistance?
• What are the implications of student resistance on curriculum, classroom processes (e.g., instructional delivery), and students' L2 and academic learning and preparation?

**Structure of the dissertation**

The structure of the dissertation is as follows. In Chapter 2, I discuss the rationale behind some of the terminology I employ throughout this dissertation, focusing in particular on the (etic) social identity category of "generation 1.5." In Chapter 3, I outline the theoretical framework that I employ in this study, with primary attention to the concept of cultural production, as well as the highly compatible theories of communities of practice and language socialization. In Chapter 4, I provide an overview of critical ethnography as a research tradition before outlining my methodology for this study in Chapter 5. Chapter 6 sets out broad historical and contemporary language and educational policy contexts within which Tradewinds High School and this study were situated. In Chapter 7, I consider the "official" conceptualizations of ESLL at the high school through an analysis of the program's organization, institutional relationships, and curriculum, from which the "structural productions" of ESLL can be discerned. Chapter 8 considers teachers' and students' representations of the ESLL program and outlines a "discourse of deficiency" concerning ESLL, which generation 1.5 students crucially drew on (and reproduced) in the various ways they performed and indexed difference from and resistance to ESLL. Chapter 9 considers a constellation of related social practices that were constituted by and were constitutive of student resistance to ESLL at the high school, as well as teachers' responses to them. I argue that by collaboratively
disengaging from (L2) learning in these classes, a space was created in which an alternative “unofficial” ESLL curriculum could develop, one that was largely “taught” by generation 1.5 students themselves. In Chapter 10, I examine in detail teachers’ “defensive teaching” accommodations to G1.5 students’ cultural productions of ESLL, arguing that in effect, they are indicative of the contingency and bidirectionality of socializing processes. In Chapter 11, I conclude the study, offering a discussion of the implications and contributions of the research for cultural studies, L2 studies, research on G1.5 students, and K-12 ESL in L2 studies, before ending with a broad appeal to other L2 researchers to redouble efforts to work in this area.
CHAPTER 2. REPRESENTATIONAL PRACTICES, "GENERATION 1.5," AND OTHER LABELS

[The ethnographer is] charged with representing the lives of people who are living or once lived, and as we attempt to push these people into the molds of our texts, they push back. The final text is a product of our pushing and their pushing back, and no text, however dominant, lacks the traces of this counterforce.

Ortner (1995, p. 189)

Life from one extreme to another,
Two different people in me – push and pull each other
In that confusion, I could even scream.
I, the generation one point five. . .
Who am I?
Am I Korean?
Am I American?
To find myself within two different worlds, I had to fight and struggle. . .

Ko (1993, p. ix)1

[One guy who was referred to me] really set me off. He said, "If I come to ESL, you're not gonna ask me to write about how I felt when I got off the boat, right?" And I looked at him and said, "Oh! When did you get off the boat?" And he said, "I came here when I was six years old."

A community college ESL teacher (in Talmy, 2001a)

Introduction

In this chapter, I consider issues in the politics of representation, particularly as they pertain to naming practices. I do so because the group of students that this study is centrally concerned with, that is, "generation 1.5" (G1.5) ESLL students, has only begun

1 My gratitude to Shawn Ford for bringing this publication to my attention.
to receive attention in the L2 studies literature in the recent past, and because there is
evidence already that the label "generation 1.5" is starting to gain some notably deficit-
oriented connotations. Thus, after considering issues in the politics of representation, I
discuss certain literature regarding G1.5 students before moving on to assert an
alternative conceptualization about this particular population, a more fluid, relational
definition that moves away from the quantification of generational status and toward a
recognition of students' linguistic affiliations, inheritance, and expertise (Rampton,
1990). I conclude with a brief discussion of some additional terms I use in this study.

The politics of representation

Concerning issues in the representational politics of qualitative empirical
research, the cultural studies/critical discourse analysts Barker & Galasiński (2001) argue
that

if we think that the purpose of ethnography and other forms of qualitative
empirical work lies in the discovery or accurate representation of an objective
reality, then the poststructuralist inspired critique of its realist pretensions is
devastating . . . . [T]he real is always already a representation. We need to be
less concerned with questions of representational adequacy and more with a
'politics of representation' in which marginality or subordination can be
understood as a constitutive effect of representation realized or resisted by living
persons (Barker & Galasiński, 2001, pp. 18-19).

Deriving from work in cultural studies, "representation" refers to the ways in
which meanings are produced and circulated through language, discourse, and images.
Representations work to position subjectivities and shape perceptions of reality, enabling people to make sense of themselves and their relations to the world. Representations are political in that the meanings they signify are not neutral or naturally-occurring; rather, they are produced within particular sociohistorical, structural, and ideological conditions. In a given context are “dominant regimes of representation” (S. Hall, 1996b), meanings produced by certain groups which at once express dominant interests and generally come to be accepted as “commonsense.” Dominant representations are hegemonic (S. Hall, 1996c, 1997a, 1997b; Volosinov, 1973/1929; R. Williams, 1977).

Harklau (2000) maintains that “representations result from constant attempts to hold a heterogeneous and ever-evolving social world still long enough to make sense of it” (p. 37). Representational practices can work to distort and marginalize experiences; they can also essentialize identities, fixing otherwise multiple, transitory, or shifting subjectivities into static wholes. They are thus reductive, “temporary artifacts that serve to stabilize” identities – more precisely, to transform them – so that we can know and understand them, as well as our relations to them (Harklau, 2000, p. 37). Edward Said (1978) reminds us that to have knowledge of such a thing “is to dominate it, to have authority over it. And authority here means for ‘us’ to deny autonomy to ‘it’ . . . since we know it and it exists, in a sense, as we know it” (p. 32; also see Mudimbe, 1988).

Indeed, an aspect central to the notion of representation is that it not only reflects particular realities and subjectivities, it also works to create them (S. Hall, 1996c, 1997a, 1997b; Mudimbe, 1988; Said, 1978; Volosinov, 1973/1929; R. Williams, 1977). As Stuart Hall (1996b) argues,
how things are represented and the 'machineries' and regimes of representation in a culture do play a constitutive, and not merely a reflexive, after-the-event, role. This gives questions of culture and ideology, and scenarios of representations – subjectivity, identity, politics – a formative, not merely an expressive, place in the constitution of social and political life (p. 443)

Representations of G1.5 ESLL students, then, can be considered as reflections of dominant attitudes and beliefs about these students, as well as constitutive of the social category “G1.5.” This does not presume an identity construct which results in a “top-down, deterministic categorisation of domination and resistance” (Thesen, 1997, p. 488) but rather a network of preferred discursive practices and meanings which, because they are preferred, inform beliefs about and perceptions of students so labeled. When such beliefs and perceptions are held by educators about their students, policies implemented to administer them, and pedagogical practices employed in their instruction, can be affected (Dusek, 1985; Kohl, 1994; MacSwan, 2000; Weinstein, 2002).

Spack (1997) discusses the utility of identity labels (and the categories they signify) in L2 studies, observing that they “provide [researchers] with a shared shorthand by which [they] can talk about learners.” Spack goes on to warn of the risks that attend such “shorthand,” however, arguing that “in the process of labeling students we put ourselves in the powerful position of rhetorically constructing their identities” (1997, p. 765; cf. Bourdieu, 1991, pp. 239-243). This practice can and frequently does lead to stigmatizing and essentialistic identity categories, a “disturbing process of constructing a fixed profile of traits for a particular ... group” (Spack, 1997, p. 768). Thesen (1997) likewise critiques the ways students come to be identified, noting that “learners are
categorized according to a limited set of identity markers, which results in a deterministic view of identity in terms of the researcher's imposed categories” (p. 488). Pennycook (2001) contends that such determinism, and the concomitant implications of cultural homogeneity, are “part of a long history of colonial othering that has rendered the cultures of others fixed, traditional, exotic, and strange” (p. 145). Contributors to Valencia (1997) trace additional, perhaps more immediate consequences of educational naming traditions, demonstrating that labels, and the categories they reference, can profoundly affect students’ access to educational opportunity through differential teacher behaviors (also see Peterson & Barger, 1985) and discriminatory practices such as tracking (also see Harklau, 1994b, 1994c; Kohl, 1994; Oakes, 1985; Spener, 1996). As Cameron (2001, p. 16) succinctly concludes: “the institutional authority to categorize people is frequently inseparable from the authority to do things to them.”

**Generation 1.5 as a social identity category**

Despite the risks that attend such “shorthand,” there is a compelling need to differentiate ESL populations, as I discuss next. In this study, I do so in ways similar to Harklau, Losey et al. (1999), distinguishing among:

- *International students*, those students who have completed secondary (or tertiary) education in their home countries and who are in the US temporarily (usually until they conclude study in a college or language school), a population that Vandrick (1995) has called “privileged ESL university students” (also see Reid, 1998);
• *First generation immigrant students*, students who have moved to the US when older, for example, after completing secondary (or tertiary education) in their home countries; and

• *Generation 1.5 ESL students*, who Harklau, Losey et al. (1999) also refer to as “long-term US-educated learners of ESL” (also see Danico, 2004; Rumbaut & Ima, 1988). With the exception of some US-born children who have grown up in multilingual communities where the language of wider communication is not English, G1.5 ESL students are generally the children of first generation immigrants. Often (though not always) they have done part of their compulsory schooling in their countries of origin (if they were not born in the US to begin with), and after immigrating, continued it in the US

Harklau, Losey et al. (1999) maintain that G1.5 ESL students have “traits and experiences that lie somewhere in between those associated with the first or second generation,” and so “pose a significant challenge to the conventional categories and practices” of ESL teachers and researchers (p. vii). First generation immigrant and international students have generally had the benefit of continuous development in their first languages (L1), and the opportunity to acquire increasingly complex academic skills and content from schooling in their home countries (August & Hakuta, 1997; Baker, 2001; Baker & Prys Jones, 1998; Crawford, 2004; Cummins, 1981, 1986, 2000; Nieto, 1992; Reid, 1998). G1.5 ESL students, on the other hand, have often had their L1 development interrupted; due to the lack of formal bilingual education across the US, many have not been provided the opportunities to develop a range of academic skills in either L1 or L2, nor had access to advanced grade-level content in ESL classes at school.
In terms of L2 learning, they may be what Reid (1998) has called "ear learners," which is to say that they may have learned the L2 less through formal, explicit L2 instruction (as is the case with what she calls "eye learners"), and more by suddenly being immersed in the language and culture [sic] of the US ....

[01.5 students may have] listened, [learned] oral language (from teachers, TV, grocery clerks, friends, peers), and subconsciously [begun] to form vocabulary, grammar, and syntax rules, learning English principally through oral trial and error (Reid, 1998, p. 4).

Thus, these students may well have a profoundly implicit, intuitive understanding of the L2, rather similar to someone who speaks English as L1 (Harklau, 2000). However, because 01.5 ESL students' experiences with academic print literacies are likely attenuated, they may struggle with L2 reading due to lack of familiarity with spelling conventions, for example, or inadequate understanding of language structure and different written genres, and their L2 writing may exhibit "the conversational, phonetic qualities of their 'ear-based' language learning as well as the use of their self-developed language 'rules'" (Reid, 1998, p. 4; also see Ferris, Kennedy, & Senna 2004; Harklau, 2000).

G1.5 students also tend to be more conversant with US cultures, schooling, and society, and may be less comfortable with their home languages and cultures than first generation immigrant and international students. Furthermore, due to experiences in ESL classes in US primary and/or secondary schools, many of these students find ESL stigmatizing, a "remedial" designation, and thus, insulting (Bennett et al., 2000; Benz,
2001; Chiang & Schmida, 1999; Harklau, Siegal et al., 1999; Kanno, 1999, 2000; McKay & Wong, 1996; Talmy, 2001a, 2004a, 2004b, 2004c). This is in contrast to (often privileged) international students, for example, who may travel to countries such as the US in order to search out ESL learning opportunities as a means for self-improvement, job-advancement, or even recreation (Reid, 1998; Vandrick, 1995).

Harklau, Losey et al. (1999), echoing Nayar (1997), note that much research in ESL has focused on international students (also see Siegel, 2003). The result is a conflation of widely varying student populations into a more or less monolithic group of “ESL learners.” As Nayar (1997) and Harklau, Siegal et al. (1999) contend, the consequences of this trend toward homogeneity are significant. Because much college-level research literature and curricula in ESL is oriented toward teaching adult international students, certain assumptions about student life histories, educational backgrounds, abilities, and so forth, become normatized:

for example, that [all students] have learned English through formal, metalinguistically oriented classroom instruction, that they are literate in their first language... or that they have had considerable life experience abroad to be drawn on in interpreting their experience in the United States (Harklau, Siegal et al., 1999, p. 2).

As the Harklau, Losey et al. (1999) collection indicates, assumptions which are based on experiences of international students often do not pertain to students who are long-term or permanent residents of the US. These students have backgrounds, experiences, and goals that are often very different from those of international students. Programs, curricula, textbooks, and instructional approaches that have been developed based on
research with international students may not, in many respects, be relevant to G1.5 ESL students (also see Ferris et al., 2004; Leung et al., 1997).

Problems

There are a number of problems associated with the term “generation 1.5.” Many derive from the reference to generational status, which introduces a “length of residence” orientation that while important in certain ways, is troublesome in others. Other problems derive from the concomitant implication that generational status can be quantified – leading to the proposition that there might be a “generation 1.2,” “generation 1.7,” or perhaps even a “generation 1.82”\(^2\) – and the incompleteness and fragmentation implied by the fraction. Rumbaut & Ima’s (1988) comparative study, among the first in which the category is invoked (see Danico, 2004, Chapter 1 for others) exemplifies some of these problems. Their report, commissioned by the US Office of Refugee Resettlement in the mid-1980s, concerns “a distinctive cohort” of Cambodian, Vietnamese, and Laotian “refugee youth” living in Southern California. The G1.5, as they are represented in this study, are dissimilar from their first generation parents, “the responsible adults who were formed in the homeland,” and the second generation, “for whom the ‘homeland’ mainly exists as a representation consisting of parental memories and memorabilia.” The G1.5 are the “young people who were born in their countries of origin but formed in the US” (p. 1). Elaborating on this group’s singularity, Rumbaut &

\(^2\) The discussion by Park (1999, p. 141) clearly indicates the theoretical minefield that awaits anyone attempting to quantify generational status this way: “[T] hose who immigrated to the US before age five are considered second generation. Immigration between the ages of six and ten places one as 1.7 generation; between eleven or twelve, 1.5 generation; between thirteen and fourteen, 1.2 generation. After graduating high school, one is classified as the first generation.”
Ima (1988) employ a discourse similar to what Nayar (1997, p. 20; also see Harklau, 2000) terms the “Ellis Island Syndrome,” a romantic disaffection which marks the G1.5 as distinctively and enduringly “in between.” The G1.5 are in many ways marginal to both the new and old worlds, for while they straddle both worlds they are in some profound sense fully part of neither of them. Though they differ greatly from each other in cultural and social class origins ... they occupy ... the interstices, as it were, of two societies and cultures, between the first and second generation, between being ‘refugees’ and being ‘ethnics’ (or ‘hyphenated Americans’) (Rumbaut & Ima, 1988, p. 2).

The “in-between” marginality of these G1.5 immigrants, with their feet at once in two worlds and in neither, occupying the “interstices” of language, culture, family, and society, marks the appearance of a central theme in representations of G1.5, one that is, indeed, signaled by the fraction “1.5.” Even as they acknowledge the diversity of those who come to be identified as G1.5, Rumbaut & Ima (1988) narrow its range, so that there are just two worlds that G1.5 “straddle” (those of the home country and the US), two languages (the L1 and L2 English), and two identities (the “first” generation and the “second”). By conflating nationality with culture, identity, language, and personhood, differences between groups are elided; differences within them are, too (cf. May, 2001; Woolard, 1998). Personal histories, educational backgrounds, religious affiliations, and life experiences come to matter less than the monolithic experience of “in between-ness”; this stripped down diversity is easily transcended by it. The result is a manageable, quantifiable, iconic, and peripheral homogeneity (cf. Thesen, 1997). In many respects, Rumbaut & Ima are playing on a “melting pot” trope. However, what Fine (1994) calls
the "Self-Other hyphen," the split affinity implied in second generation "ethnic" labels – e.g., Vietnamese-American, Cambodian-American, Laotian-American – is for the G1.5 a mere aspiration, ensnared as they are by a decimal point signaling interstitial incompleteness.

Ways forward

The contributors to Harklau, Losey et al. (1999) offer some important ways forward by extending and elaborating Rumbaut & Ima’s (1988) definition of G1.5. G1.5 in this collection is any immigrant whose L1 is not English and who graduated from a high school in the US. Significantly, Harklau, Siegal et al. (1999) call into question the notion of immigrant generational status itself by including US-born students who grew up in multilingual enclaves where the language of wider communication is not English (e.g. Puerto Rico, and areas of Hawai’i, Alaska, California, New York, Connecticut, among many others). In terms of age, G1.5 can range from those who were born in the US to those who arrived in the country as high school seniors.

This is a robust expansion of the identity category, an expansion that some might argue threatens its utility. But Harklau, Siegal et al. (1999) assert that there is a need to keep the definitions of G1.5 open since the category represents such a diversity of students. Indeed, they problematize the G1.5 category as Rumbaut & Ima (1988) define it, challenging not only indices such as generational status and age on arrival to the US, but socioeconomic background, schooling histories, L1 and L2 English literacy practices, and more. Furthermore, the variation of G1.5 may mean that in many instances these students are more different than alike. G1.5
may be too diverse, too particularistic in their backgrounds, needs, and characteristics to hold under any single label or rubric. Yet as the ranks of US high school graduate English language learners continue to grow in [community college and university] ESL and composition programs nationwide, we feel that it is vital to raise issues that often attend their instruction (Harklau, Siegal et al., 1999, p. 12; also see Ferris et al., 2004).

The tension in naming practices – between homogeneity and essentialism on the one hand, and the need to classify, however broadly, on the other – is clear. Therefore, in order to circumvent the essentializing tendencies that attend labeling the G1.5, Harklau, Siegal et al. (1999) and Rodby (1999) suggest that a web of social factors be taken into consideration. They include resident and generational status, (or community origins if born in the US); extent of formal schooling completed in the country of origin; when schooling in English began; type of bilingual program (if any) encountered in US schools; socioeconomic status; L1 literacy practices; L2 English literacy practices; social relationships at home, in the school, and in the community; family and community attitudes toward English and education; family and community obligations; employment and workload; finances; linguistic and cultural affiliations; experiences in and attitudes toward ESL programs in the US; as well as ascriptive characteristics such as race, ethnicity, and gender (Harklau, Siegal et al., 1999; Rodby, 1999). The host of salient factors here clearly signals the difficulty in codifying the G1.5.

Still, as these authors make clear, there is a pressing need to establish a research literature concerning this particular population, as it is only growing in this nation’s schools. As it happens, the label “generation 1.5” in the L2 studies literature has among
the more robust research concerning it; in the spirit of this endeavor, therefore, I utilize "generation 1.5" as a social identity category in this study to refer to an adolescent or pre-adolescent ESL population with some length of residence in the US, although it is counterproductive and needlessly prescriptive to define "X" number of years as some sort of "qualifying" criterion (cf. Park, 1999). Certainly length of residence is informative; for example, if a school-age student has lived for three years in the US, there is good probability that that student has been to school in the US for that period of time, probably had some experience in an ESL program, and so forth. However, the problem is that it may mean that because students have lived in the US for a certain period of time, that there is the automatic presumption that a) they speak L2 English (and/or Pidgin, in the case of Hawai‘i) well, or have some sort of G1.5 configuration of L1/L2 proficiencies, b) that they have connections to local (or Local, in the case of Hawai‘i) communities, which is to say communities beyond those of their immediate families or ethnolinguistic groups, and c) therefore, that they have some affiliation with those communities. While a long length of residence would seem to suggest these as possibilities, they are not necessarily guaranteed.  

For these reasons, I prefer to use a more relational definition of G1.5, one that simultaneously acknowledges that these students may well have spent significant periods of time in the US and in US schools, but more to the point, one which takes into account

---

3 I briefly describe two ESLL students to elaborate why length of residence should not be the superordinate criterion for defining G1.5. Laidplayer, a 15-year-old from Palau, for example, had lived in the US for one month, but had very strong connections to and affiliations with Local communities due to his ties with extended family in Hawai‘i; Laidplayer’s L2 (oral) proficiencies in both English and Pidgin were also very advanced. Conversely, Cici, a 16-year-old from China, had lived in the US for five years, had comparatively low L2 English proficiency (and virtually none in Pidgin), and exhibited little affiliation to the US. I assert that these two examples suggest why length of residence should not be the primary criterion around which G1.5 is defined (in contrast to the claim to generational status which the label explicitly invokes).
how the students *themselves* orient to a) the languages and cultures of their countries of origin (if they were born outside of the US), b) those of the US, and c) being classified as "ESL" students. Regarding this last point in particular, a relational definition of G1.5 highlights how students define themselves in terms of a relational other, which is to say, in terms of what (they signify) *they are not*. By emphasizing less what G1.5 students are attempting to *become*, and more what they are attempting to *be different from*, a relational definition of G1.5 helps to move away from the pitfalls of potential essentialism by radically expanding the capability to conceptualize hybridity in identity, that is, identity as a site of ambiguity, tension, and contradiction (Barker & Galasiński, 2001; Barth, 1969). A relational definition of identity emphasizes identity as a highly local, specific, and therefore multiple and shifting *interactional accomplishment*, rather than as a static, decontextualized, and essential internal "trait" or "attribute" that endures in isolation across time and space.

In this regard, in addition to linguistic expertise and inheritance, I elaborate one important element in Harklau, Siegal et al.'s (1999) expanded definitional criteria of G1.5, one which is centers around the notion of affiliation (Rampton, 1990; see Chapter 8).

With these points in mind, I here enumerate the primary criteria that I have used in this study to determine the social identity category of G1.5 ESL student at Tradewinds High School:
1. The students are enrolled in the ESLL program at the high school;

2. These students have somehow developed ties to and affiliations with communities beyond the ESLL program. This can certainly be due to a length of residence in the US, but also family connections, exposure to media, and more;

3. These students have some experience with US cultures and schooling practices, particularly in these schools’ ESL programs;

4. These students index difference from and/or opposition to ESLL, primarily (but not necessarily exclusively) through affiliations, connections, and experiences with Local communities and practices, the US, L2 English and/or Pidgin, and/or US cultures and customs, however various, shifting, multiple, and/or hybrid these may be. Such a perspective implies some degree of understanding of or socialization into wider linguicist, assimilationist ideologies in the US that cast non-native speakers, immigrants, and ESL programs into marginal, low-prestige positions;

5. These students have the L2 English and/or Pidgin oral/aural proficiency, and pragmatic and interactional competence to accomplish #4 (see Chapter 9). This criterion allows these students to be identified not in deficit terms, for example, as “lacking writing skills” but in terms of what they do well, and that is speak and interact in the L2.

This way of classifying a population of ESL students that is clearly different from “privileged international students” (Vandrick, 1995), realizes Rampton’s (1990) important framework of expertise, affiliation, and inheritance (see Talmy, 2004c). Specifically, for the purposes of this study, I am concerned with how these students’
affiliations manifest in terms of attitudes about, perspectives on, and representations of ESLL.

I do want to point out that my use of G1.5 does not refer to any group that self-identified or was otherwise labeled at the high school as “G1.5.” This is an etic, analytic term, used to gloss not really individuals so much as a set of distinctive practices, orientations, and affiliations that get taken up to varying degrees by individuals in particular settings. In this regard, my use of “G1.5” is a relational one as well, rather than referential of some sort of existing, natural, or ascriptive category. Although I do use the term frequently throughout the dissertation as if it is an ascriptive category, readers should remain aware that it is invoked always in terms of its relational aspects for descriptive and analytic purposes.

Local

At Tradewinds, many G1.5 students (though not all) indexed their counter-ESLL affiliations in broadly Local terms. The term “Local” in Hawai‘i refers to “a racialized social identity category; a panethnic formation composed primarily of the various non-White groups that usually trace their entrance into the islands to the plantation era. . . . For many Hawai‘i residents. . . Local is the most salient category for political and cultural identification” (Labrador, 2004, p. 295).

At Tradewinds, as at all schools in Hawai‘i, G1.5 ESL students had a distinctive linguistic resource to draw upon to perform or index Local identity, and that was Pidgin (cf. Zentella, 1997; 1998). Pidgin, or Hawai‘i Creole, a creole language that developed at the turn of the 20th century in Hawai‘i, is a critical, if often stigmatized symbol of
"Local" culture and identity. Any discussion of language learning, indeed, any linguistic research in Hawai‘i, particularly concerning a public high school, must acknowledge and account for it. However, despite the apparent ease that Pidgin might seem to afford in helping to determine whether a student is indexing Localness, in fact, and predictably, the issue is much more complex (cf. Zentella, 1997; 1998). At Tradewinds, both Pidgin and standardized English (SE) were the predominant languages: SE was reserved primarily for the classroom, whereas Pidgin was used in classrooms, hallways, courtyards, and parking lots, by students and teachers alike. Due to a number of factors, however, many students in the Tradewinds ESL program believed only SE comprised their L2 environment, when in fact Pidgin did too. Likely reasons for this misunderstanding range from the grammatical and lexical similarities between SE and the lighter (or acrolectal) varieties of Pidgin common in urban areas of Hawai‘i, to the lack of a (critical) language awareness component in the curriculum, to not knowing about the existence of Pidgin in the first place. Therefore, it is not always clear whether a student is switching to Pidgin to index Local identity or simply is speaking what s/he believes is SE, when in fact it is Pidgin.

To contend with this issue, I have drawn on my extensive ethnographic knowledge of the students and teachers as it developed during fieldwork in the school, and in addition, analysed how codeswitching functions and is treated by interlocutors in specific instances of interaction represented below. Regardless, of course, it is difficult,

4 For more on the origins, linguistic features, and politics of Pidgin see, e.g., Da Pidgin Coup (1999), Roberts (2000, 2003), Sakoda & Siegel (2003), Sato (1985, 1991), and Siegel (2000); also see Chapter 6.
5 A class of 2nd-year (ESLL B) students I was once talking to was surprised to learn that their L2 environment included Pidgin as well as SE. One 16-year-old Filipina exclaimed: “so where can I learn real English?” (ELB22Ufu: 378)
if not impossible to determine a speaker's "real" or "true" intention in terms of the linguistic and other communicative resources they draw on in a particular interaction, including code alternation between L2 English and Pidgin.

In terms of identifying what was and was not Pidgin in this study, I have used Sakoda & Siegel (2003), my own intuitions, and those of two authorities on Pidgin.\(^6\) Regarding transcription, I have opted to use the phonemic Odo orthography (Sakoda & Siegel, 2003, pp. 23-26) to represent Pidgin in the extracts below, rather than English etymology, or an "eye dialect" (Woolard, 1998, p. 23), as the politics of representing a creole in a colonial language are extremely problematic (see Schieffelin & Doucet, 1998).

**Lifers, FOBs, and rocks: Distinguishing ESLL at Tradewinds**

In light of the significance I have attached to "naming" practices, it is imperative to pause and consider the notably loaded labels I have used in the title of the dissertation. I use the terms "lifer," "FOB," and "rock" on the one hand to signify certain participant perspectives on selected segments of the ESLL population at Tradewinds, and on the other, to minimally suggest some of the diversity that the term "ESLL" itself obscures. This is not to say that the terms themselves were used frequently at the high school, nor that I condone their use, but as I will argue in subsequent chapters, the differences that they signify were crucial to the cultural productions of ESLL at Tradewinds. As I detail in Chapters 5 and 7, ESLL students at the high school were placed into ESLL classes not by L2 English proficiency but by how long they had been at the high school. Although

---

6 They are Jo Ann Kadooka, who is, among much else, a Pidgin speaker and contributor to Da Pidgin Coup (1999), and Gloria So, who is also a Pidgin speaker and translator for the Cantonese and Mandarin data in this study.
there certainly were institutional categories of “non-English proficient,” “limited English proficient,” and “fluent English proficient” that were used in the ESLL program at the school, these were not categories that were particularly salient either administratively, to the teachers, or to the ESLL students themselves (in part due to a significant lack of transparency in the ESLL testing and placement process). Therefore, an important aspect in the cultural productions of ESLL at Tradewinds was an astounding range of identity work that students engaged in, in a broader effort to differentiate themselves in ways that the program did not.

“ESL lifer” (Faltis & Wolfe, 1999, pp. 275-276) refers to students who have been in ESLL programs for a considerable period of time and who, for whatever reason, “can’t get out.” By definition, therefore, it refers to ESL students with substantial lengths of residence in the US, primarily G1.5 students. It is not a term that any teacher, G1.5 student, or non-G1.5 student used in any of my data. However, as elucidated in Chapter 8, a predominant representational practice of G1.5 students in regard to ESLL was that of being “stuck” in the program, unable to “escape.” The jailhouse imagery encoded in so many of these students’ descriptions of ESLL suggested an overwhelming sense of powerlessness, of being “sentenced” to these classes for the duration of their school lives.\(^7\) I note that, of course, no “criminal” connotation should attach to my particular use of the term; rather, I employ it to refer to an important segment of the ESLL population at Tradewinds, in ways that I believe are consonant with their represented perspectives.

---

\(^7\) My thanks to Mary Schmida (personal communication, 23 September 2004) for her insight on this point. Faltis & Wolfe (1999, pp. 275-276) also note that “ESL lifer” can reflect mainstream teachers’ views of ESL programs as “holding cells where students can be placed and never released into ‘mainstream’ education” (see Chapter 8).
“FOB” stands for “fresh off the boat,” a noxious label signifying a recently-arrived, monumentally uncool, non-English-speaking rube of mythical, and for some, hilarious proportions (also see Jeon, 2001; Reyes, 2003, pp. 82-128). “FOB,” pronounced both as an initialism (cf. Talmy, 2004a) and as a word /fab/ (cf. Jeon, 2001), was a local (student) term from Tradewinds, used primarily by G1.5 ESLL students to refer to newcomers and lower-L2-English-proficient ESLL classmates. In addition, I use “FOB” as a gloss for an exoticized Newcomer, a cultural and linguistic Other that I argue ESLL students were often positioned as at the high school, primarily through curricula and instruction that played on a nationalist language ideology (Woolard, 1998) and a well-meaning, yet ultimately superficial form of multiculturalism (Banks, 2001; cf. May, 2001; see Chapter 7; Chapters 9-10).

Finally, “rock” was a label that Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bradley, and Ms. Enders used occasionally to refer to the “lowest of the low” L2 English proficient students, in addition to, as Mr. Anderson blithely explained, “the ones who don’t know nothing” (MSCNefn: 347). In this respect, “rock” was a term used by some teachers to refer to one segment (the “lowest of the low”) of the same population that G1.5 students called “FOB.” Specifically, the “rocks” were students with interrupted formal educations, that is, students who had “little or no formal education . . . little or no literacy in their native language, and . . . limited academic content knowledge” (Mace-Matluck, Alexander-Kasparik, & Queen, 1998, p. 12; also see Freeman et al., 2002). Most were from rural areas of China and certain out-lying islands of Micronesia, and most, as might be imagined, struggled mightily in their time in Tradewinds classrooms (cf. Ruiz de Velasco & Fix, 2002; Ruiz de Velasco et al., 2000; Talmy, 2005). Although I initially hesitated to
include what is, as it is used here, an obviously disparaging term, it refers to an important
group of ESLL students at Tradewinds, students who in many ways functioned as iconic
stand-ins for the subject position “FOB,” in ways that I believe reflected predominant
attitudes toward them both among teachers and students. At the same time, perhaps
incidentally, the term evokes the “sink or swim” metaphor regarding “submersion” L2
education (see, e.g., Garcia, 1997).

Conclusion

In this chapter I have briefly considered some of the politics of representation in
this study, particularly as they relate to naming practices, and with specific regard to the
label “generation 1.5.” I have examined the use of “generation 1.5” in L2 studies and
related fields and described some of the problems it connotes, primarily in terms of its
invocation and quantification of generational status. I have argued that despite the label’s
many drawbacks, that it should be retained since there is an increasing, identifiable
literature that is accumulating around it. However, I have suggested a much more
relational definition, one that does on the one hand account for length of residence, but on
the other, does not reify it, instead emphasizing students’ orientations to the languages
they know, their self-identifications, and the L2 expertise they bring to bear in indexing
their various affinities and affiliations. Having established my use of terms, I turn next to
my theoretical frameworks.
CHAPTER 3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

(L)earners must be legitimate peripheral participants in ongoing practice in order for learning identities to be engaged and develop into full participation. Conditions that place newcomers in deeply adversarial relations with masters [of a community of practice] . . . distort, partially or completely, the prospects for learning in practice. Our viewpoint suggests that communities of practice may well develop interstitially and informally in coercive workplaces. What will be learned then will be the sociocultural practices of whatever informal community takes place in response to coercion . . . . These practices shape and are shaped indirectly through resistance to the prescriptions of the ostensibly primary organizational form.

Lave & Wenger (1991, p. 64)

Introduction

In this chapter, I provide an outline of the three associated dimensions of a broadly specified social practice theoretical framework, starting with the general notion of cultural production, then continuing more specifically with communities of practice, and finally, language socialization.

I begin with an overview of the development of theory and research in cultural production, describing its relation to several social reproduction theories as well as the theoretical advances it offers to them, particularly in terms of how social practice, agency, and subjectivity, with particular regard to resistance, are conceptualized within a cultural production theoretic. I continue by addressing a number of substantive critiques of formulations of resistance in early cultural production research, before moving into consideration of communities of practice. This is followed by a brief discussion of situated learning and language socialization as they relate to cultural production. I then pause briefly to consider the related concepts of ideology, language ideology, and
linguicism, as these concepts are invoked consistently in the chapters ahead, before concluding with three related reviews of L2 studies, one of literature that incorporates a notion of resistance, ranging from more implicit conceptions in early social psychological L2 literature up to recent, post-structuralist formulations, another of work that focuses on identity and L2 learning, and the last of select studies relevant to research conducted in a formal school setting that employ some combination of cultural production/communities of practice/language socialization.

From resistance to cultural production

Cultural production as a theoretical concept and as an increasingly coherent empirical research literature, has been developing in cultural studies since the 1960s, particularly in educational and linguistic anthropology, and critical education studies (Eisenhart, 1996; Lave, Duguid, Fernandez, & Axel, 1992; Levinson, 2001; Levinson, Foley, & Holland, 1996; Levinson & Holland, 1996; O'Connor, 2001, 2003). Deriving as it does from cultural studies, it takes as part of its project the fundamental reconceptualization of “culture,” dispensing with the notion of a monolithic, unitary, capital “C” culture that comprises a static corpus of customs, beliefs, arts, or ideas, in favor of lowercase “c” cultures, that is, of systems of social practices, that are produced and reproduced by human agents situated in time and place. Culture, in this view, is a dynamic “constitutive social process” (R. Williams, 1977, p. 19; 1983), in which agents create meaning by drawing on cultural forms as they act in social and material contexts, and in so doing produce themselves as certain kinds of culturally located persons while at the same time reproducing and transforming
the cultural formations in which they act. Thus, "cultural production" has a double meaning: it is concerned with how persons are produced as cultural beings, and with how this production of persons results in the (re)production of cultural formations (O'Connor, 2003, pp. 61-62).

Much of the initial work on cultural production came out of British cultural studies in the 1970s, particularly early work concerning resistance at the University of Birmingham's Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS). This early work on resistance developed out of a number of loosely connected, critical ethnographic analyses undertaken at CCCS that highlighted situated human agency as it was manifested through conflict, struggle, and opposition.¹ It focused on ways that social actors in particular contexts – especially members of oppositional youth ‘sub-cultures’ in industrialized societies (cf. Hall & Jefferson, 1976) – negotiated the social structures, institutions, and discourses of everyday life.

Perhaps the best known and most influential of this work is Willis's (1977) study of "the lads," twelve working-class boys who comprised the "counter-school culture" of Hammertown Comprehensive, an English secondary school.² The "lads" rejected the middle-class values and meanings of the school by asserting their working-class identities in the form of dramatic displays of masculinity and sexism. The "lads'" resistance was manifest in what Willis (1977, p. 19) calls "continuous guerrilla warfare" that took place both inside the classroom and out. The "lads" missed class, showed up late, arrived to

¹ For an in-depth discussion of the particular conceptualization of "agency" that I use in this study, see the sub-section about it below.
² There is considerable precedent for using Willis (1977) as the locus classicus for early cultural production research (e.g., Eisenhart, 1996; Giroux, 1983a, 1983b; Lave et al., 1992; Levinson, 2001; Levinson & Holland, 1996; Weis, 1985). I do so here, as well.
school drunk. They vandalized books, disrupted lessons, harassed teachers and conformist classmates (the “ear’oles”), and otherwise flouted school rules with an array of oppositional behaviors. Willis traces this to the “lads’” reification of manual labor as a symbol of masculinity; the mental labor called for in schoolwork was rejected as an index of femininity. All that was associated with mental labor – the school, the teachers, the conformist “ear’oles,” the liberal ideology of education as provider of social mobility – was similarly rejected. Willis thus shows the rationale, or “counter-logic,” in the “lads’” resistance by tracing it to their working-class roots. Their families, the shop-floors where their fathers worked, the street life they knew, the terms of their counter-school culture – “having a laff,” “taking the piss,” “wagging off” – all pointed to a different ethos than the normative, domesticating, middle-class culture promoted at school.

Cultural production as elaborated in Willis (1977) bears important relations to (as well as equally important differences from) a cluster of social, cultural, and economic “reproduction theories” (Giroux, 1983a; 1983b; Morrow & Torres, 1995). Reproduction theories center on the social structural determinants that promote inequality, the ways that dominant ideologies, relations, and interests are reproduced, uncontested, through social and cultural institutions (see Table 3.1 for a basic taxonomy). Such theories are variously and in varying degrees informed by structuralist critical social theory, in which schooling is determined by a society’s economic necessities, and human subjects are reduced to passive “bearers of structural relationships . . . who share no collective principles of variation or continuity of their own” (Willis, 1981, p. 52). Althusser (1971), for example, maintained that “the category of subject is only constitutive of all ideology insofar as all ideology has the function . . . of ‘constituting’ concrete individuals as subjects” (p. 171).
Table 3.1 Theories of cultural and social reproduction and cultural production (based on Giroux, 1983a; 1983b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theories of social reproduction</th>
<th>&quot;Mechanism&quot; of reproduction</th>
<th>Key theoretical construct</th>
<th>Representative work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural-reproductive model</td>
<td>Dominant culture transmitted by school; school legitimates certain class-specific forms of knowledge, ways of speaking, etc., and not others.</td>
<td>Cultural capital</td>
<td>Bourdieu &amp; Passeron (1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hegemonic-state reproductive model</td>
<td>The State limits and controls how schools contend with ideology, culture, and social practices, e.g., through policies that shape the reproductive function of schools.</td>
<td>Hegemony</td>
<td>Gramsci (1971)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural production</td>
<td>Cultural production is manifest in the complex interplay between social structure, social practice, and human agency; reproduction is never guaranteed; however, agency always constrained</td>
<td>Social practice; agency; subjectivity</td>
<td>Willis (1977)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here, ideology is little more than a hegemonic social force that constitutes an individual's subjectivity; there is no room for the human agent to respond to, accommodate, or resist ideological control.

A primary site of interest in reproduction studies has been the school. In contrast to liberal theories that maintain schools are neutral promoters of equality and excellence, reproduction theories implicate schools in the reproduction of (dominant) ideologies, forms of knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to reproduce the relations of an existing social order (Giroux, 1983a, 1983b; Levinson & Holland, 1996; McLaren, 1994; Morrow & Torres, 1995; Willis, 1981). Thus, there are social reproduction studies of the “hidden curriculum” in schooling (e.g., Anyon, 1980), analyses of “cultural capital” as the means by which reproduction occurs (e.g., Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977), theories of school/workplace “correspondences” (Bowles & Gintis, 1977), as well as other structural determinants of reproduction. Reproduction theories offer compelling insights regarding the political nature of schooling and the role that education can play in reproducing (hegemonic) social relations (Giroux, 1983a, 1983b; Levinson, 2001; Levinson & Holland, 1996; McLaren, 1994; Morrow & Torres, 1995). Further, they provide a critical theoretical antidote to explanations for school failure. That is, instead of blaming students for low achievement due to deviance, cultural deprivation, or “learned helplessness,” for example, reproduction theories allow broader sociopolitical and sociohistorical factors to be implicated (cf. Valencia, 1997).

A central problem with reproduction theories, however, is the determinism and homogeneity implicit in the notion of all-pervasive structural domination. As Willis (1981) argues, reproduction theories provide “no sense of structure being a contested
medium [or] an outcome of social process”; instead, “agency, struggle, change – those things which at least partly . . . help to produce ‘structure’ to ‘start with’ – are banished” from consideration (p. 52; cf. Ahearn, 2001; Giddens, 1979). Due to the emphasis on macro-level processes, reproduction theories offer little insight into the ways that social actors negotiate the complex, dynamic, and often-contradictory conditions of everyday life. Humans disappear in reproduction theories, leaving

no room for moments of self-creation, mediation, and resistance. These accounts often leave us with a view of schooling and domination that appears to have been pressed out of an Orwellian fantasy; schools are often viewed as factories or prisons, teachers and students alike act merely as pawns and role bearers constrained by the logic and social practices of the capitalist system (Giroux, 1983a, p. 259).

By dissolving subjectivity and human agency, reproduction theories ultimately underestimate and diminish – and minimize the need to examine – the experiences of social actors in actual contexts; these experiences become homogeneous, determined, and predictable. Reproduction theories also offer little hope for transforming the hegemonic features of schooling they illuminate, since the creative potential for counterhegemonic thought and action is absent (Canagarajah, 1999; Giroux, 1997; Morrow & Torres, 1995; Willis, 1981).

Although theories of cultural production retain an interest in and a strong orientation toward a cultural and social reproduction analytic perspective, a primary difference is the interest in the “discourses, meanings, materials, practices, and group processes [that human agents use] to explore, understand, and creatively occupy
particular positions in sets of general material possibilities” (Willis, 1981, p. 59; also see Willis, 1977; Levinson & Holland, 1996; Levinson, 2001). In this respect, social and cultural reproduction are not foregone conclusions within a cultural production theoretic; social structure is mediated by agents multiply situated in historical, political, and social contexts. Cultural production

signifies not the contours of formal categories outlined by the theorists – “sex, race, class” and their dry . . . separate vegetative propagations – but the profane, living, properly fertile, often uncontrollable combinations of these elements in actual collective life projects, decisions, and changes . . . . This is the actual stuff of the creation and recreation of material and social life which can only then be re-classified out by the theorists: “sex, race, and class” (Willis, 1981, p. 62).

Human subjectivity and agency thus are restored in theories of cultural production: they “add to reproduction theories . . . the sense of activity and practice” (Willis, 1981, p. 64). Indeed, Willis’s “lads” were anything but the passive bearers of structure implied in theories of reproduction. They produced Hammertown Comprehensive’s “counter-school culture” through their particular “counter-school” practices and cultural forms, drawing on the cultural resources of their working class worlds to do so. At the same time, these particular cultural forms and social practices mediated the maintenance of structural inequality, ultimately working to reproduce the boys’ class positions in society: these “working class kids” did, after all, “get working class jobs.” Crucial here is the point that the school itself did not unilaterally accomplish this: the lads were centrally involved in the processes of reproduction. In short, while

---

3 This interest in the cultural forms and social practices of the “lads” is what ultimately compelled Willis (1977) to employ an ethnographic research methodology, as I discuss in Chapter 4 below.
structural determinants such as class do not determine social practices or cultural forms, they can “imprint themselves on living experiences and meanings” (Willis, 1981, p. 50). These then “pass through the cultural milieu” to achieve a symbolic power which can lead to “uncoerced outcomes” that “have the function of maintaining the structure of society and the status quo” (Willis, 1977, p. 171; cf. Ahearn, 2001; Bourdieu, 1991; Giddens, 1984).

Theory and research in cultural production thus integrate many insights offered by reproduction theories, but by recovering agency and subjectivity, underscore the notion that power is not one-dimensional; the processes of reproduction are never guaranteed since they are “always faced with partially realized elements of opposition” (Giroux, 1983a, p. 283). This highlights the complexity and unpredictability, the productive tensions and disjunctures, which can exist in what might otherwise be conceived as a simplistic dialectic between the individual and social structure. Any reproductive potentiality of schooling “must pass through the dynamics of cultural production, the consequential making of meanings . . . the implacable agency of students,” notes Levinson (2001). This allows for “a more nuanced picture of how power operate[s] within schools to shape particular student outcomes” (p. 326; also see Ahearn, 2001).

This complexity and unpredictability is further advanced in the ways that cultural production theory and research has conceived of the “relative autonomy” of social institutions, not just from political and economic determinants, but also from each other. A cultural production theoretic asserts that different spheres or cultural sites, e.g., schools, families, trade unions, mass media, etc., are governed by complex ideological properties that often generate
contradictions both within and between them. At the same time, the notion of ideological domination as all-encompassing and unitary . . . is rejected. As such, it is rightly argued that dominant ideologies themselves are often contradictory, as are different factions of the ruling classes, the institutions that serve them, and the subordinate groups under their control (Giroux, 1983b, p. 102).

Just as cultural production emphasizes that agency is not unconstrained, it also holds that social structures, conflicting and contradictory as they may be, do not go uncontested. Cultural production therefore combats the pessimism of reproduction by demonstrating that change can occur. Specifically, it suggests ways of constructing alternative, radical pedagogies – e.g., a critical pedagogy of hope (Freire, 1993; Giroux, 1996, 1997) – that centers on analyses and insights provided through, e.g., the notion of resistance. This is needed to transform the reproductive potentialities for those who resist, since they may end up participating in their own domination (Canagarajah, 1993, 1999; Kadooka, 2001; McLaren, 1994; Willis, 1977, 1981).

**Critiques**

Despite the advances in the way Willis (1977) conceives of cultural production and the relationships between subjectivity, agency, and structure, a number of criticisms have been leveled at his work. Lave, Duguid, Fernandez, & Axel (1992), for example, in a paper that approvingly outlines the complementarity between Willis’ (1977) work on cultural production and their own theory of social practice, argue that the “lads” as a

---

4 The following commentary concerns critiques of research concerning cultural production rather than of critical ethnography. While both sets of critiques are related, those of critical ethnography have a different overall emphasis, i.e., they take issue with the “value-ladenness” of critical theoretical research, preferring instead an ostensibly “less ideological,” or more “objective” interpretive position. See Chapter 4.
group is conceived in ahistorical, universalistic terms, lending it a static, "irreducible character" (see also Walker, 1985). They maintain that the dynamics of the group *itself* need to be analysed, that "the subjectivities that it comprises - the 'lads'’ entrances, exits, and ways of participating in the ongoing activities of the informal group" need to be examined since they "are important facets of the constitution of both the group and members' subjectivities" (p. 275). Since analysis of the interrelations of the "lads" is absent – for example, how precisely working-class boys *become* "lads," what the intragroup dynamics are – the group is characterized by a peculiar homogeneity. Walker (1985) extends this criticism to the "lads'” conformist counterparts, the "ear’oles." As he intimates, Hammertown Comprehensive appears to be comprised of two monolithic student groups: a boy there is either a “lad” or an “ear’ole.” Rampton (1995; 1996) agrees, noting the problem in part derives from use of the sub-cultural *group* as a unit of analysis. This leads to conceptions of subjectivity and agency which are too rigidly constrained, though not by structure or institution or ideology, but by the group itself.

Walker (1985) admits the "lads”/"ear’oles” binarism may be an emic construction (of the “lads”), but chastises Willis nonetheless for his “uncritical perspective” (p. 68): it "leaves him without the means of *effective, practical criticism* of lad culture” (p. 71, emphasis in original). Although Walker (1985) overstates the case here – he is ultimately arguing against what he calls Willis’ “dogmatic inductivism and . . . . theoretical rigidity” (p. 70) – he is right in questioning Willis’ silence regarding the "lads”’ sexism and racism. This is a point that has been taken up by a number of scholars. McRobbie (e.g., 1978; 1992), for instance, whose work concerns working-class girls, “takes issue” with the general neglect of gender relations in much early CCCS work, including Willis
(1977). She points out that “the culture of adolescent working class girls” is not only shaped by their class position, but is also “an index of, and response to their sexual oppression as women” (p. 108). She criticizes Willis both for neglecting to consider gender relations in general in Learning to labour, and for not addressing the “lads”’ virulent sexism, about which Willis remains curiously quiet (an omission that Willis later [1981] admits was a mistake). Lave et al. (1992) add that by simply labeling the “lads”’ as sexist, Willis has missed the opportunity to investigate their “subjective preparation as sexual and sexist subjects” (p. 276). These same arguments can and have been made about the neglect of race relations and racism in Learning to labour (e.g., CCCS Race and Politics Group, 1982; Fine, 1991; Giroux, 1983a, 1983b; Levinson & Holland, 1996; Rampton, 1995, 1996; Solomon, 1992; Weis, 1985). As Giroux (1983b) concludes, this failure to include women and [people of color] . . . has resulted in a rather uncritical tendency to romanticize modes of resistance even when they contain reactionary racial and gender views. . . . [Thus, they] end up contributing to the reproduction of sexist and racist attitudes and practices (p. 287).

Criticisms such as these highlight important limitations in the predominantly class-based analyses of early work at CCCS.5

These sorts of problems with reductionism and omission in Willis (1977) evoke a pointed criticism made by Hargreaves (1982): that studies on resistance have “ignore[d] a sizeable amount of ethnographic research which points to the immense diversity and

5 However, Lave et al. (1992) were quick to point out that as a result of such criticisms, the pendulum may have swung too far away from a materialist, class-culture position, to one that was overly discourse-oriented. They suggested (in 1992) that it was “time to look back, with all the benefits of hindsight, to cultivate some of the more deeply rooted initial insights [offered by a class-culture theoretic] that current fashion is in danger of obscuring” (p. 258). The work of Levinson, Foley, & Holland (1996) and Levinson (2001), for example, can be seen as addressing Lave et al.’s (1992) point.
complexity of . . . pupils' responses” to schooling (p.112). Instead of attempting to
document and analyse such complexity, Hargreaves (1982) argues, these studies either
ignore it or try to incorporate it somehow under a rubric of “resistance” (see also
Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983). Hargreaves (1982) states that in research on resistance,
the concept of resistance [is used] as a sort of trawling device which, like a finely
meshed fishing net, sweeps the oceans of pupil activity for ‘appropriate’
examples, allowing only the smallest and most insignificant items of pupil activity
to get away (p. 113).

Rampton (1995, 1996) is not as harsh, but agrees in principle: a focus on resistance can
“obscure moments in cultural expression when autonomy and alternative identity have
priority over active opposition” (pp. 134-135). This may lead to one-dimensional
analyses of phenomena and social settings, as well as reductive identities of resistance
that endure across time and context.

Echoing Hargreaves’ (1982) and Walker’s (1985) concerns, Giroux undertakes to
resuscitate the concept of resistance lest it “become a category indiscriminately hung over
every expression of ‘oppositional behavior’” (1983b, p. 291). Giroux maintains that
resistance “redefines the causes and meaning of oppositional behavior by arguing that it
has little to do with deviance and learned helplessness, but a great deal to do with moral
and political indignation” (p. 289). In this regard, he conceives of a distinction between
“resistance” and “opposition.” For an oppositional action to be considered “resistance,”
he maintains, it must

---

6 It is important to note that Hargreaves (1982) takes aim at the work of Michael Apple, Henry Giroux, and
Jean Anyon, not of Paul Willis. The rationale for excluding Willis (1977) in his discussion goes
unexplained.
[contain] a critique of domination and [provide] theoretical opportunities for self-reflection and struggle in the interest of social and self-emancipation. . . .

[Resistance] represents an element of difference, a counter-logic, that must be analyzed to reveal its underlying interest in freedom and its rejection of those forms of domination inherent in the social relations against which it reacts (Giroux, 1983a, p. 290, my emphasis).

Thus, resistance is marked by a principled, critical-theoretical motive and an emancipatory potential – a “counter-logic” – in contrast to “opposition,” which lacks ideological clarity or purpose, and thus offers no critique or commitment to praxis (cf. Cameron, Frazer, Harvey, Rampton, & Richardson, 1993; Canagarajah, 1993).

Although on the surface this may appear to be a useful distinction, in fact, it presents the research with a host of dilemmas, not the least of which is determining social actors’ “real” motives. Giroux argues strongly for ethnography to resolve this issue, maintaining that the researcher “must either link the behavior under analysis with an interpretation provided by the subjects themselves, or dig deeply into the historical and relational conditions from which the behavior develops.” In instances where individuals cannot explain a particular behavior, “the interest underlying [it] may be illuminated against the backdrop of social practices and values from which [it] emerges.” Finally, resistance researchers “must [go] beyond the immediacy of behavior to the interest that underlies its often hidden logic, a logic that must also be interpreted through the historical and cultural mediations that shape it” (p. 291).

Although this ethnographic “solution” is helpful, what remains for the researcher is the problem of investigating from a post-structuralist, critical-theoretical framework, a
fundamentally rationalist, modernist distinction, an abstracted, psychological dichotomy that at its base rests on questions of intentionality – that is, the degree to which a particular action can be accounted for in terms of some form of “counter-logic.” By positing two *a priori* categories (opposition vs. resistance), it also clashes with a (critical) hermeneutic paradigm and subjectivist epistemology (see Chapters 4-5). Additionally, even if an empirically defensible act of resistance can actually be claimed, it winds up *reifying* both a monolithic classroom agenda and the resistant and oppositional responses to it, rather than allowing for alternative, competing, or even analogous cultural productions to be examined *in practice*. That is to say, such a reification privileges product over process, the “result” being that the inevitable contingencies and contradictions of social practice become elided, locked as they are into the two main categories of official classroom agendas and resistant responses (cf. O’Connor, 2003). As well, the resistance/opposition distinction, like all (modernist) binarisms, suffers from problems in terms of reductionism (Rampton 1995; 1996), as well as what has been termed a doctrinaire presumptuousness implicit in the notion of “emancipation” (see, e.g., Ellsworth, 1989; Gore, 1992, 1998).

**Communities of practice, situated learning, and language socialization**

Work that has been conducted within a cultural production theoretical framework more recently addresses many of the critiques outlined above. In this section, I discuss these frameworks, with particular regard paid to the notion of “communities of practice,” its attendant theory of situated learning, and then relatedly, language socialization. These are highly complementary cultural production frameworks, united as they are by their

Communities of practice

Lave & Wenger’s (1991) theory of situated learning accounts for “the varied, problematic, partial, and unintentional production of persons through historical and biographical time, in a multiplicity of identities constructed and reconstructed through participation in social practice” (Lave et al., 1992, p. 257). It does so by highlighting “the relational interdependency of agent and world, activity, meaning, cognition, learning, and knowing” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, pp. 50-51). As such, it is a critical theory of learning, one which brings together for analysis both situated activity and theories of production and social reproduction (p. 47).

Wenger (1998) defines the concept of social practice as connot[ing] doing, but not just doing in and of itself. It is doing in a historical and social context that gives structure and meaning to what we do. . . . It includes what is said and what is left unsaid; what is represented and what is assumed. It includes the language, tools, documents, images, symbols, well-defined roles . . . that various practices make explicit for a variety of purposes. But it also includes all the implicit relations, tacit conventions, subtle cues, untold rules of thumb, recognizable intuitions, specific perceptions, well-tuned sensitivities, embodied understandings, underlying assumptions, and shared world views (p. 47).
Learning, in this theory, can be contrasted to more traditional theories of learning-as-internalization, which assume that this “is an individual process, that it has a beginning and an end, that it is best separated from the rest of our activities, and that it is the result of teaching.” Situated learning, in contrast, places learning “in the context of our lived experience of participation in the world” (Wenger, 1998, p. 3). Learning in this view becomes a natural and inevitable part of life, a fundamentally social process involving participation in “communities of practice” (CoP).

Following Lave & Wenger (1991), the CoP has been defined for sociolinguistics as “an aggregate of people who come together around mutual engagement in an endeavor. Ways of doing things, ways of talking, beliefs, values, power relations – in short, practices – emerge in the course of this mutual endeavor. . . . [A CoP] is defined simultaneously by its membership and by the practice in which that membership engages” (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1992, p. 464). As with other social theories of learning, this takes learning out of the heads of people, shifting focus from the “kinds of cognitive processes and conceptual structures” that are involved in learning to the “kinds of social engagements [that] provide the proper context for learning to take place” (Hanks, 1991, p. 13; also see Ahearn, 2001).

CoP are maintained and sustained by members engaging in the sociocultural practices which “produce” a community at a given point in time, which make it distinct from others (people have multiple memberships in multiple communities); as they engage in those practices, and produce the community, they also produce their identities as members of that community; finally, and in ways that suggest the association to reproduction theories discussed earlier, by engaging in those practices, they reproduce
that particular community, as well as their memberships within it. Communities can gain new members, who learn through “legitimate peripheral participation”; that is, they become “apprenticed” into the practices of the community by “old-timer” community members, at first participating peripherally, and over time, participating more fully in the CoP and developing mastery over its practices. This is not to suggest that legitimate peripheral participation in a CoP is a seamless, linear, or assimilative process, however. Rather it is, as with all social practice, marked by productive tensions, inevitable contingency, and potential conflict: because CoP are under ongoing production – are being continually constructed, as it were – by members who are at once multiply situated in diverse and changing historical, political, and social contexts, and are members at any one time of multiple communities (Wenger, 1998), CoP are also continually changing, as members increasingly do or do not take up particular practices associated with the community, as they do or do not variously accommodate, modify, or resist participation in certain practices. Therefore, learning, apprenticeship, trajectories of participation in communities of practice are not only (re)productive processes, they are transformative as well: communities are (re)produced and transformed through participation in the particular, continually-changing practices that distinguish one community from others; simultaneously, participants’ community memberships and subjectivities are (re)produced and transformed by participation within particular communities. Just as subjectivity is (re)produced and transformed by membership and participation in a community, communities are (re)produced and transformed through participation in social practice. Learning, here, therefore becomes a *production and transformation of*
identity as new members take up new subject positions as they learn and are apprenticed into the practices of new, distinctive, yet ever-changing communities.

Drawing on Giddens' theory of structuration (see below), Lave et al. (1992) suggest that their work on social practice offers advances over that such as Willis (1977) in conceiving of the interrelationship between structure and subjectivity, arguing that early research at CCCS has been generally more successful accounting for the former rather than the latter (cf. Ahearn, 2001; Billig, 1997). Rampton (1995, p. 134) echoes this sentiment by noting that CCCS work “often fell short of the requirements for an adequate symbolic analysis, moving too rapidly away from description of concrete instances and local interpretations into accounts of their wider sociological significance.”

CoP help to impede the reification of structure and thus, interpretive reductionism. Eckert (2000) suggests how the framework can work to ground analysis better: because CoP research “focuses on the day-to-day social membership and mobility of the individual, and on the co-construction of individual and community identity. . . . it ties social meaning to the grounded social aggregate at the same time that it ties the grounded aggregate to abstract social structures” (pp. 40-41). As such, the CoP is what Wenger (1998, pp. 124-126) calls a “midlevel category” of analysis, that is, it is neither focused too narrowly on isolated interaction or activities nor too broadly on ungrounded, macro-level abstractions.

As outlined by Eckert & McConnell-Ginet (1992) above, Wenger (1998, pp. 72-85) clarifies the three broad criterial dimensions of practice that signal the “coherence” of a CoP: mutual engagement, by which individuals come together to do things to achieve a shared endeavor; a joint enterprise, which involves the processes of negotiation and
accountability necessary for and implicit in mutual engagement; and a shared repertoire, that is, a coherent set of specialized activities, symbols, artifacts, language, and so forth “that the community has produced or adopted in the course of its existence, and which have become part of its practice” (Wenger, 1998, p. 183). Wenger (1998) also asserts that these three dimensions of a CoP can be instantiated through a number of more specific indicators:

1) sustained mutual relationships – harmonious or conflictual
2) shared ways of engaging in doing things together
3) the rapid flow of information and propagation of innovation
4) absence of introductory preambles, as if conversations and interactions were merely the continuation of an ongoing process
5) very quick setup of a problem to be discussed
6) substantial overlap in participants’ descriptions of who belongs
7) knowing what others know, what they can do, and how they can contribute to an enterprise
8) mutually defining identities
9) the ability to assess the appropriateness of actions and products
10) specific tools, representations, and other artifacts
11) local lore, shared stories, inside jokes, knowing laughter
12) jargon and shortcuts to communication as well as the ease of producing new ones
13) certain styles recognized as displaying membership
These 14 more specific indicators of CoP offer the ethnographer and applied linguist a wealth of possibilities for data collection and analysis. Holmes & Meyerhoff (1999), in their introduction to the 1999 Special Issue of *Language in Society* (28) on CoP in language and gender research enumerate some of these, adding that "[i]t is important to keep the three criterial characteristics of a [CoP; i.e., mutual engagement, joint enterprise, shared repertoire] distinct from the 14 constitutive features" just described, as CoP, which by "definition" must include the three "criterial characteristics" may not exhibit all 14 of these latter points (p. 177).

In short, a CoP framework contends with many of the criticisms that have been made of earlier studies in cultural production, without sacrificing the interest in the ways that particular, locally produced cultural forms and social practices relate to broader macro-level considerations, that is, how they may end up helping to reproduce and/or transform dominant social relations.

**Situated learning and cultural production**

According to O'Connor (2001; 2003), two distinct lines of research have developed out of Lave & Wenger's (1991) seminal work on situated learning. One, which O'Connor calls the "prescriptive" (2001)/"cognitive apprenticeship" (2003) approach, "has been primarily concerned with improving instruction by designing learning contexts that take account of the practical basis of cognition." The second, which O'Connor calls the "critical" (2001)/"cultural production" (2003) approach, "has been primarily concerned not with the design of better learning contexts, but with
formulating a general theory of learning, wherever it occurs and in whatever form, as an aspect of processes of cultural production” (O’Connor, 2003, pp. 64-65).

Whereas both the “prescriptive/cognitive apprenticeship” and “critical/cultural production” avenues of inquiry have provided significant contributions to research on situated learning, O’Connor notes that the former has tended to implicitly assume the homogeneity of learning contexts, and to privilege “official” understandings of learning contexts through their use of particular models of practice as the basis for understanding the meaning of participation and for assessing learning or ‘improved participation.’ This strategy, however, backgrounds some of the subtle ways in which participants in activity draw on heterogeneous resources, both ‘official’ and ‘unofficial,’ as they negotiate the meaning of the context, their ongoing activity, and their own emerging identities (2003, p. 71).

Such a subtle difference has important implications for research in “heterogeneous” learning contexts, for example, high school ESL classrooms in contemporary Hawai‘i with large and equally heterogeneous populations of language minority adolescents. In terms that have particular salience for this study, “success” or “failure” to learn would be conceived in radically different terms. Rather than as an aspect of the “design” of a particular learning context, putative success or failure would be “accounted for as outcomes of the same kinds of process” (p. 68). That is to say, “failure” to learn in the “critical/cultural production approach” to situated learning would in fact be conceived as simply another form of learning (cf. Kohl, 1994; McDermott, 1993). As O’Connor (2003) elaborates:
From the perspective of situated learning as an aspect of cultural production . . . both those who succeed and those who fail in school, like Lave and Wenger's apprentices, are simply becoming good at what they are given the opportunity to do on a routine basis – that is, at engaging in the kinds of practices through which they become identified and identifiable to themselves and others, within the cultural categories of “educated persons” or “uneducated persons” (pp. 68-69; cf. Levinson et al., 1996; Levinson, 2001).

O’Connor (2001; 2003) maintains that the “prescriptive/cognitive apprenticeship” and “critical/cultural production” approaches to situated learning could both derive from Lave & Wenger’s (1991) work due to what he calls the “strategic” focus in that volume on “benign” communities of practice. Indeed, as Lave & Wenger (e.g., 1991, p. 61) themselves admit, they focus on “exemplary” communities of practice involving midwifery, tailoring, and naval navigation, rather than coercive or conflictual CoP such as those found in institutions of formal learning, in an effort to elaborate better their theory of learning. As O’Connor (2003, p. 70) notes, more contemporary research concerning the critical/cultural production approach to situated learning “has begun to move beyond Lave & Wenger’s early portrayals of communities of practice as benign, stable, bounded, and homogeneous, and to pay increased attention to the heterogeneity of social practice” (cf. Levinson et al., 1996; Levinson, 2001; Wenger, 1998). What has been emphasized in this latter line of inquiry is that “participants in activity are never engaged simply and straightforwardly in a single practice or a single community,” that “participants bring with them a history of participation in different contexts,” and “that these various contexts are not necessarily easily embedded within one another, . . .
introduc[ing] potentially destabilizing elements into social practice” of respective CoP (O’Connor, 2003, pp. 70-71).

Important for investigating the linguistic and interactional dynamics of situated learning in heterogeneous contexts that are characterized by relations of coercion and conflict is an approach that can adequately account for language in context, language and social identity, and language as social practice in a robust, rigorously data-near manner. O’Connor (2001; 2003) joins a host of other linguistic anthropologists, sociolinguists, and applied linguists when he opts for a language socialization approach in his own study of situated learning in a geographically distributed situated learning project (also see, e.g., Ahearn, 2001; Bucholtz, 1999; Gutierrez, Rymes, & Larson, 1995; Holmes & Meyerhoff, 1999; Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991; Norton, 2001).

Language socialization and cultural production

First and second language socialization (LS) research concerns the processes by which novices do (or do not) become “competent” members, which is to say, expert or “effective” participants (Garrett & Baquedano- López, 2002, p. 346), in new communities or cultural groups, primarily in terms of “socialization through the use of language and socialization to use language,” to use a well-known, oft-cited phrase from Schiefflin & Ochs (1986).7 The rich, if still emergent tradition of LS research in L2 studies is, as its predecessor concerning first language socialization, strongly ethnographic in orientation, takes a longitudinal approach, maintains a commitment to linking micro-level phenomena with macro-level processes, and has demonstrated

---

7 As I discuss below, a subtle yet important distinction in CoP research and LS concerns expert/novice and oldtimer/newcomer categories.

As its name suggests, the focus of LS research is on linguistic practices and how they function as socializing resources for experts and novices in terms that range from the propositional content of utterances to the “social meanings” they convey or “index” regarding the social identities of interlocutors in a particular context or communicative “situation,” particular social acts being performed, activities being engaged, affective and epistemic stances being displayed, relevant genres, goals, and more. These social meanings are variously encoded in “such variable features as . . . speech acts and conversational sequences, members of lexical sets, case marking, inflectional morphology, verb voice, sentential mood, particles, phonological variants, intonation, and voice quality” and more (Schiefflin & Ochs, 1986a, p. 171).

The four dimensions of social context that are of central concern in LS research are: social identities, which “encompasses all dimensions of social personae, including roles. . . relationships. . . group identity. . . and rank”; social acts, which refer to “socially recognized goal-directed behavior, e.g., a request, an offer, a compliment”; social activities, which are “sequence[s] of at least two social acts, e.g., storytelling,
interviewing, giving advice”; and finally stances, of which two are of interest: affective stance, which “refers to mood, attitude, feeling and disposition, as well as degrees of emotional intensity” and epistemic stance, which refers to “degrees of certainty of knowledge, degrees of commitment to truth of propositions, and sources of knowledge . . .” (Ochs, 1996, p. 410; 2002, pp. 108-110). As already discussed, these dimensions of social context, or the social “situation,” are indicated in various ways with particular linguistic forms and interactional practices. As Ochs (1996) asserts:

A basic tenet of language socialization research is that socialization is in part a process of assigning situational, i.e., indexical meanings (e.g., temporal, spatial, social identity, social act, social activity, affective or epistemic meanings) to particular forms (e.g., interrogative forms, diminutive affixes, raised pitch, and the like).

This is what Ochs refers to as the Indexicality Principle. She continues:

To index is to point to the presence of some entity in the immediate situation-at-hand . . . . A linguistic index is usually a structure . . . that is used variably from one situation to another and becomes conventionally associated with particular situational dimensions such that when that structure is used, the form invokes those situational dimensions (Ochs, 1996, p. 410, emphasis in original).

The early, groundbreaking research in LS, what Garrett & Baquedano-López (2002, p. 339) call “the first generation” of LS studies, was begun in the 1970s, and primarily concerned L1 language socialization of children across the globe, e.g., Western Samoa (e.g., Ochs, 1988), Papua New Ginea (e.g., Schiefflin, 1990), the Solomon Islands (e.g., Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1986; Watson-Gegeo, 1992), Japan (e.g., Clancy, 1990;
1999; Cook, 1990) and the US (e.g., Heath, 1983). As Duff (2003, p. 2) has noted, the goal in these L1 socialization studies was primarily "to understand how children, by means of their social interaction with others, and with the benefit of either explicit or implicit messages about how to use language appropriately in different contexts, acquired and used particular language forms in their natural sociocultural contexts."

Despite the significance of these "first generation" LS studies, several scholars have noted certain problems in a number of them, including essentialism, a tendency toward universal, totalizing conceptions of socialization, a reductive notion of "culture," and a conception of socializing processes as easy and uncontested (see, e.g., Bayley & Schecter, 2003a, 2003b; Duff, 2002, 2003; He, 2003; Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991). As Duff (2003, p. 5) succinctly concludes, socialization in much of this research was conceived as a more or less "inevitable, linear, accepted, expected, desired, facilitated and accommodated" process.

Indeed, although a common statement in LS research is that socialization is a contingent, reciprocal, and bidirectional process, "first generation" LS studies can be generally characterized as being concerned with what might be called the top-down, unidirectional aspects of socialization, with less consideration of how those who are ostensibly being socialized might negotiate, accommodate, resist, and otherwise transform the processes they are by definition part of. This is perhaps due to the fact that much earlier LS research was concerned with how children are socialized by their caregivers to become competent members of communities (see He, 2003, p. 128; also see Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002, p. 341; Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991, p. 151; cf. Poole, 1992). That is to say, for all of the important methodological and analytic benefits that
LS has brought to bear in studies of situated language development, there has remained in some sense a notable lack of agency, particularly in regard to the putative "targets" of the socialization process. The process of "becoming" competent members of particular communities, the aim of socialization, has largely remained assumed, "characterized as smooth and seamless [with] novices . . . often presumed to be passive, ready, and uniform recipients of socialization" (He, 2003, p. 128; also see Duff, 2002, 2003). 8

More recent iterations of particularly second language socialization research have worked at addressing these concerns (Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; Duff, 2002, 2003). They have done so by not only "broadening" analytic focus to include bilingual, immigrant, and other language minority students' integration (or lack thereof) into L2 learning contexts, and "how older children, adolescents, and adults acquire knowledge of the interpretative frameworks of their own and other cultures in which they must function" (Bayley & Schecter, 2003a, p. 1; also see Duff, 2002, 2003), but also by heeding the important insights brought by the general post-structuralist critique of anthropology (and related social sciences) initiated in the 1980s (see, e.g., Marcus & Fisher, 1986; also see Clifford, 1997; Geertz, 1973). In this latter, mostly L2 strand of LS research,

the social contexts of learning tend to be much more complicated, fluid, dynamic, competitive, multilingual, and potentially unwelcoming [than in previous, mostly first language socialization studies]. People are concurrently negotiating and maintaining membership and identities in many different communities, in their

---

8 Interestingly, some of these issues recall certain problems in earlier communities of practice research which stemmed from Lave & Wenger's (1991) focus on "exemplary" or "benign" CoP (cf. O'Connor, 2001; 2003).
L1, L2 and even L3 or a mixture of these at any given time, and their degree of affiliation with each community and language may vary, waxing and waning over time (Duff, 2003, p. 24).

LS provides CoP the methodological and analytic means to examine community practices and the production of particular cultural forms in a fine-grained, rigorously data-near, theoretically compatible, post-structuralist social-practice framework. In turn, situating LS within a cultural production theoretic provides LS a broader scope and greater theoretical clarity as well as purpose for examining the tensions and conflicts involved in socialization processes, since these remain among the foci of theory and research concerning cultural production. Thus, just as a cultural production theoretic offers language socialization greater theoretical scope, language socialization offers cultural production research more robust, accountable means for examining the moment-by-moment development of social practices and cultural forms.

Agency, ideology, language ideologies, and linguicism

I pause here before proceeding with a review of literatures on topics discussed to this point to consider briefly the conceptualizations of “agency,” “ideology,” “language ideology,” and “linguicism,” that I use in this study. These are used to considerable extent in the chapters that follow, and thus warrant some extended discussion.

Agency

A notion of agency is central to any theory of social practice (see, e.g., Ahearn, 2001; Bourdieu, 1991; Giddens, 1979, 1984; Lave, 1991; Lave et al. 1992; Lave &
Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). Anthony Giddens has been a key figure in conceptualizing agency (and theorizing social practice), with particular regard to its relation to structure, in his theory of “structuration” (see, e.g., Giddens, 1979, 1984). As he has noted, “structuration” centrally concerns the *duality of structure*, which relates to the *fundamentally recursive character of social life, and expresses the mutual dependence of structure and agency*. By the duality of structure I mean that the structural properties of social systems are both the medium and the outcome of the practices that constitute those systems. . . .

According to this conception, the same structural characteristics participate in the subject (the actor) as in the object (society). Structure forms ‘personality’ and ‘society’ simultaneously – but in neither case exhaustively: because of the significance of unintended consequences of action, and because of unacknowledged conditions of action . . . . [E]very process of action is a production of something new, a fresh act; but at the same time all action exists in continuity with the past, which supplies the means of its initiation. *Structure thus is not to be conceptualized as a barrier to action, but as essentially involved in its production* . . . (Giddens, 1979, pp. 69-70, emphases in original).

In contrast to formulating “agency” as something akin to “free will,” and of “structure” as an objective, independent entity “out there” somewhere, pre-existing its enactment, Giddens conceives of agency and structure both as mutually *dependent*, and as mutually *constitutive*, in their instantiation in social practice. As he emphasizes, social structures are the “rules and resources” which constrain and enable social action; thus, “people’s actions are shaped (in both constraining and enabling ways) by the very social structures
that those actions then serve to reinforce or reconfigure” (Ahearn, 2001, p. 117). This conceptualization recalls a much earlier one, by Marx, in *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*:

> Men [sic] make their own history, but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given, and transmitted from the past. The tradition of all the dead generations weighs like a nightmare on the brain of the living (Marx, 1994/1852, p. 188).

“Agency,” in this formulation, thus refers to individuals’ capacity to act; however, this “capacity” is always already situated, shaped and mediated by “sociocultural formations” particular to specific contexts; these, then, are thereby produced and potentially reproduced or transformed through social action (Ahearn, 2001).

I would like to recapitulate (see Chapter 1) the implications such conceptualizations have for this study, particularly in terms of theorizing teacher and student participation in social practice. Situated theoretically as it is, this study is centrally concerned with structure and agency, production and reproduction, resistance and transformation, power and practice, all as they are variously manifest and instantiated in social interaction; located as it is in the ESLL classrooms of a public high school, it is thereby necessarily interested in classroom discourse and social interaction between teachers and students, and students and students; endeavoring to answer the research questions that I have articulated for it (see Chapter 1), this study thus takes a clear and emphatic analytic interest in the micropolitics of everyday classroom interaction, in addition to how these relate to and inform, are constitutive of and constituted by, macro-
level practices, policies, and processes. This has profound – and hopefully by now, obvious – implications for the way that I theorize teacher and student social action in the chapters below. Because this study does *not* conceptualize agency as an internal, intra-individual "trait" possessed by autonomous persons existing freely and independently of history, culture, politics, and/or social context, but rather as social action that is always already mediated, informed, and shaped by the "rules and resources" in play in a particular sociocultural context, it should *in no way* be construed below that I am personally implicating, indicting, and/or valorizing any of the many people who generously agreed to participate in this study. That is, any misconstrual that I am working with an "individualist" conception of teachers or students (or agency), or that I am assigning "cause" or "blame" for participation in the social practices below to particular "deficiencies" or "faults" internal to teachers and/or students themselves, would be precisely that: a misconstrual, and an egregious one at that (cf. Ahearn, 2001; Bourdieu, 1991; Giddens, 1979, 1984; O'Connor, 2001, 2003). Such a misreading would not only be an oversight of the theoretical frameworks outlined in this chapter, but would result in a dramatically impoverished accounting of the phenomena, findings, and conclusions discussed in this study, would, depending on one's view, ennoble or vilify individual students or teachers such that their actions might be simply celebrated (cf. Walker, 1985) or sanctioned (cf. Wadden & McGovern, 1991).
In his history of the concept of “ideology,” Williams (1983, pp. 153-157) discusses four main meanings: one, as a “science of ideas,” a usage which has been largely abandoned; a second, pejorative usage, which is the “main modern meaning” for “ideology” in the “sense of abstract, impractical or fanatical theory”; a third meaning, also pejorative, was advanced in Marx & Engels’s (1977/1846) critique of the Hegelian idealists (and Feuerbachian materialists) in The German ideology, which holds that ideology is nothing more that “an upside-down version of reality” which is to say, “false consciousness”; and a final related, although more neutral meaning, also from Marx, in which ideology is “the set of ideas which arise from a given set of material interests or, more broadly from a definite class or group.” Williams (1983) maintains that the second negative meaning (ideology is impractical or fanatical theory) is in widest usage in contemporary times. Following Woolard (1998, p. 9) who maintains that “there is little point to attempting to legislate a single interpretation of ideology from the range of useful meanings,” my use of the term in this study will range between fourth and third meanings that Williams glosses (Woolard’s [1998, pp. 6-7] second and third glosses).

Language ideologies

“Language ideologies” essentially refer to people’s articulated beliefs about language and language use. Woolard (1998) defines the concept as representations, either explicit or implicit, that construe the intersection of language and human beings in a social world . . . [I]deologies of language are not about language alone. Rather, they envision and enact ties of language to
identity, to aesthetics, to morality, and to epistemology. Through such linkages they underpin not only linguistic form and use but also the very notion of the person and the social group, as well as such fundamental social institutions as religious ritual, child socialization, gender relations, the nation-state, schooling, and the law (p. 3).

Koskrity (2000, pp. 7) elaborates this definition, arguing that language ideologies are in fact "a cluster concept" which consist of several overlapping aspects. These include that "language ideologies represent the perception of language and discourse that is constructed in the interest of a specific social or cultural group" (p. 8); that they are "profitably conceived as multiple" (p. 12); that there may be "varying degrees of awareness" among people about them (p. 18); and finally, that they "mediate between social structures and forms of talk" (p. 21). Common language ideologies include those about the relative status of a language (e.g., whether one language is "better" than another), commonsense beliefs about language learning (e.g., that learning grammar is the best way to learn an L2), and classroom policies that ban use of the L1.

The language ideology that I discuss in most detail in the chapters that follow is a one nation/one language, nation-state, or "nationalist" language ideology in which nation, language, culture, and social identity are mapped onto one another in straightforward, one-to-one correspondence. Auer (2005) discusses both the derivation and implications of a nationalist language ideology for immigrants and language minorities in ways that are particularly salient for this study when he states that:

discourse about national languages and national identities is a key feature of European modernity underlying the formation of the European nation states. This
discourse is deeply rooted in, and makes use of, a *monolingual* language ideology. Each collectivity (particularly a nation) expresses its own character (*Volksgeist*) in and through its language. With some justification, we can call this ideology essentialist since it assumes a 'natural' (or perhaps God-given, *weltgeist*-derived) link between a nation and its language. Seen from this perspective, migration unavoidably threatens identity. Migrants may switch (national) identity and become members of the receiving society, giving up their language of origin in the melting pot. Or they may maintain their identity by forming a ‘language island’ which is not only geographically but also socially and ideologically separated from the ‘main land’. This involves a constant struggle to withstand the surrounding society which threatens to break down the walls of this endangered collectivity. For the migrant, any solution between these two extremes would mean a loss of one identity without gaining another—social schizophrenia (Auer, 2005, p. 406, italics in original).

Auer argues that these views are “obsolete” and cites examples from bi- and multilingual language contact situations in contemporary Europe, where immigration has led “to the emergence of new but systematic ways of speaking which do not fit into nationalist language ideology since they are neither standard varieties nor monolingual” (Auer, 2005, p. 406). As I argue in depth in subsequent chapters, ESLL students at Tradewinds were subject to a nationalist language ideology as it was realized through program curriculum and instruction, which consistently positioned these students as cultural and linguistic Others. However, as I demonstrate in Chapters 9-10, “generation 1.5” ESLL
students in particular resisted the various ways that they were positioned as Other, along lines that lend substantial support to the “obsolescence” of this language ideology.

**Linguicism**

Skutnabb-Kangas (2000a, p. 30) defines linguicism as the “[i]deologies, structures, and practices which are used to legitimate, effectuate, regulate, and reproduce an unequal division of power and resources (both material and immaterial) between groups which are defined on the basis of language” (also see, e.g., Phillipson, 1992; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000b; Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 1994). Linguicism is a more sophisticated, socially acceptable form of racism and classism: as openly race- and class-based arguments of superiority and inferiority have waned in government, business, education, and popular discourses, it has been “necessary to find other criteria which [can] continue to legitimate” inequity (Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 1994, p. 104). Language is one such criterion, whereby “the dominant group/language presents an idealized image of itself, stigmatizing the dominated group/language, and rationalizing the relationship between the two, always to the advantage of the dominant group/language” (Phillipson, 1988, p. 341). Education institutions are primary sites for linguicism, as discrimination based on language can be naturalized by policies as “commonsense” as the medium of instruction for a school: usually the majority language, often with minimal provisions for minority languages or their speakers (see Lippi-Green, 1997; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004).

human rights are basic human rights which must be observed in order to protect language
diversity and to prevent discrimination by majority language speakers against speakers of
minority languages (cf. United Nations General Assembly, 1948). They include the right
to identify with one's L1, the right to education through the L1, the right to public
services in the L1, the right to transmit the L1 intergenerationally, as well as the right for
minority language speakers (either immigrants or indigenous peoples) to learn the
majority language of their country of residence. Majority language speakers normally
enjoy these basic rights; minority language speakers most often do not (Skutnabb-Kangas
& Phillipson, 1994, pp. 1-2). This can lead to linguicide, a term linked to genocide,
where "one of the acts counting as genocide is the 'forced transfer of children [either
physical or psychological or both] to another community or group'" (pp. 72-73; cf.

Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson have been charged (see, e.g., Blommaert, 2001a,
2001b; Heller, 2002) with promoting a "nationalist language ideology" (Woolard, 1998)
through their linguistic human rights "paradigm," as their arguments appear predicated on
a conflation of language with ethnic group and ethnolinguistic group with nation. Though
I fully support the notion of linguistic human rights, I am equally opposed to linguistic
nationalism (see May, 2001, pp. 52-90); it is also at odds with the principles informing
this study and contradicts many of its conclusions. For the record, Skutnabb-Kangas
(2002, p. 540) has explicitly denied working within "the outdated (Herderian) nation-
state ideology," maintaining that critics have mistaken her use of terms and arguments
from international human rights law as evidence for it. While this point may be arguable,
and while I firmly believe in tracing the history of the terms one uses (R. Williams,
1983), I maintain that the way I use “linguicism” throughout the dissertation, as a
descriptive gloss for discrimination based on language, need not – and as used here, does
not – connote linguistic nationalism (see Goldstein, 2003, for a similar appropriation of
the term).

Resistance in L2 studies

In the following three sections, I review L2 studies that are variously relevant to
the proposed study. In the immediate section below, I consider certain different ways
that resistance has been conceived in L2 studies; following that, I review work that
focuses on identity and L2 learning and how that may relate to resistance; and finally, I
discuss selected L2 research conducted in formal school settings that employs some
combination of cultural production/communities of practice/language socialization as
theoretical framework(s).

The better known literature concerning social reproduction in L2 studies mostly
involves the sociopolitical dimensions of the global spread of L2 English: Phillipson’s
eminent (1992) critique of the ways English has been used in service of “western”
hegemony is one example; Tsuda’s (1994) evaluation of the “diffusion” of English is
another. Spener’s (1996) discussion of the limited life opportunities afforded immigrants
to the US due to transitional bilingual education policies is another example, as is,
arguably, Auerbach & Burgess’s (1985) important rereading of the hidden agenda in
survival ESL curricula.

Some early considerations of resistance in L2 literature come from “humanistic”
pedagogical approaches, such as Curran (e.g., 1976), who refers to it in his Counseling
Learning/Community Language Learning Approach (CLL) (Stevick, 1980; other examples include Gattegno, 1972; Lozanov, 1982; Blair, 1982, 1991). Reflecting principles from Rogerian psychology, resistance in CLL is inherent in education, arising because learning requires an implicit acknowledgement of one’s own inadequacies (cf. Ehrman & Dörnyei, 1998, p. 185). For adolescents and adults, “who, by definition, have reached the developmental stage of strong, psychological self-consciousness,” the “struggle with a second language” can be a painful, humiliating experience (Curran, 1976, p. 5). The humiliation attending the recognition of one’s ignorance is compounded by the subsequent “dependency on another [i.e., the teacher/counselor] with which adolescents and adults are generally not comfortable” (p. 106). CLL teacher/counselors thus facilitate the “client”/learner’s “five-stage” trajectory from dependence/ignorance to independence/expertise with sensitivity and understanding (also see Ehrman, 1996).

A more “commonsense” conception of resistance is advanced in work such as Wadden & McGovern (1991) whose under-theorized construct is the “curse” (p. 126) they call “negative class participation,” that is, “the wide range of passive and active behaviours that are detrimental to classroom learning” (p. 119). They focus specifically on seven kinds of classroom “misbehaviours”: disruptive talking, inaudible responses, sleeping in class, tardiness and poor attendance, failure to complete homework, cheating, and “unwillingness to speak in the target language.” Because little consideration is given to what might motivate these sorts of “inappropriate conduct” – whether there might be a reason beyond wanting to chat, feeling shy, being sleepy (though these are, of course, possibilities in themselves) – the authors resort to providing disciplinary strategies such as “locking out [talkative] students by placing them at the back of the classroom,”
“appropriating” sleeping students’ textbooks, lowering grades, and other sanctions (Wadden & McGovern, 1991, pp. 121-124). The image of the classroom and the practices that occur within it is emblematic of what Pennycook (1990) calls an “instrumentalist” perspective that pervades much discussion on L2 pedagogy, a perspective that “remains strangely isolated from educational theory” (p. 304; see also Crookes & Lehner, 1998, p. 320). Because historical-structural factors and power are under-theorized in Wadden & McGovern (1991), student actions are reduced to simple obedience or misbehavior. Teacher responses to such misbehaviors are similarly reduced to ostensibly straightforward disciplinary correction.

A significantly different conception of resistance can be found in certain social psychological work on L2 motivation. Most of this research implicitly acknowledges a conception of human agency (cf. Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; McKay & Wong, 1996), which could conceivably accommodate a limited notion of resistance (e.g., Beebe, 1988; Beebe & Giles, 1984; Beebe & Zuengler, 1983; Gardner, 1979, 1985; Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Giles & Byrne, 1982; Noels, Clément, & Pelletier, 1999; Noels, Pelletier, Clément, & Vallerand, 2000; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). However, Schumann (e.g., 1978, 1986) explicitly discusses resistance in his Acculturation Model (AM), theorizing it in terms of social dominance, one of a host of macro-level social factors that partly comprise “acculturation,” the causal variable for L2 acquisition in the AM. Resistance in AM takes form in a refusal to acculturate to the “target” group. Schumann claims that if the L2 learning group is subordinated politically, culturally, and/or economically to the target language group (e.g. through colonization or war), “there will also be social distance between the two groups and the [L2 learning] group will tend to resist learning
the target language” (Schumann, 1986, p. 381). He gives an example of Native Americans in the Southwest of the U.S. who evidently have resisted acculturating to dominant Anglo “culture” and acquiring English.

Resistance as conceived in CLL and AM (as well as other humanistic and social psychological work) is clearly different from how it is conceived in, e.g., Willis (1977). Though humanism offers a number of important insights to L2 pedagogy (for a summary, see M. Williams & Burden, 1997, pp. 30-38), and though social psychological work has been significant in its efforts to address the role that social contextual factors may play in L2 learning, their conceptions of resistance are, among other things, apolitical and ahistorical. They are, in that sense, individualist psychological theories, rather than social or anthropological theories (see Crookes, 1997a). Because historical-structural factors and power are under-theorized, the “range of ‘choices’” that are available to an individual, or “the constraints operating upon individuals that determine the meaning of their ‘choices’” cannot be adequately explained (Tollefson, 1991, p. 72). This means that resistance, were it conceived in terms of theories such as these, would be detached from its sociocultural and sociopolitical context, decontextualizing the phenomenon so that it would become, in essence, an individual “problem” (cf. McKay & Wong, 1996, p. 579).

Other, more recent L2 work which concerns resistance has mostly been undertaken from a post-structuralist perspective, including studies by McKay & Wong (1996), Norton (2000, 2001), Norton Peirce (1995a), and Siegal (1994, 1996) (also see Pavlenko, 2002); Canagarajah (1993, 1999) is one of the few, however, who has undertaken a study from a Girouxan opposition/resistance theoretical perspective outlined above.
Norton/Norton Peirce’s (1995a, 2000) work expands the potential for theorizing resistance, first, by substantially developing a conception of learner agency, and second, by implicating power relations rather than traditional social psychological factors such as intergroup distinctiveness or social distance. Norton’s notion of “investment” is the construct that expands learner agency. She argues that traditional conceptions of “motivation” do not “capture the complex relationship between power, identity, and language learning” (Norton Peirce, 1995a, p. 17). Instead of motivation, she conceives of “investment,” a shifting and multiple set of relationships that individuals have to particular social contexts. Drawing on Bourdieu & Passeron’s (1977) notion of “cultural capital,” investment signals the socially and historically constructed relationships of learners to the target language, and their sometimes ambivalent desire to learn and practice it. . . . If learners ‘invest’ in a second language, they do so with the understanding that they will acquire a wider range of symbolic and material resources, which will in turn increase the value of their cultural capital. As the value of their cultural capital increases, so learners’ sense of themselves and their desires for the future are reassessed (Norton & Toohey, 2002, p. 122).

Investment is highly agentive, yet at the same time, it retains a focus on social structure. The degree to which a person becomes invested implicates relations between learners and social contextual conditions rather than putative “deficiencies” within the individual.

McKay and Wong’s (1996) study of four Chinese junior high school L2 English learners further develops Norton Peirce’s (1995a) conception of investment by highlighting the interconnections between power, agency, and discourse in language
learning. While McKay and Wong (1996) incorporate the notion of investment, their “contextualist perspective” offers a critique of it as well. By situating students within multiple discourses and counterdiscourses, McKay and Wong (1996) highlight how learner agency is constrained. Students are certainly subjects of, but are also subjected to “mutually interacting multiple discourses” which co-occur and compete in particular contexts (p. 577).

Employing a similar post-structuralist notion of agency as Norton/Norton Peirce (1995a, 2000) and McKay & Wong (1996), Siegal (1994; 1996) describes ways that Anglo American women learning L2 Japanese in Japan can resist subject positions that linguistically index a shy and submissive Japanese femininity they find problematic. “Sally’s” Japanese, for example, was marked by extensive use of plain verbs rather than the polite desu/-masu forms or the honorific keigo more commonly expected of women speakers of Japanese. Phonologically, Sally also refused to adjust her pitch to the higher tones often expected of women, indicating such pitch sounded “‘silly and giggly,’” and indexed shallowness, cuteness, and “‘babyish’” enthusiasm that “‘really irritates me because it’s not natural’” (Siegal, 1994, pp. 336-337). Such evaluations are echoed by the Anglo women in Ohara’s (2001) study who also resisted high voice pitch in L2 Japanese because it sounded “fake” and “unnatural” (p. 244)

Siegal (1994, 1996) documents a dynamic form of agency as it is manifested in her participants’ resistance to a normative gender/ed social positioning they find unacceptable. This is an agency that is fraught with tension and conflict, as the participants simultaneously use the L2 to communicate and to resist, juggling sociolinguistic “appropriacy” with their own beliefs and values in face-to-face
interaction. Siegal also demonstrates the effects of such resistance, as Sally, for one, is rebuked by native and non-native Japanese speakers alike for her language use, is judged to be less sociolinguistically competent, and in one instance, endures the unwelcome advances of a bicycle repairman, who construes her use of plain-verb forms as a desire to be familiar.

In distinction to the above studies, Canagarajah (1993, 1999) employs the Giroux (1983a, 1983b) opposition/resistance theoretical perspective outlined above. His research concerns an eight-month long critical ethnography of 22 Tamil students in a Sri Lankan university L2 English class which was taught by Canagarajah himself. Despite professing to be highly motivated due to the social and economic advantages afforded English speakers in the country, these students increasingly displayed oppositional tendencies to the English course’s curriculum, textbook, and pedagogy. Canagarajah interprets attendance, for one, as oppositional due to its drastic drop-off: 94% at the end of the first month, but 50% by the end of the second. Those students who did attend actively resisted the use of the L2 as a medium of instruction or of peer interaction by using the L1. They further resisted the teacher’s innovative pedagogical style by refusing to participate in pair/group work, asking for lectures and deductive presentations of grammar rules instead, and by forcing the teacher into more traditional teacher-regulated classroom discourse structures (cf. Shamim, 1996).

Canagarajah finds opposition to the curriculum and textbook in the glosses, commentary, and graffiti students wrote in the margins of the books as well as the mildly pornographic “additions” scribbled onto pictures of textbook characters. He calls this the secret “underlife” of student opposition (cf. Gutierrez et al., 1995), a collaborative
counterculture of coping strategies students deployed to oppose the “alien ideologies and cultural values of the textbook” (Canagarajah, 1999, p. 93). He suggests that such a secret community, which so glaringly opposed curriculum, provided satisfaction to students not just because it took place under Canagarajah’s nose – indeed, in textbooks which Canagarajah distributed and collected every day – but because it was a way students could appropriate what was communicated through the curriculum and reconstruct it in ways they preferred or believed were to their advantage.

Resistance, identity, and L2 learning

Social identity figures in each of the studies considered above in important ways, as it does in cultural production research and more generally in post-structuralism, including in L2 studies. Norton/Norton Peirce (1995a, 2000) conceives of social identity as multiple and shifting, a site of struggle, and changing over time. She argues that it “must be understood with reference to larger, and frequently inequitable social structures which are reproduced in day-to-day interaction.” Her position thus “foreground[s] the role of language as constitutive of and constituted by a language learner’s identity” (Norton, 2000, p. 5).

Social identity is inevitably implicated in investment, in ways that also bear on resistance. Norton/Norton Peirce illustrates this point with a discussion of one of her research participants, Martina, whose “multiple identities” included mother, immigrant to Canada, L2 learner, and wife. As L2 learner, Martina was anxious and ashamed of her apparently poor L2 abilities, and thus felt uncomfortable speaking in the L2. Norton argues that Martina was keenly aware of the low-prestige subject position of “immigrant
L2 learner” and had in some sense taken it up since she referred to herself as stupid and inferior. Yet, her identity as “primary caregiver in the family” overrode such concerns, leading her to be invested in language learning, to the point that she showed “remarkable resourcefulness” in seeking out and creating opportunities to speak the L2. Norton concludes that

despite feelings of inferiority and shame . . . Martina refused to be silenced . . .

[H]er social identity as a mother and primary caregiver in the home led her to challenge what she understood to be appropriate rules of use governing interactions between anglophone Canadians and immigrant language learners . . . By . . . resisting the subject position immigrant woman in favor of the subject position mother, Martina claimed the right to speak (Norton Peirce, 1995, pp. 21-23).

Working from a Foucauldian perspective, McKay & Wong (1996) similarly conceive of identity in ways which highlight the relationship between identity, L2 learning, and resistance. In their study of four Chinese junior high school ESL learners, they follow Norton/Norton Peirce (1995a, 2001), by linking L2 investment with investment in social identity. At the school where they conducted their research, they identified a number of discourses employed by teachers, administrators, and students which shaped their participants’ “positioning in power relationships” as well as their responses to them, “the coping strategies they adopted to exercise agency” (McKay & Wong, 1996, pp. 591-592). Among the discourses in which students were situated were “colonial/racialized discourses on immigrants,” “model-minority discourse,” “Chinese cultural nationalist discourses,” “gender discourses,” and social and academic “school
discourses.” In each of these, McKay & Wong (1996) distinguish identities which students were simultaneously subject to and subjects of. One such subject position in which colonial/racialized discourses and school discourses came together was “immigrant ESL learner,” an identity which connoted powerlessness and ignorance; this subjectivity positioned ESL students as “candidate[s] for cognitive overhaul and rescue” (p. 590). McKay & Wong (1996) note the ways that one of their participants, Michael, resisted this positioning, preferring instead to take up other more positive subject positions available to him. Though he was receiving A’s in his other courses, he was getting C’s and D’s in ESL. He acted notably “sullen and fractious in [ESL] class,” talked back to the teacher, disobeyed instructions, and expressed defiance in his school assignments (pp. 592-593). His investment in written L2 English, a primary focus of the ESL class, was also evidently low. This lack of investment in written English was ultimately “self-destructive,” preventing Michael from moving on to the advanced ESL classes he craved to join. Yet, as McKay & Wong (1996) conclude, Michael apparently gained enough agency and derived enough satisfaction from his multiple social identities as athlete and popular friend (to both Chinese and non-Chinese) . . . [that] he did not feel compelled to develop further as scholar or to placate his parents and teachers by perfecting his academic writing skills (p. 594).

Michael’s rejection of the subject positioning in McKay & Wong (1996) is similar to Martina’s and other participants’ in Norton/Norton Peirce (1995a, 2000), as well as Sally’s in Siegal (1994). However, Pennycook (2001) and Price (1996) have argued that subject positions in some of this work have been conceived in ways that may seem too coherent and static. Pennycook (2001), for one, prefers “to see identities not so much as
fixed social or cultural categories but as a constant ongoing negotiation of how we relate to the world” (p. 149). This is aligned with Lave & Wenger’s (1991) and Wenger’s (1998) work on identity, learning, and social practice, where learning is “the vehicle for the development and transformation of identities” (Wenger, 1998, p. 13). Identity here “serves as a pivot between the social and the individual” and consists of continually “negotiating the meanings of our experience of membership in social communities” (p. 145). These insights enhance the possibilities for conceiving of the relationship between identity, L2 learning, and resistance by directing attention to “the ways in which learners respond to the specificity of discourses . . . how interests and discourse positions are structured and taken up by learners in ever changing contexts” (Price, 1996, p. 336).

Communities of practice and language socialization in L2 studies

As already discussed, identity is a central consideration in communities of practice, as learning “implies becoming a different person” (Lave & Wenger 1991, p. 53). L1 sociolinguists (notably language and gender researchers), who first brought the communities of practice framework into language study, have made important links between identity and language use.9 Eckert (1989; 2000), for example, examines the dynamics between identity and language use in her study of the Jocks and Burnouts. The Jocks were middle class high school students in a suburban town outside of Detroit, who accepted and were engaged with the values and culture promoted by the school. The
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9 Much of the discussion in the L1 literature has centered on how CoP offers advances over conceptions of “speech community” and gender as a fixed social category. According to Eckert & McConnell-Ginet (1992), by employing a CoP perspective, researchers can move beyond such a static conception of gender to a “view of the interaction of gender and language that roots each in the everyday social practices of particular local communities and sees them as jointly constructed in those practices. . . .” (p. 462).
Burnouts were these students’ working-class counterparts, who rejected school and were oriented away from the institution and toward the community. Eckert argues that the Jocks and Burnouts “are not simply two visible social groups,” but “embody opposing class-related ideologies, norms, trajectories, and practices” (2000, p. 3). She shows how Jocks and Burnouts differentiated themselves from each other through their clothing, styles, social networks, hang-outs, and other social practices, how they “live very different lives, and as a result do very different things with language” (p. 3). Focusing on phonological variation specific to the region – the urban-to-suburban spread of the Northern Cities Chain Shift – she finds that “the major determiners of the use of sociolinguistic variables [at the school] are Jock or Burnout affiliation, and engagement in the practices that constitute those categories” (p. 112). The Burnouts (especially the female Burnouts) “led” in the use of “advanced variants of urban variables” in nearly all cases due to their community affiliations: “the Burnout network itself reaches out to the city and brings the city into” the high school (p. 224). The Jocks, on the other hand, generally lagged in the use of these variables oriented as they were to the school.

Eckert’s work is important on a number of accounts, not the least of which is that she examines intra-group differences among both social groups. While there are larger patterns of intergroup differences, she finds variation not just according to social group affiliation, but in gender as well as “socio-geographic” location. Therefore, she demonstrates, one must look not only at Jock/Burnout affiliation, nor at being male or female in accounting for phonological variation at this school “so much as about being a male or female Jock or Burnout in a particular place in the urban-suburban continuum” (p. 137).
Similarly, Bucholtz (1999) illustrates the links between identity and language use by examining the phonological, syntactic, lexical, and discourse practices of a group of high school “nerd girls” that differentiated them from their “cool” classmates. She shows how the girls produced this identity through their verbal jousting, use of parody, punning, hypercorrect phonological forms, and “superstandard” syntax, as well as their resistance to colloquial language forms and practices that indexed “non-nerds.” The girls’ identity as “nerds” is central in their use of language, just as language is central in producing their identity as “nerds”: language use, social practice, and identity are mutually constitutive.

Toohey (1998, 2000) employs the community of practice framework in her research on language minority children in kindergarten, first, and second grades. She shows, among much else, how young children become identified and labeled in particular ways by the social practices they do or do not take up in school, and what that means in terms of the ways that the teacher and school, in turn, position them. She identifies three such school-valorized practices — “sitting at your own desk,” “using your own things,” and “using your own words and ideas” — which have consequences for the ways students become positioned, how they respond to that positioning (and the consequences of those responses), as well as the ways such practices individualize and stratify classrooms, “dislocating” language minority children from one another, and mediating opportunities for them to “appropriate” classroom language.

Norton (2001) also employs a communities of practice framework in a reanalysis of instances in which two participants from her doctoral dissertation research reportedly withdrew from participating in their ESL classes. Norton employs the distinction between legitimate peripheral participation, in which newcomers to a particular
community become “scaffolded” into its practices, and marginal non-participation, in which an individual is prevented from participation (see Chapter 9, “Peripherality vs. marginality”). Norton maintains that her research participants’ non-participation was “not an opportunity for learning from a position of peripherality, but [was] an act of resistance from a position of marginality” (Norton, 2001, p. 165). Such non-participatory resistance resulted “from a disjuncture between the learner’s imagined community and the teacher’s curriculum goals” (p. 170). That is, Norton’s participants resisted because their conceptions of themselves and their relations to the world outside the classroom were not compatible with those of the teacher. What is interesting here is not only the concept of an agentive non-participation, but also that both students remained highly invested in learning English despite their resistance.

Jacoby & Gonzales (1991) offer a suitable bridge between discussions of applied linguistics CoP and language socialization research as they incorporate both perspectives in an early and important paper. In it, they adopt a CoP perspective for their study of a university physics research team, examining in particular the negotiation of expert-novice roles within the group in an attempt to account for the largely asserted, infrequently documented bidirectionality and contingency of socialization processes in LS research. They argue that the roles of “expert” and “novice” in this CoP do not necessarily proceed along a priori categories of hierarchical status, age, or gender, but shift in interaction. They demonstrate how at certain moments a white, male professor in the group assumes the role of expert, in terms consistent with the hierarchical ranking of participants, yet in other instances, how a male graduate student from Colombia (it is not clear what “Miguel’s” L1 or race is in the paper), does instead. Thus,
the same individual can be constituted as an expert [in a given interaction] in one knowledge domain, but constituted as a novice when traversing to some other knowledge domain. Secondly, within a single knowledge domain, the same individual can be constituted now as more knowing, now as less knowing. Finally, in either of these two situations, the valence of expertise may shift with a change of recipients (Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991, p. 168).

These shifts in expert roles therefore attest to the bidirectionality and contingency of socialization processes, and thus call for rigorous questioning of what they call “ethnographic givens,” that is, that socialization will always proceed unidirectionally along hierarchical lines, for example, from parent to child or teacher to student.

Despite the significance of Jacoby & Gonzales’ (1991) argument, it is open to question whether they are too quick to dispense with the “ethnographic givens.” Miguel, for example, does indeed assume an “expert” role, despite his lower status as a student, yet he arguably does so on the professor, “Ron’s,” terms (cf., e.g., Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991, Segment 4, pp. 166-167). Ron, in his position as professor and team leader could just as easily have denied Miguel the opportunity to assume an “expert” role, as allowed it; in these terms, then, the more fundamental socializing process that is available for potential analysis is the notably collaborative, democratic participation framework promoted by Ron, particularly in an institutional setting in which the “ethnographic givens” (e.g., power asymmetries between teachers and students) dismissed by Jacoby & Gonzales (1991) are normally so salient.

In addition, the notion of “expertise” arguably remains under-examined in the paper. Although Jacoby & Gonzales (1991) endeavor to develop more fully the notion of
“expertise” beyond simply “knowing more” (cf. pp. 150-151), ultimately this is what it seems reduced to (cf. p. 168). “Expertise” is also advanced in ways that conceivably mask power and other relations that may be just as salient, e.g., gender. In Segment 2 (pp. 160-161), for example, “Marsha,” a female doctoral student from the US has her attempt to assume a position of expertise in interaction rejected by Ron, but this rejection is glossed by Jacoby & Gonzales as Ron’s judgment that Marsha has “insufficient expertise for the magnitude of [the] problem” being discussed. What remains unaddressed is that Ron’s assessment of Marsha’s “expertise” could be a potential veil for his sexism.

The difficulties with “expertise” in fact lead to a more fundamental issue in Jacoby & Gonzales (1991), one that has important bearing on this study. Although the authors argue that expert/novice roles are intrinsic to communities of practice, in fact, the expert/novice relation comes from language socialization research. In CoP, relations are between oldtimers and newcomers; they are temporally related, and involve apprenticeship, rather than being based on putative “amounts” of knowing in “knowledge domains.” As Lave (1991) argues:

[n]ewcomers become oldtimers through a social process of increasingly centripetal participation, which depends on legitimate access to ongoing community practice. . . . Knowledgeable skill is encompassed in the process of assuming an identity as a practitioner, of becoming a full participant, an oldtimer. The terms used here – oldtimers/newcomers, full participants, legitimate peripheral participants (but not teachers/pupils, or experts/novices) – result from a search for a way to talk about social relations in which persons and practices,
change, reproduce, and transform each other (Lave, 1991, p. 68, emphases in
original).

This is a far more holistic, and, to use Wenger’s (1998) term, a much less “instrumental”
way of conceiving of “mastery” and related “master/apprenticeship” roles. As Wenger
(1998) elaborates

knowing is [not] all that communities of practice are about, especially if by
‘knowing’ one refers to some instrumental kind of expertise. Communities of
practice should not be reduced to purely instrumental purposes. They are about
knowing, but also about being together, living meaningfully, developing a

Despite these issues, Jacoby & Gonzales’ (1991) central thesis concerning the
need to closely analyse interaction in an attempt to locate the contingency and
bidirectionality of socialization processes beyond hierarchically valorized roles is
exceptionally important, and in many respects, admirably demonstrated. It is a thesis that
has in important ways guided my analysis in the chapters below, particularly in terms of
the relative status of “official” cultural productions of ESLL in classrooms where
competing “generation 1.5” ESLL student cultural productions of ESLL vied for
dominance (see Chapters 9 and 10).

Poole (1992) is among the first L2 classroom language socialization studies. She
endeavors to examine the “underlying cultural ideologies” of interactional routines
between “white middle class American” (or “WMCA”) female teachers and their
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10 *Master/apprentice* are roles also used in Lave & Wenger (1991), but as Lave (1991, p. 68) argues, these
terms “are not intended as a disguise for teacher-student relations: Masters usually do not have a direct,
didactic impact on apprentices’ learning activity, although they are often crucial in providing newcomers to
a community with legitimate access to its practices.”
students in two university ESL classrooms. In a fundamentally culturalist rereading of the functions of a number of aspects of teacher talk, she reframes such common routines as display questions, clarification sequences, and incomplete sentence frames as different types of “discourse accommodation” by teachers/experts to scaffold the interactional efforts of students/novices. She also examines how the teachers in her study regularly assigned students with the “entire credit for completing a task that they obviously performed with assistance” (p. 604) as well as teachers’ efforts to “suppress the display of power differences” (p. 607) between themselves and their students by using language that indexed, for example, indirectness and epistemic uncertainty. The forms of discourse accommodation evident in these teachers’ discourse are all, Poole (1992) concludes, “consistent with WMCA norms,” indeed, are motivated by them, and wind up as socializing resources for teachers in their interactions with students.

Poole’s arguments are compelling, and her insistence that teacher discourse – which had been treated in the instrumentalist L2 pedagogy literature primarily in terms of facilitating or impeding L2 learning – is in fact informed by and conveys implicit cultural values and attitudes, are extremely important. However, implicit in this study are similar sorts of concerns that, e.g., Duff (2002, 2003) and Garrett & Baquedano-López (2002), have raised about many “first generation” LS studies, primarily in terms of essentialism, and a reductive conception of culture (i.e., capital “C” Culture). This is evident, for example, in the conceptualization of “White middle-class American” culture, values, and norms that novices are socialized into, as well as the comparisons between the socializing routines in “WMCA culture” in this study, and some of Ochs’ early LS research concerning caregivers raising their children in Western Samoa. Finally, although it is
explicitly recognized that “novices act as agents” (p. 612) in socialization processes, which thus admits the bidirectionality and contingency of them, the exclusive attention on the teachers’ socializing interactional routines rather than on student uptake works to mitigate the proviso. This is not to critique the study for something it did not intend to examine – it is about teacher talk, not student uptake of it – but simply to note a point in many earlier LS studies about the assertion of contingency and bidirectionality in socialization, rather than illustrating its occurrence.

Finally, Duff’s (2002) important study about ESL students in a mainstream classroom of a Canadian high school shows the advances that a LS study undertaken from an explicit post-structuralist perspective can have over “first generation” LS studies. This is signaled early on when she writes:

Although [LS] models tend to imply that the appropriation of target culture norms and practices is always desirable, virtuous, inevitable, and complete, a greater range of possible intentions and outcomes actually exists, including non-conformity, partial and multiple community memberships and linguistic repertoires, and social exclusion. Seen in this way, knowledge and participation in educational activities are co-constructed and are crucially linked with issues of identity, agency, and difference . . .” (Duff, 2002, p. 291, emphases in original).

Duff examines interaction in a mainstream social studies class in which ESL and mainstream students studied together, and in which the teacher’s “overriding objective [concerned] creating a respectful, inclusive classroom culture” (p. 295). Duff found that the ESL students in the class infrequently interacted in a whole-class discussion participation structure, and when they did, their contributions were shorter, softer, more
guarded, and less sure than those of their mainstream classmates. Thus, these students “forfeited – or resisted – opportunities to convey aspects of themselves, their knowledge, interests, and opinions to the class, or to make the personal connections for others, valued social and cognitive practices in the [class]” (p. 305). Duff then goes on to demonstrate how the teacher’s efforts to intercede on the ESL students’ behalf, that is, to facilitate their more active participation, ultimately worked to subvert her articulated goal to build tolerance and respect for multiculturalism in her classroom culture. This occurred in the way she positioned ESL students during a discussion of Chinese ancestor worship, as representative experts on “their” cultures. As Duff (2002) notes, with a finding consistent with mine reported in the chapters below:

Having students report on events, customs, and values in other countries or cultures in a personal, authoritative way can be counterproductive when students do not want to or are unable to speak about cultural practices with which they do not currently identify – or at least choose not to publicly identify in mainstream classroom contexts. (Duff, 2002, p. 305).

Duff concludes with discussion about the contingency of socializing processes, which are clearly supported in her data. She notes that many of the ESL students rejected to take up the subject positions made available to them by their teacher and as well participated variably in socializing practices, with serious consequences for their (lack of) standing among and relations with mainstream peers. Finally, she notes the consequences of her findings for LS research: in contrast to the assumption underlying much LS research that novices will over time come to participate like experts in a given setting, the ESL students in her study did not change their interactional patterns in class
discussion participation structures over the course of the school year she observed. As she notes, these students “didn’t seem to need to. Instead, they had other multilingual repertoires, literacies, expertise, and identities to draw on and use in the multiple discourse communities they belonged to locally and internationally” (p. 314).

As indicated in this review, LS and CoP are highly compatible frameworks with much to contribute to one another. Although there is a large LS literature in L2 studies, the CoP framework, particularly CoP that incorporates a LS approach, has only recently begun to be applied in L2 studies (but see Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991). Watson-Gegeo & Nielsen (2003) argue that CoP holds considerable promise for the field, particularly for research with populations such as language minority children in schools. They argue that CoP can help us understand the complex sociocultural/cognitive process of L2 learning in classroom and community contexts, and how learners are brought into or excluded from various activities that shape language acquisition. They draw our attention to the importance of studying access, negotiation and re-negotiation, and roles in L2 learners’ movement from beginner to advanced L2 speaker status. These issues and processes have critical importance for linguistic minorities and immigrants, who may face social and political hostility or exclusion, and may react with resistance (p. 11).

Bergvall (1999), Kanno (1999), and Canagarajah (2003), among others, while in overall approval of the notion of communities of practice have offered some critiques. As I understand their arguments, both Kanno (1999) and Canagarajah (2003) make a case for a more decentered notion of communities of practice. Canagarajah, for example,
maintains that as an "off-networked" scholar in Sri Lanka, he did not have the same sorts of opportunities for "legitimate peripheral participation" in applied linguistics communities as scholars in the "West." Kanno similarly argues that language minority students may not acquire the linguistic resources to be "legitimate peripheral participants" in (L1 English) communities of practice. She contends that the notion of "legitimate peripheral participation" does not adequately account for potential structural barriers language minority students may face to legitimate peripherality and thus to participation. However, CoP have been theorized as highly local social phenomena, in part in the broader effort to decenter such notions as "culture." It may be the case that both Kanno (1999) and Canagarajah (2003) are concerned with the notion of "marginality," which is indeed absent in Lave & Wenger's (1991) focus on "exemplary," or "benign" CoP, but which Wenger later elaborates in his (1998) volume as an undesired form of non-participation, in which hopeful members are effectively prevented from entering into a community for whatever reason, be it lowly status as an ESL student, low L2 proficiency, lack of access to computers, libraries, and so on (cf. Norton, 2001; see Chapter 9). An additional critique of the framework is offered by Bergvall (1999) who warns against the potential for CoP research to become, in essence, too locally oriented, at the expense of macro-level analysis. Though Lave (1991), Lave & Wenger (1991), and Wenger (1998) continually argue for linkage between micro- and macro-analyses, the explicit business-orientation of Wenger's later work (e.g., Wenger, 1998; also see Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002; Wenger & Snyder, 2000), in particular, may lead some to question the political sensibilities of this framework.11 Bergvall (1999) thus
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11 All references to and discussion of critical theory in both Lave & Wenger (1991) and Wenger (1998) notwithstanding.
suggests that critical discourse analysis, for example, be employed as a means to maintain the micro/macro connection, an approach taken in this study (see Chapter 5).

**Effects of resistance on students**

As I have mentioned above, an important idea in studies of student resistance (and cultural production) is the notion of social reproduction: nearly all of Canagarajah’s (1993; 1999) resistant students, for example, failed his class. Beyond failing grades, though, their demands for teacher-centered, forms-focused instruction, combined with their refusal to use English, left students with “the smattering of ‘marked’ English they [had] brought with them” to class. Thus, by not improving their English, “these students will continue to occupy the marginalized position accorded to the monolingual, poorly educated, rural poor” Tamil (Canagarajah, 1993, p. 623). Student resistance in Kadooka’s (2001) ethnographic study of a high school ESL program in Hawai‘i resulted in the co-construction of the “culture of reduced expectations” she elucidates; the students in her research participated in their own academic under-preparation, and thus, their own marginalization. Willis’s lads were ultimately so successful in challenging the dominant ideology of their school that they limited the means available to them to critique and change what it was they were resisting. As Shor (1992) puts it, while resistance works to deny school authority, it can also deny academic development: “it is a complex way of sabotaging oneself and authority at the same time” (p. 137).

Student resistance to learning can be mistaken for *failure* to learn, or worse, for an *inability* to learn. Kohl (1994), in a lengthy reflection on his teaching career, illustrates how student resistance can lead to further educational inequity: rather than reforming
schools, or curricula, or pedagogy, educators may try to remediate the internal "deficiencies" of the student instead.

A line of work on "teacher expectancies" in educational psychology is worth referencing here. This research concerns the potential for educational "self-fulfilling prophecy," that is, the ways that teachers' beliefs about, expectations of, and attributions for student performance can bias the instruction students receive, and ultimately affect student achievement. Teachers often form expectancies about student ability based on students' race, ethnic, or ethnolinguistic background, class, past and present classroom performance and conduct, and a number of other factors (August & Hakuta, 1997; Baron, Tom, & Cooper, 1985; Clark & Peterson, 1986; Delpit, 1998; Dusek & Joseph, 1985; Eccles & Wigfield, 1985; Lucas, Henze, & Donato, 1990; Peterson & Barger, 1985; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968; Valencia, 1997). Students who perform poorly in class, for example, or who do not behave "appropriately," may be considered by teachers to be lazy, to lack ability or intelligence, or other similar "deficiencies," attributions that form the bases for lowered expectations (Dusek & Joseph, 1985). These expectancies can then be communicated in the form of differential behaviors which alter the nature of classroom interaction and the impact of instruction. "Low expectation" students have been observed to receive less attention from teachers, to be called on less frequently, to receive less wait time to answer questions, to be criticized more often and praised less, to receive less accurate and less detailed feedback, and to have less demanded of them in terms of work or effort than "high expectation" students (Brophy & Rohrkemper, 1981; Cooper, 1985; Tauber, 1997; Weinstein, 2002). Students, in turn, interpret the results of
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12 Other work outside of educational psychology which comes up with similar conclusions include August & Hakuta (1997), Delpit (1998), Lucas, Henze, & Donato (1990), and Valencia (1997).
their performance and of their teachers' actions. In the case of low expectations, student self-efficacy beliefs about their academic ability may be (further) undermined, important because self-efficacy beliefs "mediate the effect of skills or other self-beliefs on subsequent performance by influencing effort, persistence, and perseverance . . . ." (Pajares, 1996, p. 553, see also Peterson & Barger, 1985, Wigfield & Harold, 1992). Self-efficacy beliefs can inform subsequent student performance, which in turn is interpreted by the teacher, who in turn maintains or modifies expectancies, which again are communicated to students, and so on, an unending cycle that can conspire against student achievement (Harklau, 2000; Valencia, 1997).

While teacher expectancy research and cultural production research are disciplinarily, culturally, and historically quite separate, both lines of work do suggest (in their different ways) that resistance can result in profoundly negative experiences for students. However, as Fine (1991), Kohl (1994), Shor (1992), and others indicate, there may be more positive effects of resistance in addition to the negative consequences mentioned above. Fine (1991), for example, in her research on urban high school drop-outs, had her assumptions "uncomfortably disrupted" when she realized that many drop-outs perceived leaving school as a positive act of resistance; on psychological tests she administered, she was surprised to find they scored as "healthy":

Critical of social and economic justice, [dropouts were] willing to challenge an unfair grade and unwilling to conform mindlessly. In contrast, the student who remained in school was relatively depressed . . . . Dropouts [thus] could be reconceptualized as critics of educational and labor market arrangements. The act
of dropping out could be recast as a strategy for taking control of lives fundamentally out of control” (p. 4).

However, as she notes, the feelings of optimism and pride were among recent drop-outs; she found that older drop-outs, most of whom had experienced years of reduced “opportunity structures” (Spener, 1996) without a high school diploma, were largely “dulled, disappointed, and desperate. . . . Their social critique of younger years had boomeranged back on themselves” (Fine, 1991, p. 124). Despite the ultimately negative outcomes Fine describes, the idea that resistance can be viewed positively is taken further by Kohl (1994). He writes of students’ “willed not-learning” of racist curricula and refusal to participate in sexist classroom practices. Chicano children and parents at a Texas school resisted a Eurocentric curriculum and fought for one that included their own histories, literature, and values, while female and male students confronted, and ultimately changed, a teacher (Kohl himself) whose sexism they objected to. These students resist for similar reasons as the students in Shor (1992), in response to perceptions of historical, social, and/or institutional injustice. Considerations such as these leave a more complex, variegated picture of resistance, a conception that moves beyond cultural and social reproduction and toward social change.

**Conclusion**

I have covered much territory in this chapter, starting with early cultural studies work on resistance and cultural production, with a focus on research carried out at the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies at the University of Birmingham, primarily Willis (1977). I then addressed central criticisms made of some of this early literature and before turning
to consider advances made in more contemporary work on cultural production. My focus on this latter work was on Lave & Wenger's conception of "communities of practice" in which they advance their theory of situated learning. Following this, I considered two divergent camps in situated learning theory, and located this study in one of them, that is, "critical/cultural production" (O'Connor, 2001; 2003). Afterward, I outlined a theoretical framework for language socialization, a highly compatible approach for CoP and cultural production, which has the methodological and analytic means to deal with cultural production in a fine-grained, data-near approach. This was followed by a brief discussion of agency, ideology, language ideology, and linguicism. From there, I reviewed a number of disparate literatures concerning resistance, communities of practice, and language socialization. These reviews necessarily included discussion of earlier considerations of resistance from humanistic psychological and then social psychological perspectives, both of which I argued were fundamentally lacking in the ways they considered and could account for the phenomenon. My literature review then turned to how resistance, identity, and agency have been considered from a post-structuralist perspective. After that, I reviewed selected L2 research undertaken from a CoP and then a language socialization perspective. I concluded the chapter with a discussion of the consequences of resistance on students, from different theoretical perspectives. In Chapter 4, I turn to another review of literature in order to articulate a theory of the methodology undertaken in this study, that is, critical ethnography.
CHAPTER 4. CRITICAL ETHNOGRAPHY

Introduction

As Willis (1977; 1981) makes clear, a primary reason why he and other early cultural production theorists initially turned to ethnography for their research was the need to include for analysis ways in which structure was or was not instantiated in the cultural forms and social practices of people as they lived their everyday lives. These analyses were accomplished through investigation of language, rituals and styles, systems of meaning, and processes of identity formation. As a consequence, ethnography “inoculated” studies of cultural production “from the reductions and elisions” of reproduction theories (Willis, 1981, p. 58). Levinson & Holland (1996) point out that “[e]thnography problematized the reproductionist formula by showing that students created cultural forms which resisted ideological interpellation, and that schools were not monolithic purveyors of dominant ideologies” (p. 9, also see Lave et al., 1992, p. 273). A study of resistance, therefore, “logically concludes with socially contested reproduction of the conditions for capital accumulation.” A study on reproduction, in contrast, “begins with this point and therefore writes out the space for a dynamic analysis” (Willis, 1981, p. 59, my emphasis).

Locating ethnography within a critical theoretical framework allows human experience to be situated such that social structures mediating and constraining human experience can be implicated in analysis (Anderson, 1989; Carspecken, 1996; Carspecken & Walford, 2001; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000; Masemann, 1982; McLaren, 1994; McLaren & Giarelli, 1995; Quantz, 1992; Quantz & O'Connor, 1988; Simon & Dippo,
Indeed, critical ethnography (CE) as a research tradition has developed due to work concerning resistance, and, reflecting the reciprocal relationship between CE and resistance, resistance theory has developed due to CE. Quantz (1992, p. 457) maintains that resistance is, in fact, the “primary orientation” for CE.

**Ethnography and critical ethnography in L2 studies**

Qualitative inquiry in L2 studies continues expand, and one of the primary approaches that has been employed L2 qualitative inquiry is ethnography. In her now classic paper, Watson-Gegeo (1988) “defines the essentials” of ethnography as the study of people’s behavior in naturally occurring, ongoing settings, with a focus on the cultural interpretation of behavior. . . . The ethnographer’s goal is to provide a description and an interpretive-explanatory account of what people do in a setting . . . the outcome of their interactions, and the way they understand what they are doing. . . . (p. 576).

Central principles of ethnographic research include a research focus on group behavioral patterns, holistic, contextual interpretation, “emic” analysis, and abstract etic comparison all derived from long-term, ongoing data collection, requisite “thick description,” and an emergent, recursive relationship between data, research questions, and interpretation (Creswell, 1998; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Erickson, 1986; Hornberger, 1994; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Watson-Gegeo, 1988).

As late as 1988, applied linguistics remained relatively unacquainted with ethnography, hence the appearance of (and need for) Watson-Gegeo’s article mentioned above, and the comparatively few that have followed (e.g., Davis, 1995; Edge &
Richards, 1998; Lazaraton, 1995; Norton Peirce, 1995b; K. Richards, 2003; Toohey, 1995). Cumming’s (1994) article on descriptive, interpretive, and critical approaches to L2 research, for example, indicates some of the long-standing confusion about ethnography in L2 studies. In it, ethnography is classified as an “interpretive” orientation to research rather than a “descriptive” or “ideological” one, the implication perhaps being that description is devoid of interpretation and interpretation is not informed in some way by ideology. As Canagarajah (1999) notes, “[t]he fact is that the three orientations (i.e., description, interpretation, and ideology) are interconnected.” As he continues, “such categorization creates the impression that ideological orientation is a distinct approach to research . . . . with the worrying implication that being socially or ideologically conscious is optional” (p. 40).

Canagarajah (1993, 1999) is one of the few in L2 studies to have conducted a CE. He distinguishes CE from “descriptive ethnography” by noting how the former moves beyond description to an engagement and critique of social structure and power relations. CE works to uncover the interplay between micro-level human activity and macro-level social structure, situating “the embedding of richly described local cultural worlds in larger impersonal systems of political economy” (Canagarajah, 1993, p. 605). In addition, Canagarajah (1999) maintains that CE is more sensitive to power relations between researchers and researched, and that it encourages reflexivity.

**Critical ethnography: An introduction**

Kincheloe & McLaren (2000) assert that the task of “defining” CE, or any other form of critical qualitative research is problematic because critical theory itself is neither
monolithic nor static: there is a plurality of critical theories which changes due to ongoing “synergistic relationships” with cultural studies, poststructuralism, and postmodernism (p. 296; also see Levinson, 2001). Thus, to determine a catalogue of CE characteristics is to deny the dissensus among critical theorists, who would prefer “to avoid the production of blueprints of sociopolitical and epistemological beliefs” (p. 281). Quantz (1992) goes further when he contends that no definition of CE could ever satisfy critical ethnographers themselves “because to define the term is to assume an epistemological stance in which the social world can be precisely defined – a position that is not very critical” (p. 448).

However, while there is no single agreed-upon “definition” of critical ethnography (CE), there are certain common themes, principles, and objectives evident in what Simon & Dippo (1986) call the critical ethnographic “project.” These distinguish CE from other “non critical” forms of qualitative research, including ethnography. Anderson (1989), for example, in a discussion of CE’s development, distinguishes CE from other forms of interpretive ethnography in terms of what the others cannot do. According to Anderson, CE grew

out of dissatisfaction with social accounts of “structures” like class, patriarchy, and racism in which real human actors never appear . . . [and] dissatisfaction with cultural accounts of human actors in which broad structural constraints like class, patriarchy, and racism never appear” (1989, p. 249).

In an early paper, Masemann (1982) is more specific, distinguishing CE from other interpretive approaches such as symbolic interactionism, phenomenology, and ethnomethodology. The latter approaches emphasize the importance of participants’
subjective interpretation of localized events and the interpretation of interactional sequences. They also share the assumption that any study of schooling is inadequate if it does not “uncover the workings of . . . educational systems in terms of their meanings for the participants, either teachers or learners” (p. 5). However, because wider sociohistorical, structural forces may not be salient to participants, (critical) analysis of them is generally precluded (also see Cameron et al., 1993; Fairclough, 1995, 2001). While CE is equally interested in participants’ understandings of localized events, it differs from these approaches by its “connection to theoretical perspectives which are linked to a general theory of society and a concept of social structure which exists beyond the actor’s perception” (p. 9). Masemann (1982) notes the advantages that (non-critical) interpretive approaches provide in “yielding interesting data”: for example, by allowing for the dissection of taken-for-granted categories in education. Yet, she ultimately declares these benefits are superceded by the way non-critical approaches mask power arrangements, “their lack of connection to a wider theoretical framework, and their essentially (suppressed) functionalist analysis of social relations” (p. 8; also see Cameron, et al. 1993).

Simon and Dippo (1986) maintain a three-part distinction between “traditional” ethnography and CE: the latter employs “an organizing problematic that defines one’s data and analytical procedures in a way consistent with its project”; it is situated “within a public sphere that allows it to become the starting point for the critique and transformation of the conditions of oppressive and inequitable moral and social regulation”; and finally, it addresses “the limits of its own claims by a consideration of

---

1 Cf. the Billig & Schegloff exchange in Discourse & Society, 10 (Billig, 1999a, 1999b; Schegloff, 1999a, 1999b).
how, as a form of social practice, it too is constituted and regulated through historical relations of power and existing material conditions” (p. 197). Methodologically, ethnography as a general term refers to a range of possible procedures for structuring one’s experience of a social situation and transforming that experience into a systematic account which renders the social practices of the situation into patterns through which social forms are constructed and maintained. Critical ethnographic work transforms this general procedure into a particular one by supplying it with additional perspectives, principally historical and structural, that alter the ethnographic project toward one which supports an emancipatory as well as a hermeneutic concern. . . . this makes it a procedure with a pedagogical and political interest. (p. 201).

The pedagogical interest they note is echoed by other CE researchers, highlighting the praxis orientation of CE, both in concrete action and in the reciprocal refinement of critical theory (Carspecken, 1996, p. 3; Willis, 1977, pp. 3-4).

In an effort to elucidate the CE “project,” I have organized a taxonomy around certain (often overlapping, interconnected) elements that consistently arise in the diverse work on CE.

- **CE and society**: Society in a CE is generally considered to be unfair, unequal, and oppressive for many, with differential structural access to power, opportunity, mobility, and education privileging certain groups and not others. Inequitable social structures are characterized (and in large measure promoted) by dominant hegemonies that organize, regulate, and naturalize
particular meanings, "commonsense" assumptions, ways of communicating, acting, and more, over others.

• **CE and power.** Accordingly, society is characterized by asymmetries in power arrangements specific to particular sociohistorical contexts. Because "[p]ower operates not just on people but through them," power structures the ways that people live everyday life as well as "how forms are produced and reproduced to limit and constrain, as well as contest and redefine what one is able to be" (Simon & Dippo, 1986, p. 197).

• **CE and agency.** Therefore, necessarily, in place of structural determinism, is a dialectic between social structure and human agency. While social structures mediate social practice, they do not determine them; that is, they constrain and *enable* practice (Giddens, 1979). Structural reproduction is never inevitable or guaranteed since power is not one-dimensional.

• **CE and culture.** Thus, there is a "need to recognize the influence of both human agency and material relations in the construction of culture" (Quantz, 1992, p. 477). Culture is not a static body of customs, beliefs, or "art," but is a critically conceived "ongoing political struggle around the meaning given to actions of people located within unbounded asymmetrical power relations" (p. 483; cf. Simon & Dippo, 1986; J. Thomas, 1993; R. Williams, 1977).

• **CE and history:** CE is always historicized because cultural practices and forms are particular. "To historicize within ethnographic work is to show the conditions of possibility of a definite set of social forms and thus
simultaneously establish the historical limits of their existence” (Simon & Dippo, 1986, p. 198)

• **CE and praxis.** Critical ethnographers are not content to simply describe what they see. Central to CE is the moral imperative to promote the change of iniquitous conditions through sustained critique and collaborative action. As Levinson (2001, p. 363) makes clear, praxis here is not circumscribed as immediately transformative action, as “in this sense, only a kind of collaborative action research designed to raise awareness and empower can truly be called critical ethnography.” Instead, he maintains a broader perspective on praxis more in line with Marx (1994/1845) 11th thesis on Feuerbach, as “work that seeks to situate and understand local events in the context of broader structural relations of power, and to direct such understanding toward more expansive efforts at structural change, including cultural critique” (also see Carspecken, 1996; Carspecken & Walford, 2001; Levinson et al., 1996).

• **CE and values.** Value-free research does not exist; CE embraces this fact by addressing its “openly ideological” value orientation (Lather, 1986, 1991). Critical ethnographers “impose a value system that requires the researcher to place any culture into a wider discourse of history and power, which serves an emancipatory interest. . . .” (Quantz, 1992, p. 471). It is somewhat ironic that because critical ethnographers go to great lengths to address their value orientations, they are susceptible to criticisms about the trustworthiness of their research or the so-called imposition of “ideological” values
(Hammersley, 1992, 2000; Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983; Hargreaves, 1982; Walker, 1985). Quantz (1992) retorts that “[t]his criticism is unfair because it is never a matter of whether or not researchers impose their values but the implications of the values they are imposing” (p. 471, my emphasis; also see Proctor, 1991).

- CE and reflexivity. Because of the above, CE “must reflexively address its own situated character. This means that we must acknowledge that the knowledge we produce is inevitably limited by our own histories and the institutional forms within which we work” (Simon & Dippo, 1986, p. 200; also see Anderson, 1989; Erickson, 1986; Lather, 1991; Carspecken, 1996, 2001; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000; Levinson, 2001).

In sum, CE, like other forms of critical qualitative research, is interested in power and social justice, and how race, class, gender, the economy, ideologies, discourses, and social institutions such as education and religion operate in the construction of a social system. The CE project is explicit about its values, openly partisan, concerned with confronting inequality, and committed to refining social theory.

**A theory of critical ethnographic methodology**

Quantz (1992) sums up the view of many other critical researchers when he states that any discussion of methodology divorced from the theoretical concepts that delineate research as a process and as a product is “not only sterile but distorted,” resulting in the reduction of method to technique (Anderson, 1989; Carspecken, 1996; Carspecken & Apple, 1992; Carspecken & Walford, 2001; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000; McLaren,
1994; McLaren & Giarelli, 1995; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Quantz, 1992). LeCompte & Preissle (1993) point out that theories (formal and otherwise) influence what kinds of studies researchers propose, the questions they ask, as well as the methods they choose to gather, analyse and interpret data. Thus, method needs to be considered as “fully embedded in theory” just as “theory is expressed in method” (Quantz, 1992, p. 449). In order to talk of a CE methodology, then, I first discuss a theory of CE methodology.

Critical hermeneutics both grounds and provides a theoretical rationale for a CE methodology. Critical hermeneutics “holds that in qualitative research there is only interpretation, no matter how vociferously many researchers may argue that the facts speak for themselves.” While inadequate interpretations can be transcended (e.g. through methodological rigor), “[n]o pristine interpretation exists” (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000, p. 285). This foregrounds Simon & Dippo’s (1986) contention that “ethnographic data is ‘produced’ and not ‘found’” (p. 200) and signals why for them one of the three defining criteria for a CE is reflexivity: the historical and cultural situatedness of the researcher, the interpreter, is central to critical ethnography, and it must be recognized and included in analysis. The critical hermeneutical tradition “puts the politics of interpretation at center stage” (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000, p. 288).

The purpose behind a critical hermeneutics is “to develop a form of cultural criticism revealing power dynamics within social and cultural texts” (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000, p. 286). It “attempts to connect the everyday troubles individuals face to public issues of power, justice, and democracy” (p. 289) This is done within a critical hermeneutical circle of interpretation, a reciprocal, recursive analysis between parts in relation to whole, in which “researchers inject critical social theory into the
hermeneutical circle to facilitate an understanding of the hidden structures and tacit
cultural dynamics that insidiously inscribe social meanings and values” (p. 288). This is
an
extremely complex enterprise that demands a nuanced analysis of the impact of
hegemonic and ideological forces that connect the micro-dynamics of everyday
life with the macro-dynamics of structures such as white supremacy, patriarchy,
and class elitism. The central hermeneutic of many critical qualitative works
involves the interactions among research, subject(s), and these situating
sociohistorical structures (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000, p. 288).

Ethnographic methodology can provide the requisite access to human experience
necessary to allow for analysis of agency, just as critical theory can situate human
experience materially, historically, and culturally. A critically located ethnographic
methodology highlights the interplay between agency and material relations; addresses
the ways that macro social structure is (or is not) instantiated, accommodated, resisted,
and/or transformed in the micro-politics of “everyday life”; contends with issues of
ideology, hegemony, and culture; critically addresses its own historically, materially, and
culturally specific interpretations; works toward change; and does so with the
collaboration of research participants.

Simon & Dippo (1986) maintain that CE “reveals social practices as produced and
regulated forms of action and meaning” by focusing on “what a particular group of
people, concretely situated in time and space, constitute as their pattern of everyday life.”
CE investigates “the character and basis of such practices as particular ways of
embodying and enacting historically structured social forms that organize, regulate, and
legitimate specific ways of being, communicating, and acting.” A focus “on sets of practices as recursively accomplishing and regulating forms” is critical because this “provides the conceptual link between a concern with experience and subjectivity and the structurally sedimented relations of power that mark the terrain of our social formation...” (p. 197). Analysis of these social practices is required so that the “nonarbitrary specificity” of how everyday life is lived can be elucidated. Only qualitative data can “provide access to the practices (the words, the actions, the personally appropriated signs that mark one’s place in social space) of social actors” (p. 198, emphasis in original) that can be used for such elucidation.

Quantz (1992) concludes by noting that an ethnography without theory grounded in the material relationships of history can too easily become a romantic display of exotic life-styles of the marginal, a voyeuristic travel log through the subcultures of society. Such studies, while claiming underdog sympathies, do little to address the marginal and subordinate status of those whom they might study. . . . At the same time, theory without empirical knowledge of lived cultures is too easily reduced to mere formalism; it remains an elitist exercise in academic conversations, which does more to advance the careers of university professors than it contributes to the empowerment of ordinary people (pp. 461-462).

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have outlined ethnography and critical ethnography in applied linguistics. I have then broadly outlined critical ethnography as a theoretical and methodological enterprise in educational research, where there has been considerable
more discussion regarding this particular research approach. Drawing on perspectives from several critical ethnographers, I have distilled a general taxonomy of principles central to the critical ethnographic “project.” Therefore, having established a theory of critical ethnographic methodology, it is now time to turn to a discussion of how this was actually realized during fieldwork at Tradewinds High School. This is the topic of Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5. METHOD

Introduction

The data, analyses, and conclusions in this study are drawn from two and a half years of field work conducted at Tradewinds High School, a public high school located in an urbanized area in Hawai‘i. I received permission to conduct research at Tradewinds from the Committee on Human Subjects at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, the Hawai‘i Department of Education Superintendent’s Office, the Tradewinds Complex Area Superintendent’s Office, the principal, vice-principal, and English for Second Language Learners (ESLL) coordinator at Tradewinds, as well as individual teachers and Tradewinds students, grades 9-12. I visited the school three times per week for a half a day in the first year and final semester of the study, and three times per week for the full school day for the second year. Site visits over the duration of fieldwork consisted of observations of 15 different classrooms, recordings of interaction in ten of those classrooms, formal and informal interviews with teachers and students, and the collection of numerous site documents. I provide more detail on the data collection procedures, research site, and teachers and students who participated in the study in the first half of this chapter, concentrating in particular on the ESLL classes I observed, as these are the focus of the dissertation. The second half of the chapter deals with how I analysed the data that I collected. I begin this section with a discussion of the procedures I undertook for a critical ethnographic analysis; this is followed by sections on critical discourse
analysis and the status of interview data. I conclude the chapter with brief consideration of my positionality.

Confidentiality and a necessary ambiguity

The educational communities of Hawai‘i are exceptionally tight-knit, a fact intensified by the geographical boundaries of the Islands themselves. This makes all efforts to protect the identity of Tradewinds and of the many people who graciously agreed to participate in this study not only difficult, but essential. There is an overwhelming amount of information, ranging from the significant to the mundane, that if revealed, would compromise the confidentiality to which these individuals are ethically and legally due. Therefore, in addition to using pseudonyms,¹ I have either eliminated or altered details that may identify the site or particular participants. Of the more significant information, I do not identify the locality in which research took place, nor do I discuss the historical background of the school, the size of student enrollment (of the entire school, or of the ESL program), or the precise demographic information about the student enrollment. The more mundane information I omit includes the total number of teachers employed at the school during the time of this research, how many worked as full-time and part-time ESL teachers, and even which school bell-schedule Tradewinds used.

While I include certain (at times altered) descriptions of the site, I am aware that I am deliberately not including much important contextual information, leaving in some sense an ahistorical, decontextualized representation of the institution that is contrary to the

¹ Teacher participant pseudonyms were chosen by me, and are alphabetized (Ms. Ariel, Mr. Bradley, Ms. Cheney, Mr. Day, etc.). Student pseudonyms were selected by the student participants themselves, unless accompanied at first mention by an asterisk ("*"). This indicates that the student did not provide a pseudonym, and that I supplied one instead.
critical and ethnographic principles informing this study. The omission of such basic contextual material may sometimes translate into a frustrating degree of ambiguity concerning points of fact that readers may wish or need to know. I suggest, however, that these many gaps are regrettable but necessary.

In addition to details about the site to preserve the confidentiality of certain teacher participants, I have interchanged, or selected comparable but different descriptors in reference to them, including race/ethnicity, gender, L1 backgrounds, the L2s they may speak, and/or their educational attainment. While I have decided that drawing participant "composites" (see, e.g., Davis, 1994) was not called for in this study, the modifications I have made do preclude a significant range of analyses. Again, this is unfortunate, but in my view, unavoidable. In those instances where changes have been made, I have been careful to balance the priority of protecting participant confidentiality with the need to maintain as accurate a depiction of participants as possible. Therefore, I state at the outset that all claims I make about teachers are based in fact. Due to a high number of participants, the only change I have made for students is to their names.

**Hawai‘i’s public schools**

As of the 2003-2004 school year, the total public school enrollment in Hawai‘i was approximately 183,000, making it the 10th largest school district in the nation (Office of the Superintendent, 2004). Public school students in Hawai‘i are served by approximately 13,000 teachers in more than 280 schools arranged into seven geographic administrative districts. These administrative districts are themselves further divided into 15 “complex areas.” Each complex area consists of between two and four school
"complexes," with each complex comprised of a single high school and its "feeder" intermediate and elementary schools. Complex areas are administered by complex area superintendents; the entire Hawai'i Department of Education (DOE) is overseen by the state Superintendent of Education. The Superintendent is appointed by the Board of Education, an elected group that devises policy for public schools.

The Hawai'i public school district is unique in that it is the only one in the country that serves an entire state. It is also unique in how it is funded. Historically, education in the US has been funded by state and local governments, the latter of which are authorized to levy local (often property) taxes to supplement state educational monies (see Kozol, 1991, for a substantive critique of such funding practices). Hawai'i, however, is the only state in the US where schools rely on federal education and state funds only: that is, "there is no comparable contribution to school funding from local governments" (Office of the Superintendent, 2002, p. 19). This has led the Islands' tax structure to be called "wealthy friendly" (Segal, 2004), and has had a substantial impact on the expenditures allocated for schools, as local governments can "provide between 26% (Alaska) and 92% (New Hampshire) of the state and local funding for public schools" (Office of the Superintendent, 2002, p. 20; cf. Kozol, 1991). This is perhaps the primary reason why per-pupil expenditures in the state are approximately 10% below the average nationwide, (despite the fact that Hawai'i is among the top five states in state per capita revenue generation and spending), and why Hawai'i easily ranks last in the country in the amount of state and local funds apportioned for schools (Office of the Superintendent, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004). This has led Patricia Hamamoto, the current Superintendent of Education, to remark that "the state's commitment to public education has persistently
lagged behind that of other states" (Office of the Superintendent, 2003, p. 1), as “there is no other state even close to Hawai‘i public education’s low percentage of total state and local spending” (Office of the Superintendent, 2004, pp. 14-15).

Hamamoto has thus called for “a major reordering of the state’s fiscal priorities” (Office of the Superintendent, 2002, p. 37), in part due to the consistent ranking of the state’s public schools as among the worst in the US, based on indices that include standardized test scores, per-pupil spending, graduation rates, school climate, out-of-field teaching, and teacher salaries.² There have been a variety of responses to the comparative status of Hawai‘i’s public schools, from the usual calls to increase funding, hire more teachers, and improve teacher pay, to decentralizing the Hawai‘i school system,³ eradicating Pidgin (Hawai‘i Creole) from classrooms,⁴ or simply sending children to one of Hawai‘i’s many private schools.⁵

The two and a half years I spent at Tradewinds High School were marked by a great deal of uncertainty and change for the students and teachers there. As I discuss in Chapter 6, policies were enacted that would fundamentally alter how language minority students in the US would be educated. In Hawai‘i, following the new nationwide trend toward “accountability,” the state DOE was struggling with the complex demands of the

² As of 2000-2001, salaries for Hawai‘i public school teachers ranked 23rd in the US; however, when Hawai‘i’s high cost of living was indexed with annual income, teacher pay sank to 51st (Hawai‘i Educational Policy Center, 2003, p. 9).
³ One of the central (and controversial) educational “reforms” proposed by Republican governor Linda Lingle is the break up of Hawai‘i’s single school system into seven regional ones.
⁴ In 1999, then-Board of Education Chairman Mitsugi Nakashima implicated Pidgin as the cause for Hawai‘i’s low test scores when he (in)famously remarked: “If you speak Pidgin, you think Pidgin, you write Pidgin” (Kua, 1999). See Da Pidgin Coup (1999) for a substantive rejoinder.
⁵ Private schools hold a uniquely high status among Hawai‘i residents, a likely holdover from colonial days when private schools were the educational province of the haole business elite and Hawaiian royalty (see, e.g., Agbayani & Takeuchi, 1986; Benham & Heck, 1998). In fact, a local television news investigation in February 2003 revealed that 53% of state legislators in Hawai‘i sent their children to private schools (“Majority of legislators send children to private schools,” 2003), a rate significantly higher than the already disproportionately high state average of 15-17%. See Chapter 6.
No Child Left Behind Act, developing, piloting, and implementing new curriculum standards, a battery of related standardized tests, and other challenges. The school system statewide was still feeling the effects of an historic teachers’ strike that had lasted for three weeks in Spring 2001. In the Spring of 2002, a budget cut which would total approximately 40% of the already meager funding for the state ESLL program was proposed (see Crookes & Talmy, 2004). During the period of this research, significant changes were being made to ESLL teaching assignments at Tradewinds, with ESLL classes increasingly being divided among various content teachers, several of whom were recent hires with no experience teaching ESL. The DOE changed the tests it used to determine whether students required ESLL services, necessitating the retesting of the entire ESLL population at the high school. Concurrently, paper-based forms were replaced by an array of online ones, which required workshops and retraining, in addition to substantial amounts of time for the initial input of student data. And finally, despite the successful defense of the ESLL program budget in 2002, disbursement of some ESLL funds at Tradewinds was deferred for the academic years 2002-2003 and 2003-2004, meaning, among other things, that the hiring of part-time temporary teachers (PTTs) that students and full-time teachers depended on was substantially delayed (see Chapter 7).

Through this all, the specter of September 11, 2001 hung over the school, the sting of its effects felt in successive waves with the invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq, policies such as the Patriot Act, a general and at times frightening expansion in jingoism and militarism

---

6 The effort to win more equitable working conditions and salaries by the Hawai‘i State Teachers Association, the union of public school teachers in Hawai‘i, combined with a simultaneous strike by the union of professors and instructors at the University of Hawai‘i, shut down the state’s entire public education system (K-16), the first time in U.S. history that this occurred.

7 PTTs are bilingual aides who assist teachers in the classroom, often providing small group instruction in L2 English and classroom ‘content,’ and serving as links to students’ parents and communities. They are widely viewed as crucial to the success of ESLL in Hawai‘i.
around the high school, and of particular salience to many students in the ESLL program, restrictions on and increased supervision of immigration and immigrant populations. In short, this was a particularly charged time to conduct research about language minority students in a Hawai‘i public high school.

**Tradewinds High School**

During the period of my research, the Tradewinds student population, like the state of Hawai‘i itself, had no single racial or ethnic majority. Local-born Chinese, Filipino, and “part Hawaiian” students comprised the largest proportions of the enrollment, along with sizable numbers of students of Samoan, Japanese, and Korean heritage. African Americans, Latinos, and *haole* (Caucasians) were marginally (less than 5% respectively) represented. Approximately half of the school population was receiving free or reduced-price lunch, an indicator of poverty commonly used by schools. Teachers and administrators at the high school, as in much of the Hawai‘i DOE (Office of the Superintendent, 2004, p. 10), were overwhelmingly haole and Asian American.

*Negotiating entry*

As many ethnographers have noted (e.g., Erickson, 1986; Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983; Hatch, 2002; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 1999), negotiation of entry into a research site is a complex endeavor that begins with the initial contacts made by the researcher to site “gatekeepers” and continues long after the researcher has finished collecting data and left the site. As Erickson (1986) notes, negotiating entry is crucial to the success of ethnography:
Potentially good field work research can be compromised from the outset by inadequate negotiation of entry in the field setting. This leads to problems of data quality and of research ethics. Careful negotiation of entry that enables research access under conditions that are fair both to the research subjects and to the researcher establishes the grounds for building rapport and trust. Without such grounds, mutual trust becomes problematic, and this compromises researcher’s capacity [to conduct research] . . . . (pp. 141-142).

Trust is essential in any ethnography of schooling, all the more so in the present-day climate of educational “accountability.” The challenges of negotiating entry to a public school for the purpose of conducting research have been mentioned briefly by a number of scholars (e.g., Erickson, 1986; Hatch, 2002; Lagemann, 2002; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Spradley, 1980). Spradley (1980), for example, called schools “limited entry” sites, as they “will usually require the permission of at least the principal and the teacher in whose classroom you make observations . . . . you may even need to get the permission of each child’s parents” (p. 49). Twenty years later, Hatch (2002, pp. 44-69) provides a glimpse into how much more restricted access has become for K-12 researchers: not only do permissions need to be sought from teachers, school administrators, district officials, students, and parents, but also university institutional review boards, which understandably have stringent criteria for research that deals with minor (i.e., under age 18) populations. However, as Lagemann (2002) notes in an address concerning the dearth of “usable knowledge” in educational research, “[a]lthough institutional review panels are necessary to protect the rights of research subjects, they can also make it inordinately difficult to conduct research that involves children – and this situation is, if
anything, becoming worse" (p. 7). Indeed, access and the trials of negotiating entry to public schools are one likely reason that K-12 populations continue to be underrepresented in applied linguistics (C. Chaudron, personal communication, 5/28/2004), where “convenience sampling” (Miles & Huberman, 1994) with readily-available university L2 learners is more often the norm.

My experience negotiating entry into Tradewinds, coming as it does in the recent past, is much more reminiscent of Hatch’s discussion than Spradley’s. I first made contact with Mr. Anderson, a Tradewinds ESLL teacher and the ESLL coordinator, because he was the colleague of a friend’s former teacher and the only real connection, if I can call it that, that I had to the school. I had devised a list of potential research sites following two broad criteria: the site had to be a public high school and it had to have ESL students. Tradewinds topped my list of candidates not only because it met these criteria but because of the distant connection to Mr. Anderson.

As it turned out, however, this connection did not help matters much at all. Mr. Anderson told me he would consider meeting me regarding my proposed research, but only once I had obtained permissions from his principal and district administrators, his complex area superintendent, and, to my surprise, the state Superintendent of Education himself (at the time, Paul LeMahieu).

After six weeks of phone calls, explanations, and written requests, I called Mr. Anderson with the approvals he had requested, and at his invitation, went to my first meeting at Tradewinds with a prepared “research bargain” (Hatch, 2002, p. 46). This was a general overview of the research project and its purpose, what I would need from the school (i.e., access to classrooms), and what I could provide in exchange: my years of
experience as an ESL/EFL instructor to help Tradewinds teachers and tutor students. Mr. Anderson seemed genuinely pleased (then, and throughout the study) with my offer to volunteer. This was no doubt due to ever-present budget constraints that limited the number of part-time teachers available to ESLL programs in the state. As it turned out, my offer to volunteer would have a significant impact on this study, in terms of which courses I would wind up observing and the students and teachers who would thereby be available as potential research participants.

It is important to note that negotiating entry is an ongoing process (Erickson, 1986; Hatch, 2002; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Wolcott, 1995); it is also multi-dimensional, such that the type, scope, and amount of negotiation varies depending on context and participant. I had little contact with the state and district administrators, for example, following my initial queries into conducting research. Similarly, what was required for the Tradewinds principal and vice-principal was relatively minimal (essentially a progress report at the end of each year and a revised proposal for continuing research the next) compared to what was involved with teachers and students. For some teachers, negotiating entry was more or less a semesterly occurrence; for others, especially the newer teachers, very nearly daily. This was no doubt due not only to my status as a researcher pursuing an advanced degree in second language acquisition, but because I was an experienced ESL teacher myself, with over

---

*As Wolcott (1995, p. 91) points out, reciprocity is essential to negotiating entry and maintaining rapport in any ethnography, all the more so in a critical one (Thomas, 1993). The exchange Mr. Anderson and I arranged without question created goodwill that was helpful in maintaining my continuing access to the school. What Wolcott does not mention, however, is the positive effects that reciprocity can have on the researcher, beyond those associated with gaining an “insider” perspective. Despite the inevitable moments of frustration and fatigue, I found the day-to-day classroom work and interaction with students extremely rewarding, professionally and personally. I believe my experiences at Tradewinds have made me if not a better teacher, then certainly a more informed and activist one, as I am now more sensitized to the realities that too many students and teachers face each day in public school ESL programs in the US.*
twelve years of ESL teaching experience at the time. As I discuss in more detail below, negotiating entry with newer teachers became an occasionally daunting task.

The general procedure for negotiating entry was as follows: after initial introductions with teachers were made by Mr. Anderson (how classes were selected is discussed further below), I would present my research bargain, discuss the project and what I hoped to accomplish, explain what services I would provide in exchange for access, and answer any questions. I continued a mostly informal, ongoing negotiation with those teachers who consented to having me in their classes in an effort to hold up my end of the bargain. Still, with the exception of three classes – Ms. Cheney's first year ESLL A (ELA IX) and Mr. Iris's Health (2Vf and 2Vs) – my participation as an instructional aide over a given school year tended to diminish appreciably. Reasons for this ranged from the vagaries of my schedule, which allowed me to attend classes at best every other day, to a perception on some teachers' parts that I was there to research only, to classroom instructional formats that did not lend themselves well to the assistance of an aide (e.g., lectures, testing, study hall), to students implying or stating outright that they did not want me to work with them (mainly in the Health classes).

Negotiating entry with the students was similar in some regards and different in others. My description of the research project was a general statement about the experiences of ESL students in ESLL, J-section (content-based ESLL), and mainstream classes. This appeared to satisfy most students, although a few wanted more details about the project and their participation. Of primary concern to many students was my relationship to the classroom teacher and school administration. Once they came to understand that the information I would record in classes was for my use only, that I
would not relay information about them to the teacher nor report anyone if I saw them, for example, cheating or committing other violations of classroom rules, many relaxed about participating. Approximately a quarter of the students at first opted not to participate in the study; however, as time went on, about half of these students (i.e., roughly one-eighth) eventually changed their minds.

The Tradewinds ESLL Program

The number of ESL students in Hawai‘i has more than doubled since 1987-1988 to nearly 16,000⁹. These students come from over 40 different language backgrounds, from Mandarin to Farsi to Chuukese (Office of Instructional Services, 1995, p. 1.5). During the period of this research, the Hawai‘i DOE’s ESLL program served this large and exceptionally diverse population in elementary, intermediate, and high schools throughout the state on a slim budget averaging between $9-10 million dollars per year. The mission of the ESLL program is “to provide every language minority student with equal or better educational opportunity to maximize his/her potential as an educated, productive, and contributing citizen.” This is done by using “instructional approaches and methods which address students’ specific language and cultural needs, while ensuring that students are taught the same challenging content and high level skills desired for all students” (Office of Instructional Services, 1995, p. 1.10).

ESLL instructional delivery differs markedly across schools in Hawai‘i. At Tradewinds High School, where the ESLL student population accounted for roughly one-

---

⁹ The number of LEP students in Hawai‘i is variable. The figure reported above is from SY 2001-2002. In SY 2000-01 there were 12,837 LEP students; in SY 1998-1999, there were 18,178 (Office of the Superintendent, 2003, p. 5). According to Kindler (2002, Table 8, p. 20), there is one certified bilingual teacher for every 226 LEP students and one certified ESL teacher for every 102 LEP students in the state.
fifth of the total enrollment, the comprehensive ESLL program suggested a strong programmatic commitment on the part of the school to providing ESL students with access to (English-language medium) curriculum. ESL students regularly took classes in the following three “tracks”:

1) *Dedicated ESL classes.* Students classified as non- and limited-English proficient were required to take one course per semester of ESLL, the explicit purpose of which was to help prepare students for the transition into the “mainstream.” These classes were to be taught by qualified ESLL teachers, that is those with ESL certification,\(^{10}\) and often were assigned one PTT. At the time of this study, ESLL was offered for three years: 1\(^{st}\) year: ESLL A; 2\(^{nd}\) year: ESLL B; 3\(^{rd}\) year: ESLL C. Placement into these classes was generally (but not always) made based on the length of time students had been at school. Thus, ESLL A was for students in their first year at Tradewinds, be they 9\(^{th}\), 10\(^{th}\), 11\(^{th}\), or 12\(^{th}\) graders, regardless of L2 English proficiency, ESLL B for students in their second year at the high school, and so forth.

2) *J-section classes.* Students classified as non-, limited-, and fully-English proficient were provided with “sheltered content” classes (see, e.g., Snow, 2001) in English language arts, social studies, and science, which paralleled those offered for “mainstream” students, but were set-aside for ESLL students. J-sections were to be taught by qualified non-ESLL

\(^{10}\) At the time of this study, qualifications for ESLL teachers indicated that they “should have ESL certification or 12 university credits from ESL, bilingual, or multicultural education courses” (Hawai‘i Department of Education, 1996, p. 28). Those not so qualified had three years in which to complete those credits. See Chapter 8 for a description of ESLL teacher qualifications at Tradewinds.
program staff, that is, faculty in the respective subject-area departments who had more than 12 credits of coursework in ESL, bilingual, or multicultural education. Student placements into these classes were made similar to those in ESLL (first year students at Tradewinds usually placed into the 9th grade sequence of math, science, and English courses), although courses taken at former schools frequently affected class assignments.

3) **Mainstream classes.** All ESLL students had to take “regular” mainstream classes in math, health, guidance, physical education, and elective classes that did not have J-section offerings. These classes served both ESL and “mainstream” students together, with no special L2 English assistance.\(^{11}\)

Thus, in a given semester, a student classified as non- or limited English proficient (the substantial majority of the ESLL program at Tradewinds), was likely to be taking one ESLL course, two or three “sheltered” content courses, a math course, another core requirement such as Health/Guidance/PE, and/or an elective(s).

**Participants**

I observed a total of 15 ESLL, J-section, and mainstream classes at Tradewinds; the teachers and students of these classes form the majority of the participants of this project. However, a number of factors influenced which classes I observed, and thus, who I wound up approaching to ask for their participation. The overriding issue

---

\(^{11}\) At the time of this study, qualifications for all non-ESLL program teachers (that is all regular classroom teachers) indicated that they “should have a minimum of 6 credits” in ESL, bilingual, or multicultural education” (Office of Instructional Services, 1996, p. 28).
concerned the services I had agreed to provide in exchange for research access: this affected the classes I was assigned to help/observe and thus the potential participants who would be available for me to approach. This issue was itself affected by larger events that were well beyond my control, events I alluded to earlier (the number of incoming ESL student populations; changes in who was assigned to teach ESLL; the switch in English proficiency tests; reduced and delayed funding for PTTs, and so forth). Thus, in terms of my classroom assignments, tradeoffs were made all the way around in an attempt to balance the needs of the program with my research agenda: those ESLL and J-section classes that had more need for a volunteer due to insufficient (or no) PTT coverage were the first options available and Mr. Anderson’s priority, but I was also able to negotiate for classes that were more preferable for my purposes (see Tables 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3 for summaries of classes I observed; this is summarized in slightly different form in Appendix A). Due to the fact that the classes I was assigned determined which teachers (and students) would participate in this study, I will frame the ensuing descriptions of the teacher participants around a discussion of how classroom assignments were made, ordered chronologically. Following this, I will discuss student participants.

**Classes & teachers: Year 1**

My classroom assignments in the first, piloting year of this study were made relatively easily and wound up fitting both my own needs and those of the program. I had wanted to observe the full range of ESLL classes that were offered at Tradewinds (ESLL A, ESLL B, ESLL C) in addition to a J-section class. Mr. Anderson laid out
available options for me and then gave me his own preferences for my placements. We negotiated so that we were both satisfied and after I discussed the project and gained the consent of respective the teachers involved, I was assigned to the following classes.

1) *ELA 1X* was a notably large (30-35 students) and notably noncompliant ESLL A class taught by a first-year teacher, Ms. Cheney. Ms. Cheney had a few years of experience teaching, but only two in a public school and none in ESL. She was not certified in ESL and had no educational background in L2 learning or teaching, noting that she drew on her own L2 learning experiences to teach her ESLL classes at Tradewinds. Her ELA 1X class already had one PTT, Ms. Meredith, but needed additional assistance – Mr. Anderson indicated that the class was “a circus” (MSCNEfn: 19) – and it was Mr. Anderson’s (and Ms. Cheney’s) first priority to get it some. I wound up observing ELA 1X for approximately 48 hours over the academic year, although my engagement in this class was heavily oriented toward participant rather observer (see below), as an instructional aide primarily for the low L2 proficient students and those with interrupted formal educations (i.e., the “rocks”).

2) In addition to Ms. Cheney’s ELA 1X, I was assigned to her ESLL B class *ELB 1U*, which was much smaller than ELA 1X and had no PTT coverage, at least for the first half of the year (a PTT was later assigned half-time in the class). I observed ELB 1U for approximately 47 hours.

3) Mr. Anderson accommodated my request to observe an ESLL C class when he assigned me to *ELC 1V*, taught by Mr. Bradley, though the class
already had a PTT. Mr. Bradley was highly experienced, with ESL certification and more than 10 years of teaching. Of the teachers I observed, Mr. Bradley had the most educational background in L2 learning and teaching, and was committed to (and with Mr. Anderson, helped to write) the school’s ESLL curriculum. He had a strong presence in the class and a well-earned reputation for being strict. Some students called him mean (to his face), a label he seemed to relish and at times cultivate. Privately, however, he told me that his “tough love” approach was a response to what he perceived as the dwindling expectations for ESLL students (TINT34: 545). Mr. Bradley was also an accomplished L2 learner who spoke a number of L2s with varying degrees of proficiency. This, combined with a firmly enforced “English-only” policy in the class, made students’ L1 use – so common in other J-section and ESLL classes – comparatively rare. I observed Mr. Bradley’s class for 21 hours over the first semester of the study.

4) At Mr. Anderson’s request, I left Mr. Bradley’s class for the second semester of the first year in order to help in a large Life Sciences J-section (LSJ IV). After discussing my research with the teacher, Ms. Frank, and gaining her consent, I observed her class for the remainder of the year, for a total of 39 hours. Ms. Frank had a substantial educational background in L2 learning and teaching. She was one of the few established subject-area teachers who regularly volunteered to teach J-section classes (see Chapter 7).
5) Rounding out the classes I observed in the first year was a Social Studies J class (SSJ 1W) that had no PTT coverage, taught by Ms. Enders. Ms. Enders was a certified ESL teacher and had been working in public schools for over 10 years; she was popular among ESLL students and was widely considered to be kind. She had had undergraduate and graduate coursework relating to L2 teaching and learning. I observed Ms. Enders’s SSJ 1W class for 37 hours over the school year.

Table 5.1. Tradewinds classes observed in Year 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course name</th>
<th>Class section</th>
<th>Duration of observation</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>ESL background/prior ESL teaching experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESLL A</td>
<td>ELA 1X</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Ms. Cheney</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESLL B</td>
<td>ELB 1U</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Ms. Cheney</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESLL C</td>
<td>ELC 1V</td>
<td>1 semester (Fall)</td>
<td>Mr. Bradley</td>
<td>ESL certification/10+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences J</td>
<td>LSJ 1V</td>
<td>1 semester (Spring)</td>
<td>Ms. Frank</td>
<td>ESL coursework/10+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies J</td>
<td>SSJ 1W</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Ms. Enders</td>
<td>ESL certification/10+ years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I should note that due to scheduling conflicts and more pressing needs in other classes, I did not observe any of Mr. Anderson’s classes. However, his mark was felt across the ESLL program as he was the primary architect of the ESLL curriculum. He was certified in ESL, had worked in public school ESL for nearly 20 years, and had had graduate coursework in second language learning and teaching. His approach to administration was decidedly hands-off (according to Mr. Anderson, more often due to
circumstance than intent), which the more established teachers appeared to appreciate, in contrast to some of the newer, inexperienced hires.

In sum, for my first year at Tradewinds, I was able to observe the full range of ESLL classes available at Tradewinds plus two J-sections, while the respective teachers were provided with (additional) classroom assistance where it was needed.

**Classes & teachers: Year 2**

I was disappointed to learn at the beginning of my second year at Tradewinds that Ms. Cheney had at the last moment decided not to return to the high school. This was a significant setback to my research, as Ms. Cheney and I had developed a good working relationship in the first year, and it was in her class that I had hoped to collaborate on a critical pedagogy during the second year of research. I was also sad to learn that Ms. Enders, who had regularly taught ESLL and J-section classes, and who had agreed to participate in my research in the second year, had suffered a serious illness over the summer and opted to leave the school as well. The turnover in staff not only posed a challenge to the ESLL program, but also to my study.

Although Mr. Anderson was instrumental in helping me overcome these setbacks, the needs of the program outweighed my own in the assignment of classes for the second year. At the beginning of the year, there still were no PTTs hired, since the release of funds for them had been delayed (see above; Chapter 7). As well, the incoming class of ESL students was particularly large, and there were several new teachers with sizeable first-year ESLL classes. In addition, several J-section science classes had large enrollments, a difficult curriculum, and lab assignments that involved instruments or
procedures that required close supervision. Although I had requested ESLL B and ESLL C classes so that I could observe the same students from the first year of the study, and at least one J-section language arts class since I had already observed J-sections in social studies and science, my negotiations with Mr. Anderson resulted in some tradeoffs, and I was assigned to the following classes (after gaining the consent of the respective teachers, as I discuss further below):

1) *ELA 2W* was one of the large ESLL A classes taught by a new teacher, Ms. Ariel. Although Ms. Ariel was new to Tradewinds, she was ESL-certified and had taught public school ESL for some years before, in addition to teaching privately. Ms. Ariel had strong interests in art- and literature-based pedagogy. I observed her class for 68 hours over the 2002-2003 school year.

2) I was also assigned to a second ESLL A class, *ELA 2X*, this one taught by Mr. Day, which I observed for 64 hours during the school year. Mr. Day was also a first-year teacher at Tradewinds who had, however, taught in another public school for a number of years prior. He was certified in Industrial Arts and had no educational background or experience in teaching ESL. As a provision for his hiring, Mr. Day was offered a number of ESLL courses as “danglers,” in order to round out his otherwise incomplete teaching schedule (see Chapter 7). As a teacher with no prior ESL experience, Mr. Day relied heavily on Mr. Anderson for help in planning and teaching lessons. He also asked for my input, though by the
middle of the first semester, he appeared comfortable with his ESLL classes and subsequently, his requests for assistance diminished.

3) The third class I was assigned was another large section of Life Sciences J, LSJ 2U, again taught by Ms. Frank. My observations for this class totaled 81 hours.

4) In exchange for these three assignments, Mr. Anderson helped me gain entry to two Health classes. I had wanted to observe a Health course because it was one of the few core “mainstream” academic classes required of all students to graduate that did not have separate sections based on students’ ability-level track.\(^\text{12}\) It was also reputed to be a challenging course, which large percentages of ESLL students regularly failed. The first Health course, HLM 2Vf, was taught by Mr. Iris, a long-time teacher with no background in ESL; I observed this class for 43 hours. After HLM 2Vf concluded (at the end of Fall 2002), I observed Mr. Iris’s next Health class in the Spring of 2003, HLM 2Vs, for a total of 38 hours.\(^\text{13}\)

5) The remaining Health class I observed, HLM 2Y, was taught by Ms. Hughes, also a long-time teacher. After observing this class for 27 hours in the first semester of Year 2 of fieldwork, I moved from it to observe an ESLL B class taught by Mr. Bradley for the second semester. Neither Ms.

\(^{12}\) As I discuss in some detail in Chapter 7, there were generally four (including the J-track) ability-level tracks at Tradewinds (A-track, for honors; B-track, for above average students; C-track, for average students and below; and J-track, for ESLL students) and most subject-area departments offered different sections of courses to accommodate them (except for J-track, which only had Language Arts, Social Studies, and Science offerings). See Oakes (1985) for a classic discussion of tracking, and Harklau (1994a, 1994b, 1994c) as it relates to ESL students.

\(^{13}\) As I mentioned above, Health is a one-semester required course, worth \(\frac{1}{2}\) credit.
Hughes nor Mr. Iris had backgrounds in teaching ESL, though each had had ESLL students in their classes over the years.

6) Mr. Bradley taught ELB 2Y, which I observed for 36 hours in the Spring of Year 2. This class had a handful of students from ESLL classes I had observed in the first year. This, in fact, spurred my move to this class.

7) Finally, the last class that Mr. Anderson help me gain entry to was Mr. Grant’s Language Arts J (LAJ 2Z) class. This class was important because it was the only one with substantial numbers of students from the first year of the study, and was also a language arts J-section. At first Mr. Grant welcomed me into his (exceptionally large) class. Unfortunately, as it turns out, he grew wary of my presence and disenchanted with me personally when I asked to work with students rather than spend class time correcting homework. After two months of field work, during which I observed the class for 16 hours, Mr. Grant withdrew his participation in the study and in one of the more demoralizing moments of my fieldwork, I was asked to leave his class.

Table 5.2. Tradewinds classes observed in Year 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course name</th>
<th>Class section</th>
<th>Duration of observation</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>ESL background/prior ESL teaching experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESLL A</td>
<td>ELA 2W</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Ms. Ariel</td>
<td>ESL certification/3+ years; previous ESL experience; 1st year at Tradewinds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESLL A</td>
<td>ELA 2X</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Mr. Day</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESLL B</td>
<td>ELB 2Y</td>
<td>1 semester (Spring)</td>
<td>Mr. Bradley</td>
<td>ESL certification/10+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences J</td>
<td>LSJ 2U</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Ms. Frank</td>
<td>ESL coursework/10+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts J</td>
<td>LAJ 2Z</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>Mr. Grant</td>
<td>ESL coursework/10+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Fall)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>HLM 2Vf</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>Mr. Iris</td>
<td>None/several years teaching ESL students in mainstream classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Fall)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>HLM 2Vs</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>Mr. Iris</td>
<td>None/several years teaching ESL students in mainstream classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Spring)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>HLM 2Y</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>Ms. Hughes</td>
<td>None/several years teaching ESL students in mainstream classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Fall)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My experience with Mr. Grant returns me briefly to problematics involving the negotiation of entry. As in the first year of the study, each of the teachers for the courses I was ultimately assigned was approached by Mr. Anderson and myself. Although Mr. Anderson’s presence was necessary – he was my sponsor at the school and made the requisite introductions – I was concerned that teachers, particularly the first-year teachers, would feel obliged to participate in the study because I had gained Mr. Anderson’s approval as well as that of school, district, and state officials. As Hatch (2002, p. 67) has noted, teachers may feel “subtly coerced into participating in studies about which they have reservations. When district officials and principals have already agreed, it may be difficult for teachers to decline an invitation to participate.” For this reason, I raised the issue with each teacher during the signing of consent forms (when Mr. Anderson was not present) and periodically throughout my classroom observations, emphasizing that participation was strictly voluntary and that they could withdraw from the study at any time. Several of the more established teachers (Mr. Bradley, Ms. Enders, Ms. Frank, Mr. Grant, Ms. Hughes, Mr. Iris, and Mr. Anderson himself) assured me
(repeatedly) that they understood and supported my research. Mr. Day, one of the new first-year ESLL teachers, seemed enthusiastic about having me in his class, both to help with students and to help him learn about teaching ESL. However, the other two first-year teachers, Ms. Cheney and Ms. Ariel, did express some reservations about my presence in their classes. Ms. Cheney, for example, wondered aloud to me if the reason I was observing two of her classes was because Mr. Anderson was concerned about her teaching. Ms. Ariel worried throughout the year about me audio-recording her classes and interviewing any of her students. For these reasons (and many others), I went to great lengths to establish and maintain dialogues with the three first-year teachers about my presence and role in their classes, dialogues that were engaged in far more often than those with the established teachers.

**Classes & teachers: Year 3**

In my final semester at Tradewinds, I observed two ESLL B classes, both taught by Mr. Bradley, between two and four times per week (*ELB 3W* for 29 hours, and *ELB 3X* for 32 hours). I had observed many of the students in these classes during the second

---

14 Classroom recordings were a concern for Ms. Ariel, she told me, because she worried that she might come across as “mean” in them. Regarding student interviews, both Mr. Day and Ms. Ariel expressed some anxiety about what students were saying to me about them. This anxiety was no doubt exacerbated by the handful of generation 1.5 students who reported to these two teachers that I was asking personal questions in interviews; this was, as I came to understand, one (mean-spirited) manifestation of a practice in which some students would play me or other teachers against each other. I assured the teachers (repeatedly) that I never solicited personal comments about them or their teaching from students, as it was of little interest to me, of little value to the research, and because I frankly believed it violated the spirit of my agreements with teachers who had granted me access to their classrooms. I also assured both teachers that if such comments arose (they rarely did) that I suggested the student talk about whatever was bothering them with the teacher, a counselor, or both. This is another indication of the vulnerability that several of the teachers felt by participating in this project, the consequent challenges I experienced in attempting to maintain rapport, and the delicate line I straddled between communities of teachers and students.
year of research, and so was able to see them in different instructional settings, and at
later periods in their L2 development.

Table 5.3. Tradewinds classes observed in Year 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course name</th>
<th>Class section</th>
<th>Duration of observation</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>ESL background/prior ESL teaching experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESLL B</td>
<td>ELB 3W</td>
<td>1 semester (Fall)</td>
<td>Mr. Bradley</td>
<td>ESL certification/10+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESLL B</td>
<td>ELB 3X</td>
<td>1 semester (Fall)</td>
<td>Mr. Bradley</td>
<td>ESL certification/10+ years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students

ESLL students at Tradewinds accounted for approximately one-fifth of the
Tradewinds enrollment. It was a diverse group, with more than 20 different language
backgrounds represented. Some of these students had been in Hawai‘i for as little as a
few days, others for several years, while still others had been born in the US. They came
from a wide range of ethnic, cultural, religious, socioeconomic, educational, and family
backgrounds and were living and going to school in Hawai‘i for an array of different
reasons.

Although I had intended to recruit focal students for this study, several factors
mitigated against this, primary among them the scheduling dilemma in the second year of
fieldwork (others included students who returned to their home countries, changed their
minds about participating, were “released” from school, or dropped out). Therefore, I
will describe in general terms the demographic profile of each of the eight ESLL classes
that I observed. Individual student information appears in Appendix B.
ELA1X (Ms. Cheney, Year 1). This class was by far the largest and most overtly noncompliant of the all the ESLL classes that I observed. It averaged more than 30 9th and 10th graders over the course of the year. Half were Pacific Islanders (Micronesian or Polynesian), one third were from China, with the remainder from Japan, Korea, and the Philippines. Approximately half of the class had lived in the US for two years or more, with most having gone to school in Hawai‘i, and for the Micronesian students, Guam, or the Northern Mariana Islands, for five years or more. Most of the East Asian students were more recent arrivals to the US. L2 English proficiencies ranged from absolute beginners (mostly students from China, a few from Micronesia) to advanced speakers, with five of the Micronesian students (all boys, all from Chuuk) with interrupted formal educations and low levels of L1/L2 print literacy and L2 oral proficiency.

ELB 1U (Ms. Cheney, Year 1). This class was smaller size than ELA 1X (second year ESLL classes were invariably smaller than the ESLL A classes), averaging 20 members over the school year. One third was Micronesian (all Marshallese), another third was Chinese, with the remaining third consisting of students from the Philippines, Vietnam, and Iran. Most of these students were 10th and 11th graders, with three in the 12th grade. Approximately one-fifth of the students were generation 1.5 (G1.5), with lengths of residence ranging from two years to 12, with one student who had been born in Hawai‘i.

ELC 1V (Mr. Bradley, Year 1). This was the smallest of the ESLL classes that I observed, with approximately 15 students. Most were 11th and 12th graders, who could be evenly divided among Chinese, Filipino, Micronesian, and Korean, with a Vietnamese and South Asian enrolled as well. Nearly all of these students had lengths of residence
over two years and were G1.5 students, and with a few notable exceptions, most seemed resigned to their ongoing placement in ESLL. I observed this class for the first semester of research, after which I changed to Ms. Frank’s LSJ 1V.

**ELA 2W (Ms. Ariel, Year 2).** This class averaged 30 students over the course of the year, most of whom were 9th graders, with a handful of 10th graders and one student in the 12th grade. About one third of the class was Micronesian, most of whom were Chuukese and were considered to have interrupted formal educations; another third consisted of Cantonese and Mandarin-speaking students from Hong Kong, China, and Taiwan; the rest of the students came from American Samoa, the Philippines, Korea, and Vietnam. Four of the students had lived in the US for eight years or more, eight had lived in the US for between two and five years, with the remainder arriving in the US from one to six months before the start of the school year. About a third of the class were G1.5 ESLL students. This same third was also highly proficient in oral L2 English and in their L1s, though the longer-term Chinese and Vietnamese learners reported that their L1 literacy was poor. Another third of the class was near or at very basic levels of oral and written L2 English ability, with two of the Chuukese students unable to write in their L1. The remaining students were at various levels of L2 English proficiency between the advanced students and the beginners.

**ELA 2X (Mr. Day, Year 2).** This class also consisted of approximately 30 students over the course of the school year. Of all the ESLL classes that I observed, this class had the highest level of L2 English proficiency, with only five students who were L2 English beginners. One third of the class was from the Pacific Islands (Chuuk, Palau, the Marshall Islands, Tonga, and Samoa), one fifth were Cantonese speakers, another
fifth were from the Philippines, with the remaining students from Vietnam, Korea, and Hawai‘i. Approximately one-third of this class was G1.5 as well, five of whom had lived in the US for seven years or more (two were born in Hawai‘i; one had been in Guam schools since the 2nd grade); and six of whom had lived in Hawai‘i for between two and five years, with Laidplayer, a unique full participant in G1.5 CoP having arrived in Hawai‘i a month before the school year started. Of the non-G1.5 students in this class, most had been in the US for shorter periods, from one month up until two years.

*ELB 2Y (Mr. Bradley, Year 2).* There were just under 20 students in this class, including three (Brahdah, Romeo, and Ben) who I had observed the year before in Ms. Cheney’s ELA 1X class. Most of the students in this class were 10th graders, nearly two-thirds of whom were Chinese, with the remainder from the Pacific Islands and Philippines. Many of the Chinese students were recent arrivals to the US with low levels of L2 proficiency. About half of the class had lengths of residence in the US for over two years.

*ELB 3W (Mr. Bradley, Year 3).* This class also had just under 20 students, several of whom I had observed in Mr. Day’s and Ms. Ariel’s classes. The majority of students had lived in the US for two years or more. About one-fifth of the class was Chinese, about one-third were from the Philippines, with the remainder coming from Korea and Micronesia.

*ELB 3X (Mr. Bradley, Year 3).* This class also had about 20 students, a few of whom I had also observed in Mr. Day’s and Ms. Ariel’s classes. About one-third of the students were Chinese with another third from the Pacific Islands, and the remainder
from Vietnam and the Philippines. As in ELB 3W, the majority of students in this class had lived in the US for two years or more.

**Data collection procedures**

As I discuss below, a primary way to ensure the trustworthiness of (critical) ethnography is through triangulation, the systematic checking of findings and interpretations through multiple sources and multiple methods. This section deals with the multiple methods through which I collected data – participant observation, field notes, audio-recording of classrooms, interviewing, and the collection of site documents – so that triangulation could occur. A key to the codes I use to refer to these different types of data throughout the dissertation can be found in Appendix C.

My first year at Tradewinds was spent negotiating entry and establishing trust with the students and teachers at the school, learning about the ESLL program and its relation to the rest of the school, asking “grand tour” questions (Spradley, 1980), and coming to understand the routines and rituals of the classrooms I was permitted to observe. The form of the data I collected this year consisted of field notes drawn from participant observation, as well as site documents, many informal interviews, and a few formal ones.

My engagement at Tradewinds was most substantial during the second year of research. I attended classes 3 times a week for the entire school day. In addition to continuing classroom observations and gathering classroom documents, the bulk of my audio-recorded data was taken this year, consisting of classroom recordings and formal and informal interviews with teachers and students.
The final semester of research consisted of observations and some classroom audio-recordings and interviews, but my primary goal this term was in testing assertions and checking findings with participants. In Table 5.4, I provide a breakdown of the time I spent observing specific classrooms and the number of hours of classroom recordings, whole-class and student-carried. I discuss this information in more detail below.

Table 5.4. Breakdown of classroom observations/recordings, 2001-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class/section name</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Total hours of classroom observation (including classroom recordings)</th>
<th>Total hours of classroom recordings (including student-carried recordings)</th>
<th>Hours of student – carried recordings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELA 1X</td>
<td>Ms. Cheney</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA 2W</td>
<td>Ms. Ariel</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA 2X</td>
<td>Mr. Day</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELB 1U</td>
<td>Ms. Cheney</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELB 2Y</td>
<td>Mr. Bradley</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELB 3W</td>
<td>Mr. Bradley</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELB 3X</td>
<td>Mr. Bradley</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELC 1V</td>
<td>Mr. Bradley</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSJ 1W</td>
<td>Ms. Enders</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSJ 1V</td>
<td>Ms. Frank</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSJ 2U</td>
<td>Ms. Frank</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAJ 2Z</td>
<td>Mr. Grant</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLM 2Vf</td>
<td>Mr. Iris</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLM 2Vs</td>
<td>Mr. Iris</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLM 2Y</td>
<td>Ms. Hughes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>626</strong></td>
<td><strong>158</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 These totals do not include observations from other social situations at the high school such as lunch hour, recess, “passing” period, assemblies, testing sessions, extracurricular activities, field trips, etc.
Participant observation

A mainstay of a qualitative methodology, particularly an ethnography, is participant observation (see, e.g., Hatch, 2002; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Spradley, 1980; Wolcott, 1995). In a well-known typology, Spradley (1980) has classified five different types of participation/observation along a continuum of researcher involvement “both with people and in the activities they observe” (p. 58, emphasis in original). On one end of the continuum is “non-participation” observation, in which data are collected by direct observation alone, with no involvement with the actors or activities being observed. This is to be undertaken if a social situation bars involvement, or as Spradley notes, perhaps wryly, if the researcher is “an extremely shy individual” (1980, p. 59). This is contrasted with “complete” participation, in which researchers “study a situation in which they are already ordinary participants”; this is a danger because “the more you know about a situation as an ordinary participant, the more difficult it is to study it” (p. 61; cf. Erickson, 1986, p. 121).

My own involvement at Tradewinds varied considerably, depending on which classes (or other social situations) I was observing. Generally speaking, my participation in ESLL classes ranged from “moderate,” in Spradley’s (1980) terms, to occasionally “active.” My participation usually involved helping students individually with class assignments; most often these were lower L2 English proficient students who needed more assistance with the instructions for an assignment and/or completing it. At times, ESLL teachers would have me take a small group of lower L2 English proficient students for instruction targeted more at their level, though this did not occur nearly as frequently
as I would have anticipated. Ms. Cheney and Ms. Ariel were the only teachers who regularly used me this way: Ms. Cheney, toward the end of the school-year in her large ELA 1X, and Ms. Ariel, in the beginning of the school year in her ELA 2W. In both classes, I tended to work with Chuukese students who were struggling with beginning oral and written English, and sometimes L1 literacy. My participation was most active in Mr. Bradley’s ELC 1V and ELB 2Y classes as he often would ask me, spur-of-the-moment, to take over instruction mid-way through a class; the prospect of these sudden, disconcerting requests loomed large over my observations in his classes at first, though I gradually adjusted to it.

In the J-sections and the mainstream Health classes, my involvement on the whole was far less than in ESLL, mainly because these classes were driven by a set curriculum, with a considerable amount of material to be covered each semester. These classes tended to have much more teacher-fronted activity such as lectures, and weekly, or sometimes twice-weekly quizzes or tests. My role in these classes was more often relegated to “passive” participation, although there were also many instances in which students were given individual seatwork assignments, group work, and other activities (e.g., physical fitness testing and CPR training in the Health classes) that allowed me more active engagement. When observing classes, ESLL, J-section, or mainstream, I usually sat in the back of the classroom with a notebook and pen to record field notes.

In addition to classrooms, I was also a participant observer in a number of other social situations at Tradewinds. These included the lunch hour (a few times in the cafeteria, most often in Mr. Anderson’s classroom where teachers often gathered to eat and hang out), recess and “passing” periods (the time between classes) in the Tradewinds
courtyards and corridors; after-school student club meetings; pep rallies and other school assemblies; ESLL extracurricular activities; field trips; and “open-house” nights. Mr. Anderson also allowed me to sit in on many teachers’ meetings, including ESLL curriculum and professional development meetings; school-wide Tradewinds teachers’ meetings; complex area meetings (in which teachers from schools in the Tradewinds complex area gathered); DOE gatherings; and DOE-sponsored professional development opportunities. With the exception of lunch, ESLL extracurricular activities, and field trips, my involvement tended toward passive participation in these other social situations.

Finally, I should note that I made no pretense as a participant to assume the role of a (high school) student, as other researchers have done. In an educational ethnography of an elementary school, for example, George Spindler assumed the role of a 3rd grader, doing the same school work, eating lunch, and playing with the children in his study (see Spindler & Spindler, 1992). Everhart (1983) offers a fascinating and insightful glimpse into the day-to-day school lives of 12-15 year olds, a glimpse afforded only by him taking on the role of a junior high school student for two years. For me and for my particular situation – and I say this with the certainty afforded by hindsight – it would have been difficult, and most likely counterproductive, for me to have attempted such a thing at Tradewinds (see Hatch, 2002, p. 74). As it was, a key benefit for teachers who accepted me into their classes, one which perhaps helped override concerns they may have had about my presence, was having extra instructional assistance. Had I not offered to provide this, it is likely that at least some teachers would not have granted me access. As well, I believe there were simply too many differences between me and the students, in terms of age, L1, race/ethnicity – and too many similarities between me and the teachers
– for me to have been accepted as a student, either by students or teachers. I think with the students, in particular, responses would have tended more toward suspicion about ulterior intentions and goals than amusement or surprise at the novelty – or plain weirdness – of someone like me trying to be someone like them; in fact, as it was, my interest in students prompted a rumor to circulate during the second year of field work that I was either an undercover police officer or an FBI agent.

Field notes

The data that were produced from participant observations took form in field notes. Hatch (2002, p. 77) aptly characterizes field notes as "descriptions of contexts, actions, and conversations written in as much detail as possible given the constraints of watching and writing in a rapidly changing social environment." These were usually written long hand and then typed up, elaborated, and "filled in" (Hatch, 2002, p. 77) as soon after leaving the field as possible for subsequent analysis.

The end result of the process that Hatch (2002) describes, a highly contextualized, nuanced rendering of observed events, has been called "thick description" by Geertz (1973). Thick description is description that offers sufficient detail to provide readers with a clear understanding both of the observed/recorded events and of what they mean in a given setting, that is, the salient "webs of significance" (p. 5) through which they were or may have been produced and made sense of. In his famous example (borrowed from philosopher Gilbert Ryle), Geertz (1973) notes that a boy's winking can be rendered simply as "rapid eyelid contractions" (thin description), or as part of "interworked systems of construable signs" (p. 14) whereby such movements impart a message, for
example, a signal of conspiracy, of ridicule, or, perhaps, parody (thick description). As Geertz (1973) elaborates:

[B]etween . . . the “thin description” of what [the boy] is doing (“rapidly contracting his right eyelids [sic]”) and the “thick description” of what he is doing (“practicing a burlesque of a friend faking a wink to deceive an innocent into thinking a conspiracy is in motion”) lies the object of ethnography: a stratified hierarchy of meaningful structures in terms of which twitches, winks, fake-winks, parodies, rehearsals of parodies are produced, perceived, and interpreted, and without which they would not . . . in fact exist, no matter what anyone did or didn’t do with his [sic] eyelids” (p. 7).

This is not to suggest that what is thickly described is the objective “truth” of what happened in the setting; to the contrary, as Geertz (1973) discusses at length, thick description is an explicitly interpretive endeavor. What thick description does provide, however, is enough contextual detail to allow for and demonstrate an empirically defensible interpretation of observed events.

It is important to point out that not all field notes need to be “thickly” described. Carspecken (1996), for example, remarks that thick descriptions can be onerous and exhausting for the researcher to produce, and unwieldy to analyse. He instead advocates writing “selective sets” of thick field notes generated from “selected periods of intensive observation” in one or more settings that are of primary interest at a given research site. In addition to selective sets of field notes, Carspecken (1996) also suggests keeping what he calls “quite thick” field notes, in which observations are written “thickly” in a notebook, as the observed events are also being audio-recorded. When writing up notes
from such an observation, the researcher then types only the written notes into the word processor, leaving what was recorded untranscribed. "This way you will always have the option of returning to the tape to give more detail to your notes if your analysis requires it" (Carspecken, 1996, p. 48). Although nearly all of my early (first year) descriptions were recorded "thickly," in the second year, I began following Carspecken's (1996) advice, on both of these accounts, for several reasons. First, my duties as a participant in some classes did not always allow me to keep a thick record of what I participated in/observed. Second, because my analysis of data was recurrent throughout the period of the study, my focus became more refined; thus, I did not need to record every class "thickly." And finally, my observations at Tradewinds in the first year and final semester averaged about four hours per day, three days per week, and about six and a half hours per day, three days per week in the second year (excluding extracurricular events, professional development meetings, etc.); it was simply too great an effort to keep a "thick" record of all I observed. In addition, I always attempted (sometimes less successfully than others) to word process my field notes the same day or at the latest, the day after my observations, which in itself would take between two and four hours.

Because I also had a part time job during the entire period of study, and became a father mid-way through the second year of it, there were simply not enough hours in the day (or night) to produce and process thick field notes for every class. Rather than limit the number of these classes so I could keep a thick record of everything I saw in them, I felt it better to observe more classes and keep a more selectively thick record so I could gain a broader perspective of ESLL at Tradewinds.

---

16 See Carspecken (1996, pp. 44-54) for other helpful suggestions on "building a primary record."
As is common, my field notes were written longhand, in a spiral notebook that I kept with me at all times. Most of my classroom notes were framed by the structure and sequence of a particular lesson in terms of what was being taught that day and the activities that were assigned. Depending on my focus for a given day, my descriptions would include what I felt were the salient features and/or content of interaction between teachers and students, students and students, and teachers or students and myself; interaction was written to the best of my ability verbatim. I also noted examples, features, and the character of teacher talk and instruction; lesson pacing; seating arrangements; classroom physical layouts; student groupings (self-selected or assigned by teacher); physical movements; classroom “interruptions” (Klugman, 2001); and many other of the seemingly limitless phenomena that take place within a high school classroom each day. I also kept careful track of the time, making frequent note of it during a lesson, and wrote verbatim what was written on the blackboard.

In addition to recording observations in field notes, I also logged in them my “bracketed” personal, methodological, and analytic reactions and reflections (see Hatch, 2002, pp. 86-87). These were personal responses to circumstances or events I observed, methodological notations and reminders to myself, as well as analytic insights or preliminary interpretations about data that I could follow up on later. I distinguished these from the observational data with brackets (“[]”). Keeping them with the observational data (rather than in a separate notebook) was useful when typing up field notes later for recapturing my state of mind at a particular moment during the observation.
Teachers and students took frequent interest in my field notes in class; on those occasions when they would try to read what I was writing, I would close the notebook and explain about the need to protect participant confidentiality. This was a particularly sensitive issue since, on the one hand, I did not want to appear secretive, yet on the other, did not want to reveal (and could not, ethically) what I was observing, for example, the various violations of classroom rules I often saw students engaging in (copying homework, cheating on tests, text-messaging during class, talking surreptitiously with friends, and the like). I was never able to resolve fully the tension between maintaining confidentiality and maintaining rapport. However, in an effort to mitigate the sense of secrecy, I wound up keeping with me a sample of (fabricated) field notes to show anyone who was interested an illustration of what I was writing.

Audio-recorded interaction

I audio-recorded classrooms during the second year and final semester of the study in order to gain a more detailed record of classroom instruction, activities, and interaction, and to use the transcriptions of these recordings for microanalysis.\(^\text{17}\) I used three main types of classroom audio-recordings: whole-class recordings, student-carried recordings, and student-carried recordings when I was not present in the classroom during the time of recording.

Whole class recordings, in which a recorder was placed at the front (or sometimes back) of a classroom, were useful for picking up teacher-fronted classroom activity, teacher-student and occasional student-student interaction, and a general sense of whole

\(^{17}\) For this reason, nearly all of the classroom transcripts used throughout this study are drawn from the Year 2 classes (and some Year 3), not the ones from Year 1.
group dynamics. For student-carried recordings, I asked selected student participants to carry a recorder in a small harness, with a microphone attached to their collars. Student-carried recordings were ideal for capturing more local interaction among students, and provided an alternative, decidedly student-oriented perspective on teacher-fronted instruction and whole class interaction. On a few occasions, usually because I was conducting an interview, I was not present in the classroom that was being recorded. Unfortunately, my absence during these recordings limited my ability to comprehend many of the important kinesic and paralinguistic dynamics of the interaction.

As I summarized in Table 5.4 above, of the ESLL classes, I recorded Ms. Ariel’s ELA 2W for a total of 26 hours (14 of which were student-carried recordings); Mr. Day’s ELA 2X for 29 hours (16 hours student-carried); Mr. Bradley’s ELB 2Y for 15 hours (one hour student-carried); his ELB 3W for nine hours (seven of which were student-carried); and his ELB 3X for six hours (4 hours student-carried). Of the J-section classes, I recorded Ms. Frank’s LSJ 2U for 33 hours (22 of which were student-carried), and Mr. Grant’s LAJ 2Z for just one hour. Mr. Iris’s and Ms. Hughes’s Fall 2003 Health classes (HLM 2Vf and HLM 2Y respectively) were both recorded for 12 hours, while Mr. Iris’s HLM 2Vs was recorded for 15. I wound up not asking ESL students to carry recorders in the Health classes because I did not want to single them out any more than my (marked) presence in the classroom as an L2 researcher and ESL instructional aide already did. This was a choice I made on my own. As it turned out, because a considerable amount of instruction in these classes was teacher-fronted or required individual seatwork, the

---

18 ESLL students’ behavior with me in the Health classes was notably different than it was in ESLL and J-section classes. I believe one possible reason for this was that if I worked with them, I would index their “ESLL-ness,” drawing unwanted attention to what was a low-prestige subject position in the classroom and school. Thus, I opted not to exacerbate this by asking them to carry recorders in these classes.
advantages of student-carried recordings would, I believe, have been fewer than they were in the ESLL and J-sections anyway. Student-carried recordings generally began in the latter halves of a semester, after several whole-class recordings.

In terms of recruiting student participants to carry recorders in class, when I first solicited volunteers, few showed interest: only one or two per class. In order to encourage greater participation, I added a $5 fast food gift certificate as a “prize” for helping with the research. This tactic proved to be more successful than I had hoped – in some classes, more than two-thirds of the students took a sudden, newfound interest in the project – and I wound up with many more requests to carry the recorder than I was finally able to satisfy (or afford). This allowed me to be more selective in choosing students for the task. It also meant that “carrying Mister’s recorder” gained some unexpected cachet.

Ultimately, I selected 30 (unique) students to carry recorders during class time: seven Chinese students (four female, three male), six Filipino/as (four female, two male), six Koreans (one female, five male), four Chuukese (three female, one male), three Samoans (two female, one male), two Palauans (one female, one male), a Vietnamese male, and a Tongan female (for a list of students who carried recorders, see Appendix B). I would like to emphasize that these students were not selected randomly nor because I felt they were “representative” of other students of the same sex, race/ethnicity, or L1 background at Tradewinds (or anywhere else). I chose these students purposefully, because I wanted to obtain more specific, detailed data concerning their L2 learning and use, their academic performance, and/or their particular classroom roles. In addition,

---

19 I struggled with the form this incentive would take and reluctantly settled on a fast food gift certificate when it became clear that it was the most popular option among the students.
each had classroom-based social and linguistic networks that I wanted to explore in more
depth than observation or interview would allow. Finally, I chose these students because
I wanted to suggest the diversity of ESLL students at the high school in terms of length of
residence in Hawai‘i, cultural and linguistic affiliations, educational backgrounds, L1 and
L2 proficiencies, and experiences with and perspectives on ESLL. None, then, should be
considered “archetypal.”

My directions to students who carried recorders during class were simple: be
yourself; don’t worry about the recorder; to the extent possible, ignore it. As I always did
before audio-recording, I informed the entire class that I would be recording that day (I
always asked teachers’ permission beforehand). When a particular student was carrying
the recorder, I added to my notice that anyone who sat near and/or talked with that
individual would be recorded, assuring those students who had not consented to
participate in research that they would still be excluded from analysis. Finally, the
number of times that a student carried the recorder varied from one time to four; there
was no principled basis upon which this particular decision was made.

Although I attempted to log and transcribe classroom recordings as soon after the
class as possible, the fact that this would take between three and six hours per class –
sometimes twice or even three times that if there were substantial amounts of L1 data
(see below) – meant that I often did not get to log and transcribe classroom recordings
until weeks later. However, I did have detailed field notes for these classes that were
inputted beforehand, which facilitated subsequent logging and transcription. I also did
not wind up transcribe all recordings, following Carspecken’s (1996) suggestion for
“quite thick” field notes (see above). The classes for which I did not transcribe all
recordings were restricted to the Health classes; that is, ESLL and J-sections that were recorded were subsequently logged and later transcribed.

**Recording equipment**

I began recording classrooms using an analog audio-tape recorder with an external flat microphone. However, I immediately realized the limitations of the analog format in terms of quality and convenience. Analog tapes contained considerable hiss and distortion, greatly reducing the clarity of the recordings. I would also have to wait for opportune moments to change tapes (and batteries) during class. For these reasons, I switched shortly after I began the recordings to digital equipment, specifically, the mini-disc (MD) recorder. I used two MD recorders throughout the study, the first (which was used most often), a Sony MZ-B100 MDLP recorder with built-in stereo flat mic, the second, a Sony MZ-N707 NetMD. The MZ-B100 was used exclusively for whole-class recordings. For student recordings, I used either recorder carried in a small fanny pack and outfitted with a high-quality, single-point omnidirectional lavaliere stereo mic, which I attached with a clip to participants' shirt collars. The mic’s T-shape (one microphone element at each end of the T) and omnidirectionality allowed for clear recording of interaction in an impressive radius around the student wearing it. Added conveniences included the recorders' battery economy and the MD media, which were capable of holding up to five hours of recorded material on one disc. Both machines were also used in the transcription of recorded data.

---

I gratefully acknowledge the TESOL International Research Foundation for providing the Russell N. Campbell Doctoral Dissertation Grant, which made purchase of this recording equipment possible.
Interviewing

I engaged in formal and informal interviews with both teachers and students. Formal interviews were semi-structured (see, e.g., Bernard, 1994; Fontana & Frey, 1994), and more or less followed an evolving set of interview protocols. Informal interviews were unstructured and on-the-spot, usually about an event that had just occurred, or a specific question I had come into the classroom with based on my ongoing data analysis. The theory of interviewing that informed my approach to this mode of data collection derives from Holstein & Gubrium’s (1997) notion of “active” interviewing, in which the interview is construed as a social encounter between individuals who are engaged in meaning-making, rather than as a “fact-finding” expedition (also see Silverman, 2001; Warren, 2002; for more on the status of interview data, see below).

The teachers

I conducted a total of 16 formal, audio-recorded interviews with 10 different teachers (all the teachers who participated in the research, with the exception of Mr. Grant) and PTTs, and many more informal interviews with them and several other PTTs, which were recorded in field notes. The formal interviews ranged from 40 minutes to two hours and were mostly scheduled before or after school hours, at the school. The informal interviews lasted anywhere from a couple of minutes to an hour and were conducted during school hours: for the shorter informal interviews, usually during class, for the longer ones, after class, or during lunch, recess, or teachers’ prep periods. I attempted to interview most teachers formally at least twice, but busy schedules, logistical problems, and some teachers’ reluctance to be formally interviewed made this a
challenge; therefore several teachers were limited to just one formal interview. As with
the student interviews, informal interviews were a more preferable format: they yielded
data that were more substantive, spontaneous, and frank since the interviews were often
during or right after class about specific events that had just transpired. A general
template for the formal interview protocol, which was tailored for specific teachers, is
included in Appendix D.

The students

For students, I audio-recorded a total of 42 formal, semi-structured interviews
with 37 (unique) students, and countless informal interviews with these students and
many others (for a list of the students with whom I conducted formal interviews, see
Appendix B). Formal interviews were anywhere from 15 minutes to an hour (usually
about 30 minutes); informal interviews were generally for a few minutes at a time during
or after class, at lunch, or recess. For formal student interviews, I used protocols that
were specific to individual students; the general protocol template they were based on is
included in Appendix E.

While formal interviews yielded some extremely interesting data, a number of
factors ultimately made them a less than desirable interview format. To begin with,
logistical complexities made formal student interviewing at Tradewinds difficult. These
derived from restrictions placed upon me by the university institutional review board,
which mandated that student interviews take place during school time, on school grounds.
Mr. Anderson helped me with the most significant challenge these restrictions posed by
locating a temporarily unused classroom and negotiating my use of it. I then scheduled
interviews with students before school, at lunch, and during some class time. These constraints, however, meant that I wound up formally interviewing most students only once.

In addition to logistical difficulties, an additional problem about formal interviews (for both students and teachers) was the intimidating character of the formal setting itself – usually an empty classroom, two chairs facing each other, a recorder and microphone, a white, L1-English-speaking adult male researcher from a university with a schedule of questions and notepad. This was hardly the sort of environment an adult, let alone an adolescent, might feel comfortable in (see Eder & Fingerson, 2002). As well, I felt it necessary to begin each student interview with a statement about the purpose of the interview, its use to me in the research, and a repeated assurance about confidentiality. I also wanted to be explicit with students about their rights: they were free to request that the interview not be recorded, they did not have to answer any question they did not want to answer, and they could stop the interview at any time. Following this admittedly stiff and legalistic introduction, I would ask if the student had any questions, and once those were answered, the interview would begin, usually with me trying hard to allay the atmosphere my introduction had created. Many students were disarmingly candid in their interviews, which itself made the formal format well worthwhile. Others were understandably guarded, no matter how I tried to break the ice. Some seemed concerned that they give me the “right” answers to my questions, all assurances that there were none notwithstanding. Others appeared uncomfortable with the one-on-one interaction with me. These and other disconcerting aspects of formal interviews thus made them less preferable to informal interviews, conducted on the spot during class, and most often
recorded in field notes. Informal interviews generated context-specific comments that were often more substantive than student answers to the more general, abstract questions I asked during the formal interviews (Eder & Fingerson, 2002). I was also able to interview far more students this way (many who I did informally interview in class chose not to interview formally with me) without going through the sometimes delicate negotiations that were required to get a student to give up part of a lunch hour or time at recess to talk to me. The trade-offs were that most of the informal sessions were not audio-recorded and were for significantly less time (between 2-5 minutes).

Although I was reasonably successful getting ESLL student interviewees, I was not when it came to mainstream students (who included L1 English speakers as well as former [or “exited”] ESLL students). Of the more than 50 mainstream students enrolled in the Health classes I observed in Year 2, I only managed to interview one, who was himself a former ESLL student. I can speculate about why this was: first, all of the Health classes were well before or after the lunch hour, the time that I usually had set for interviews. The handful of mainstream students who had arranged to interview with me may have forgotten about our agreement or changed their minds last minute. Why so few agreed to be interviewed in the first place, however, may have been due to the fact that my relationships with students in the Health classes were not as familiar as they were in the J-section and ESLL classes; this itself was due to my more passive participation in these classes. Also, my presence in the Health classes was as an ESL researcher. Mainstream students may have believed my interests did not concern them or were perhaps of little import; the former ESLL students may simply not have wanted anything
to do with ESL, including my research. Regardless, the lack of mainstream student interviewees, while unfortunate, is not by any means a serious limitation of this study.

**L1 data**

There was a remarkable amount of students' L1 use in ESLL, J-section, and mainstream classes at Tradewinds. This in itself is an interesting finding, one which in some ways complicates important earlier calls for teachers not to exclude students’ L1s from the classroom (e.g., Auerbach, 1993; Lucas & Katz, 1994): at Tradewinds, students used their L1s in such numbers, and with such regularity that the usual (mostly ESLL and J-section) classroom language policies prohibiting L1 use were rendered essentially meaningless. While this of course does not mean that L1s were effectively incorporated into instruction, it does mean that the actual day-to-day adherence to, or more precisely, realization of classroom language policies needs to be examined, in addition to the policies themselves (cf. Auerbach, 1993; Lucas & Katz, 1994; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004).

These considerations aside, students’ abundant L1 use in my observational and recorded data represented a significant challenge in terms of analysis. The number of different L1s and the amount of their usage meant that with two exceptions (Japanese and Spanish) an overwhelming amount of these data were essentially incomprehensible to me. L1 data were recorded in Cantonese, Mandarin, Korean, Chuukese, Samoan, Tongan, Tagalog, Ilokano, Cebuano, and Vietnamese; non-recorded L1 data included Marshallese, Pohnpeian, Spanish, Chamorro, Palauan, Japanese, and German.

In classes where I was not recording interaction, I simply marked the incidence of L1 use in my field notes. For recorded data, I was able to hire translators for much of the
Cantonese, Mandarin, and Korean data. The process by which the L1 data were translated generally went as follows: during the logging and transcribing of recorded classroom sessions, I would mark incidence of L1 use in the classroom transcript. After scheduling a particular translation session, to which I would bring the mini-disc equipment and a lap top computer, I would locate those points in the transcripts where I had earlier noted L1 use. The translator and I would then listen to the L1 on the MD, which the translator would then simultaneously interpret. Those segments that I (and after some time, the translators as well) deemed of interest, would then be transcribed, with an accompanying English gloss. Translation sessions generally lasted between two and four hours each.

Questionnaire

In order to gain some idea of student backgrounds, interests, and goals, I distributed a simple questionnaire to each class I observed in the second and third years of research. This was distributed at the beginning of the semester. It proved useful on a number of accounts, particularly in student interviews, where I often used it as a springboard for discussion. A sample questionnaire is attached in Appendix F.

Assignments, homework, and other documents

Over the two and a half years of this study, I collected three bankers’ boxes worth of site documents, categorized broadly into classroom documents, ESLL program documents, Tradewinds documents, and Hawai‘i DOE documents.

Payment for some translations was made possible by the Russell N. Campbell Doctoral Dissertation Grant from the TESOL International Research Foundation.
Classroom documents that I collected included class syllabi, assignment sheets, quizzes and tests, and dozens of worksheets. I also gathered a substantial amount of student work, including class assignments, projects, quizzes and tests, homework, journals, and the folders that students were required to keep all classwork in.

ESLL documents included Tradewinds ESLL policy and budgetary documents (located on the web as well as those distributed to schools), curriculum planning drafts, L2 English placement tests, and miscellaneous student recordkeeping paperwork.

Tradewinds documents that I collected included school calendars, daily bulletins, bell schedules, memos and letters from the administration, school newspapers, the Tradewinds annual School Status and Improvement Report, Adequate Yearly Progress reports, and results from the Hawai‘i Content Performance Standards II tests (later renamed Hawai‘i State Assessment). DOE materials that I gathered included much that was available on the World Wide Web, such as the annual Superintendent’s Report, No Child Left Behind accountability reports, district summaries, and so forth. I also collected materials that were distributed at the various DOE meetings and professional development seminars that I attended.

Data management

Field notes, audio-recordings, interviews, and site documents collected over two and a half years added up to a voluminous amount of data, and a significant challenge I encountered early on was organizing and managing it all. Transcribed field notes were inputted into computer files arranged by semester. Raw field notes were then set aside and kept in a locked filing cabinet in case I needed to refer to them later. Classroom recordings were
logged and selected segments transcribed roughly (i.e., not with fine detail) into course-specific computer files. All incidence of L1 data were flagged, and as described earlier, the Cantonese, Mandarin, and Korean data were translated and logged, with selected excerpts transcribed and provided English glosses. Transcriptions of classroom recordings (complete with L1 translations) were later cut and pasted into the appropriate field notes files. These were then converted into course-specific files for analysis in the Atlas.ti qualitative data analysis application (Muhr, 2004). Student and teacher interviews were similarly logged into respective computer files, with selected segments transcribed roughly and then loaded into Atlas.ti for analysis. In addition, student information generated from the questionnaire and interviews were inputted into several different Excel files for record-keeping and subsequent analysis. The approximately 150 mini-discs with which I recorded classrooms and interviews were labeled, indexed, and then cataloged in MD storage containers. These were kept in a locked cabinet.

Documents were categorized by type and class and then coded by hand.

**Data analysis**

Data analysis for this study commenced with data collection and, as is customary in ethnographic research, was ongoing, recurring, and recursive throughout fieldwork, past the conclusion of data collection and through the writing up of the study (Wolcott, 1995). In this section, I briefly review some of the qualitative data analytic procedures I undertook for the study.

---

22 All transcribed data from classroom recordings and interviews that are used in the dissertation were checked and retranscribed more finely during analysis and writing.

23 Though my description of the procedures I employed in data analysis is separate from the theoretical discussion of critical ethnography in Chapter 4, it is essential that the former be situated in the latter.
Numerous qualitative researchers assert that data analysis in critical ethnography is much the same as it is in more traditional ethnography, a primary difference having to do with the critical theoretical orientation, framework, and objectives of that analysis (see, e.g., Carspecken & Walford, 2001; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Masemann, 1982; McLaren, 1995; Quantz, 1992). "The researcher is free, even required, to invent methods or borrow existing methods to produce an analysis" (Carspecken, 2001, p. 10), so long as it is consistent with the critical ethnographic project as elaborated in Chapter 4: that it focuses on the interplay between the micropolitics of the particular and macro social relations of the general, between agency and structure, between the individual and the institution, and that it does so in open recognition of its interpretive and perspectival boundaries (McLaren, 1995).

In this study, standard procedures for analyzing qualitative data were employed (Hatch, 2002; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Richards, 2003; Ryan & Bernard, 2000; Wolcott, 1995). To begin, I reviewed my ever-increasing collection of field notes recurrently and consistently throughout the study, as is the norm in ethnographic research. The writing and rereading of field notes helped me to engage in preliminary data analysis, refine emergent understandings, and focus subsequent observations. They also helped me develop preliminary codes, "the formal representation of analytic thinking" (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 153) and the start "of the chain of theory development" (Charmaz, 2000, p. 515), and further refine them as the research continued.

Shortly after fieldwork commenced, I began using the Atlas.ti (v. 4.2) computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS) program. They switched to the much more flexible and powerful version 5.0 of this application when it was released in early 2004.
based theory builder” application (Weitzman, 2000, p. 809) that has been developed for
the set of analytic strategies known as Grounded Theory (GT) (see Charmaz, 2000;
Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Strauss & Corbin, 1990, *inter alia*). Although this study is not a
GT, which was developed within an objectivist epistemology (but see Charmaz, 2000), I
did to an extent employ two GT analytic strategies, those relating to data coding and
memo-writing, which Atlas usefully facilitated, and which are consistent with other
interpretive qualitative data analytic techniques. Coding in Atlas (and in GT) is heavily
data-near, with each line (so-called “line by line” coding), indeed, each word of the data
available for coding. As Charmaz (2000, p. 515) aptly summarizes, such data-near
coding “keeps us studying our data. In addition to starting to build ideas inductively, we
are deterred by line-by-line coding from imposing extant theories or our own beliefs on
the data” (cf. Lather, 1991). Such a data-near analytic strategy was important, not to
mention very useful for an applied linguistics study such as this one, which also includes
extensive analysis of oral interaction.

The second analytic technique I used from GT, which was also facilitated by
Atlas.ti, was memo writing, that is, the writing that is done to “explore our codes [and]
expand upon the processes they identify or suggest” and is the “intermediate step
between coding and the first draft of the completed analysis” (Charmaz, 2000, p. 517).
Theory building was further facilitated by the use of graphical network views, which
allowed codes and their relationships to other codes to be manipulated in a graphical
interface that provided a decidedly visual approach to theory building.
Critical discourse analysis

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) was undertaken for the large amount of audio-recorded interactional and interview data I collected. An important criticism of (critical) ethnography is that it has not attended to linguistic or interactional detail as much as it should, a criticism made more generally of cultural studies as well (Barker & Galasiński, 2001; Billig, 1997, 1999a, 1999b; Wetherell, 1998). As Wetherell notes:

Post-structuralist theorists, with their more global view, rarely have their noses pressed up against the exigencies of talk-in-interaction. Rarely, are they called on to explain how their perspective might apply to what is happening right now, on the ground, in this very conversation. Theoretical concepts emerge in abstract on the basis of often implicit assumptions about the nature of interaction, language, or social life (1998, p. 385).

Critical discourse analysis of interaction rigorously and demonstrably anchors claims in data, making analyses more accountable, and thus addresses criticisms made by Hargreaves (1982), Walker (1985) and others (e.g., Barker & Galasiński, 2001; Billig, 1997, 1999a, 1997b) about unsubstantiated analyses in critical ethnographic and cultural studies research.

CDA is a loosely assembled analytic framework that is united by a strong and explicit sociopolitical orientation, and as such, is highly commensurable with critical ethnography. As Van Dijk (2001) summarizes,

Unlike other discourse analysts, critical discourse analysts (should) take an explicit socio-political stance: they spell out their point of view, perspective, principles and aims, both within their discipline and within society at large.
Although not in each stage of theory formation and analysis, their work is admittedly and ultimately political. Their hope, if occasionally illusory, is change through critical understanding. Their perspective, if possible, that of those who suffer most from dominance and inequality. Their critical targets are the power elites that enact, sustain, condone, or ignore social inequality and injustice. That is, one of the criteria of their work is solidarity with those who [they believe] need it most (pp. 383-384).

The critical discourse analyst’s charge is thus to put these principles into analytic action by attempting

to unravel the ideological framings of discursive practices [which means that CDA] is firmly grounded in the analysis of the lexico-grammatical structures of language. In this context, [CDA]... points to what can be seen on the “surface” of language and argues that such constructions have ideological potency. In other words, CDA focuses upon the social meanings of linguistic structures, whether lexical, syntactic, or other (Barker & Galasiński, 2001, p. 25).

Some iterations of CDA have primarily been concerned with written text and political speeches rather than interaction (see, e.g., Fairclough, 1989; 2001; Van Dijk, 2001), although not exclusively and certainly not prescriptively. Scholars in (critical) discursive psychology (e.g., Billig, 1997, 1999a, 1999b; Edley, 2001; Wetherell, 2001) have brought methods from conversation analysis to bear in the critical analysis of talk (particularly interview data), to the consternation of some conversation analysts (e.g., Schegloff, 1999a; Schegloff, 1999b), as have discourse analysts interested in talk in a cultural studies framework (e.g., Barker & Galasiński, 2001), who have also elaborated
some of the more underspecified elements of analyzing interaction in, for example, Fairclough (1989; but see 1995).

The CDA framework I employ is indeed one that Fairclough has refined over the last dozen or so years (1989, 1995, 2001), one which a number of others have added to and elaborated (see, e.g., Barker & Galasiński, 2001; Rogers, 2004). Drawing on a range of theorists, from Gramsci to Foucault to Bakhtin (cf. Quantz & O'Connor, 1988), it has developed into a multi-stage set of analytic principles and procedures that “provides a way of moving between close analysis of texts and interactions, and social analyses of various types” (Fairclough, 2001, p. 229). CDA thus variously requires attention to “textual form, structure and organization at all levels,” including grammar, vocabulary, and the interactional conventions employed in talk. That is, CDA is centrally concerned with the ways that the semiotic and linguistic features of text are interdiscursively mediated, are implicated in and associated with discourses and genres in circulation in particular, broadly specified social contexts.

Earlier iterations (e.g., 1989, 1995) by Fairclough of his CDA framework included linguistic, interactional, and intertextual analyses. In terms of grammar and lexis, for example, experiential, relational, and expressive values were to be analysed. The experiential value of vocabulary concerns the way an interlocutor’s words suggest a particular experience of the social world. Relational value concerns the way that discourse indicates social relationships between interlocutors, while and expressive value indicates the way an interlocutor signals an evaluation of what it is s/he is talking about. These same sorts of values could be revealed grammatically by examining active/passive voice, nominalizations, modes, pronoun use, connectors, coordination, subordination, and
so on. In terms of the analysis of "higher levels of textual organization," CDA would examine interactional phenomena such as the distribution of speaking turns, as well as the structure of argumentation, and intertextuality, particularly concerning genre.

Fairclough (2001) provides an update to the analytic procedures he has developed for CDA, one which subsumes and advances these earlier versions. Analysis from this recent formulation begins with a focus on some form of discourse-related social problem. Following the specification of this problem, analysis can be undertaken of the "network of practices [the problem] is located within," "the relationship of semiosis to other elements within the particular practice(s) concerned," and finally consideration of the discourse itself by means of structural, interactional, interdiscursive, and linguistic and semiotic analyses. This is followed by consideration of how the "social order (network of practices) 'needs' the problem," which is to say, who might have a vested interest in seeing it unresolved; then the identification of potential solutions to the problem under consideration, and finally, a critical reflexivity on the analysis (Fairclough, 2001, pp. 236-239). A working assumption for all of these versions of CDA is "that any level of [discourse] organization may be relevant to critical and ideological analysis" (1995, p. 7; also see 1989, pp. 109-139; 2001, pp. 229-242).

The status of interview data

Holstein & Gubrium (1997), Silverman (2001), and Warren (2002), among others, maintain that in positivist and naturalistic interview research as it developed in the social sciences in the 20th century, interviews have been viewed as a means to gather objective "truths" about the world, or respondents' "authentic" experiences of events or
phenomena. Interviewing, from these perspectives, is "likened to 'prospecting' for the true facts and feelings residing within the respondent" (Holstein & Gubrium, 1997, p. 115). Accordingly, interview subjects have been "basically conceived as passive vessels of answers" (p. 116, emphasis in original). The status accorded to interview data in these perspectives is problematic, Holstein & Gubrium (1997) argue, because they disregard the dynamics of the interview as a social encounter itself, in which identities are negotiated and meaning is jointly constructed between interviewer and respondent.

Holstein & Gubrium (1997) maintain that because interviews are essentially interactions, their interactional dynamics must be analysed; as Silverman (2001) contends, "the facts never speak for themselves" (p. 86; also see, e.g., Barker & Galasiński; Cameron, 2001; Edley, 2001; Wetherell, 1998; 2001).

Instead of conceiving of interviewing as a "neutral conduit" to truths that can be obtained from agentless interviewees, Holstein & Gubrium (1997) propose an alternative framework which "activates the subject behind the respondent":

We suggest that researchers take a more 'active' perspective, begin to acknowledge, and capitalize upon, interviewers' and respondents' constitutive contributions to the production of interview data. This means consciously and conscientiously attending to the interview process and its product in ways that are more sensitive to the social construction of knowledge. . . . The aim is not to obviate interview material by deconstructing it, but to harvest it and its transactions for narrative analysis (pp. 114-5).

Viewing interview data as interaction has important implications for analysis, for one cannot analyse the meanings, or "content," of an interview without examining the
meaning-making processes through which it was produced (i.e., the interaction between interviewer and respondent). “While interest in the content of answers persists,” Holstein & Gubrium (1997) note, “it is primarily in how and what the active subject/respondent, in collaboration with an equally active interviewer, produces and conveys about the active subject/respondent’s experience under the interpretive circumstances at hand” (p. 117, emphasis added). The extension of analysis from the what of an interview to the interrelationships of the what and how is significant: not only is content held up for examination, but the interview as an interactional encounter itself becomes a topic for analysis. This is accomplished below (particularly in Chapter 8) using CDA, as outlined earlier.

A note about “representativeness”

Although I began the study with a broad focus on the three “tracks” that ESLL students at Tradewinds find themselves in, it became clear early on in analysis that the most important story and the one most germane to my research questions was in the ESLL classes. Therefore, the ESLL classes have become my primary focus in the dissertation. This focus, combined with the fact that the bulk of the recorded classroom data comes from the second year, and to a lesser extent the third year of the study, means that the transcripts I use for microanalysis in this study (though not my overall analysis) come from a relative minority of classes: three from the second year of the study (ELA 2W, ELA 2X, and ELB 2Y), and two from the third year (ELB 3W and ELB 3X). Although I have striven to include as much data from the first year of research, when I observed three additional ESLL classes (ELA 1X, ELB 1U, and ELC 1V), there simply
aren't as many data to include as there are from the second year (since I audio-recorded none of the first year classes). This is regrettable, on the one hand, because each of the ESL classes from the first year yielded data that were central to my developing analysis; on the other hand, this decision was intentional, as the first year was a piloting year in which I felt audio recording would interfere with my efforts to negotiate entry, establish trust, and gain an overall sense of the students, teachers, program, and high school. In short, the transcripts I use for microanalytic purposes may lead one to conclude that my entire analysis is restricted to or based on the five ESLL classes (particularly the three from the second year) in which I recorded interaction. This is not the case. The matter essentially comes down to having extensive, audio-recorded data for a relative minority of ESLL classes; however, my analysis is not restricted to these few classes, even if transcripts used in analysis predominantly come from them. Instead, I use the transcripts of audio-recordings from them as examples of phenomena that occurred in the other ESLL classes as well.

**Rigor and care**

In this section I outline the multiple methods I used to ensure rigor, depth, breadth, complexity, richness, and care in this study, that is, the procedures I used in triangulation (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000).\(^{25}\)

\(^{25}\) Denzin & Lincoln (2000, p. 5) note that “the use of multiple methods, or triangulation, reflects an attempt to secure an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon in question. Objective reality can never be captured. We can know a thing only through its representations. Triangulation is not a tool or a strategy of validation, but an alternative to validation . . . . The combination of multiple methodological practices, empirical materials, perspectives, and observers in a single study is best understood, then, as a strategy that adds rigor, breadth, complexity, richness, and depth to any inquiry.”
Because CE is "openly ideological" research (Lather, 1986, 1991), Anderson (1989) contends that validity is the most serious methodological challenge facing critical ethnographers (also see Quantz, 1992; Thomas, 1993):

Critical ethnographers are in a double bind. They are often viewed with skepticism not only by the educational research establishment, but also by fellow ethnographers who have taken care to build procedures for 'objectivity' into their work. . . . The apparent contradiction of . . . [openly ideological] research with traditional definitions of validity has left critical ethnography open to criticism from both within and outside of the ethnographic tradition (Anderson, 1989, p. 253).

The debate centers on whether or not conventional conceptions of validity, that is, those drawn from experimental research conducted within a positivist paradigm, should or even can be applied to qualitative research, especially that which is openly ideological (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Eisenhart & Howe, 1992). If such conceptions are to be applied, there are epistemological, theoretical, and methodological problems; if they are not, then how is the "trustworthiness" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) of CE to be ensured? Lather (1986) calls this being "between a rock and a soft place" where the rock is "the unquestionable need for trustworthiness in data generated by alternative paradigms" and the soft place "is the positivist claim to neutrality and objectivity" (p. 65). She offers a reconceptualization of validity, one that recognizes that while research is never neutral (and thus, that there is "no longer need [to] apologize for unabashedly ideological research"), data credibility checks are needed "to protect our research and theory constructions from our
enthusiasms” (p. 67). Lather (1986, 1991) provides the critical researcher with four such checks:

1) triangulation, through the use of multiple data sources and multiple methods.

2) systematized reflexivity, or a “ceaseless confrontation with and respect for the experiences of people in their daily lives” which is necessary to ensure the validity of researchers’ constructs (1991, p. 67).

3) face validity, or the “‘click of recognition’ and a ‘yes, of course,’ instead of a ‘yes, but’ experience” (p. 67).

4) “catalytic validity,” which represents the degree to which the research initiates Freire’s (1970/1993) conception of “conscientization” among research participants (and presumably, the researcher).

While Anderson (1989) agrees that the rigor of CE must be ensured through the use of systematic procedures (cf. Carspecken, 1996, 2001; Carspecken & Apple, 1992), he warns that these procedures are valuable to the “extent that [they] provide the reader with a record of the decision-making process that produced the final analysis.” Claims to analytic objectivity that derive from methodological rigor, work to deny “the creative act of researcher interpretation, [and] are attempts to fit ethnography into a positivistic framework” (p. 252). McLaren (1995) concurs, if slightly more obscurely, when he maintains that CE “contests the epistemological closure of the so-called objectivity and scientificity” of positivist quantitative and qualitative research (cf. Creswell, 1998). Rather than shrinking from “the charge of perspectivism,” critical ethnographers “openly contest those discourses which attempt to occlude the historicity and partisanship characteristic of the analysis of social life” (p. 282). In other words, while critical
ethnographers make every effort to produce rigorous, "trustworthy" research, they
reflexively recognize the situatedness (and thus the perspectival limitations) both of their
interpretations and of their representations. Kincheloe and McLaren (2000) sum this
point up as follows:

As creatures of the world, we are oriented to it in a way that prevents us from
grounding our theories and perspectives outside of it. Thus, whether we like it or
not, we are all destined as interpreters to analyze from within its boundaries and
blinders (p. 286).

The means that I employed to ensure "trustworthiness" of my developing analysis
took several forms. First, as discussed earlier, data analysis was ongoing and recursive
and thus involved the testing of emergent understandings throughout fieldwork, analysis,
and writing. These understandings were refined by incorporating relevant negative
instances in the data, and in the resultant search for alternative explanations. 26 Second, I
triangulated data by method and source, using different methods (e.g., observation,
recordings, documents, interviews) as well as different sources (e.g., different teachers or
students) in my developing analyses as means to ensure ongoing rigor, breadth,
complexity, richness, and depth of interpretations. Third, I maintained a persistent and
critical reflexivity, which was crucial as fieldwork stretched from months into years and I
myself became socialized into the various teacher and student cultures at the high school
(cf. Erickson, 1986; Spradley, 1980). In this regard, occasional debriefing sessions with
another qualitative researcher interested in K-12 ESLL in Hawai'i, as well as with my

26 I should note that my search for alternative explanations was always made in terms of the conceptual
frameworks discussed in Chapters 3 and 4, and not in terms of rival or competing theories (cf. Miles &
advisor and dissertation committee members were important. Fourth, I conducted ongoing member checks of emergent analyses. Due to the sensitivity of some of the issues involved, the populations that were concerned, and constraints such as busy schedules, the unexpected departure of participants (both students and teachers) and so on, member checking was much less formalized and more indirect than Miles & Huberman (1994, pp. 275-277), for example, suggest. On a given day, I would go into the field with a question that had arisen in my preliminary analyses, or an emerging understanding of an event or practice, and work it into short discussions with students, PTTs, or teachers, and record their responses in field notes. I also used the formal interview sessions with students and teachers as a forum to check understandings or conclusions, which were audio-recorded. In addition, I was fortunate enough to develop "confidant" relationships with three of the teachers/PTTs and several of the students, which allowed me to obtain in-depth feedback on interpretations (cf. Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 275). Finally, a key to rigor and care in qualitative inquiry is prolonged and persistent engagement (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 1999), which as indicated above are two criteria that were met in the fieldwork for this study.

Positionality

As Matsuda (2003) points out, questions of validity in empirical research are inextricably bound up in how findings are represented. "Empirical inquiry – qualitative or quantitative – cannot remain aloof from the process of discursive construction in so far as research problems are constructed discursively, participants and data are represented discursively, and findings and their implications are considered and articulated
discursively” (p. 75). Hidden among these passive constructions lies the subject of this section of the chapter: the researcher, the author, the creator of these representations. As Ortner (1995) notes, ethnography “means many things. Minimally, however, it has always meant the attempt to understand another life world using the self – as much of it as possible – as the instrument of knowing (p. 173).” Miles & Huberman (1994, p. 17), among others, have argued for explicit comment on researcher positionality since “any researcher, no matter how unstructured or inductive, comes to fieldwork with some orienting ideas.” Wolcott (1982, p. 157) concurs when he states that it is “impossible to embark upon [ethnographic] research without some idea of what one is looking for and foolish not to make that quest explicit.” For these reasons, it is important for readers to understand as much about this particular “instrument of knowing” as possible, in order to judge for themselves the representations of experiences that I have produced above and below.

As a brief introductory preamble, I have conceived this study to be part of the growing trend toward more socially accountable theories, research, and classroom practices in L2 studies. This trend has taken form variously: from problematizing so-called “autonomous” approaches to classroom practice and literacy (e.g., Cain, 1999; Coleman, 1996; Hull & Schultz, 2002; McKay, 1996), to critiques of the instrumental “disciplinarity” of L2 studies (e.g., Crookes, 1997a, 1997b; Pennycook, 1989, 2001), to calls for more social-critical/critical-theoretical approaches to curriculum design (e.g., Auerbach, 1992, 1995; Benesch, 1996, 2001), pedagogy (e.g., Auerbach, 1995; Crookes & Lehner, 1998; Hall & Eggington, 2000; Norton Peirce, 1989; Pennycook, 1990), language planning and policy (e.g., Huebner & Davis, 1999; Tollefson, 1991, 1995;
Tollefson & Tsui, 2004), sociolinguistics (e.g., Coupland, Sarangi, & Candlin, 2001; Rampton, 1995) and ethnographic research. This study has thus been conceived as contributing to the growing critical mass in L2 studies by evincing the altogether sociopolitical nature of teaching, learning, and using a second language.

In many ways, I am fortunate to be in a position to have conducted a study such as this one. Yet, I am mindful that in many ways, I am so “fortunate” because I am a white, middle-class, English-speaking man in a society where structures are in place that virtually assure that white, middle-class, English-speaking men can be “fortunate.”

However, as should be clear by now, reproduction is never guaranteed. Human beings are agentive in “the messy crucible” of everyday life (Atkinson, 1999, p. 637) and we are capable of change. We are capable of intervening in larger social processes, of transgressing them (hooks, 1994). And it is in this spirit that I conducted and written this study: as an attempt to create a counterhegemonic space within which praxis can be envisioned and implemented, which works however locally to promote a future where the way things are, will not necessarily have to be.

In short, I have conceived of this research as what it has sought to study: an act of resistance.

It is an act of resistance in terms of who it concerns: there are a host of reasons why university students and adults are frequently the focus of L2 research rather than primary or secondary school students, ranging from difficulties negotiating entry to simple convenience. Yet, this is a particularly difficult and troubling time for public school ESL students and teachers faced as they are with a litany of standards and batteries of tests that have not been designed with them in mind; with punitive, yet ever-
increasing “performance targets” that supposedly indicate whatever “adequate yearly progress” is; just as “accountability” has shifted from institutions to individuals; and just as researchers in the American Association of Applied Linguistics are about to inexplicably extend the ever-widening gulf between them and their (K-12) teaching colleagues in the Teachers of English for Speakers of Other Languages organization by “unlinking” their respective conferences. This a time when more research is needed as K-12 ESL populations grow ever more diverse, more connection between researchers and teachers, more cooperative linkages developed between university departments of applied linguistics and second language studies and the public schools in the communities they serve. Not less. Not at all.

This study is an act of resistance in terms of what it concerns: a little-investigated, yet intuitively understood phenomenon encountered daily in ESL classrooms across the US, with potentially lasting consequences for the “resisters,” their teachers, and their classmates. This study also resists normative conceptions about the homogeneity of ESL populations, their backgrounds, prior educational experiences, language and literacy proficiencies, orientations toward learning, goals, and agency. It frames this problem politically, as well, in terms of cultural production and social reproduction, rather than as the putative deficiency of individuals.

This study is an act of resistance in terms of how it has been conducted: there have been few critical ethnographies in L2 studies, perhaps reflecting what a number of critical L2 scholars have maintained is the instrumental view many L2 researchers and educators have of the field. The study I have conducted embraces and reveals its value
orientation, and in the process, resists the notions of neutral, value-free research, "uninterested" knowledge production, moral detachment, or inaction.

This study is an act of resistance in terms of who conducts it: as a doctoral student in second language acquisition at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, it would have been much easier to conduct a different study on a different topic (cf. Markee, 1994, p. 91). The study I have conducted is one way to resist what I believe are normative expectations for research in hopes of broadening those expectations, or at least promoting recognition of the legitimacy of “alternative” theoretical frameworks, research methodologies, and even topics for inquiry in L2 studies.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter I have described the research site, my negotiation of entry into it, how courses and participants were selected/assigned and approached regarding research participation, as well as details about the classes, students, and teachers, focusing in particular on the ESLL classes as they are the focus of the dissertation. I have also described data collection procedures, how data were managed, and data analysis, with particular regard to the analysis of interview data and critical discourse analysis. I turn now to consider elements of the broader macro context of Tradewinds High School in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 6. TRADEWINDS HIGH SCHOOL IN CONTEXT: HISTORICAL AND POLICY PERSPECTIVES

Speak American! To speak American is to think American! . . . . Here in Hawaii the language is AMERICAN. The majority of us speak American... but there are still some of us who, by choice or from necessity, still speak other languages. Many among us still speak, almost exclusively, the language of our enemy... Japanese. These include many American citizens as well as aliens. There is no excuse for either group to use Japanese except in rare instances. No alien Japanese has been in Hawaii for so short a time he or she has not had the opportunity to learn the language of the nation. Every citizen has been given the advantage of American school education... and knows the language!

Advertisement for the World War II “Speak American” campaign in Hawaii
From Hawaii Magazine, May/June 1943
(in Roberts, 2003)

Introduction

As mentioned in the previous chapter, local policies and practices regarding ESLL\(^1\) students at Tradewinds High School were shaped by a number of national policies, political trends, and other supra-local factors that had indisputable bearing on a public high school in early 21st century Hawaii. The purpose of this chapter is to examine certain of these policies in order to contextualize the circumstances of language minority students at Tradewinds during the time of this study. I begin, however, with an

---

1 The US Department of Education’s prescribed term for school-age ESL learners is “limited English proficient” or LEP. In Hawaii, this population is referred to as “English as a second language learners” (ESLL), the abbreviation I use throughout this dissertation, which is itself divided into three sub-populations (based on performance on the Language Assessment Scales, the L2 English proficiency test used in Hawaii): FEP (fluent-English proficient, or fully-English proficient), LEP (limited English proficient), and NEP (non-English proficient). To avoid confusion, all references to “LEP” in this chapter will refer to the US Department of Education definition. For discussion related to the Hawaii ESLL program or students, I will use the term “ESLL”; to refer to the Hawaii NEP, LEP, or FEP categories, I will use “ESLL-NEP,” “ESLL-LEP,” and “ESLL-FEP.”
historical overview, outlining language and education politics in the Islands since the founding of a colonial formal education system, as it is equally important to situate Hawai‘i language minority students’ present-day circumstances in the state’s complex sociolinguistic past. Following the historical discussion, I move on to consider the recently “deceased” (Crawford, 2002) *Bilingual Education Act* (Title VII of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act*) followed by the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB). I conclude with a discussion of the implications that NCLB has for “limited English proficient” (LEP) students, specifically in terms of the successor to Title VII, NCLB’s Title III: *Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students*.

**An historical perspective on language politics and education in Hawai‘i**

Language politics have figured centrally in Hawai‘i’s colonial history, evident in the colonization of the Islands by *haole* missionaries and businessmen, the near extinction of the Hawaiian language, the segregation created by the “select schools” and English Standard Schools, the ongoing attempts to repress Pidgin (Hawai‘i Creole) in Hawai‘i classrooms, the sustained neglect of immigrant languages in public education, and more (Agbayani & Takeuchi, 1986; Benham & Heck, 1998; Haas, 1992; Kawamoto, 1993; Sato, 1985, 1991; Tamura, 1993, 1996). This is a history typified by what Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson (1994) have called “linguicism” (see Chapter 3).
Linguicism in Hawai‘i

The historical roots of present-day linguicism and linguicidal policy and practice in Hawai‘i extend to the very institutionalization of the state’s formal educational system. This educational system, established by missionaries in 1820 as a means of converting indigenous Hawaiians to Christianity, was pivotal in the development and maintenance of a stratified colonial social order. An early and ultimately successful mechanism in this effort was the creation of a system of “select” and “common” schools: “select” schools were created for white and mission children and the children of Hawaiian royalty. “Common schools” enrolled the children of Hawaiian non-elites. In addition to institutionalizing racism and elitism, the select schools codified linguicism: the language of instruction in the select schools was English; in the common schools, it was Hawaiian (Agbayani & Takeuchi, 1986; Benham & Heck, 1998; Kawamoto, 1993).

In 1896, three years following the US-backed coup that toppled the Hawaiian monarchy, Hawaiian was banned as a language of instruction, replaced by English throughout the Islands’ schools. This policy led to a further decline in the use of the Hawaiian language, a decline that, until recent revitalization efforts, threatened the existence of the language (see, e.g., Warner, 1999). It also marked the start of a period in which race as a factor in educational segregation would be complemented, and later superseded, by language.

By the turn of the 20th century, thousands of immigrant laborers from China, Portugal, Japan, the Philippines, Korea, and Puerto Rico had arrived in Hawai‘i to work the Territory’s sugar and pineapple plantations. A contact language, or pidgin, developed as a result of these workers’ need to communicate. Eventually, this pidgin developed into
a creole, a fully-elaborated code spoken as a first language by immigrant children and used throughout the wider community. By the 1930s, Pidgin, or Hawai‘i Creole, was spoken by approximately 40% of the Islands’ population and had become a critical, if often stigmatized symbol of “Local” culture and identity. However, due to its origins, the sociopolitical context of its development as a creole, and the occupations and backgrounds of many of its speakers, Pidgin was, and for many still is seen as a sloppy way of speaking, a bad habit, “broken English”: negative views perpetuated by decades of linguicidal policies aimed at “correcting” Pidgin out of existence (Roberts, 2003; also see Buck, 1986; Da Pidgin Coup, 1999; Kawamoto, 1993; Sakoda & Siegel, 2003; Sato, 1985, 1991; Tamura, 1993, 1996; Watson-Gegeo, 1994).

At the turn of the century, campaigns to Americanize immigrants swept the US, an effort which Tamura (1993) characterizes as a “crusade” (also see Buck, 1986; Higham, 1955; McCarty, 2004). Crawford (2004) maintains that during World War I, Americanization efforts “took a coercive turn” as “proficiency in English was increasingly equated with political loyalty; for the first time, an ideological link was forged between speaking good English and being a ‘good American’” (p. 88; also see McCarty, 2004; Wiley & Wright, 2004). In the Territory of Hawai‘i, Americanization was manifested in, among other things, the suppression of a multilingual press, the eventual closure of heritage language schools, ongoing attempts to eradicate Pidgin, and the creation of yet another mechanism to segregate haole children from children of color:

More thorough discussions on the genesis and development of Pidgin can be found, e.g., in Roberts (2000), Sakoda & Siegel (2003), Sato (1985, 1991), and Siegel (2000). An early, influential perspective can be found in the work of Derek Bickerton (e.g., 1977, 1981).

Whereas many of the "select" schools went on to become Hawai‘i’s private schools, the English Standard Schools (ESS) were part of the public education system. According to Sato (1985, pp. 263-264), because *haole* middle class "parents could not afford private school tuition, their only alternative was to call for segregation in the public school system"; as Agbayani & Takeuchi (1986) succinctly conclude, the ESS were "an attempt at having private schools at government expense" (p. 33). In 1924, the ESS were established. As with the "select" schools, several institutions were set aside; this time, however, admission was based not on race or class, but on proficiency in English. Yet, as Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson (1994) and Skutnabb-Kangas (2000a, 2000b) have pointed out exhaustively, linguicism frequently produces the same results as racism and classism (and is increasingly used as their proxy). Such was the case with the ESS: Lincoln Elementary, for example, the first designated English Standard School, in 1924 had a student body comprised of 19 Japanese, 27 Chinese, and 572 *haole* children (Benham & Heck, 1998, p. 149).

After 25 years, due to demographic changes exacerbated by World War II, the ESS system began to be phased out, with the 1960 class of Honolulu’s Roosevelt High School eventually becoming the last of the ESS graduates (Agbayani & Takeuchi, 1986). However, segregation remained, both in the form of Standard English classes within

---

3 See Agbayani & Takeuchi (1986, pp. 35-36) for examples of these tests.
4 It is worth noting that the ESS system coincided more generally with the eugenics movement that had at the time gained a significant following in the US and Europe (cf. Gould, 1996; Higham, 1955; Lears, 1981). Agbayani & Takeuchi (1986) make an implicit connection to eugenics in their extensive discussion of the development of ESS. They also provide compelling evidence, much derived from primary sources, for the argument that linguicism works as a surrogate for racism and classism.
schools, and in the continuing existence of private schools, the descendents of the original "select" schools (Benham & Heck, 1998). In fact, at approximately 16%, Hawai‘i today has the one of the highest percentages of children in the U.S. who attend private school.\(^5\)

**Contemporary pressures and language politics in Hawai‘i**

Just as in the colonial past, a number of trends at the national level of US politics and educational policy-making today affect the public school education of language minorities in Hawai‘i. These include the ratification, subsequent reauthorizations, and finally, the elimination of the 1968 *Bilingual Education Act* and the 2001 passage of the *No Child Left Behind Act.*

*The Bilingual Education Act*

In 1968, Congress passed *The Bilingual Education Act* (Title VII of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act*) which, along with compliance oversight provided through Title VI of the 1964 *Civil Rights Act*, laid the foundation for federally funded bilingual education in the US. Despite the enactment of Title VII, and the subsequent broadening of its scope through several federal court cases – e.g., *Serna v.*

---

\(^5\) Benham & Heck (1998, p. 13) assert, without reference, that the percentage of students in Hawai‘i enrolled in private school “average[es] nearly 20%,” by far the highest in the nation (see Reardon & Yun, 2002). However, review of Hawai‘i public and private school enrollments over the past decade (Office of the Superintendent, 2003, p. 3) indicates that the percentage in fact ranges between 15-16%; for 2002-2003, it was 16.0% (Hawai‘i Council of Private Schools, 2002-2003; Office of the Superintendent, 2004, p. 7). This is consistent with the numbers compiled by Schmitt (2002, Table 3.10, p. 45) which puts the percentage for the years 1997-1999 between 16-17%. Though both sets of percentages are lower than Benham & Heck’s calculation, 15-17% is still very high, putting Hawai‘i in the top two or three states with such a large proportion of private school enrollments. The national average is approximately 10% (National Center for Education Statistics, 2002a; Reardon & Yun, 2002). For an historical perspective on the unique prestige accorded private schools in Hawai‘i, see Agbayani & Takeuchi (1986).
Portales Municipal Schools (1972), Castañeda v. Pickard (1974), Rios v. Read (1977) – and the 1974 Lau v. Nichols Supreme Court case, Hawai‘i has consistently flirted with the minimum standards set by federal law for language minority students. As Michael Haas (1992) has chronicled, until the early 1990s, the Hawai‘i Department of Education (DOE) was repeatedly cited by federal oversight agencies for not adequately serving the state’s language minorities. The pattern of misconduct receiving federal sanction included the under-identification of language minorities, the under-servicing of those who were identified, a disproportionate placement of language minorities in special education programs, inappropriate staffing of programs designed for language minority students, segregation, and improper mainstreaming procedures (Haas, 1992).

This is not to suggest that Hawai‘i is the only state that has had trouble implementing bilingual education or, increasingly in its stead, ESL programs (see Crawford, 2004; Wiley & Wright, 2004). Indeed, the sorts of linguicism encountered in Hawai‘i are in many ways emblematic of a discriminatory nationalist language ideology (May, 2001; Woolard, 1998) that pervades the United States, an orientation that reifies English monolingualism and sees multilingualism as a nuisance at best; at worst, evidence of disloyalty or a lack of patriotism (cf. Crawford, 1999, 2004; Ruiz, 1984; Takaki, 1989; Wiley & Wright, 2004). Therefore, a number of connections can be made

---

6 Violations dwindled as funds were cut (and mandates reduced) to oversight agencies such as the Office of Civil Rights (Crawford, 2004).
7 Although there is a long history of linguicism in Hawai‘i in which indigenous, Local, and immigrant populations have been denied the right to their L1s, it is important to note that Hawai‘i currently is a leader in developing school programs intended to revitalize the Hawaiian language, with over 1,600 children in K-12 Hawaiian immersion schools across the state (see <http://www.k12.hi.us/~kaiapuni/FAQ.html>).
8 In a deeply ironic twist, however, the US federal government is at present actively recruiting language professionals in “critical languages” such as Arabic, Dari/Pashto, Chinese, and Korean for intelligence purposes. See Kramsch (2004) for an insightful discussion about the politics of applied linguistics and “national security” in post-September 11, 2001 USA.
from contemporary language politics in Hawai'i to the national US context. This is no more evident than in current threats to bilingual education as well as ESL programs nationwide (Crookes & Talmy, 2004; Wiley & Wright, 2004). Successive reauthorizations of the Bilingual Education Act – no paragon of linguistic diversity in even its most liberal form – moved the Act away from bilingual and toward monolingual English education, with “special alternative” ESL programs increasingly supplanting bilingual ones (Crawford, 2004; Wiley & Wright, 2004). This particular manifestation of linguicism culminated in the elimination of the Bilingual Education Act altogether in 2002 as part of the Bush administration’s No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (for an “obituary,” see Crawford 2002). Federal policy for LEP students under the English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act of NCLB’s Title III, Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students, now makes no reference to bilingualism at all.9 Even still, around the country, efforts to cap the time that students are allowed to remain enrolled in ESL classes are ongoing, reductions to ESL program staffing continue, cuts in funding ESL teacher-training, professional development, research, and support services are being made (Crawford, 1999, 2004; Crookes, 1997; Crookes & Talmy, 2004). According to a recent US Department of Education-sponsored survey, ESL students increasingly receive instructional services delivered completely in English, more than half receive instruction not specifically designed for L2 learners, and curricula for ESL students are less aligned

---

9 Similarly, the branch of the US Department of Education responsible for language minority students has been changed from Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs to the Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement for LEP Students, just as the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education is now called the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction Educational Programs (cf. Crawford, 2002; 2004).
with content and performance standards than they are for other students (Development Associates, 2003). Finally, only 30% of public school teachers with ESL students have received the training necessary to teach them; of these teachers, fewer than 3% have degrees in ESL or bilingual education (National Center for Education Statistics, 1996, 2002b).

**No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

Educational systems in countries around the world are increasingly turning to standards-based reforms. Cummins (2000) suggests the “common context” for this reform movement “is one where educational systems are attempting to redefine themselves in light of rapidly changing economic, technological and social conditions . . . [spurred by the] shift . . . to a knowledge-based economy.” This has translated into “the need for workers with higher levels of literacy and numeracy than was previously the case” (p. 140). Regardless of the cause, the effect is the same: “central governments assum[ing] more control of what is taught and frequently how and when it is taught” (p. 141, emphasis in original), leading to what McNeil (2000) aptly phrases “legislated learning” (also see Center on Education Policy, 2004, McNeil, 1986; Ohanian, 1999).

The **No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**, signed into law by George W. Bush on January 8, 2002, is the archetype of standards-based reform in the US. NCLB reauthorizes the **Elementary and Secondary Education Act** (ESEA), originally passed in 1965 as part of the Johnson Administration’s War on Poverty. The ESEA is the primary federal law affecting K-12 public education in the US, providing billions of dollars in annual federal funds for educational programs, including those for the poor, for ESLL and immigrant students, and Native American, Hawaiian, and Alaskan Native children.
As the most far-reaching federal educational reform initiative to be enacted in a generation, NCLB is intended to bring all students' reading and math proficiencies up to grade level, as determined by each state, by 2014 (Title I, § 101, Stat.1439-1148). The centerpiece of NCLB is a series of systemic, standards-based reform measures centered around four “key” principles: “accountability for results; greater flexibility for states, school districts and schools in the use of federal funds; more choices for parents of children from disadvantaged backgrounds; and an emphasis on teaching methods that have been demonstrated to work” (U.S. Department of Education, 2002, p. 9). These principles are realized through the following measures (see "No Child Left Behind Act of 2001," 2002, Title I, § 1001, Stat.1439-1140):

- **Annual standards-based assessment of students.** All students are to be tested each year in reading and math proficiency in grades 3-8, plus once in grades 10-12, using standardized tests developed by states. These tests must be aligned with and measure newly developed or revised content standards that states have been required to devise and implement. Hawai‘i uses the Hawai‘i State Assessment (formerly the Hawai‘i Content and Performance Standards [I and II] test), for which there are four student performance levels: “well below proficiency,” “approaching proficiency,” “meets proficiency,” and “exceeds proficiency.”

- **Determination and monitoring of schools’ “adequate yearly progress.”**

Under NCLB, schools must determine a 12-year schedule of “annual measurable achievement objectives” (AMAOs) for the percentage of students

---

10 Student report cards that incorporate these standards-based categories will soon replace those that use letter grades to indicate student performance.
performing at the “proficient” or higher on the states’ content standards assessments (see Table 6.1 below for Hawai‘i’s targets). AMAOs are reported separately for nine groups in each school: overall student population, plus eight different sub-groups (5 ethnic groups, ESLL, special education, and economically disadvantaged students); the data for these sub-groups is “disaggregated” from the whole to determine respective performance. If any one of these groups doesn’t make the reading or math AMAOs, or targets, for proficiency in a given year, or if any one of these groups doesn’t make a required 95% test-participation rate for either area, or if any school doesn’t make required retention/graduation rates, the school is not considered to have made “adequate yearly progress” (AYP). This means that there are 37 different performance targets that schools must meet in order to make AYP, and 37 different ways they can fail (9 groups x 4 categories = 36 + 1 graduation/retention rate) (Hawai‘i State Department of Education, 2003a). Should even one performance target not be met, the school is considered not to have made AYP and is considered to “need improvement.” If AYP targets are not met for two consecutive years, schools receiving Title I federal funds (in Hawai‘i, this applies to all schools) achieve the dubious distinction of reaching NCLB “status” for school improvement, triggering a series of corrective measures.

- Remediation for “underperforming” schools: The remedial measures that are triggered once a school does not make AYP for two consecutive years include giving students the option to transfer to other, better-performing schools, and
offering staff additional professional development. After three years of not making AYP, Title I students are provided with tutoring and other supplemental services. If the school continues to fall short of AYP targets, more drastic “corrective action” can be taken, including school “restructuring,” termination of some staff, extending the school day or year, and so on (Hawai‘i State Department of Education, 2003a, 2003c; U.S. Department of Education, 2002).

Table 6.1 Hawai‘i NCLB AMAOs 2002-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Target % of Ss “proficient” in reading on Hawai‘i State Assessment</th>
<th>Target % of Ss “proficient” in math on Hawai‘i State Assessment</th>
<th>Target % of elementary/intermediate retention/high school graduation rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3/6/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3/6/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3/6/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3/6/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3/6/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2/5/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2/5/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2/5/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2/5/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2/5/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2/5/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2/5/90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hawai‘i State Department of Education (2003d)
• **Qualified teachers in every classroom.** A main goal of NCLB is to have all teachers in "core content area" classrooms be "highly qualified" by the school year 2005-2006. "Highly qualified" is defined as "a teacher with full certification, a bachelor's degree, and demonstrated competence in subject knowledge and teaching skills" (U.S. Department of Education, 2002, p. 57). Paraprofessional teachers hired with Title I funds are to have at least two years of college education or an associate's degree. In Hawai'i, this extends to all part-time teachers and educational assistants.

• **Emphasis on "scientifically based" instruction and reading.** The new competitive-grant *Reading First* program is an example of the emphasis in NCLB on reading and on "educational programs and practices have been clearly demonstrated to be effective through rigorous scientific research" (U.S. Department of Education, 2002, p. 11). *Reading First*, however, advances a notably skills-based, decontextualized conceptualization of literacy. In addition, what qualifies as "scientific research" has become a major concern as the language of NCLB clearly favors a quantitative methodology (Laitsch, 2003).

• **Data generation and access.** Whatever one may think about NCLB, it has fulfilled at least one of its purposes: generating voluminous amounts of data that "allow parents, educators, administrators, policymakers, and the general public to track the performance of every school in the nation" (U.S. Department of Education, 2002, p. 9). One way this data will be reported is on newly devised annual "report cards" for schools and school districts which
contain student performance data for school districts as well as individual schools. For Hawai‘i, this information is available online at <http://arch.k12.hi.us/school/NCLB/default.html>.

All public K-12 schools in the US are subject to the objectives and data reporting requirements of NCLB, but only schools receiving Title 1 federal monies must abide by the series of corrective actions described above (U.S. Department of Education, 2002). However, in Hawai‘i, the State Superintendent of Education and the Board of Education have extended NCLB requirements to all public schools, not just those receiving Title I funds (Hawai‘i State Department of Education, 2003c).

“No school left unpunished”

Despite the laudable goals (and strategic name) of NCLB, it has come under increasingly acrimonious attack since its passage, as schools face the escalating costs of the law’s many requirements and the harsh realities of its accountability provisions. Education workers in states, school districts, and individual schools across the country have complained about the prescriptive, intrusive, and coercive nature of NCLB, that its inflexible, test-based AYP accountability structure is overly stringent and impractical, that using high-stakes standardized test scores as the only measure of performance is inequitable, and that promises for funds to implement the law’s many provisions have been broken (e.g., Center on Education Policy, 2004; Crawford, 2004; Cuban, 2004; Dobbs, 2004; FairTest, 2004a, 2004b; Linn, Baker, & Betebenner, 2002; National Board on Educational Testing and Public Policy, 2003; Neill, 2003; Ruiz de Velasco & Fix, 2002; Ruiz de Velasco et al., 2000; Wiley & Wright, 2004). There have also been
widespread complaints that the law has been onerous in terms of implementation, not only taking money away from other needs, but teachers’ and administrators’ time and energy as they cope with the “blizzard” of paperwork that attends NCLB (Archer, 2003). Legislatures in several states, including Vermont, Utah, Arizona, and Minnesota, have voted to reject parts of NCLB, with lawmakers in other states adopting resolutions that are critical of it (Dillon, 2004; Dobbs, 2004). One Pennsylvania school district has gone so far as to sue the state’s education department over NCLB requirements, with groups as varied as the National Conference of State Legislatures and the nation’s largest teacher’s union, the National Education Association, reportedly considering lawsuits over NCLB’s “unfunded mandates” (Dillon, 2004; "Education law tries thin state budgets," 2003).

A primary criticism of NCLB is that it is too uniform to address adequately the needs of individual school districts, schools, and sub-populations of students, let alone individual students, a problem that can be traced not only to the emphasis on standardized testing, but to the entire notion of “standards” itself (FairTest, 2004a, 2004b; McNeil, 1986, 2000; Neill, 2003; Ohanian, 1999). Essentially, this is a “reform” that is based on assumptions about student homogeneity, which fundamentally implies that student diversity needs to be ironed out. As McNeil (2000) forcefully concludes, the “panacea” of standards-based school reforms in fact leads to lowered educational quality (in terms of deskilled teachers forced to teach a generic curriculum) and increased discrimination in schools. Indeed, the across-the-board performance targets for all sub-groups, while admirable in the abstract are predicated on the following two assumptions:

11 It is interesting to note that for all the criticisms in the media and educational literature about the uniformity of NCLB (encoded in the collocation of “one-size-fits-all” that increasingly accompanies mention of the law), few trace the problem to its source: educational standards (cf. McNeil, 1986, 2000; Ohanian, 1999; Wells, 2004)
that the basic elements for academic success (i.e., educators with appropriate resources and know-how) already exist in the classroom... [and] that students are ready to perform at or near the desired performance level.... [Accordingly, all that is] needed for success is for administrators, teachers, and students to be given clear signals about what is expected (performance standards) and the right set of incentives (accountability systems and high-stakes assessments) to get them to focus on production (meeting the standards) (Ruiz de Velasco & Fix, 2002, pp. 249-250; also see Ruiz de Velasco et al., 2000; Linn et al., 2002).

These are assumptions that may pertain to some schools (e.g., those in wealthy, suburban districts), but they are clearly at odds with the realities of many schools today, particularly those that NCLB is aimed at helping the most. What is in fact a highly restricted notion of “proficiency” is normalized in NCLB; applied to all students in all schools, large-scale failure is virtually assured (FairTest, 2004b; Linn et al., 2002; Neill, 2003). A sample of AYP rates around the country for 2002-2003 shows that this has indeed been the case for the first years of NCLB: in Virginia, 40% of schools did not make AYP; in California, 45% failed; 50% failed in Missouri; 57% in Delaware; 58% in Alaska; and 87% in Florida (Hiller, 2003); in Hawai‘i, 61% of schools did not make AYP. Given that these early performance targets are the least demanding of NCLB’s

12 Of state NCLB exams, Neill (2003) avers that “much of what is important is not tested and much of what is tested is not of major importance” (p. 225). He argues (p. 227) for alternative forms of assessment such as performance tasks, portfolios, exhibitions, and other types of classroom-based formative assessments that are more valid, and “less damaging” to students (also see, e.g., Brown & Hudson, 1998; Cummins, 2000; Genesee & Upshur, 1996 for similar arguments related to L2 testing). Neill (2003, p. 227) also argues for an alternative conception of “accountability,” maintaining that “participatory democracy should be at the heart” of any accountability system. He offers a model in which schools evaluate themselves, with results provided to the community “as a basis for dialogue about how well the school is doing, what it should do better, and how it can make those things happen.”

13 This percentage was first widely reported as 64% (e.g., Hiller & Dayton, 2003). However, 25 schools that were deemed not to have made AYP appealed the decision (based primarily on calculation of student
12-year schedule of test-score improvement (see Table 6.1), it appears inevitable that widespread “failure” will indeed continue.

Cumulative failure on high-stakes tests such as those mandated by NCLB can have far-reaching consequences, for educational systems, individual schools, and students, as well. As the National Board on Educational Testing and Public Policy (2003) comments:

Decisions based on state testing programs in elementary school can influence the type of secondary education one receives, and decisions at the high school level can affect one’s path after graduation. All of these decisions are based on the quantification of performance – on numbers – and this bestows on them the appearance of fairness, impartiality, authority and precision (p. 5).

In Hawai‘i, recent revelations (Essoyan, 2004a, 2004b, 2004c) about numerous errors in the 2004 administration of the Hawai‘i State Assessment (HSA), have stripped away this veil of infallibility, undermining the HSA’s validity and highlighting once more the dangers and difficulties that often attend high-stakes standardized tests. While officials at Harcourt Assessment, the testing company that Hawai‘i has contracted to administer the HSA, blamed a “time crunch” as the cause for these mistakes (Essoyan, 2004c), they bring to light the fact that there is no federal oversight and no independent auditor of standardized testing companies or their products; companies are left to police themselves.

---

14 Forty-five mistakes were found in the HSA administered in Spring 2004, including “punctuation, misleading instructions, missing items, and wrong answers in sample questions given to guide students” (Essoyan, 2004c). See National Board on Educational Testing and Public Policy (2003) for dozens of examples of similar sorts of errors on standardized tests in the US and United Kingdom.
in an industry that is, in the words of one assessment watch-dog group, already “shrouded in secrecy” (National Board on Educational Testing and Public Policy, 2003, p. 8). The conclusions of a 1990 report by the National Commission on Testing and Public Policy continue to resonate in today’s climate of accountability:

Today those who take and use many tests have less consumer protection than those who buy a toy, a toaster, or a plane ticket. Rarely is an important test or its use subject to formal, systematic, independent professional scrutiny or audit. Civil servants who contract to have a test built, or who purchase commercial tests in education, have only the testing companies’ assurances that their product is technically sound and appropriate for its stated purpose. Further, those who have no choice but to take a particular test – often having to pay to take it – have inadequate protection against either a faulty instrument or the misuse of a well-constructed one. Although the American Psychological Association, the American Educational Research Association, and the National Council for Measurement in Education have formulated professional standards for test development and use in education and employment, they lack any effective enforcement mechanism (p. 21).

Despite these conclusions, the fact remains that NCLB and its test-based accountability system are here to stay, at least for the foreseeable future. AYP failure rates such as those reported earlier have increased the amount of pressure on schools, teachers, and students to bring up scores, claims of test bias, unfairness, and errors notwithstanding. Some states have simply lowered performance targets so that schools can more easily meet AYP (cf. Crawford, 2004, p. 355; Linn et al., 2002, p. 19). One high school in
Hawai'i resorted to “bribing” students with free food in order to encourage attendance for testing sessions ("School uses food as incentive for testing," 2003). The incentive failed and the 95% participation requirement was not met. In Chicago, low-performing students are apparently being “dumped,” that is, “pushed out,” since NCLB “creates a disincentive to hang on to students and help them go the extra mile to stay in school” (Grossman, 2004). In Florida, 5% of one high school’s “low-performing and often-absent” enrollment (126 students) was “purged” from the school’s attendance role a month before the state’s round of standardized testing was to begin (Shanklin, 2004), while at a Florida elementary school, students who were “dragging down” the school’s test scores were reportedly “weeded out” by the school principal (also see Orfield et al., 2004; The Public Advocate for the City of New York & Advocates for Children, 2002).

Sensational cases such as these may be more the exception than the norm; nevertheless, rising drop-out (or “push-out”) rates among students are a serious and frequently cited concern of NCLB opponents (Advocates for Children & The New York Immigration Coalition, 2002; Ambrosio, 2003; Center on Education Policy, 2004; FairTest, 2004a, 2004b; Orfield et al., 2004; Ruiz de Velasco & Fix, 2002; Ruiz de Velasco et al., 2000). With classrooms being turned into little more than centers for test preparation, schools being labeled as “low-performing,” and students pressured to improve test scores lest they and their institutions be cast as “failures,” disaffection with formal schooling can easily set in. This may be particularly acute for members of sub-

---

15 Test attendance is extremely important under NCLB: in one well-known case, a school in Connecticut had 100% of its students test as “proficient” in reading, and 99% as “proficient” in math. Yet, because only 94.3% of the 10th-graders at the school took the test, the school failed to make AYP (Dillon, 2004). In response to cases such as this, the US DOE relaxed attendance rates in March 2004: the 95% target can now be averaged over three years, rather than taken every year.
populations who are more likely to perform below performance targets and thus cause entire schools to miss AYP. Special education students, for example, have been singled out across the country for being a leading sub-population in schools not making AYP (Ambrosio, 2003; "Special ed students skew test results," 2003). The same has been said of ESLL students (cf. Wiley & Wright, 2004), as the results from Hawai‘i’s NCLB statewide test for 2002-2003 reported in Table 6.2 suggest.

Table 6.2 Hawai‘i NCLB State-wide Performance, 2002-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Retention/Graduation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% proficient</td>
<td>% tested</td>
<td>% proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AMAOs</strong> (targets) 2002-03</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Ss</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically disadvantaged</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESLL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Evaluation Section, Planning and Evaluation Branch (2003)

Of the three groups that did not meet the 30% target (AMAO) for reading proficiency, special education and ESLL sub-groups scored a dismal 6%. Similarly, 4% of ESLL students in the state scored proficient in math, compared to 3% in special education, the only two groups not to make the 10% NCLB target. Though elementary and intermediate
retention rates for ESLL and special education were low, graduation rates were, too, with both groups well below the 70% target. As the percentages indicate, special education and ESLL students were the lowest performers of the eight disaggregated sub-groups.\footnote{One Hawai‘i principal in Hiller (2003) remarked that “[t]he more ESLL we have, the harder it is to meet (No Child Left Behind) requirements.” As if in response, at a Hawai‘i Department of Education district meeting, an administrator remarked to the crowd of assembled ESLL teachers: “We hear our colleagues saying ‘you know it’s those ESL kids that are pulling down our [AYP] scores.’ We know they’re wrong.” (MSCPDfn: 645).}

With the AYP performance targets set to increase over the next twelve years, the pressure on these students will only intensify (Advocates for Children & The New York Immigration Coalition, 2002; Wiley & Wright, 2004, p. 160). Indeed, it appears that schools serving large numbers of poor, ESLL, and special education students are effectively assured of not “clear[ing] these arbitrary hurdles” (Neill, 2003, p. 226).

It is well established that students in these groups are disproportionately low achieving [on standardized tests]. Despite the great benefits that could accrue from a sound system of subgroup accountability for academic achievement, students in these groups are more likely to get pressure to leave [school] when test scores alone determine whether schools and districts are sanctioned (Orfield et al., 2004, p. 11).

The irony that NCLB may in fact facilitate disaffection among and early school exits of precisely the populations it singles out for assistance should be lost on no one.

\textit{Title III of NCLB and its impact on LEP students}

The English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act of NCLB’s Title III, Language Instruction for Limited English
Proficient and Immigrant Students, stipulates that ESLL students must be included in AYP calculations, both as members of a school’s population and as one of eight subgroups for whom test scores are disaggregated. Provisions for ESLL testing can be found both in Title III (e.g., § 3121) and in Title I (e.g., § 1111) of the legislation. Testing for ESLL students who have attended school in the US for up to three years is to be done ‘to the extent practicable… in the language and form most likely to yield accurate data on what such students know and can do in academic content areas’ ("No Child Left Behind Act of 2001," 2002, §1111, Stat. 1451, my emphasis). After three years, except on a case by case basis (extending to a maximum of five years length of residence), ESLL students are to be tested in English, using the regular state content standards exams. Due to apparent “impracticability,” however, most states do not have content standards exams in languages other than English (Zehr, 2003). Therefore, the majority of ESLL students “must take such tests in English as soon as they enroll in US schools” (Zehr, 2003, p. 1); this is the case in Hawai‘i. As of 2004, the participation requirements for ESLL students taking the HSA are for all students to take the test in English, regardless of English proficiency. The HSA provides test administrators with explicit instructions for dealing with ESLL students who are “unable to read and comprehend any of the [test’s] ‘on-grade level’ reading passages, mathematics problems, and related questions”: they are to have the student “open his/her reading/writing response booklet and bubble any response… for the first multiple choice item” in a given section, as “completion of this

---

17 This is a new provision in Hawai‘i. Prior to 2004, one of many “accommodations” ESLL students were granted in taking the state standards assessment (in English), was “out-of-level testing” (see Hawai‘i State Department of Education, 2003b, pp. 27-41). This meant that ESL1 10th graders took the state tests for 8th graders, 5th graders, and, as happened at Tradewinds (by mistake, as it turned out), 3rd graders, rather than the 10th grade tests. I discuss the implications of this in more detail in Chapter 7.
task will ensure a student’s inclusion in a school’s 95% participation rate.” Following this, the “student should be excused from the rest of the assessment sessions” (Hawai‘i State Department of Education, 2004, p. 20). The students most likely to be affected by this test policy are those categorized as ESLL-NEP, and perhaps some of those designated ESLL-LEP. To give an idea of how many students this could represent, in 2002-2003, 39% of the nearly 16,000 ESLL students in Hawai‘i were classified as ESLL-NEP, 49% as ESLL-LEP, and 7% ESLL-FEP (Hawai‘i State Department of Education, 2003a). One must wonder not only if this particular assessment procedure is “most likely to yield accurate data on what such students know and can do in academic content areas” (cf. Adebi, 2002), but precisely whose purposes are being served here?

While this is certainly not the first instance of people being administered high-stakes tests in a language they could not speak (see, e.g., Gould, 1996; Wiley & Wright, 2004), it is indicative of what Cummins (2000, p. 145) has politely called the “awkward reality” of ESLL students in accountability systems such as NCLB: that provisions for them in standards-based practices such as assessment tend to be an “afterthought,” even as they are held to the same performance targets as their peers (also see Crawford, 2004, p. 348). The Citizens’ Commission on Civil Rights (CCCR) asserts that for ESLL students, “many states have put standards and high-stakes assessments in place ahead of the support and teacher preparation that are prerequisite for their success” (Ruiz de Velasco & Fix, 2002, p. 249). Yet, in a large-scale analysis of ESLL students’

---

18 The text continues: “It is the Department’s responsibility to attempt to test each student, but not to force him/her to participate when he/she is unable to read and comprehend any session included in the assessment. This student will receive “Well Below Proficiency” scores . . . which is the same score he/she would have received in the past for an ‘out-of-grade-level’ assessment in relation to his [sic] peers” (Hawai‘i State Department of Education, 2004, p. 20).
standardized achievement test outcomes, Adebi (2002) demonstrates that language background confounds standardized achievement test scores for ESLL students. Adebi (2002) maintains that these tests, which are “administered in English and normed on native-English speaking test populations,” are not valid or reliable for L2 English learners as they “inadvertently function as English language proficiency tests” (p. 232). For this reason, he asserts that it is “imperative that test publishers examine the impact of language factors on test reliability and publish reliability indexes separately for the [ESLL] subpopulations” (p. 254). In light of these considerations, it is noteworthy that in Hawai‘i in 2004, not only do ESLL students take their content standards tests in English, there actually are no standards in place designed for the unique achievement capabilities of language minority students.19 According to a Hawai‘i Department of Education official, as of November 2004, “there has been some work done on ESLL standards” in Hawai‘i, “though they probably will need more revision” (personal communication, 4 November 2004). It is important to point out, however, that in addition to the omission of standards relating to ESLL students, the omission of standards relating to language minority students’ L1s implicitly codifies a linguist, monolingual English norm as the desired standard. This is an issue that is seldom mentioned in critiques of NCLB, yet it is crucial for educators of language minority students to remember: any state standards that neglect bilingual students’ L1s are effectively English-only standards, and any state with English-only standards is by default complicit in promoting a monolingual English language ideology on par with, for example, that of the US English-only movement (cf. Crawford, 2004; McCarty, 2004). Once again, this signals the federal government’s

---

19 Although the TESOL organization has a set of exemplary standards intended precisely for this population (TESOL, 1997; also see Agor, 2000).
inexorable push away from bilingualism toward monolingual English. It is also suggestive of US schools' "low system capacity" to meet the needs of language minority students, and is clearly further evidence of the marginal status of this population (Crawford, 2004; Ruiz de Velasco & Fix, 2002; Ruiz de Velasco et al., 2000).

While it is essential that ESLL students' L2 learning and academic progress be monitored in any accountability system (lest it be disregarded), it is equally essential that the tests that are used for these purposes be valid, reliable, and, one would hope, designed with the specific intent and population in mind (Adebi, 2002; August & Hakuta, 1997; Crawford, 2004). This is not the case for ESLL students who are being tested for academic achievement in a language they are by definition not yet proficient in. Yet remedies for these dilemmas are potentially as damaging as the problems themselves. Neill (2003, p. 227), for example, points to the "fear that, if stringent goals are relaxed or accountability [is] simply handed back to the states, many children will continue to be ignored" (also see August & Hakuta, 1997; Crawford, 2004). Ruiz de Velasco & Fix (2002) agree, arguing that the exclusion of [ESLL] immigrant youth from standards-based accountability systems threatens to widen performance differences between [ESLL] students and others. At the same time, applying a one-size-fits-all accountability system to an [ESLL] population in schools with low capacity to meet their needs could lead to equally undesirable consequences. These include increased grade retention and drop-out rates among language minority students and low morale among their teachers and administrators (pp. 255-256).
Neill (2003) aptly characterizes this dilemma as being “caught between the Scylla of high-stakes, test-based numerical accountability and the Charybdis of allowing states, districts, and the federal government to fail to educate many children” (p. 227). This latter concern has been voiced by others (e.g., August & Hakuta, 1997; Crawford, 2004; Cummins, 2000; Nieto, 1992; Ruiz de Velasco & Fix, 2002; Zehr, 2003) and has been amplified with the recent “relaxation” of NCLB requirements relating to ESLL students, as I briefly discuss next.

In February 2004, in response to mounting criticisms about the inflexibility of NCLB, particularly regarding AYP requirements for sub-populations, the US Secretary of Education announced two new policies designed to ease requirements relating to ESLL students (U.S. Department of Education, 2004). The first involves allowing ESLL students who have been in the US for less than a year to substitute test scores from the state English language proficiency exam for the reading portion of the content standards exam. The second new policy is more consequential, as it addresses a central absurdity about the ESLL sub-population under NCLB AYP requirements, one that again highlights the rigidity of NCLB as well as the unsettling incomprehension that too many policymakers have about ESLL: students exit ESL as they become proficient in L2 English (“mainstreaming” is the goal of ESL programs in K-12 schools after all), and, as one would expect, lower-L2-English-proficient newcomers take their place. This means that schools can actually expect to see little improvement in the annual AYP percentages for this sub-population. The new policy takes this into consideration, allowing schools to continue to count students in their AYP calculations for two years after they have exited ESL. While this seems like a suitable remedy in certain respects, the additional effort for
monitoring exited students will no doubt fall onto teachers’ already burdened shoulders. Indeed, both new policies have been described as a “short-term fix” (Zehr, 2004), with the larger issue (at least in terms of accountability) being “that most states still don’t have available academic tests that are valid and reliable for testing the academic achievement of English-language learners” (p. 25; also see August & Hakuta, 1997; Crawford, 2004).

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, I have sought to provide some context for the study that follows by outlining a history of linguicism in language and education politics in Hawai‘i. I have done so in the belief that it is necessary to situate the contemporary circumstances of language minority students at one public high school in Hawai‘i in a larger sociohistorical context. I have also examined some of the ways that two major educational policies – the Bilingual Education Act and the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 – may impact Tradewinds High School. I have argued that these policies are continuing evidence of a discriminatory nationalist language ideology that values English monolingualism over bi- and multilingualism and that increasingly equates English proficiency with patriotism and US-American identity. I focused in particular on the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, as it has deeply altered the K-12 educational landscape in the US, for ESL students and teachers, for all students and teachers.
CHAPTER 7. STRUCTURAL PRODUCTIONS OF THE OTHER:

INSTITUTIONAL DEFINITIONS OF ESLL

[S]chools [are] sites of learning which hegemonic groups, in alliance with consolidating states and/or expanding bureaucracies, often utilize to form certain kinds of subjectivities. The historically specific models of [schooled identities]... often represent the subjectivities which dominant groups endorse for others in society... Teachers play a crucial role in enforcing such models... though they may in practice challenge or ignore the models bequeathed them by policymakers and politicians... Finally, students... exercise agency in responding to the practices and discourses of the school. They, too, engage in the cultural production of practices and discourse which accommodate, resist, or otherwise adapt to the dominant school definition of [schooled identities].

Levinson & Holland (1996, p. 24)

One of the greatest errors in education is to assume that the larger social context of the school is irrelevant or even secondary to learning... The social structure of the school is not simply the context of learning; it is part of what is learned.

Eckert (1989, p. 179)

Introduction

The cultural production of "ESLL" that is the focus of this study occurred within the specific setting of Tradewinds High School, a setting without which the local instantiation of the institutional category "ESLL" itself would not have existed. In order to undertake an analysis of the cultural production of ESLL, it is therefore essential to explicate the context that it was ultimately produced within and against. In this chapter, I do this by examining the "structural productions" of ESLL as manifested in the ESLL program's intra-institutional relationships, its policies, and especially, its curricula. I use
the theoretical concept of "structural productions" following Eisenhart (1996), who has
drawn on Willis (1977; 1981) and curriculum theorist Nespor (1990) in an effort to
describe the ways that social structure is realized in school settings. As Giddens (e.g.,
1979, pp. 59-73) has emphasized, social structures are the "rules and resources" which
constrain and enable social action; "[s]tructure thus is not to be conceptualized as a
barrier to action, but as essentially involved in its production (Giddens, 1979, p. 70; see
Chapter 3). For this reason, structure is a "necessary postulate for the explanation of the
enactment of a social practice" (Cassell, 1993, p. 11; also see Ahearn, 2001). Structure
can also be "[u]sed in a looser fashion . . . [to refer] to the institutionalized features
(structural properties)" of social systems (such as schools) (Giddens 1984, p. 185). As
formulated by Eisenhart (1996), the term "structural productions" draws on both of these
senses of structure in an effort to highlight the ways that the subject position of "student"
is constructed and structurally positioned within particular institutional settings (personal
communication, 8 October 2004), that is, how program organization, institutional
relationships, and curriculum "constitute" certain preferred meanings of "being" a student
in those contexts (Eisenhart, 1996, p. 171). This "creates the conditions for some
identities to be made central or hegemonic while others are marginalized" (p. 169; also
In her study, Eisenhart (1996) documents ways that the structures of different university
biology programs produced different ways for students to be biologists, "which students
took up, or 'consumed,' as they progressed through the program. Other possible student
identities . . . were discouraged and thereby marginalized within" the respective programs
(p. 170). In this regard, work on school-based "structural productions" bears associations
to the important social reproduction literature on the "hidden curriculum" (see, e.g., Anyon, 1980; Apple, 1996; Giroux, 1983b; McNeil, 1986). However, as situated within post-structuralist theories of cultural production, the focus of analysis is not solely on class relations, and outcomes are not guaranteed; that is, conceptions of structural productions "are more locally specific, heterogeneous, and relational than the social reproduction literature often recognizes" (Eisenhart, 1996, p. 183; also see Chapter 3).

By examining "local structures" of the Tradewinds ESLL program, insights into certain aspects of the formal, official, hegemonic meanings of "being ESLL" at the high school can be explicated (Eckert, 1989; McNeil, 1986).

**ESLL program organization, institutional relationships, and policies**

The ESLL program's organization and intra-institutional relationships were unique when compared, for example, with those of the subject-area departments. I will briefly discuss three points that highlight this uniqueness: the ESLL program's place in the overall Tradewinds curriculum, the organizational association of J-section courses to their mainstream counterparts, and issues concerning communication between ESLL and subject-area departments offering J-sections. Following this, I consider two important local ESLL policies regarding teachers' classroom assignments and student placement.

*A required elective': ESLL in the Tradewinds curriculum

During the period of this study, high school graduation requirements for Hawai'i public school students consisted of a minimum of 22 credit hours distributed as follows:
Table 7.1 Distribution of credits for high school graduation (1 credit = course taken over one academic year; ½ credit = course taken over one semester)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language arts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social studies</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 7.1 indicates, all students intending to graduate were required to take four years each of language arts and social studies, three years of math and science, one year of PE, and one semester each of Health and Guidance, a career planning course. These 16 credits constituted the “core” curriculum; students were then able to choose a minimum of six additional elective credits to round out their degree requirements. 1

ESLL courses, which were to “enable [ESLL students] to function in the regular program of studies” (Tradewinds High School Course Description Manual, MSCNEdoc: A) were classified as “electives,” and in this regard, they, like all other electives, were in a hierarchically subordinate position to the core classes: although students were required to take six elective credits, there were no specific elective courses that were required to be taken, unlike in the core. Students could choose from a wide range of offerings, from art to mechanical drawing, ukulele to band, woodworking to auto shop, although those intending to go to college were advised to opt for classes in world languages, technology, business, and other ostensibly more “academic” alternatives (Tradewinds High School Course Description Manual, MSCNEdoc: A).

---

1 In 2006, the Hawai‘i State Board of Education will increase these requirements from 22 credits to 24, with the two additional credits reserved for “world languages,” fine arts, or “career/technical education.” This makes Hawai‘i one of only seven states nationwide to require this number of credits for graduation. Most states require between 19-22 (Thompson, 2004).
However, distinct from other electives, students who were identified as non- or limited English proficient (NEP/LEP) were required to take ESLL classes. This is of some note, not only because ESLL became the oxymoron of “required elective,” but because, in essence, the “core curriculum” for NEP/LEP ESLL students was increased from 16 to 19 credits. This meant that students’ effectively had their options to take classes of their own choosing reduced by as much as half, which worked to fuel animosity toward ESLL and contribute to some students’ perception of the program as “jail” (see Chapter 8). More significantly, however, it meant that NEP/LEP students would remain together taking classes within the ESLL program rather than outside it. This, of course, is not unexpected for a transitional program such as ESLL, which by definition is intended for a select student population with unique (in this case, L2) learning needs. Nonetheless, as Nespor (1990) and Eisenhart (1996) have argued, the ESLL program’s curricular “density” and “tightness” – that is, the proportion of total credit hours taken within the program and the proportion of explicitly identified courses that were required – had the effect of “plac[ing] powerful constraints on academic careers by limiting the courses students could take . . . . [which thereby] created pressure for particular kinds of learnings to take place” (Nespor, 1990, p. 220). Nespor’s (1990) notably longitudinal perspective on curriculum, which considers not just isolated courses but how children’s formal educational trajectories are cumulatively shaped over months and years, thus indicates how specialized programs such as ESLL, which simultaneously

---

2 Parents of students identified as ESLL could petition for an ESLL waiver (“action code 04”) (Office of Instructional Services, 1996), but according to Mr. Anderson, this was a rare occurrence.

3 Given the predominant organizational structure of schools in the US, classifying ESLL as an elective, as is common in Hawai‘i public secondary schools, seems to be one of the more viable options available, short of radical school restructuring (cf. Spaulding et al., 2004).
promote access to particular forms of knowledge, learning, and educational experiences – and deny it to others – have the potential to “produce cohorts of graduates with shared outlooks, ambitions, definitions of reality, and strategies for acquiring and using knowledge” (Nespor, 1990, pp. 231-232). Put another way, curricular density and tightness have “implications for how students spend their time (e.g., with whom, doing what) and what they learn . . . (e.g., the extent to which useful knowledge [is] delimited by the boundaries of [the program])” (Eisenhart, 1996, p. 172). As I shall describe below, the boundaries of the ESLL program did indeed delimit forms of knowledge and educational experiences that were uniquely specific to “being ESLL” at Tradewinds.

It may be argued that the increase in ESLL students’ required credits, from 16 to 19, is comparatively minor; however, it should be noted that continuing ESLL placement meant for all but a minority of FEP students a continuing placement in J-section classes as well. To understand the implications of this on the amount of time an ESLL student would thereby end up in ESLL and J-section classes, compare the following (not-uncommon) hypothetical situation of a NEP/LEP student with an ESLL placement of three full years, with that of a mainstream peer:

---

As I noted in Chapter 6, of the nearly 16,000 ESLL students in Hawai‘i in 2002-2003, 39% were classified as NEP, 49% as LEP, and 7% FEP (Hawai‘i State Department of Education, 2003a).
Table 7.2 Comparison of ESLL/non-ESLL credit hours (adapted from Nespor, 1990)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NEP/LEP student (taking full 3 yrs of ESLL)</th>
<th>Mainstream student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total credits to graduate</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total \textit{required} credits</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (unrequired) \textit{elective} credits</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total credits in ESLL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total credits in J-sections</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total &quot;within-ESLL program&quot; credits (ESLL + J-sections)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of &quot;within-ESLL program&quot; credits to total credits</td>
<td>11/22 = 50%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 19 required credit hours for this ESLL student, three credit hours would be comprised by ESLL, the "required elective," plus eight hours of J-section classes (three credits each in Language Arts and Social Studies, two in Science), for a total of 11 "within-ESLL program" credit hours, that is, ESLL plus J-section courses. This represents fully one half of the credit hours that students would need in order to graduate, or two years of coursework. These 11 credit hours would be spent in ESLL and J-section classes with other ESLL students, where ESLL and J-section specific curricular knowledge would be made available for learning: the kinds of learning that were made available will be the topic of discussion in sections farther below.

\textit{A, B, C, J}

There were three general ability-level tracks in the core subject-area departments that offered J-sections at Tradewinds: the "A track," for honors students, "B track," for
above average students, and "C track" for average and below students (cf. Oakes, 1985). The *Tradewinds High School Course Description Manual* (MSCNEdoc: A) indicated that student placements into respective courses were based on subject-area achievement test score "stanines": "A track," generally stanines 8-9; "B track," stanines 5-7, and "C track," stanines 1-4. Thus, in metaphorical terms, the structure of the curriculum indicated that J-classes were effectively "below" the A-, B-, and C-tracks of the regular curriculum, that is, for students who had no "stanine" in which to be placed. Although I have no data for the language arts and social studies subject-areas, for the Science Department, the descending hierarchy of mainstream ability-tracks to ESLL (i.e., A, B, C, J) was confirmed: during the period of this research, ESLL students who were deemed capable of handling the challenges of a mainstream science class were exclusively placed into the C-track counterpart of the J-section class, never the B- or A-track (cf. Harklau, 1994a, 1994b, 1994c; Oakes, 1985).

*Communication between ESLL and subject-area departments with J-sections*

Although J-section classes were classified as part of the ESLL program, respective subject-area departments were responsible for administering these courses, developing curricula for them, and assigning them teachers. This was not only because faculty in these departments had expertise in the subject-areas, whereas ESLL teachers often did not, but because J-sections were held to the same subject-specific content and performance standards as the mainstream classes. Thus, even though J-sections were

---

5 It is also of note that these mainstreaming decisions were made by the J-section science teachers alone, without consulting the ESLL program staff (to the ESLL staff's considerable exasperation).
classified administratively as ESLL courses, in actuality, they remained comparatively autonomous from the ESLL program (also see Kadooka, 2001).

The autonomy of the subject-area departments that offered J-sections resulted in (and was a result of) a notable lack of communication and minimal collaboration between these departments and the ESLL program on a range of issues, including curriculum planning, L2 pedagogy, ESLL subject-area materials, the classroom assignments and use of part-time teachers (PTTs), and even individual students. The lack of collaboration with ESLL specialists likely contributed to the clear prioritization of subject-area content instruction over L2 instruction in the four J-section classes that I observed. It meant that opportunities to develop the kinds of curricula that were more aligned with each other and were more responsive to ESLL students’ (L2) learning needs were missed. It meant that certain J-section classes received PTT help that needed it less than others. It contributed to ESLL and J-section teachers’ mutual misunderstanding about each others’ classes, curricula, and students, and it signaled the general lack of integration of ESLL at Tradewinds, not only with these departments, but with the rest of the school.

All three J-section teachers I observed had several years of experience teaching ESLL students in addition to coursework pertaining to L2 teaching and learning. The J-section teachers that I spoke with about this issue thus indicated that collaboration with ESLL was not needed. They also suggested they had enough to do already, with Ms. Frank, the Life Sciences J teacher, in particular, noting the enormous demands placed on subject-area teachers of J-sections by No Child Left Behind (NCLB) to "cover," as opposed to "teach" (cf. McNeil, 2000), as much material as possible. Pausing for L2 instruction would apparently result in his J-sections falling farther and farther behind
their mainstream counterparts. Mr. Anderson, the ESLL coordinator, also rejected the additional burdens that such collaboration would engender, exclaiming that "my hands are already full!" (TINT18: 65). In this regard, Mr. Anderson pointed to the overwhelming number of responsibilities that he and other ESLL teachers had in comparison to mainstream and J-section teachers (cf. Harklau, 1994a, p. 266), which ranged from completing the large amount of state-mandated paperwork used to monitor ESLL student performance, to providing bilingual support as needed to the rest of the school, to offering extra tutoring to students during lunch and after class hours. However, in an aside that hinted that other considerations may also be involved, Mr. Anderson suggested that the costs for any proposals he might make for improving J-section classes – for example, using ESL-specific textbooks, dictionaries, and other materials in these classes, rather than ones intended for monolingual English speakers – would come out of the meager ESLL budget, rather than the (much more substantial) budgets of the subject area departments (MSCXCfn: 249).6

In addition to issues such as these, it is important to note that there were systemic impediments to collaboration between ESLL and subject-area departments as well. These ranged from the mundane, such as lack of physical proximity (J-section teachers were located in separate buildings from the building that housed the ESLL program) to the more complex: for example, on the occasional Professional Development and Complex Area Collaboration Days that took place throughout the school year, J-section

---

6 This possibly resulted in certain J-section teachers using in their classes sometimes out-of-date, cast-off textbooks that were intended for monolingual English speakers. The two main textbooks for the Social Studies J class that I observed, for example, were non-ESLL texts published in 1981 and 1985; the main text used in the Language Arts J class I observed was similarly intended for monolingual English speakers, and was published in 1983. Only the Life Sciences J class used an up-to-date text, but it too was intended for monolingual English speakers. In fact, it was the same text used in the regular Life Sciences classes.
teachers' subject-area departmental affiliations and responsibilities overrode those of ESLL. Thus, the primary administrative mechanism for ensuring continuing professional development and teacher collaboration was effectively nullified for these teachers, at least in terms of ESLL: they met and collaborated with colleagues from their subject-area departments, not ESLL, and took part in professional development activities relating to their subject-areas, not those concerning ESLL. Problems such as these derive from the departmentalization of US schools, an issue that has received considerable attention from educational reformers (e.g., Sizer, 2004; Spaulding et al., 2004), including Ruiz de Velasco & Fix (2002), who point out:

The organization of secondary schools into departments based on subject matter often leads to the exclusion of ESL/bilingual teachers from functions such as school-wide curriculum planning and standards development that often occur within the regular academic departments. . . . [D]epartmentalization [has also been] found to encourage mainstream subject teachers to believe that addressing the language development needs of their LEP students is the responsibility of other school staff or departments (pp. 253-254; also see Harklau, 1994a; Spaulding et al., 2004).

It is instructive that the problematics of “departmentalization” at Tradewinds even existed between ESLL and mainstream subject-area departments that housed the sheltered-content ESLL classes.
‘Danglers,’ ‘lines,’ and ‘prima donnas’: Fishing for ESLL and J-section teachers

As I indicated in Chapter 5, there was significant turnover in the ESLL program staff between the first and second years of this study, and while this posed a number of difficulties to the program, the teachers, the students, and my research, it also offered a glimpse into some of the politics and practicalities of ESLL teacher hiring and class assignments at Tradewinds, at least at one particular point in time.

The majority of the dedicated ESLL classes at Tradewinds were taught by certified ESLL teachers on the ESLL program staff. However, a small number of ESLL classes were not. These classes were what were called the “danglers,” an assortment of extra classes across the school curriculum that were used to complete subject-area teachers’ otherwise incomplete “lines,” or teaching schedules. Those with incomplete lines tended to be tenured teachers of elective courses with few enrollments, or junior faculty members in subject-area departments which did not have enough sections to provide a full line.

Of the ESLL danglers I knew of during the period of my study, each was taught by junior faculty who had only recently joined Tradewinds. Despite Hawai‘i Department of Education (HDOE) guidelines that specified ESLL teacher hiring criteria at the time (see, e.g., Office of Instructional Services, 1995; Office of Instructional Services, 1996), each of these teachers had little, if any, ESL teaching experience or training (cf. Kadooka, 2001). Why junior faculty with little or no ESL training wound up teaching ESLL

---

7 Several teachers offered anecdotal reports indicating that assignment of ESLL classes to unqualified new hires rather than unqualified tenured teachers was not unique to Tradewinds. This was possibly due to a provision in HDOE hiring guidelines which allowed unqualified new hires who were assigned ESLL classes three years in which to complete the necessary 12 credits of ESL coursework (Office of Instructional Services, 1996, p. 28). In fact, though some teachers believed that the HDOE guidelines were “law,” they were, according to a HDOE administrator, “only a recommendation . . . which was approved by the OCR [Office of Civil Rights].” However, the official clarified: “If schools don’t hold to the
classes is beyond the scope of this study; "out-of-field" teaching is a problem that is by no means limited to ESL (see, e.g., Ingersoll, 2003). Although comparatively limited in degree, and likely a result of a rare confluence of circumstances relating to staff turnover, the effects of this particular administrative decision were significant, ranging from the more obvious implications for L2 learning and teaching (cf. Evans, 1996; Ingersoll, 2003; Kadooka, 2001), to the increased demands made on Mr. Anderson and other ESLL teachers in their efforts to provide extra organizational, curricular, and instructional support to the dangler teachers.

The issues concerning teacher recruitment for the J-section classes differed somewhat from those concerning the dedicated ESLL classes. Similar to Kadooka (2001), J-section classes at Tradewinds were apparently low-prestige teaching assignments in subject-area departments, with many of the more senior faculty members refusing to teach them. One instructor noted that teachers who refused to teach the J classes were deemed "prima donnas" by their colleagues; Ms. Frank gave some indication of why when he noted some teachers "only want to teach the best of the best and that's it, because they don't know how to deal with problem children. And they don't want to have to deal with ESL. They don't." (TINT11: 76). The views that ESLL was not "the best of the best" and that ESLL classes were filled with "problem children" were supported by Mr. Day, who asserted that "there are [regular] teachers who feel that [J-sections] are kind of like an extra challenge and a liability ... and it's kind of like

---

8 Ingersoll (2003) traces the problem of out-of-field teaching to "the low stature and standing of the teaching occupation," and concludes, somewhat contentiously, that the practice is motivated by "the assumption that female-dominated, pre-collegiate school teaching requires far less skill, training, and expertise than traditional professions, and, hence, [that] it is appropriate to use teachers like interchangeable blocks" (p. 24).
'well, if only my kids were all honors students, it would be easier for me to teach them. I could just focus on the cream of the crop’” (TINT9: 441-443). Because J-sections were not preferred in a system in which teaching assignments were made based on seniority, a few, although certainly not all J-sections were assigned to junior subject-area faculty, at least during the period of this research; of these junior faculty, most did not have substantial backgrounds in ESLL, if any at all.

This brings me to a brief discussion about the ESLL qualifications of non-ESLL/J-section teachers at Tradewinds. Although the Hawai‘i DOE has specified that all non-ESLL/J-section program staff (i.e., regular teachers, Special Education teachers, etc.) “should have a minimum of 6 credits” of ESL, bilingual, or multicultural education coursework (Office of Instructional Services, 1996, p. 28), in my first year at Tradewinds, 80% of these teachers indicated that they did not meet these qualifications, with 70% reporting that they had no ESLL credits at all (Tradewinds High School ESLL Compliance Record, MSCNEdoc: B). This is similar to the percentage reported by Kadooka (2001), where 84% of non-ESLL teachers at the Hawai‘i high school of her study indicated that they did not meet these qualifications; it also finds parallels nationwide (National Center for Education Statistics, 1996, 2002b). According to a Hawai‘i DOE official, the provision for all non-ESLL program staff to have six ESLL credits was “more of a recommendation” than a requirement, and as a consequence, it really has no teeth. The state has been struggling with this for years, both in gathering and keeping [these] data accurate. Also, since there is no pre-service requirement [for ESLL credits], we are always behind . . . . [I]f there were an
"ESLL Felix," this might become a law, like in other states. If they have ESLL students in their class, technically they probably should have the ESLL credits (personal communication, 4 November 2004).

Mr. Anderson and Ms. Frank both suggested one possible reason for the widespread lack of ESLL credits among non-ESLL teachers: that if teachers did indeed have the credits, the likelihood that they would be assigned ESLL and/or J-section classes would be much higher.

Hiring and assigning PTTs

As described in Chapter 5, part-time temporary teachers (PTTs) are bilingual aides who assist teachers in the classroom, often providing small group instruction in L2 English and classroom ‘content,’ and serving as links to students’ parents and communities. They are widely viewed as crucial to the success of ESLL in Hawai‘i, due to the fact of the diversity of the state’s ESLL population. This was particularly true at Tradewinds, where the ESLL placement policy resulted in remarkably heterogeneous classes (see below). Despite the importance of these positions, however, and the great reliance that schools have upon them, they are low-paying, non-union, uncontracted jobs that provide no benefits; this clearly affected Tradewinds’ ability to hire and, more

---

9 In the early 1990s, a class action lawsuit was brought against the state of Hawai‘i concerning compliance with federal laws assuring education and mental health services for special needs children in public schools. The state settled and agreed to revamp its delivery of Special Education services, with state compliance overseen by a federal judge. This is the “Felix Consent Decree.” As Crookes & Talmy (2004) describe, there have been occasional similar rumblings in Hawai‘i about an “ESLL Felix,” that is, a class action lawsuit brought against the state concerning compliance with federal laws that assure equal educational opportunity for language minority students in public schools (also see Chapter 6).
importantly, to retain qualified PTTs. In addition, the disbursement of ESLL funds was postponed and the hiring of PTTs was substantially delayed in the second and third years of this study, despite the successful overturn of a proposed statewide budget cut that would have slashed already meager ESLL funding by 40% (see Crookes & Talmy, 2004; Chapter 5), leaving the Tradewinds ESLL program understaffed, and ESLL students with little additional classroom and language instruction, at a time when they arguably needed it most: at the beginning of the school year, when many (especially first-year) students need the support necessary to become successful in high school. In addition, once PTTs were hired, they were required to administer time- and labor-intensive English proficiency tests to all ESLL students at the high school, which took them away from their classroom duties for several weeks at a time. Thus, in the third year of research, for example, those classes that were assigned PTTs did not actually have them present for most, and for some classes, all, of the entire first semester of the school year. A check I made for the most recent school year found the same pattern. The message communicated by this situation was that the testing and monitoring of student performance was more important than the instruction intended to “improve” that performance.

*Early HCPS testing policy*

Until 2003-2004, ESLL students were permitted “out of level” testing as an “accommodation” on the Hawai‘i Content and Performance Standards (HCPS) test, the

---

10 At the end of each school year, PTTs could never be assured that they would be rehired in the fall. The delay in the disbursement of funds created additional obstacles as some PTTs opted to find more secure employment elsewhere.
predecessor to the Hawai‘i State Assessment (HSA) (see Chapter 6 for more on HCPS and HSA). This “accommodation” meant that LEP 10th graders were provided not with the 10th grade HCPS reading and math tests, but the 8th grade ones, and that all 10th graders who were classified as NEP took the 5th grade HCPS math test and no reading test at all.\footnote{This resulted in audible sighs of exasperation and cries of “what!?” when students received their test booklets, which had their grade levels clearly marked (MSCTEfn: 143). As well, in the first year of HCPS testing I observed, Tradewinds NEP students wound up taking the HCPS 3rd grade math test instead of the 5th grade test, by mistake as it turned out, which resulted in these students, one of whom was a member of the Tradewinds Math Team (MSCTEfn: 155), taking a (monolingual English) math test seven years below grade-level. This no doubt contributed to the widespread perception (at the very least among those in the testing hall) that ESLL was “childish.” See Chapter 6 for more on the English-only implications of NCLB as well as the serious limitations of a “one size fits all” accountability framework.}

This state-mandated policy, which was used to comply with the directives for NCLB, was evidently based on a belief that lower-grade level material was more suitable for ESLL students, a belief that also extended to ESLL curricula (see below). It also resulted in what was termed “out-of-level” testing, which would have meant that all LEP and NEP students would have tested “well below proficiency,” since they were not taking the on-grade-level (10th grade) HCPS test. As I have described in Chapter 6, this would then ensure that the school would not make its “adequate yearly progress” (AYP) for the ESLL sub-category, and thus at all. Schools with ESLL students were therefore at a structural disadvantage compared to schools without ESLL students, since they would be assured of consistently not making AYP, which in turn would have precipitated state intervention in the form of “corrective action.”

This incongruity was remedied in the last year of research, when all ESLL 10th graders took the 10th grade HCPS/HSA test. This is certainly an improvement, since at least ESLL students had a\textit{ chance} to “meet proficiency” or “exceed proficiency,” even if
the tests were designed not for these students' unique L1/L2 achievement capabilities, but those of monolingual English-speaking peers. But more to the point, these difficulties are emblematic of what results from systems as rigid as NCLB, how a "reform" that is based on assumptions about student homogeneity, utterly stumbles when confronted with real world cultural and linguistic diversity, all lists of "accommodation options" to test administrators notwithstanding (see Chapter 6).

*Lifers and FOBs together forever: ESLL placement policy*

The Language Assessment Scales (LAS) was the annually-administered English proficiency test used by the ESLL program to monitor students’ L2 English development. It consisted of two main components (which were notably time- and labor-intensive to administer and score). For the Oral Component, students were tested individually by an examiner (usually a PTT) on the following:

a) "Action Words" – Examiner points to pictures; student describes action that is represented. (10 items)

b) "Opposite Words" – Student listens to tape which has list of adjectives and adverbs; after each word, must say its antonym. (10 items)

c) "Listening Comprehension" – Student listens to tape of two people talking; afterward must answer yes/no comprehension questions about what was said (10 items)

12 The reasons that students underwent ESLL testing varied from recent arrival from a country where English was a second or foreign language, to prior ESLL status in middle school, to parental request for ESLL services.
d) "Story Retelling" – Student listens to tape of someone narrating a story. Afterward, using picture prompts, must retell the story. Examiner must tape record student’s story and transcribe verbatim.

e) "Minimal Sound Pairs" – Student listens to tape of two words with/without minimal pair differences; student must identify if they are “same” or “different.” (35 items)

f) "Phonemes" – Student listens to tape of words, phrases, and sentences and must repeat them. (35 items)

For the second part of the LAS test, the Reading/Writing Component, students were tested either individually or in groups on the following:

a) "Synonyms" – A one-word prompt (noun, verb, adjective, or adverb) is followed by list of four words. Student must decide which one is the synonym. (10 items)

b) "Fluency" – Cloze sentence followed by list of four words. Student must choose correct word to fill in the blank. (10 items)

c) "Antonyms" – Same as a), but with antonyms rather than synonyms.

d) "Mechanics & Usage" – Cloze sentence followed by list of three items testing punctuation, verb tense/aspect forms, comparative/superlative forms; pronominal forms; etc. (15 items)

e) "Reading for Information" – Five-seven paragraph reading passage followed by factual-recall comprehension questions. (10 items)

f) "What’s Happening?” – Picture prompt, student must write one sentence description. (5 items)
g) “Let’s Write!” – Student provided lead-in dependent clause to generate essay (during this study it was “The most beautiful place I have ever visited . . .”, which was found posted on whiteboards in every ESLL class for weeks at a time). (1 item)

Student performance on these tests resulted in one of three Hawai‘i Department of Education classifications: non-English proficient (NEP), limited English proficient (LEP), and fully/fluent English (FEP).

Due to the administrative policy and practice at Tradewinds, however, the vast majority of placements into ESLL classes there was based not on L2 English proficiency, as measured by the LAS, but by the length of time students had been enrolled at the school (see below).13 Thus, ESLL A classes were for classified ESLL students who were in their first year at Tradewinds, be they 9th, 10th, 11th, or 12th graders, regardless of their proficiency in English (i.e., regardless of NEP, LEP, FEP designations). Similarly, ESLL B classes were for those students who were in their second year at Tradewinds, regardless of grade level or L2 proficiency, just as ESLL C classes were for students in their third year at the high school.14 Tradewinds ESLL classes were thus remarkably heterogeneous: for example, ESLL A classes regularly had students from 14-18 years of age and one of four grade levels, from up to 15 different language backgrounds, with a tremendous range in L1 and L2 English proficiencies and literacy abilities, differences in prior formal educational experiences, and academic preparation. Newcomers sat beside

13 Exceptions to this policy tended to be sophomores and juniors who had previously been mainstreamed, but were failing one or more of their regular classes (e.g., Ioane, Computer, Shorty). Because these students’ class schedules had already been determined, and because they were not in the 9th grade course sequence, the school registrar had fewer options to place them into available ESLL classes.

14 Placements into the various “sheltered content” ESL classes were made in similar ways.
students who had been born in the US; students with interrupted formal educations shared
books with members of the Tradewinds Math Team; absolute beginners in L2 English
studied alongside long-term L2 English-dominant speakers.

Mr. Anderson (TINT18: 188) indicated that this policy had been implemented for
administrative reasons: there were core course sequences for each grade-level year (i.e.,
the 9th grade course sequence consisted of the 9th grade courses for Language Arts,
Science, Social Studies, and Math; a 10th grade core course sequence, etc.) and this made
the scheduling of ESLL classes by language proficiency rather than grade-level
unworkable. However, Mr. Anderson also indicated that this placement policy had been
implemented with the assumption that there would be a large number of PTTs available
so that such heterogeneous ESLL classes could be sub-divided into more manageable
groupings based on similar L2 proficiencies. Unfortunately, budget cutbacks occurred as
the state continued to cope with rising number of ESLL students (between 1989-2002 the
ESLL population increased nearly 110%), and one of the first places that cuts had been
made was to the number of PTTs that could be hired.15 Thus, according to Mr. Anderson,
by the second year of fieldwork for this study, Tradewinds employed fewer than half the
number of PTTs from just five years earlier (TINT 18: 188).

However unintentional, the policy that resulted in the placement of students with
such extraordinarily diverse L1/L2 abilities into the same ESLL classes sent a tacit
message that ESLL students did not need specialized instruction targeted at specific L2
proficiency levels, and, thus, were essentially the same. Just as with NCLB (see Chapter

---

15 In final semester of research, Mr. Anderson showed me a memo from a school administrator that
indicated that due to budget constraints, the ESLL program needed to cope with fewer PTTs and larger
class sizes.
the implication was that ESL students could be conceptualized as a single category of learners with negligible differences in L1 and L2 proficiencies, educational backgrounds, or needs, who were identified by the simple fact that their L1s were not English.

‘Flying by the seat of your pants’: ESLL curricula

Compared to mainstream Health and J-section classes, the curricula for dedicated-ESLL at Tradewinds were notably unprescribed, undocumented, and flexible (see Appendixes I-L). Similar to Harklau (1994a), who found a comparable discrepancy at a Northern California high school, assumptions about the backgrounds of respective student populations had much to do with the differences between subject-area and ESLL curricula. Mainstream curricula were designed with “continuity” in mind, based on the presumption of “a relatively stable student population with a uniform knowledge base shaped by 8 or 9 years of previous instruction in US elementary and middle schools” (Harklau, 1994a, p. 256). Teachers in the ESLL program, both at Harklau’s school and at Tradewinds, could make no such assumption. Additionally, the numerous directives of NCLB-mandated content and performance standards for subject areas at Tradewinds were explicit and prescriptive; in contrast, and despite being a “required” course, as well as one of eight sub-categories for which schools’ “adequate yearly progress” data were to be disaggregated, ESLL at Tradewinds had no standards at all (all other required courses had standards; see Chapter 6). Additionally, both the size and demographic profiles of incoming ESLL populations varied from year to year, with classes similarly affected by year-round entrances of new students, sometimes just weeks or even days before a school year ended. And finally the ESLL placement policy noted above resulted in classrooms
with tremendous diversity in terms of students' L1/L2 language and literacy proficiencies, prior formal educational experiences, and academic preparation. Each of these factors contributed in some way to an ESLL curriculum that was far less rigid or prearranged than the mainstream and J-section classes.

As a result of the lack of a detailed, prescribed curriculum, Ms. Cheney asserted that "there is no [ESLL] curriculum" (ELA12Xfn: 185), and therefore, as Ms. Ariel commented, that there was "a lot of flying by the seat of your pants" for teachers in Tradewinds ESLL classes (ELA31Wfn: 30). However, this was not entirely the case, even for Ms. Cheney and Ms. Ariel. Instead of an actual document in which learning objectives and goals and the means to accomplish them were explicitly articulated, as in the J-section and mainstream classes I observed, the ESLL "curriculum" was a much more general set of guidelines that Mr. Anderson and Mr. Bradley had developed in unwritten form. Although these orally-communicated guidelines allowed teachers a great deal of latitude in terms of what they chose to teach – for Ms. Ariel, Ms. Cheney, and Mr. Day, more choice than they would have preferred – each of the eight ESLL classes that I observed (four of which were taught by Mr. Bradley) followed them to varying degrees. I shall outline the central elements of this loosely assembled curriculum next.\footnote{It is important to note that shortly after I concluded fieldwork at Tradewinds, and as an apparent result of NCLB, the ESLL curriculum as I describe below appeared to change somewhat (this is based on three observations I conducted in follow-up visits to the school). Although all of the features that I outline below remained, they were placed within a different pedagogical framework, which included use of teaching techniques that were intended to "scaffold" instruction more effectively, e.g., through the use of think-aloud models, preview and prediction strategies, graphic organizers such as KWL charts, and so forth (see, e.g., Cazden, 2001; Chamot & O'Malley, 1994). This may be due to the influence of the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol model (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2000), which the Hawai'i Department of Education had at that time been attempting to implement in ESLL programs statewide. Unfortunately, it is beyond the scope of this study to consider these changes, or if they were continued.}
'Ages 10 and up': Juvenile fiction in the high school ESLL classroom

The centerpiece of the literature-based curriculum in ESLL was a series of L1 English children's novels, one of which was assigned for reading per quarter. They included well-known, sometimes classic children's titles such as *Shiloh* (Naylor, 1991), *Sadako and the thousand paper cranes* (Coerr, 1977), *Bud, not Buddy* (Curtis, 1999), *Call it courage* (Sperry, 1940), *Because of Winn-Dixie* (DiCamillo, 2000), *The lion, the witch, and the wardrobe* (Lewis, 1950), *Sarah, plain and tall* (MacLachlan, 1985), and *James and the giant peach* (Dahl, 1961). According to the publishers' own estimations, these novels were intended for children who were aged between 8 and 12 years old, or were at "reading levels" between 3rd and 6th grade. This information was usually clearly printed on the books' back covers.17

The choice of children's novels around which the ESLL curriculum was centered was based on Mr. Bradley's (e.g., ELB51:Wfn: 121) and Mr. Anderson's (e.g., MSCNE:fn: 371) expressed beliefs that these coming-of-age books had wide appeal since they concerned such universal topics as love, grief, fear, courage, belonging, and self-discovery, and that material written for younger children was appropriate for ESLL students in high school because it was lexically and syntactically "easier" than on-grade-level material.18 This latter point is a language ideology that while perhaps true in certain

---

17 There is considerable debate concerning the validity of these so-called "reading age" and "readability" determinations, which I have no intention to enter into here. However, see Anderson-Levitt (1996) for an historical-structural analysis of conceptions of chronological and "mental" age, school organization, and literacy "stages" as applied to first-grade children in French and US schools.

18 To my surprise, Mr. Anderson indicated that his first choice for the ESLL curriculum had in fact been "survival ESL," but that district ESLL administrators "kinda like discouraged survival texts, workbook skills things. So the push was literature" (TINT18: 178). Mr. Anderson also indicated that he hoped to eventually revisit the "survival ESL" idea, in order to focus on "Conversation. More oral things. Yeah, yeah." (TINT18: 180). Among many other things, this indicates Mr. Anderson's conception of the ESLL population's demographic and educational profile and their L2 learning needs (see below). For a substantive critique of "survival ESL," see, e.g., Auerbach & Burgess (1985).
respects, ignores several others. When compared to the texts that ESLL students encountered in their J-section and mainstream classes, for example, these books did indeed include far fewer syntactically complex constructions and less jargon and field-specific terminology (cf. Schleppegrell, 2001, 2004). This is not to say that they did not present challenges to those ESLL students who actually wound up reading them, however: they included many features common to (English language) juvenile fiction that may have appeared “easy” to those familiar with the genre (i.e., those who had read them or similar books as children), but in fact posed unique difficulties for (L2) initiates: onomatopoeic neologisms such as “squinch up,” “scooch over,” and “ginormous;” colloquialisms like “lickety-split,” “into power yelling,” and “down the road a piece;”; “eye dialect” (Woolard, 1998) such as “siddown” (sit down), “musta” (must have), and “figgered” (figured), and a preponderance of references that assumed prior knowledge of US cultures, geography, history, and more. Generic features such as these, and the struggles students encountered with them (e.g., non-standard vocabulary were not located in dictionaries; non-standard grammar contravened rules previously taught or learned; culturally specific references were rarely explicated in class), led one PTT to confide that many of these books were “not fair” to the lower L2 proficient students because they were “too hard” (ELB52Xfn: 535). Not mentioned was the fact that the books were unfair to those advanced L2 proficient students for whom they were too easy, a point made repeatedly in formal and informal student interviews (see Chapters 8 and 9).

In addition to being lexically and syntactically simpler than most materials in J-section and mainstream classes, the children’s books used in ESLL classes were also *substantively* and *conceptually* simpler, with plots usually concerning a pre-teen
protagonist and/or a friend, relative, or pet overcoming a significant (and invariably poignant) personal difficulty; this generally provided the basis for a moral or “life lesson” to be learned. In this regard, certain of these rite-of-passage books involved topics that evidently did not resonate with particular groups of students: 16- and 17-year-old Marshallese girls in one ESL B class, for example, complained about *Are you there God? It's me, Margaret* (Blume, 1970), a book about an 11-year-old girl’s anxieties concerning impending adolescence, because it was “only about how girls always think about boys” (ELB12Ufn:154); 10th grade boys apathetically stumbled through (when they read at all) one of Ann M. Martin’s books about an 8th grade girls’ babysitting club; and G1.5 students regularly protested titles that either they or younger siblings had read in earlier grades (see Chapter 9).

The choice of children’s literature for ESLL curriculum did not appear to take into account the affective impact these books might have on high school students, that is, how certain 14, 15, 16, and 17 year-olds who were negotiating identities in the liminal period between childhood and adolescence (Eckert, 1989, 2000; Rampton, 1995, 2001), might react to books that many viewed as “childish.” Indeed, in addition to being less complex syntactically, lexically, substantively, and conceptually, these novels *appeared* simpler than texts that students encountered in classes outside of ESLL, with their colorful covers (see Appendix H), large print, abbreviated chapters, wide margins, and frequent illustrations, and with their intended age group and reading level clearly indicated on the back covers.

Finally, I should note that each of the children’s books used in the ESLL classes I observed had much to recommend them in terms of their overall quality; in fact, I have
read and enjoyed many of them myself. However, the centrality of juvenile fiction in the ESLL curriculum meant that students were exposed to a notably different genre in ESLL classes than in J-section and mainstream classes, a notably different register of L2 English, notably different content, and at the same time were not provided instruction in the genres, registers, and content encountered in non-ESLL classes (cf. Schleppegrell, 2001, 2004). This is not to reify the materials that students were assigned in J-section and mainstream classes, only to point out differences between them and those used in ESLL classes, and thus the apparent incongruity between the program’s stated purpose to facilitate students’ transition to the mainstream (*Tradewinds High School Course Description Manual, MSCNEdoc: A*; see Chapter 8). Furthermore, the centrality of children’s literature in the ESLL curriculum contributed to the public perception of the program’s childishness, what Leki (1999, p. 24) has aptly termed “Mr. Rogers-like ESL.”\(^\text{19}\) This was, as I discuss in subsequent chapters, a perception that was shared and reproduced (and brought into ESLL classrooms) by many ESLL students themselves, particularly G1.5 students.

*Coursework derived from juvenile fiction*

There were a number of associated course activities intended to facilitate L2 English learning that derived from the use of children’s novels in the ESLL classes I observed, including a “core” sequence of assignments centered on reading, writing, and vocabulary.

\(^{19}\) Mr. Rogers was the well-known host of a long-running children’s show on US public television. In her text, Leki (1999, p. 24) refers to him as “Mr. Roberts.”
"Readings." Once a children's book was selected (by the teacher) for the quarter, it would be divided into a series of "readings," each comprised of several chapters that students were to complete by particular dates throughout the school term. At the beginning of the year, these readings would often be assigned as homework, but as the semesters wore on, they would increasingly be assigned as in-class work (reasons for this are discussed in Chapters 9 and 10). Whether in-class reading was done in group work (using choral reading or having individuals taking turns reading aloud), or with students reading silently in their seats, depended upon the teacher. Mr. Bradley and Ms. Cheney opted for more oral group readings, and Mr. Day and Ms. Ariel opted for more (ostensibly) silent individual seatwork. This was likely due, at least in part, to different instructional support in these teachers' classes: in addition to my assistance, Mr. Bradley always had at least one regular PTT in his (smaller) ESLL B and ESLL C classes, as did Ms. Cheney (in ELA IX, she had two PTTs; in ELB 1U, the PTT came mid-year). This allowed the teachers to split the class into groups based on L2 proficiency, so that more individualized instruction could be provided (in Ms. Cheney's ELA 1X, for example, the class could be divided into four different groups since there were two PTTs, Ms. Cheney, and myself present). In contrast, and for reasons discussed in Chapter 5, Ms. Ariel and Mr. Day did not have PTTs in the classes that I observed.²⁰

²⁰ In addition, as I noted in Chapter 5, my participation as an instructional aide diminished considerably in Ms. Ariel's and Mr. Day's classes as the school year progressed. Whereas both teachers used me at the beginning of the year to work with one of two groups that respective classes had been divided into, they wound up abandoning this practice. This was likely due to a confluence of circumstances, including (but not limited to) my own intermittent presence in their classrooms (my observations at the high school were three times per week, not five) and to "defensive teaching" (McNeil, 1986), which, as I argue in subsequent chapters, was one of many outcomes of (and contributions to) the G1.5 cultural productions of ESLL at Tradewinds.
Comprehension questions. Each reading was accompanied by between three and five comprehension questions, which had been written by Mr. Anderson or Mr. Bradley. They appeared on mimeographed worksheets that were shared among all the ESLL teachers (see Appendix I.4; L.1 for examples). Students were to write short answers to them: two to five complete sentences per question. I include here the questions for Reading 1 of Missing May (Rylant, 1992), a moving story about the loss of a beloved family member (May), which was intended for an audience “ages 10 and up”:

1. Describe Summer’s background. Who is she living with now? What is [sic] her present living conditions?

2. Would you say it’s unusual for such an elderly couple to adopt and take care of such a young girl? What might the advantages and disadvantages be?

3. Why does [sic] Ob and Summer miss May so much? Is it healthy to grieve and miss a loved one for a long period? How would you help Ob and Summer overcome such sadness?


As these questions indicate, students were asked a combination of display questions and (open and closed) referential questions (see, e.g., Cazden, 2001; Crookes & Chaudron, 2001), although few were particularly challenging. Students were reminded frequently to elaborate their answers to these questions beyond the rudimentary and to keep them in their “own words.” As with the reading assignments themselves (and also with summaries and vocabulary components discussed next), the comprehension questions
were often assigned as homework, particularly at the beginning of the school year, though as the semesters passed, they were increasingly given as in-class work instead.

**Summaries.** Each reading was accompanied by a summary assignment, in which students were to recap the main plot points of the chapters they had been assigned to read, generally in one handwritten page. As with the comprehension questions, students were frequently warned, to varying effect, to make sure that their summaries were long enough and in their “own words” (cf. Pennycook, 1996), rather than copied directly from the book (see Appendix M for some examples of these summaries).

**Vocabulary.** The juvenile fiction curriculum component that received the most attention and took the most class time concerned vocabulary. Students were required to make a list of 10-15 vocabulary words that they did not know from respective reading assignments and then define the words using students’ own (usually electronic) bilingual dictionaries or (Japanese, Korean, Cantonese, Mandarin, and Vietnamese) bilingual dictionaries available in most of the ESLL classes. They were then to label the words’ parts of speech and copy the sentences where they had appeared in the novel. These vocabulary lists would then be turned in to the teacher, who would subsequently select between 10-20 words from the students’ lists for a “master” vocabulary list, on which students would later be quizzed (see Appendix J.3, K.7 for such a list; see Appendix M for how some students completed this assignment).

**Quizzes and tests.** A substantial amount of class time was devoted to “reviewing” for the vocabulary quizzes that accompanied each reading, particularly in Mr. Day’s, Ms. Ariel’s, and Ms. Cheney’s classrooms (see Chapter 10 for more on test preparation). With the exception of Ms. Cheney, who never administered them, time was also spent
preparing for the quarterly “end-of-book” tests, which always consisted of the following eight prompts:

1. Title and relationship [relationship of the title to the book]
2. Setting [description of the time/place that the book took place in]
3. Two conflicts/two resolutions
4. Main character description (five sentences)
5. Character development (how main character changes)
6. Theme (lesson from the author)
7. Plot (ten sentences)
8. Personal reaction: “I like this book because...” (support answer with evidence)

In addition to the end-of-book test, Mr. Bradley had students take a comprehensive vocabulary test on 50-75 of the words that had been quizzed throughout the quarter. None of the first-year teachers required this in their classes.

**Supplementary ESLL curricula**

Interspersed among the coursework based on children’s novels were miscellaneous grammar and vocabulary assignments, occasional written work on paragraphs or journals, assorted worksheets, and quarterly projects. These elements of what I shall call the ESLL “supplementary curriculum” most clearly allowed teachers to

---

21 For the last question, Mr. Day and Ms. Ariel permitted students to write why they did not like a particular book (see Appendix J for an example from Mr. Day’s class). Mr. Bradley, however, forbade this choice. In response to one (G1.5) student who stated that she wanted to describe why she hated the book, Mr. Bradley replied, “You can’t write that. Just say you liked it. Lie if you have to. Start your answer with ‘I like this book because’” (ELB42Yfn: 277). See Chapter 9 for more about the differences between Mr. Bradley’s classes and those of the first-year ESLL teachers.
realize their own beliefs about L2 teaching and learning, to put their personal mark on their classes, so to speak, and thus varied significantly from teacher to teacher (cf. Bailey et al., 1996; Clark & Peterson, 1986; Crookes, 2003; J. C. Richards & Lockhart, 1996).

Mr. Bradley’s ESLL B & ESLL C classes. Mr. Bradley’s choice of supplementary material favored oral performance pieces such as famous speeches and songs that he would have students memorize and recite, usually in choral readings (see Appendix K.2, K.3, K.4, K.5, and K.9). These ranged from Martin Luther King, Jr.’s “I have a dream” speech and Michael Jackson’s song “Heal the world” (see Chapter 9 for a discussion of “multiculturalism” in the Tradewinds ESLL program), to Lincoln’s “Gettysburg Address” and poems and stories downloaded from the internet, which could be broadly subsumed under the rubric of “character education.” They included patriotic poems with titles such as “Patriotism is strong in their hearts,” and “The day the world cried: September 11, 2001” (see Appendix K.3, K.4), to paeans celebrating the value of acquiescent labor like the following, extracted from a poem entitled “Work”:

.... Think of work as something that needs to be done

So you can make time for something more fun

I know it’s hard so I won’t pretend

But think of work as a means to an end

Find something about work that is even ‘okay’

Then give it your best day after day

And when you feel like crying, in between each sob

Send up a prayer and thank God you have a job.... (ELB51Xdoc: B; cf. Auerbach & Burgess, 1985; see Appendix K.5).
In addition to materials such as these, Mr. Bradley also provided cloze exercises, games (e.g., crosswords and "acrostic" puzzles, word search games), and short readings on topics specific to Hawai‘i, many also downloaded from the internet. Of the latter group, for example, he provided students with a sentence reordering exercise (ELB51Wdoc: F; see Appendix K.1) for a reading about agriculture in Hawai‘i (students were to put the sentences in the correct order) in addition to a cloze worksheet entitled "Hawaiian Supaman," about the life and death of Israel Kamakawiwo‘ole (ELB52Wdoc: K). Mr. Bradley also included occasional writing assignments from books such as *Writing by doing: Learning to write effectively* (Sohn & Enger, 1985), a skills-based L1 English composition textbook, and *Write Source 2000* (Sebranek, Meyer, & Kemper, 1990), an L1 English text intended for 6th–8th graders. Assignments from these books generally involved formulae for writing "effective" paragraphs and particular essay types (e.g., the "expository essay," the "narrative essay," etc.).

*Mr. Day’s ESLL A class.* Mr. Day’s curriculum was by far the most centered around the main juvenile fiction curriculum, reflecting by his own admission his lack of background in L2 studies, and indicating his heavy reliance on Mr. Anderson for guidance, particularly early in the school year (see Appendix J for samples of materials from this class). As the year wore on, Mr. Day opted to incorporate a grammar dimension into his ESLL classes, using Dixon’s (1956) *Regents English workbook, Book 2: Intermediate-Advanced,* which came to occupy an increasingly central place in the curriculum. Reflecting the strong influence of structural linguistics and audiolingualism in sway during the 1950s, this book consisted of nearly 150 different transformation exercises for a multitude of discrete, decontextualized points of grammar and usage,
ranging from verb conjugations to the form of tag questions. Exercises generally consisted of 20-45 items with prompts and blank spaces beside them where the target grammar points (only) were to be transformed; complete sentences and punctuation were not required. The following review of “question form” illustrates what was asked of students (also see Appendix J.1):

. . . Practice changing these sentences to question form. In the blanks at the right, write the auxiliary verb (or the indicated form of the verb to be) followed by the subject of the sentence. Also include the main verb where one exists.

1. John will study in our group. (Will John study)
2. She can speak French well. _________
3. He is an American. _________
4. He may sit here. _________
5. They were tired after the dance. _________ . . . (Dixon, 1956, p. 22).

A considerable research literature has accumulated concerning the problems of “form-focused” instruction such as this (see, e.g., Doughty & J. Williams, 1998; Long, 1991), which Mr. Day, an industrial arts teacher by training, was understandably unaware of. He stated that he had incorporated this particular grammar component on the advice of Mr. Anderson, as a means “to reinforce what [the students] are seeing in the [reading] book” (TINT09: 261), although Mr. Day himself often told students (and me) that grammar was of central importance in L2 learning (cf. Bailey et al., 1996; Clark & Peterson, 1986; Crookes, 2003; J. C. Richards & Lockhart, 1996). As it turned out, this grammar component wound up becoming the one recurrent instructional activity that
most students in the class would come to reliably complete, given time in class to do so (see Chapter 9).

Ms. Ariel’s ESLL A class. Of all the teachers that I observed, Ms. Ariel used the widest variety of supplementary materials in her ELA 2W class (see Appendix I). These ranged from videos of major motion pictures – e.g., Rush hour (Birnbaum, Glickman, & Sarkissian, 1998); Kung pow: Enter the fist (Koranda, Marshal, & Odekerk, 2001); The wild Thornberrys movie (Csupo & Klaskey, 2002); The king of masks (Fong & Ho, 1999) – to reference materials and story books brought in from the school and local public libraries, to an array of new and old ESL textbooks that Mr. Anderson and Mr. Bradley had stored in their classrooms. For the videos, short stories, and occasional newspaper articles, Ms. Ariel usually created short worksheets concerning the main idea, some comprehension questions, and a few vocabulary words that required dictionary work. Textbooks were used primarily for grammar; however, rather than use a single textbook, as Mr. Day did, Ms. Ariel distributed mimeographed worksheets from a variety of texts, several of which, judging by their content, typeface, and accompanying illustrations, were intended for children. These included “review” exercises distributed to the whole class, such as “What is an adjective?” (ELA32Wdoc: E), a worksheet adorned with cartoons of dinosaurs that asked students to identify the adjectives that described

---

22 Mr. Anderson and Mr. Bradley had a variety of textbooks, new and old, ESLL and otherwise, stored in bookcases in their classrooms, most of which remained unused during the period of my research. They included “survival ESL” texts, English conversation books, anthologies of fiction and non-fiction, reading and composition texts, grammar books, several different (new) volumes of literature from the Pacific Islands (including Micronesia), as well as an excellent series concerning study skills, important concepts, key vocabulary, and more for ESL students in subject-area classes such as math, geography, history, and science. When I asked Mr. Anderson why the Pacific Islands books were not being used, he stated that they were of limited interest (not all students were Pacific Islanders) and were difficult anyway. When I asked about the subject-area ESL books, he stated he was using them in tutoring sessions during lunch and after school (MSCLU4fn: 203). However, I observed several of these sessions and never saw them used. As well, and unfortunately, only a tiny minority of students made use of these tutoring sessions, anyway.
underlined nouns in a list of sentences (e.g., "The word dinosaur means ‘terrible lizard.’"); an error correction worksheet (ELA41 WBarehand: C), with drawings of school books, an apple, pencils, and “ABC” in block letters across the top that required students to identify and correct errors in sentence pairs (e.g., “a. did chad like the brown bear  b. the bear he did tricks.” which needed to be corrected to “a. Did Chad like the brown bear?  b. The bear did tricks.”) (see Appendix 1.7 for an example worksheet); and worksheets distributed to the advanced L2 students on more difficult topics, such as distinguishing between “action verbs and linking verbs” (ELA32 WMaria: H) and conjugating different verb tense/aspect combinations (ELA32 WMaria: J). Ms. Ariel also used similar textbook materials to teach reading skills such as determining the main idea of a paragraph or short passage. In “The Zoo Newspaper” (ELA42 WSouLi: D) and “Summer Fun” (ELA42 WRaven: C), for example, students were to underline sentences containing the main ideas of several short (three to five sentence) “articles” (extra credit was to make an illustration of one of the articles), while in “What’s it all about?”, students were to write in their own words the main idea of a short paragraph (see Appendix 1.6 for an example worksheet). For example:

... 3. My mother bought me a skateboard. It was shiny green. It had black wheels with green shiny centers. It could go fast or slow. It could tip down in front, or in the back, and even on the sides. When I came to cracks in the sidewalk, I hardly felt a thing. It was the greatest gift ... (ELA41 WRaven: F).

Below this was a line on which to write the main idea of the passage; Raven, a 9th grade G1.5 student (and avid surfer) who had spent his entire formal schooling in US schools, wrote “New skateboard.”
Of the ESLL teachers I observed, Ms. Ariel also had students write in journals most frequently. For much of the second semester, she had students do this for between 20-30 minutes every class that I observed (journals were assigned intermittently in the first semester). Journal prompts included topics such as “My New Year’s resolution,” “If you had a million dollars, what would you do?”, “Should the US go to war with Iraq?”, “Free writing,” and “Something I’m interested in and want to learn” (see Appendix M for examples of student written products).

Ms. Cheney’s ESLL A & ESLL B classes. Ms. Cheney also drew from a range of materials for her supplementary curriculum, although in general contrast to Ms. Ariel, her choice of assignments did not appear to be given in an obvious order or for apparent reasons, in what Kadooka (2001, pp. 28-29) has called “an absence of [curricular] continuity” (see Appendix L). This was particularly the case with Ms. Cheney, as in both classes that I observed, the children’s reading books were usually abandoned at some point in the latter half of a quarter (i.e., neither class ever finished a book they had been assigned). On a given day, students could have been assigned work related to the children’s books as described above, or any number of the following: reading and discussing in groups a newspaper article, such as about “tongue clipping” in Korea (ELA22Xfn: 18) or student elections at school (e.g., ELB21Ufn: 598-606); discussing controversial issues in the news such as the words “under God” in the Pledge of Allegiance (ELA22Xfn: 185); playing “getting to know you” ice-breaker games (mid-semester) like “snake memory” (ELA12Xfn: 60-98); writing paragraphs about topics such as “What America means to me” (ELB11Ufn: 27), or, as happened in one memorable class, doing an assignment to simply “write 100 words” (ELA21Xfn: 153);
doing vocabulary exercises, including one that required students to look up the names of 50 different fruits and vegetables (e.g., ELA22Xfn: 100); writing resumes and cover letters (ELB12Ufn: 261-275); using reading and grammar worksheets to practice for the ESLL placement and Hawai‘i Content and Performance Standards (HCPS) II tests\(^2\); and doing pronunciation and intonation exercises such as the following, for which students over two class sessions were to practice and discuss the differences in meaning of:

I didn't say she stole the money.
I didn't say she stole the money.
I didn't say she stole the money.
I didn't say she stole the money.
I didn't say she stole the money.
I didn’t say she stole the **money**. (ELA12Xfn: 197-204)

Ms. Cheney also allowed her PTT, Ms. Meredith, to teach a variety of lessons, which centered on common grammar points, and occasionally the *Hooked on phonics* reading program for children, the latter of which was usually assigned to the less L2 proficient students in class.

**US holidays worksheets.** With the approach of holidays during the school year, teachers in every ESLL class that I observed prepared worksheets for their students about them. Most were drawn from Kennedy’s (1995) *Celebrate with us: A beginning ESL reader of holidays and festivals* (see Appendix H.7), a book with units on many holidays celebrated in the US, including the following, which were all covered in the ESLL classes I observed: Labor Day, Veteran’s Day, Halloween, Thanksgiving, Christmas, New Year’s, Valentine’s Day, Mother’s Day, and Memorial Day. Each six- to eight-page unit

---
\(^2\) Ms. Cheney and Mr. Bradley were the only two ESLL teachers I observed who incorporated work dealing specifically with the ESLL placement and HCPS (later Hawai‘i State Assessment) tests in their classes. Mr. Bradley, who used test preparation activities as one sort of “filler” assignment (ELC11V: 126; see Chapter 9), tended to do it if there was nothing else to do in class, whereas Ms. Cheney usually did such work in the two or three weeks leading up to the tests.
consisted of a short, four or five paragraph introductory reading about the holiday, followed by a series of comprehension questions, vocabulary exercises, and writing and discussion activities (see Appendix J.5, J.6, and J.7 for an example). Classes were generally given the better part of one or two class sessions to do these worksheets, usually in pairs or individual seatwork.

The apparent intended audience for this particular holidays book suggests something about how the ESLL students who were assigned activities from it were structurally positioned in the ESLL curriculum. As can be seen in Appendix H.7, the title of the book, “CELEBRATE WITH US,” appears in capital letters on the cover, set above a (color) photograph of fireworks exploding in the night air, which itself is set against the broad red, white, and blue background of a US flag. The capitalized title suggest a possible play on the abbreviation for the United States, “US,” and the 1st person plural pronoun “us.” The use of the 1st person plural perspective to refer to “Americans” and the 2nd person to refer to the reader throughout the text further indicates that the intended audience of the book is cultural and linguistic outsiders (or Others: see Chapter 9) who are unfamiliar with US holidays. Thus through the use of this text, and others like it, ESLL students were positioned as newcomers repeatedly.

Projects. A final mainstay of ESLL supplementary curricula which also worked to position students as cultural and linguistic outsiders was the “project.” Each ESLL class I observed had students engage in a varying number of projects, from one or sometimes two per quarter in Mr. Bradley’s and Mr. Day’s classes, to three or more per quarter in Ms. Ariel’s class. Projects could take parts of class periods over a one week time span (i.e., two or three class hours) to entire sessions over two or even three weeks
(i.e., 12-15 class hours). Most involved a considerable amount of artwork, with crayon drawings, collages, dioramas, and the like counting for one-third to one-half of the project grade. A one- or two-page written product, usually a summary of some sort of research about the topic (often simply downloaded from the internet and turned in verbatim), and an oral report to be given in front of the class, generally counted for the remainder. This suggests that L2 oracy (i.e., in terms of classroom presentations), in addition to artwork, superseded considerations about L2 literacy (especially since “summaries” were often simply downloaded from the internet; see Chapter 9).

Topics for the projects included the “School Brochure Project,” which had students summarize in a self-designed pamphlet introductory information about Tradewinds (year of founding, school colors, school song, etc.); the “Map Project,” where students drew maps and wrote directions from school to their homes; the “Heroes Project” that asked students to write and illustrate pictures about a hero in their lives; the “Ohana Project,” where students wrote and illustrated information about their families (see Appendix I.1 for the handout); the “Flag Project,” which had students research, write about, and draw the flags from “their countries”; the “Pop-Up Holiday Project,” for which students were to research, write about, and construct a diorama for a holiday again from “their countries”; the “Comic Book Project,” which required students to draw a six-frame comic summary of the reading book for the quarter (see Appendix J.2 for the handout); and the “Fairy Tale Project,” for which students were to read a fairy tale and then adapt it for an illustrated story book they were to draw (see Appendix I.3 for the handout). As I discuss in Chapter 9 and 10, many of these projects were informed by

Kadooka (2001) notes a similar proclivity for drawing pictures and coloring in her study of a high school ESLL program in Hawai‘i; also see Chapter 9.
rather superficial notions of multiculturalism (cf. Banks, 2001; May, 1999), linguicism (Phillipson, 1992; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000a, 2000b; Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 1994), essentialism, and a nationalist language ideology (Woolard, 1998), which thus cast ESLL students as cultural and linguistic Others (Talmy, 2004a). This is a manifestation of what I call "FOBeing," a topic which I take up in some depth in Chapter 9 and 10.\(^{25}\)

Of some import is not just what was taught in the ESLL classes, but what was not. Despite the emphasis on reading, and suspending comment for a moment on the content of what was read, I observed little reading strategy instruction, or more preferably, instruction in "strategic reading" (Grabe & Stoller, 2001), despite considerable research indicating its effectiveness, particularly for ESL students in high school (see Chamot & O'Malley, 1994; Ediger, 2001; cf. Day & Bamford, 1998; Grabe, 1993; 2004; Grabe & Stoller, 2001). As well, even though summarizing was a key feature of writing assignments in the ESLL classes, there was little instruction over the course of this study that explicitly taught students how to – and perhaps most importantly – what to summarize (cf. Appendix M). In fact, a review of teachers’ corrections of students’ summaries in Mr. Bradley’s and Ms. Ariel’s classes indicated that they were used more as a check that students had done the readings, rather than how they had summarized them. Minimal attention was given to forms of writing beyond summaries, too, meaning that students were consistently reproducing other people’s words, ideas, and perspectives (often verbatim, despite teachers’ directives to do otherwise) rather than synthesizing, critiquing, and transforming them to establish their own (cf. Atkinson & Ramanathan, 1995). Journal writing certainly should have a place in the (L2) classroom (see, e.g.,

\(^{25}\) As I discuss in Chapters 2, FOB stands for “fresh off the boat”; the practice of FOBeing refers to the positioning of ESLL students as exoticized cultural and linguistic Others.
Elbow & Belanoff, 2003; Leki, 1998, among many others), but not as the only type of writing that provides students with the opportunity to develop their thoughts, forms of written self-expression, and the L2 (cf. LeNoue, 2000). Because there was no use of (post) process writing pedagogy in these classes (Atkinson, 2003; Hyland, 2003; Trimbur, 1994), the ideas that were generated in journals remained there, the unrevisited products of “brainstorming” sessions that were looked over once by the teacher toward the end of the semester and graded, not so much for their content or evidence of L2 English literacy abilities or development, but that they had been done at all. Finally, although vocabulary had a central place in the ESLL curriculum, and though it was drawn from the books that students were to be reading, the form of and the emphasis on the vocabulary quizzes promoted rote memorization (cf. Moir & Nation, 2002). I saw few attempts to teach vocabulary learning strategies such as inferencing, use of vocabulary notebooks, or the like (DeCarrico, 2001; Read, 2004; N. Schmitt, 1997); instead, students were consistently referred to dictionaries as the source for word definitions (cf. Appendix M). Regarding this latter point, no instruction about how to use dictionaries was provided: thus, on many occasions, students unversed in dictionary skills struggled to use them correctly. In fact, with the notable exception of vocabulary and grammar, there was little explicit instruction of any kind relating to L2 English in the ESLL classes I observed. Instead “instruction” primarily involved instructions, that is, going over the directions for class work that students had been assigned.

I have briefly outlined above some of the central curriculum components in the ESLL classes that I observed over the period of my fieldwork at Tradewinds. I should note that despite the heterogeneity of classrooms resulting from the ESLL placement
policy described earlier, there was generally only one curriculum in each of these classes, that is, there were not multiple curricula, nor much "differentiated instruction" (e.g., Gregory & Chapman, 2002; Tomlinson, 1999) in respective classes that was aimed at addressing the needs of students with a wide range in L1/L2 proficiencies and literacy abilities. Students in nearly all of the ESLL classes I observed were given the same books, the same assignments, the same activities, the same tests, each with the same demands and deadlines. Thus, a common complaint I heard from long-term and advanced ESLL students was that classwork was either too easy or that they had completed similar assignments in earlier grades, sometimes repeatedly (see Chapter 8). Much like the placement policy described above, the undifferentiated curriculum implied an undifferentiated group of learners, a monolithic "ESLL student." As will become clear in subsequent chapters, one of the recurring activities that students engaged in, in their ESLL classes, was to differentiate themselves in ways that the school, the ESLL program, the curriculum, and NCLB never did.

Two small but important exceptions to this were Ms. Cheney’s ELA 1X class, which late in the school year was finally split into four different groups, to good effect, and the ELA 2W class, in which Ms. Ariel tried assigning material that was ostensibly better suited to the Micronesian students with interrupted formal educations in the class. In terms of material, Ms. Cheney’s used shorter (but not necessarily easier) books with the lower students; Ms. Ariel provided worksheets and workbooks on spelling, the alphabet, basic vocabulary (e.g., days of the week), and functions such as telling time. Ms. Cheney was relatively successful in implementing her more differentiated curriculum, even though the books were never completed, but Ms. Ariel, despite her best intentions, was not. Toward the end of the third quarter (second semester), she largely ended any principled attempt at providing these students with an alternative curriculum. This was due at least in part to the difficulty of running what were in fact two very different classes simultaneously, with minimal instructional support. Unfortunately, an unintended consequence of Ms. Ariel’s efforts was that a form of intra-class segregation resulted, as the more L2 proficient Micronesian students were assigned as language brokers for the low L2 proficient Micronesian students. This led to a situation in which more often than not, all the Micronesian students in the class would be seated off to the side of the classroom, ostensibly working together, even after the alternative curriculum intended for them was gradually phased out (see Talmy, 2005, for more on Micronesian students at Tradewinds).
Structural productions of ESLL

In her ethnography of a high school ESLL program in Hawai‘i, Kadooka (2001) describes how ESLL came to be realized by teachers there as what one instructor, Mr. Brown, euphemistically termed “a different kind of academics.” Mr. Brown made this statement during an illustrative comparison between history J-section classes and their A-track counterparts, both of which he taught. In the honors classes, Mr. Brown indicated that he expected students to demonstrate “critical thinking” and advanced analytic ability; in his J-sections, he expectations minimally concerned comprehension of “main ideas or basic concepts” (Kadooka, 2001, p. 27). To this end, his “preferred instructional strategy” for teaching history in his J-section classes was showing videos of Hollywood feature films in class, for example, *Gladiator* (Franzoni, Lustig, & Wick, 2000) for ancient Rome, *The Mummy* (Daniel, 1999) for Egypt, and *Braveheart* (Davey, Gibson, & Ladd Jr., 1995) for Scotland (p. 30); a “different kind of academics,” indeed (cf. Schleppegrell, 2001, 2004).

As the brief discussion of the ESLL program curriculum above suggests, a similar characterization could be made of ESLL at Tradewinds. Considering Eisenhart’s (1996) and Nespor’s (1990) discussion of curricular “density” and “tightness,” this had potentially serious implications for ESLL students. What types of educational experiences and forms of knowledge were made available for students in the Tradewinds ESLL program that made it “a different kind of academics” (cf. Schleppegrell, 2001, 2004)? What “historically specific models of schooled identity” were endorsed and made available for ESLL students in a program that had them reading four, five, or six years below grade level? What were the formal, “official” conceptions of ESLL in a
curriculum that consistently positioned students as young children, as cultural and linguistic Others? What was, in short, the institutional context within and against which cultural productions of ESLL would come to be made?

In terms of the ESLL program’s organization and institutional relationships, ESLL was structurally produced in various ways: by the program’s singular place and marked status in the Tradewinds curriculum as a “required elective”; by J-section classes as the lowest ability-group track, metaphorically located “beneath” their A-, B-, and C-track mainstream counterparts; by the notable absence of communication between ESLL and the rest of the school, even with departments housing J-section courses; by the fact that J-section and ESLL dangler teachers’ subject-area affiliations overrode those of the ESLL program; and by the program’s lack of integration with the rest of the school. These particular structural productions were augmented by the administrative policy of assigning ESLL danglers (and some J-sections) to (junior) faculty who often had little background in L2 learning or teaching. In these terms, the structural productions of ESLL at Tradewinds signified an isolated, subordinate, low-prestige program: an afterthought or late-arriving add-on to pre-existing institutional arrangements, which did not quite fit into them. The program’s awkward intra-institutional relationships suggested that it was, as Harklau (1994a, p. 244) has put it, “a necessary nuisance” for the high school, a federally-mandated compensatory program whose existence was tolerated when it was not ignored.27

27 It is well worth pointing out that the structurally-encoded low prestige and marginality of ESLL at Tradewinds is not only similar to that of ESL programs in other schools (Grabe, 2004; Harklau, 1994a; Johnson, 1996; Kadooka, 2001; McKay & Wong, 1996), but has been documented as extending to ESL and ESL teacher education programs at the university level (Ramanathan, Davies, & Schleppegrell, 2001).
The ESLL curriculum structurally produced ESLL in ways that reflected, and helped to (re)produce, the program's institutional standing: marginal, marked, and unintegrated with the school. This was most clearly evident in the choice of children's novels as the centerpiece of the ESLL curriculum, as these books, and many of the activities that derived from them, were well below high school grade level and too often had tangential relevance to (mainstream) high school academics and/or L2 learning. Aside from this, and in stark contrast to other required (i.e., core) courses, the fact that the curriculum was not codified in some form suggested that it did not need to be, a point underscored by the absence of ESLL standards. During the period of my research, this meant that the unelaborated elements of ESLL curricula for a large number of ESLL classes were in the hands of three inexperienced teachers, two of whom had little background in L2 teaching. The lack of a written, codified ESLL curriculum, and the absence of ESLL standards, thus resulted in considerable variability in terms of what was made available for learning across sections, as these teachers had little to rely on but "commonsense" intuitions about L2 teaching and learning, likely based in their own experiences as L2 learners (cf. Bailey et al., 1996, pp. 14-16; Clark & Peterson, 1986; Crookes, 2003, Chapter 7; J. C. Richards & Lockhart, 1996, Chapter 2). Therefore the lack of codified ESLL curriculum and standards may have signified a "commonsense" belief about ESLL itself: that if one speaks English, one is automatically qualified to teach it, and therefore needs no explicit curriculum. Such a perspective would virtually ensure a continuing cycle of ESLL inconsequentiality and marginality within the school.

Of particular consequence to students was how ESLL student identity was structurally produced through the ESLL curriculum. In terms of the forms of knowledge
that were made available through the ESLL curriculum, students were variously constructed as a more or less undifferentiated group of recently-arrived, cultural and linguistic Others, a structural manifestation of “FOBeing.” In contrast to the J-section and mainstream classes, the lack of curricular continuity in the ESLL classes – ESLL classes did not require any particular kind of previous curricular knowledge since it was evidently unknown – indicated that students had not had much previous schooling in the US that could be usefully or dependably incorporated into class instruction. Beyond the implication that ESLL students could not meet the linguistic demands of on-grade-level material, and by extension, the substantive and conceptual demands of it as well, the centrality of children’s novels in the ESLL curriculum signaled an apparent supposition that students wouldn’t have read such books in earlier grades, perhaps wouldn’t mind or wouldn’t understand what the intended audience for these books was, and wouldn’t have connections to the wider school population, who most likely would. The use of activities, materials, and projects that many G1.5 students maintained they had completed in earlier grades, sometimes repeatedly (e.g., family trees, the Fairy Tale Project, lessons on holidays, etc.), further signaled that ESLL students were conceived as recent arrivals, as did the implicit assumption (evident, e.g., in the “project” assignments) that students both knew about and identified with the cultures, customs, and languages of “their” countries, and would be amenable to efforts to incorporate them into ESLL curricula (cf. Duff, 2002). As well, vocabulary and grammar instruction (both in terms of what was and was not taught) appeared based on the supposition that ESLL students had had the benefit of continuous formal schooling in their L1s, had already acquired such basic skills as how to use a dictionary, and were generally print-literate in and had a metalinguistic
understanding of their L1s. And finally, ESLL placement policies and curricula signaled that ESLL students were essentially the same, with negligible differences in L1 and L2 proficiencies, educational backgrounds, or needs, a conception also advanced beyond local levels (e.g., with NCLB).

Before concluding, I would like to point out that on the one hand, it is entirely understandable that students who are identified as needing ESLL be required to take ESLL courses. These programs are intended to promote language minority students’ academic success, and prevent their failure, in an educational system that is too often oblivious to their needs. In this regard, the attempt to make school curriculum accessible to language minority students across three different subject-areas, with the additional support of dedicated ESLL classes is highly commendable, and I in no way intend to diminish the commitment or efforts of Tradewinds administrators and ESLL teachers. On the other hand, however, because students with ESLL designations were effectively “broken up and taken away” from mainstream peers and classrooms (Toohey, 1998, 2000), for up to half of the four years they were to spend at the high school, one must ask whether the forms of knowledge, learning, and educational experience that were made “accessible” in the marginalized and isolated ESLL program helped or hindered students; if the program worked to integrate students into the school or kept them segregated; if curricular “density” and “tightness” were in fact desirable; or if, despite the best intentions of teachers, these classes wound up becoming repositories of lowered expectations, reduced requirements, and decreased demands – as warehouses for the academically undesirable.
This is not to suggest that the ESLL curriculum was a static, unilateral, top-down accomplishment, or that isolation and marginalization were guaranteed. As the subsequent chapters on the cultural production of ESLL will seek to demonstrate, in fact, students played a key role in the way that the curriculum was realized in the everyday life of their ESLL classrooms, that is, they were central players in its co-construction. I also in no way mean to suggest that ESLL programs should be eliminated: *just the opposite*, short of fully bilingual classes, they are urgently needed for language minority students. However, if they function as academic ghettos, virtually ensuring that students enrolled within them will lag behind their mainstream peers, then they directly contradict their stated purpose to provide equal educational opportunity, serving instead as structural impediments that work toward the reproduction rather than the elimination of linguistic, academic, and ultimately, social inequalities.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, I have described certain “structural productions” of ESLL at Tradewinds High School in order to provide a context within and against which cultural productions of ESLL were produced. I have done so by examining certain intra-institutional relationships between the ESLL program and subject-area departments, ESLL program organization and policies, and by providing a brief overview of the ESLL curriculum. I have argued that ESLL was structurally produced as a marginal program that was unintegrated with the rest of the school and that made available to students forms of knowledge and educational experiences that contradicted the program’s express purpose of facilitating ESLL students’ transition into the mainstream (*Tradewinds Course*
Description Manual, MSCNEdoc: A; see Chapter 8). I have also argued that contrary to demographic actualities, the structural production of ESLL student identity was of an undifferentiated group of cultural and linguistic Others, recently-arrived incompetents who could not meet the linguistic, substantive, or conceptual demands of material beyond that written for young children. In this regard, ESLL intra-institutional relationships, program organization and policies, and curricula were, in broad terms, mutually reinforcing.

I conclude here by noting that the outline of the structural forces producing “ESLL” that I have described above is but an outline. However partial, though, I hope to have indicated the extent to which these broad structural productions penetrated various aspects of “being ESLL” at Tradewinds. I also would like to note that this is but one part of the story: the chapters that follow shall describe how students accommodated, resisted, and otherwise negotiated these particular structural productions of ESLL, how they variously did or did not take up the formal “official,” or dominant, definitions of ESLL identity at Tradewinds. Before embarking on that discussion, however, the marginality of ESLL, as variously encoded in local school structures, was also signaled in the ways that teachers and students spoke about ESLL at Tradewinds, the significance of which I shall turn to next.

28 Greater detail and more specificity would reveal more nuance and complexity, but would also require significantly more time and space for discussion. Although my data in this area are extensive, the structural productions of ESLL provide the larger context for the cultural productions of ESLL; they are therefore more usefully discussed in detail in subsequent chapters when I examine specific instances in the cultural productions of ESLL.
CHAPTER 8: DISCOURSE, DEFICIENCY, AND DIFFERENCE: TEACHERS AND STUDENTS REPRESENT ESLL

_They say ESLL is meant to help mainstream the kids. But I think a lot of it is to keep them out of the regular classes and out of the other teachers' hair because they wouldn't know what to do with them . . . . So I think it's become sort of a – in a way, a dumping ground for kids that they don't want to deal with._

Ms. Ariel, ESLL teacher (TINT08: 148-149)

_Iz laik bin in sevn gred wen ai go in daet klaes. Rimain mi baek tu da sevn gred () o baek tu da fif gred._

It's like being in the seventh grade when I go to that class. It reminds me of the seventh grade (.) or the fifth grade.

Ioane, 11th grade G1.5 ESLL student (SINT15: 54)

**Introduction**

In this chapter, I initiate analysis into ESLL teacher and generation 1.5 (G1.5) student representational practices of the ESLL program and the social identity category of “ESLL student” at Tradewinds High school, using mostly formal interview data. I undertake this analysis in order to provide, from the perspectives of ESLL teachers and students, a local school context within which to site the ESLL program, as well as to see the mutually informing, interdiscursively mediated relationships between the semiotic and linguistic properties of these representations and linguicism as manifest in what I argue are the discourses about ESLL in circulation in the high school and wider society (Fairclough, 1989, 1995, 2001). Additionally, this chapter lays the groundwork for a discussion that I shall be taking up throughout the remaining chapters of the dissertation, which centers
around two broad sets of competing cultural productions of “ESLL”: on the one hand, formal, school-sanctioned structural and cultural productions, which I shall gloss as “official” and “hegemonic,” as manifest in program organization, institutional relationships, curriculum, classroom instructional practice, defensive teaching accommodations (McNeil, 1986), and teachers’ representations; and a loosely assembled “alternative” G1.5 cultural productions of ESLL, as manifested in classroom resistance, performance strikes (Shor, 1992), and other communicative practices.¹

Teachers’ representations of ESLL are of interest for many reasons, not the least of which (though certainly not exclusively) is their propositional content, in that they provide some perspective on teachers’ orientations to the ESLL program. As research has shown, teachers’ expressed beliefs, or as Bartolomé and Trueba (2000) prefer, “teachers’ ideologies,” about students – and in this case, an entire program – can powerfully influence curriculum and instruction intended for them (Bartolomé & Trueba, 2000; Clark & Peterson, 1986; Dusek, 1985; Tauber, 1997; Weinstein, 2002). Perhaps more to the point, teachers’ representations of ESLL are of interest in that they provide

¹ I do not mean to reify school-sanctioned conceptions of identity when I call them “official” and “hegemonic.” Rather, I am attempting to distinguish between differing conceptions of a particular subject position (“ESLL student”) as evident in, e.g., school curricula, and as realized in subject positionings versus student responses to those positionings. Some might take issue with the implied reactivity and passivity of students here, and the privileging of institutional hegemony, but it is fair to say that without institutions, we would not have “ESLL students” or their responses to being positioned as “ESLL students.” In other words, institutions are authorized to label students and do so with significant consequences. This is not to suggest (as I make clear throughout the dissertation) that students lack power or agency, only that these are inextricably bound up in – are constrained and enabled by (Giddens, 1984) – being “officially” named and positioned as a particular category of student. In addition, some may find problematic the simple association of teachers with institution, which implies a stable and oversimplified consonance between the two, as if all teachers share the same goals as institutions, as well as a passive teacher population that lacks heterogeneity (cf. Levinson & Holland, 1996, p. 24). However, teachers are the school’s human face, so to speak, and they are authorized to instantiate and mediate school structures in crucial ways. The inevitable differences between teachers and their positionings of ESLL students – and of the range of student responses to those positionings – are prime subjects for ethnography, as I make clear in subsequent chapters (cf. Levinson et al., 1996; Willis, 1977).
some indication about the discourses circulating about the program at Tradewinds, particularly those that were sanctioned by the school in some way (cf. McKay & Wong, 1996). These discourses, I will argue, signify a notably deficit-orientation cohering around the identity category of ESLL, what I will call the linguicist “discourses of deficiency” about ESLL at Tradewinds.

G1.5 students’ representations of ESLL at Tradewinds are also of substantial interest, if only to compare and contrast with those of the teachers. In this respect, they allow analysis into what Thesen (1997, p. 488) calls “the tensions between the labelers and the labeled” (also see Fairclough, 1989). I look specifically at G1.5 students’ representations of the ESLL program for a number of reasons: first, as I have indicated earlier, and detail in Chapters 9 and 10, these students played a significant role in terms of what kinds of learning could and could not occur in the ESLL classrooms, such that at times, it was unclear whether the “official” cultural productions of ESLL were dominant in a given classroom or if G1.5 students’ oppositional cultural productions were instead. Examining G1.5 students’ representations of ESLL also provides further insight into the linguicist “discourses of deficiency” circulating about ESLL at Tradewinds, which indeed G1.5 Ss drew on and reproduced as they performed and indexed their differences from and resistance to ESLL (cf. Fairclough, 1989, 1995).

It is worthwhile to pause here and reiterate that my conceptualization of teacher and student social action (including representational practices) is situated in and derives from a social practice/cultural production theoretic, as outlined in Chapter 3. I do not conceptualize agency as an internal, intra-individual “trait” possessed by autonomous persons existing freely and independently of history, culture, politics, and/or social
context, but rather as social action that is always already mediated, informed, and shaped by the “rules and resources” in play in a particular sociocultural context (cf. Ahearn, 2001; Bourdieu, 1991; Giddens, 1979, 1984; O’Connor, 2001, 2003). Indeed, such an “individualist” theory of agency would run counter to my argument in this chapter (and others) about the “discourses of deficiency” of ESLL at Tradewinds. That is, in a slight reemphasis of my argument in Chapter 2, representations are not only constitutive of reality, but also expressive of it, signaling the circulation of discourses and representational practices in the wider social context, which participants did or did not take up, that is, which they were both subject of and subject to (cf. Fairclough, 1989, 1995, 2001; Foucault, 1972; S. Hall, 1996b, 1997b; McKay & Wong, 1996; Volosinov, 1973/1929; R. Williams, 1977). Central to my discussion below is the concept of “identity markedness” (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004). The notion of markedness, which derives from linguistics, as applied to identity “describe[s] the process whereby some social categories gain a special, normative status that contrasts with the identities of other groups, which are usually highly recognizable” (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 372). Unmarked identity categories are thus “less recognizable as identities” than marked ones because they appear “natural”: they are “the norm from which all [other identity categories] diverge.” Markedness therefore “implies hierarchy” (p. 372).

As I have suggested in the chapters above, at Tradewinds, one such “highly recognizable,” or “marked” identity was “ESLL student.” Its unmarked counterpart was “regular” or “mainstream student”; these correspond with a “non-native” and what Leung, Harris, & Rampton (1997) have called “the idealised native speaker.” As
Bucholtz & Hall (2004, p. 372) note, "marked identities are also ideologically associated with marked language: linguistic structures or practices that differ from the norm." In this regard, the role or function of language in identity hierarchies is analogous to its "symbolic power," as theorized by Bourdieu (e.g., 1991), whereby it works to locate speakers in social hierarchy. At Tradewinds, many of the ESL students spoke a marked variety of the dominant code; it is what marked them as ESL to begin with. That is, they were identified at Tradewinds by their linguistic "deficiencies," how they "fail[ed] to measure up to an implied or explicit standard" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 372).

Thus, as becomes evident in the discussion below, many of the teachers' and G1.5 students' representations of ESLL, and the linguist discourses of deficiency about it, variously draw on an assumed mainstream/ESLL identity hierarchy at Tradewinds, with an unmarked "native" English speaker counterposed against a marked "non-native" English speaker. I argue that due to a "nationalist language ideology" (Woolard, 1998) that was in play at the high school, an ideology in which language, culture, nation, and people were mapped onto one another in one-to-one correspondence, this identity hierarchy came to signify not only "native"/"non-native" English speaker and mainstream/ESLL, but also US-American/ Other, familiar/exotic, in-group/out-group, us/them (cf. Leung, Harris, & Rampton, 1997; Thesen, 1997; also see Chapter 9). As I argue throughout this study, the "marked" variants of these dichotomous, hierarchicalized identities converged in the subject position of "FOB," or "fresh off the boat," that is, a cultural and linguistic Other (Said, 1978) that ESLL students at Tradewinds were frequently positioned as (see Chapter 7).
Objectifying the Other: Representing ESLL deficiency

In formal and informal interviews over the course of this study, students and teachers characterized the ESLL program in ways that were remarkably consistent. In this section, I focus on the semiosis in the representations about the general purpose and status of ESLL at Tradewinds since these are, it turns out, acutely related, and since both wound up influencing what was taught and learned in Tradewinds ESLL classes. Descriptions of the ESLL program’s purpose tended to focus on the program’s transitional and assimilatory aims. Responses regarding the status of the program overwhelmingly signaled its low prestige, an evaluation which inevitably extended to the social category of “ESLL student” itself; teachers portrayed the program as remedial, while students frequently equated it with Special Education, the apparent cellar dweller in the high school social hierarchy. As I attempt to make clear throughout the study, I believe the institutional labeling practices that are so common in public schools are suspect and need to be seriously interrogated if not challenged outright (cf. McDermott, 1993; Mehan, 1993). This is no more true than for Special Education, where differences in terms of expected norms for student behavior, achievement, and so forth may be interpreted as deficiencies (see, e.g., MacSwan, 2000; McDermott, 1993; Valencia, 1997). It is also true for ESL, as the nexus of the two programs has historically proved to be too frequent, with language minority students disproportionately placed into Special Education (Baca & Cervantes, 1998; Baker, 2001; Haas, 1992). While this is not the place to enter into an extended discussion about Special Education or its “interface” with ESL (see, e.g., Baca & Cervantes, 1998; Baker, 2001; Valdés & Figueroa, 1994), I would like to state very clearly here that the negative valuations of Special Education by participants in this study, particularly in the equation by students of ESLL with Special Education, are not my own.

2 As I attempt to make clear throughout the study, I believe the institutional labeling practices that are so common in public schools are suspect and need to be seriously interrogated if not challenged outright (cf. McDermott, 1993; Mehan, 1993). This is no more true than for Special Education, where differences in terms of expected norms for student behavior, achievement, and so forth may be interpreted as deficiencies (see, e.g., MacSwan, 2000; McDermott, 1993; Valencia, 1997). It is also true for ESL, as the nexus of the two programs has historically proved to be too frequent, with language minority students disproportionately placed into Special Education (Baca & Cervantes, 1998; Baker, 2001; Haas, 1992). While this is not the place to enter into an extended discussion about Special Education or its “interface” with ESL (see, e.g., Baca & Cervantes, 1998; Baker, 2001; Valdés & Figueroa, 1994), I would like to state very clearly here that the negative valuations of Special Education by participants in this study, particularly in the equation by students of ESLL with Special Education, are not my own.
‘A dumping ground’: Teachers talk about ESLL

According to all of the teachers that I interviewed, the overall purpose of the ESLL program at Tradewinds was to prepare students for the transition into the mainstream. This is a theme echoed by the Tradewinds High School Course Description Manual (MSCNEdoc: A), which states that the ESLL program’s mission was to “enable [ESLL students] to participate effectively in the regular program of studies.” Mr. Anderson, the ESLL coordinator, used an illustrative metaphor to describe the program, when he called it “a bridge.”

(8.1) A bridge [TINT18: 142-148]^3

1 Mr. Anderson: {ESLL} is supposed to, like – it’s a foreign language for the student, the immigrant student. It’s supposed to help them I guess, with different needs, but to help the school, as a student, adjust into the mainstream of the school. I think that is one of the main focus of ESL.
3 ST: To get students ready for the mainstream?
5 Mr. Anderson: Right.
7 ST: Is it fair to say then that it’s uh=
9 Mr. Anderson: =A bridge.

Mr. Anderson’s comments here point to a common representation not just about the ESLL program at Tradewinds, but about ESL programs across institutions of formal learning. The expressive value of ESLL as a “bridge” to the mainstream suggests that it plays a “service role” (Benesch, 2001, p. xvi) to the content area departments of the

---

^3 Transcript conventions can be found in Appendix G. Interview transcripts have been edited for readability.
school, rather than is a subject matter course in itself, ostensibly “equipping” students with the requisite skills they would need in order to function adequately in “regular” classes (cf. Pennycook, 1990). As Benesch (1993, 2001) has detailed, this is a common perception of ESL programs, so common, indeed, that perhaps most ESL teachers would see it as merely commonsense. Benesch, however, in her important work in critical English for academic purposes, argues that such a perspective is problematic, describing it as informed by an “accommodationist politics of pragmatism” (1993, p. 706), pragmatism here used in a pejorative, instrumentalist sense. The “dominant goal” of ESL from this perspective is “to adapt students to the existing curriculum” (p. 712) and thus, “to adapt [them] to the status quo” (p. 714). Such an accommodationist ideology serves as an “endorsement of traditional academic teaching and of current power relations in academia and society” (p. 711; also see Bartolome & Trueba, 2000). Mr. Anderson alludes to this ideology when he notes, in lines 3-4, that the purpose of ESL is “to help the school, as a student, adjust into the mainstream of the school,” highlighting, in a rather awkward construction, that it is the school that that will benefit from students’ adjustment; he iterates this in line 11, when he notes that it’s not “just the school” that benefits, but society as well. Here he also makes the macro connection that Benesch (1993, 2001) maintains is implied in a pragmatic view of ESL, when he states that the assimilatory function of ESLL extends beyond the school to society.

The metaphor of “bridge” (cf. Fairclough, 1989) is an interesting one in terms of what it suggests about movement, traversal: of a divide that separates two distinct entities, which would otherwise remain unconnected, isolated. According to the Tradewinds teacher participants, the divide that the ESLL program spanned between
ESLL students and the mainstream at Tradewinds consisted primarily of English proficiency, study skills, and cultural knowledge of US society and school practices. Those who lacked one or more of these, as indicated by a combination of scores on the English proficiency test used at Tradewinds (the Language Assessment Scales [LAS]; see Chapter 7), a minimum of a 2.0 (or “C”) grade point average, no grade below “D” in a core content class, and the ESLL teacher’s recommendation, remained classified as ESLL students; those able to “pass” the LAS and meet other exit criteria were likewise able to “pass” over the “bridge” and into the mainstream to become “regular” students (Kawaguchi, 2002). The normative or “unmarked” (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004) status accorded the mainstream, encoded most obviously in the term “mainstream” (or more commonly “regular”) itself, suggests a lack of prestige associated with any non-mainstream or “marked” corollary: in this case, ESLL. The eminence (and appeal) of the mainstream is further signified by the implied unidirectionality of the trajectory across the “bridge,” and as its status as the ultimate and desired goal of ESLL.

The themes of traversal, transition, and assimilation that are sounded in Mr. Anderson’s comments above (and in the Tradewinds High School Course Description Manual) are elaborated by Ms. Frank, the Life Sciences J teacher.

---

4 Students classified as ESLL receive designations of non-English proficient (NEP), limited English proficient (LEP), and two varieties of fully/fluent English proficient (FEP). FEP1 students have met all exit criteria and can be exited from the program, after which course grades are to be monitored for two years. FEP2 students are those who have met LAS exit scores but not one or more of the remaining exit criteria (Kawaguchi, 2002).
What do you think is the purpose of ESL in a high school like this?

Hopefully it's a transition for them from their, you know, culture to American culture. And being able to make it a more comfortable transition for them than just, you know, like baptism by fire . . . like in {a mainstream} class. Tough. Okay? You know what I'm saying?

So, they get to be babied for two years in ESL science and then after that they gotta go out to the real world.

The hierarchy in the mainstream/ESL dualism is implicated in the association here of “real world” to the mainstream. Clearly suggested is that ESL is somehow not the “real world”; how it might not be is variously signified, perhaps most clearly by the assertion that students are “babied” in the program’s classes as they make the transition from “their culture to American culture.” This transition is evidently a painful one, however, as implied by Ms. Frank’s choice of “baptism by fire” to describe ESL students’ submersion into an all-English learning environment. ESL apparently is to ameliorate this pain, making the transition “more comfortable,” easier, or, to use the term applied to the J-classes at Tradewinds, “sheltered.”

The choice of “babied” is suggestive of another representation commonly made by Tradewinds ESL and mainstream students: that ESL classes were “childish” (see below; also see Chapter 7). From my time at Tradewinds, this was in fact a widely held perception of ESL at the school, leading Ms. Ariel, one of the first-year ESLL teachers, to comment about what she perceived was the public appraisal of the program: “people ( . . . ) think it’s ‘lite.’ Like they’re easy classes” (TINT08: 187). Indeed, the use of
children's novels in the ESLL curriculum can be seen as contributing to (or perhaps, as being an outcome of) this particular discourse about ESLL at the high school.

Also of note in Extract 8.2 is the conceptualization of a singular ESL student culture (line 2), which, in accord with the Tradewinds ESLL placement policy and curriculum (see Chapter 7) and the category of ESL in No Child Left Behind (see Chapter 6), signifies a monolithic ESL student. As well, “their culture” recalls the nationalist language ideology I have argued is so salient at Tradewinds, with country, culture, language, and personal identity mapped seamlessly and unambiguously onto one another (also see Chapters 9 and 10). “Their culture” is additionally contrasted with “American culture,” also represented in the singular, in ways that further invoke both a conception of ESL students as Other, as well as the mainstream/ESLL identity hierarchy. Finally, students’ transition to “American culture” is articulated as inevitable and ultimately, total, denying both the potential for student agency – agency is imputed to the ESLL program not the student (see below) – or for hybridity or complexity in identity.

Both of these extracts indicate that the semiotic properties of these representations are interdiscursively mediated, that is, “that what is going on socially is, in part what is going on interdiscursively in the text” such that discourses about ESLL in the wider context materialize and are thereby reproduced in the semiotic features of these representations (Fairclough, 2001, p. 240). This is further elaborated in a response that Ms. Enders, the long-time Social Studies J teacher, provided to a question about what she saw as the differences between J-section and “regular” classes:
Ms. Enders’ comments concerning what she viewed as the three major differences between J-classes and their mainstream counterparts, evoke those of both Ms. Frank, about ESLL students being “babied,” and Ms. Ariel, about the program being “lite,” and in this respect are also indicative of how these themes figure in the larger discourses about ESLL at Tradewinds (Fairclough, 1989, 1995, 2001). The remarks in lines 4-6 about using a “very limited” vocabulary in the J-classes suggest not only how, in one regard, the classes were much easier, but also a possible reason for why this was: that the students were cognitively incapable of a broader range of more challenging vocabulary work because it might “jam up the kids’ mind.” This is also sounded in terms of the pacing of the classes: “slow. So slow!”, with the analogy that students “cannot run yet; let them walk, walk slowly.”, terms and imagery used frequently in reference to young

---

5 The Great Mahele concerned the Hawaiian Monarchy’s apportionment of Hawaiian lands in the mid-19th Century for private ownership. Although intended for Hawaiian “commoners,” by the late 1800s, haole businessmen and missionaries wound up owning 90% of the lands (see Chinen, 1994).
children and novices. Finally, the statement that students cannot see the various “connections” with “higher concepts” implies that course content is limited to apparently “lower” concepts. The conflation of seeming low L2 proficiency with a lack of intelligence is clear; indeed, this too, was part of the larger discourses about ESLL and ESLL students at Tradewinds (see below).

As mentioned earlier, these points bring to mind an argument made often in the literature on teacher expectancies, about how “teachers’ ideologies” (Bartolome & Trueba, 2000) about students can influence curriculum and instruction (Bartolome & Trueba, 2000; Clark & Peterson, 1986; Dusek, 1985; Tauber, 1997; Weinstein, 2002). They also are indicative of the ways that discourse is not only expressive, but formative of reality (Fairclough, 1989, 1995, 2001; S. Hall, 1996c, 1997a, 1997b; Mudimbe, 1988; Said, 1978; Volosinov, 1973/1929; R. Williams, 1977). Indeed, as discussed in Chapter 7, the focus on (a limited) vocabulary, the slow pacing, and the prevalence of assignments such as worksheets, which required of students little cognitive effort to complete, were, in addition to children’s books and other components, curricular mainstays in the ESLL and J-section classes that I observed (also see Kadooka, 2001; LeNoue, 2000). The representations above of the purpose of ESLL, as a compensatory program designed to shield cultural and linguistic naives from the rigors of “real” learning, suggest much about the program’s relative status: an easy, unchallenging, if friendly, program (cf. Harklau, 1994a, 2000; Kadooka, 2001; Leki, 1999; McKay & Wong, 1996). In this respect, ESLL at Tradewinds was frequently equated with another well-known and equally stigmatized compensatory program intended for a select population at the high school: Special Education.
The association of ESLL with Special Education was the single most prevalent, enduring, and frankly, exasperating discourse about ESLL at Tradewinds, made mainly by students, both mainstream and ESLL. This is not to denigrate Special Education in any way, only to state that the aims of the two programs and the populations they serve are vastly different (although a student can, of course, be placed in both). The source of annoyance for several ESLL teachers – and for me – derived from the ignominy associated with Special Education at Tradewinds as the domain of “dummies,” the implication being that because ESLL students presumably lacked L2 proficiency, they were “dummies,” too. Thus, the negative evaluations of and association with Special Education as a program inevitably extended to the ESLL students themselves. Ms. Ariel, one of the first-year ESLL teachers, grew considerably frustrated with this particular representational practice as it was repeated throughout the school year, as the following extract suggests:

(8.4) *Completely bollocks* [TINT08: 199-206]

1 ST: What do you think is like a – a general perception of ESL in the high school? . . .
3 Ms. Ariel: I have the feeling from ESL students that it’s thought of as Special Ed.
5 ST: Yeah, I hear that a lot.
7 Ms. Ariel: You know, not a very smart class, you’re not smart if you’re in ESL, which is completely bollocks. Because, you know, send anyone to a foreign country and see how they fare, you know? It’s a funny
9 perception, I don’t really understand it.

Of some interest in this extract is the apparent source of Ms. Ariel’s asserted understanding about (and frustration with) ESL being equated with Special Education in
the high school: as she says in line 3, it comes “from ESL students.” On the one hand, this suggests that ESLL students were aware of the “ESLL = Special Education” discourse in circulation in the wider school context, and, as I shall elaborate below, were contributors to it as well. Yet, on the other, it appears equally clear that Ms. Ariel attributes the locus of this particular discourse not to ESLL students but to those, as indicated in lines 7-9, who have apparently never been to a foreign country and fared in an L2 in school: that is, it would seem, mainstream or Local students. It is arguable that Ms. Ariel is suggesting a possible relation here between ESLL and mainstream students, whereby the former group is apprenticed to the discourses of ESLL by the latter.

Indeed, as I detail below, those ESLL students who most frequently made the assertion that ESLL was the same as Special Education – in Ms. Ariel’s class, in all the ESLL classes I observed – were G1.5 students: this particular representational practice was in fact part of the “shared repertoire” of the G1.5 community of practice (CoP), one way these students indexed their differences from lower L2 proficient and newcomer classmates, who thereby became the “real” ESLL students. That is, Ms. Ariel’s comments here allude to a central finding of this study: that the multiple (mainstream and Local) cultural and (L2 English) linguistic resources that G1.5 students gained from their associations and affiliations with communities outside of ESLL were drawn on, utilized, and reproduced by these students inside their ESLL classes as they worked to differentiate themselves from their “real” ESLL classmates (cf. Fairclough, 2001). This is, in turn, suggestive of the role that G1.5 students played as “brokers” (Wenger, 1998) in ESLL, mediating memberships in multiple (mainstream or Local) CoP beyond the ESLL program with that of the (institutionally imposed) one of ESLL, bringing elements
of practice (including representational practices) from those other CoP into the ESLL classrooms, which were thereby made available for learning not just by their ESLL classmates, but their (newcomer) teacher as well (see Chapters 9 and 10).

Ms. Ariel’s response that those who equate ESLL and Special Education should go abroad to see how they would do enrolled in a school with a different language of instruction from their own, while effective perhaps in the short term, masked a greater set of complexities involving the status of ESLL, chief among them, linguicism, leaving Ms. Ariel to conclude that she didn’t “really understand” how Special Education and ESLL could come to be associated (cf. Fairclough, 1989, 2001). However, Mr. Day, another of the first-year ESLL teachers, located the association of Special Education with ESLL in what he called “language stigmatism,” in which he linked perspectives on the relative lack of L2 English proficiency to broader issues of discrimination.

(8.5) Language stigmatism [TINT09: 369-377]

1 Mr. Day: The students have a lot of, um, negative self-image for being in the class.
3 ST: Um hmm.
5 Mr. Day: Um, some of them have said this is, you know, a retarded {sic} kids’ class. . . . I think that there’s a lot of language, uh, stigmatism in this country, “you don’t know the language, oh, you must be dumb.” Not, “oh, you have a hard time learning the language, oh, this language is specifically hard to learn because it’s very different from the language that you know, and you know, the structures are different,” things like that.

Mr. Day here maintains that students have a “negative self-image” for being in ESLL, acknowledging that some call it a class for “retarded kids,” using a vulgar, disparaging label here often used by (ESLL) students to refer to Special Education. He
then attributes the association between ESLL and Special Education to what he calls “language stigmatism” in the US, in which lack of L2 proficiency becomes equated with a lack of intelligence. In doing so, Mr. Day makes an important macro-micro link to linguistic discrimination to explain how L2 English learners, and the ESL programs they are placed in, might be viewed as “deficient,” including by ESLL students themselves. Indeed, such views, as Mr. Day indicates, have enjoyed varying degrees of popular, political, and “scientific” prestige for some time (see, e.g., Gould, 1996; Lippi-Green, 1997; Ruiz, 1984; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000; Tollefson, 1991; Valencia, 1997; cf. Fairclough, 1995, 2001). Thus, in certain respects, it is not entirely unsurprising – even if it is still, certainly, repugnant – to see such perspectives in circulation, in this case in one particular discourse about ESLL at Tradewinds. Mr. Day concludes that the consequences of “language stigmatism” marked ESLL to the extent that it interfered with students’ self-concept, and also masked other considerations that might bear on L2 learning, such as the difficulty of English, “language distance,” and the like.

Interestingly, Mr. Day singles out difficulties in language structure as being a cause for lack of L2 proficiency, as he spent the most time of all the teachers I observed attempting to teach English grammar (see Chapter 7). Unfortunately, Mr. Day never brought the discussion about language stigmatism to the attention of the class, despite expressing an intention to do so.

As I have argued, the association of ESLL with Special Education is a clear manifestation in the discourses about ESLL at Tradewinds of the conflation of putative deficits in intelligence with lack of L2 proficiency. What this association does not adequately signify, however, is the corresponding conflation of low L2 proficiency with
deficiencies in character and motivation. Indeed, as signaled by the phrase “baptism by fire” in Extract 8.2 discussed above, another constituent feature of the discourses about ESLL at the high school was that ESLL students needed and were expected to undergo a process of personal transformation as they were prepared for the mainstream. This was a process that was variously described as assimilation, adaptation, and Americanization.

While it is to be expected that some degree of acculturation should and will take place in an ESL program, what was striking in several of the teachers’ comments was an apparent attitude that this change was necessary for and would result in students’ personal improvement. As Mr. Bradley, the ESLL teacher commented, ESLL students “are in a little world, like in the Bible, right? Lost. They’re lost” (TINT14: 257). It was an apparent objective of the ESLL program to help these students “find” themselves.

The themes of personal transformation and improvement through assimilation, L2 English learning, and Americanization have long been constituent features in the various discourses concerning immigrants and language minorities in Hawai‘i and the US (see, e.g., Crawford, 2004; Haas, 1992; Higham, 1955; Lears, 1981; McCarty, 2004; Takaki, 1989; Turner, 1893; cf. Fairclough, 1989, 1995, 2001; Roberts, 2003; see Chapter 6). This was no different at Tradewinds, although it took different forms with different teachers, ranging from the reading of patriotic poems in some classes to lectures on morality in others. In Ms. Enders’ Social Studies J class, for example, it was manifest in a “character education” component of the social studies curriculum. Each week one assignment in this class was devoted to a short reading, often drawn from Ann Landers or Dear Abby advice columns, which involved the importance of altruism, multicultural tolerance, integrity, and respect, particularly for military veterans. As Ms. Enders stated
in one class session to the students, the character education lessons were intended “to change your character. To change you. To improve you and your character!” (SSJ12Wfn: 189). She later told students that it was her job – and as an instructional aide, mine as well – to “help you change to the better, not only good students but good people. Some are changing, but some haven’t. Attitudes the same. Ideas the same. Thinking is limited. This is a turning point for you. Time to change” (SSJ22Wfn: 19).

Indeed, when I asked Ms. Enders in an interview about what she liked about teaching, one of the first points she made concerned “character education.”

(8.6) *Change and grow up* [TINT16: 69-79]

1  Ms. Enders: And I like the program, I like teaching. The main thing is not putting information in kids’ minds. My job in teaching is to help kids change and grow up.

3  ST: How do you – how do you mean? How do you mean change?

5  Ms. Enders: It means a lot of character education along with curriculum. Right? If you just take the curriculum, you don’t help them change or grow.

7  Yeah? So, a social studies teacher here should be, well, a curriculum teacher and motivator.

9  ST: A motivator. Hm.

Ms. Enders: Parallel.

11 ST: So you have that character education. I notice every once in a while you pass out assignments that are “character education.”

13 Ms. Enders: Yes, yes. And, well, it doesn’t make it more heavy for you. Each week give them a talk. On Monday or Friday afternoon.

15 ST: Each week you give them a talk.

Ms. Enders: Each week. Yeah, you reinforce the Guidance teacher.

17 ST: Sure.

Ms. Enders: You reinforce the Technology teacher. So you are like a reserve force. But most of all, love the kids.

19 ST: Sure.

21 Ms. Enders: Yeah, and I love them. I have a mini United Nations here.
There are several features in Ms. Enders talk in Extract 8.6 that signal interdiscursivity, that is are both constituted by and constitutive of the discourses about ESLL at Tradewinds (Fairclough, 2001). Most evident, of course, is precisely this theme of students changing, or “growing up” through their experience in the program. In this respect, Ms. Enders considered herself not just a teacher but a “motivator”; these two duties were “parallel” as she emphasizes in line 10. The form of “motivator” clearly attributes the agency for inducing students’ transformation to the teacher, and by extension, to the ESLL program under whose auspices the teacher is acting. Other linguistic features in the text also signal the attribution of agency to teachers and the ESLL program, for example, “help kids change and grow up” (lines 2-3), and “give them a talk” (line 14) both syntactically render the “kids” as passive recipients (or “objects”) of actions carried out by the teacher (“subject”) (cf. Barker & Galasiński, 2001; Fairclough, 1989, 2001). In fact, Ms. Enders’ reference to other teachers, that is, to “reinforce[ing] the Guidance teacher . . . . the Technology teacher” (lines 16, 18), not only implicates the “service role” ESLL plays to subject-area classes, but expands the mandate for promoting ESLL students’ change to all the teachers at the high school, and thus, recalling Mr. Anderson’s comments in Extract 8.1, to the school as well (Benesch, 1993, 1996, 2001). The martial imagery of “reinforcements” and a “reserve force” suggests a corps of teachers who are aligned as they undertake the development ESLL students’ characters, and is perhaps indicative of the battle that awaits; this imagery, however, seems to be in tension with Ms. Enders’ assertion that “most of all, love the kids” (cf. Barker & Galasiński, 2001; Fairclough, 1995, 2001). Why it is that she “loves” them is suggested in concluding sentence of the extract: “I have a mini United Nations here.” This hints at
the sort of harmonious multiculturalism that I have argued persists also in the discourses about ESLL program at Tradewinds (see Chapter 7); in this respect, this intertextual tension is an example of the contradictions that can inhere in overlapping discourses (Fairclough, 1995, 2001). In addition, the phrase “a mini United Nations” points to a conception of these students as newcomers, foreigners from around the world (see below); in this latter respect, it also evokes the nation-state language ideology described earlier, in which language, country, and personal identity are associated in one-to-one correspondence (Woolard, 1998).

The notion of motivation – and its association with “character” – also implicates students as the apparent “problem” that this force of teachers needs to “fix”: that need motivating, that lack character, that must grow up, that have to change. These “problems” in essence become internal, intra-individual deficiencies located within the ESLL student collective, which is also suggestive of the monolithic, undifferentiated ESLL student argued earlier. As Norton/Norton Peirce (1995a; 1997; 2000) has argued, such a conceptualization disallows consideration of learners’ relations to the social contexts in which they as “ESLL students” are situated, where, in the case of the Tradewinds ESLL program, ESLL was held in low regard, where what Mr. Day called “language stigmatism” was common, where discourses of ESLL were in circulation that led ESLL students to be viewed as deficient in the first place.

The discourses about ESLL at Tradewinds as suggested in the extracts above imply an interrelationship between the program’s assimilationist purpose and its low prestige. ESLL was widely held to be a transitional program that sheltered, shielded, or “babied” students as they were prepared for a valorized mainstream. Preparation
included L2 English instruction, but perhaps more significantly, it involved a uniquely personal transformation for students, which was the responsibility of teachers (and by extension, the school) to initiate and guide. Descriptions of this transformation indicated that apparent “deficiencies” in L2 proficiencies were associated with corresponding deficits in students’ intelligence, character, and motivation. These were certain of the constitutive features of the linguicist discourses of deficiency about ESLL at Tradewinds realized in these particular representational practices (Fairclough, 1989, 1995, 2001).

These perspectives play on what might be called a “conversion complex” that frequently accompanies discussion of ESL learners’ challenges in K-12 contexts: that ESL students must be “converted” into “regular” students – and will be once they learn the L2 – at which point “real” teaching and learning can commence; as Christian (2002, p. x) succinctly puts it, as soon as English is learned, “the ‘problem’ is ‘fixed.’” Such a mindset is based in part on the notion that “content” learning can only occur after the L2 has been learned, a perception that denies a wealth of research in content-based L2 pedagogy and bilingual and immersion education (for overviews, see, e.g., August & Hakuta, 1997; Baker, 2001; Baker & Prys Jones, 1998; Snow, 1991, 2001) – a research base that ironically guided the implementation of the content-based J-class program in Hawai‘i in the first place (see Office of Instructional Services, 1995). It is a mindset that can translate into ESL students being warehoused for indeterminate amounts of time in programs that aim to “prepare” them for the “real world” of learning, substantially delaying access to the language, content, and learning opportunities that peers encounter in mainstream classrooms, and thus running the risk of institutionalizing linguistic, and more significantly, social inequality (cf. Ruiz de Velasco et al., 2000).
Indeed, many of the teachers I observed and interviewed asserted that ESLL students would be better off not just in a separate program, but in a separate school altogether. Mr. Bradley talked of a “newcomer school” that recent arrivals could attend for intensive L2 instruction and a general orientation to US school practices and expectations, since ESLL students at Tradewinds “don’t fit here” (TINT14: 114). Ms. Ariel echoed these sentiments, as did Ms. Frank, who spoke of a “transitional school,” and Mr. Anderson, whose idea was a “lab school” where ESLL students wouldn’t be “mingled up” with regular ones (TINT18: 89). Mr. Iris, one of the Health teachers, did not mention a separate school per se, but did similarly assert that “the kids should be retained in the ESL classes at first until they have a real good knowledge of the English language and then slowly allow them to attend other classes” (TINT12: 59).

There are in fact a growing number of top quality newcomer schools in the US, both at the program and school level (see Genesee, 1999; Short & Boyson, 2000, 2004). They range from one-year transitional programs to fully autonomous four-year schools that have the capacity to graduate their own students. Although newcomer schools offer tremendous promise as a program alternative for language minority students, particularly those whose formal educations have been interrupted, the issue of segregation inevitably arises (see Ruiz de Velasco et al., 2000; Samway & McKeon, 1999, pp. 79-84; Short & Boyson, 2004, p. 16). According to a recent report (Ruiz de Velasco et al., 2000), close to 50% of “limited English proficient” (LEP) students attend schools where a third of the student population is LEP, whereas approximately two-thirds of mainstream students attend schools where less than 1% of their classmates are LEP. As the authors conclude:
new patterns of ethnic, economic, and linguistic segregation may be emerging (Ruiz de Velasco et al., 2000, p. 3).

Many K-12 L2 English researchers have argued against this form of isolation in favor of increased ESL integration within schools. Harklau (1994a, p. 268), for example, calls for greater collaboration between mainstream and ESL teachers, so that both can become more responsive to the language learning needs of ESL students; she acknowledges, however, that there is a need for “[m]ore fundamental changes, leading to a systematic integration of content and language” school-wide. Drawing on findings from interactionist SLA research, Wong-Fillmore (e.g., 1991, 1992) maintains that segregation denies L2 learners with exposure to appropriate “native-like” input and interactional opportunities with fluent L1 English speakers that would facilitate L2 acquisition. She argues (1991) that the more L2 learners interact with L1 English speakers, the more motivated they will become to speak the L2 as they see a need to learn it, and the better input they will receive. Those working from a sociocultural framework come to similar conclusions, though clearly for different reasons, with Toohey (1998, 2000), for example, asserting that the segregation of L2 students from their mainstream peers leads to increasing patterns of educational stratification that ultimately become reproduced in society. When schools “break them up [and] take them away,” as she says: second language learners become systematically excluded from just those conversations in which they might legitimately peripherally participate with child experts, English old-timers . . . . In a stratified community in which the terms of stratification become increasing visible to all, some students become defined as deficient; this systematically excludes them from just those practices in which
they might otherwise appropriate identities and practices of growing competence and expertise (Toohey, 2000, p. 93).

Miller (2003, 2004) concurs, stating that “if you can’t establish meaningful relations with members of the mainstream discourses, you will use other means to represent who you are, within your group and to others – and you will remain at the margins” (2003, pp. 107-108; also see Duff, 2002; Norton, 2000; 2001). This is not to denigrate L1-based friendship-networks and communities by any means, only to argue that if ESL students are to have access to dominant English-medium discourses in their schools, they cannot be isolated from them or placed in “marginal” positions that disallow participation (cf. Wenger, 1998, pp. 165-167, 203). In their review of newcomer programs in the US, Short & Boyson (2004) counter that most of these programs are for limited durations (between one and two years) and cite research indicating that at least for the first few months, newcomers seldom interact with L1 speakers in schools anyway. To complicate matters, Miller (2003) notes that the ESL students in her study remained marginalized in a regular Australian high school, despite having spent several months in a separate newcomer school beforehand. And as my data indicate in Chapters 9 and 10, issues are complicated even within ESL classrooms, particularly in heterogeneous, mixed-L2-proficiency-level classrooms, where newcomer, non-G1.5 students can become the targets of G1.5 students’ indexical displays of difference.

It is not my purpose here to attempt to answer important issues concerning isolation and segregation here (but see, e.g., Samway & McKeon, 1999, for some clarification); what is relevant is not only that the Tradewinds ESLL teachers who participated in this study asserted that isolating students from mainstream students would
be beneficial, but that their comments signaled a normative conception of the ESLL program target population: that it was, essentially, comprised of newcomers. As Mr. Bradley stated:

(8.7) *Definitely* [TINT14: 173-178]

1    ST: Is the ESL program here geared more for newcomers than it is for people who have been here for longer time or, (2)
3    Mr. Bradley: Yeah, for newcomers.
      ST: For newcomers. It is.
5    Mr. Bradley: Definitely.
      ST: Definitely. And can you talk about that a little bit?
7    Mr. Bradley: I guess because the population. It seems like the bulk of our student ESL student population is newcomers. So, yeah, we gear for that.

In terms of the interview as an interactional encounter, it could be argued that my question is a leading question, revealing to Mr. Bradley quite clearly that I indeed believe the program is indeed "geared more for newcomers" (which I did), and leaving him in the comparatively precarious, potentially face-threatening position of disagreeing with me "on the record" so to speak (cf. Cameron, 2001; Holstein & Gubrium, 1997; Warren, 2002). In other words, it could be argued that my leading question resulted in an answer that (Mr. Bradley rightly or wrongly perceived) I wanted to hear. However, both Mr. Bradley and Mr. Anderson on numerous occasions in the past had talked of the ESLL program as serving newcomer students; in fact, earlier in this particular interview, Mr. Bradley had again mentioned it (also see the discussion in Chapter 7 on "survival ESL" materials). Thus, in my view, my question was simply confirming statements that Mr. Bradley and Mr. Anderson had made several times before; and his answer is consistent
with his previously represented views that the ESLL program “was geared more for newcomers.”

But how consistent was this view – that the “bulk” of the ESLL population consisted of recent arrivals – with the realities of the ESLL program’s enrollments? Of the students who participated in this study (not all the students in the ESLL program), over 40% had been living and going to school in the US (including Guam and the Northern Marianas) for at least two years, with 30% having studied in the US (including Guam and the Northern Marianas) for 3 years or more, and a number enrolled in ESLL throughout much if not all of their entire formal schooling (see Appendix B). This finds some parallels nationwide: in their large-scale survey, Fleishmann and Hopstock (1993) found that upwards of one-third of all LEP students in US schools had actually been born in the US, with an additional 11% reported to have resided in the US for at least five years. Although I have argued that length of residence is an unsatisfactory indicator of anything except how long students have lived somewhere, it does provide some hint that the intended population of the ESLL program, those students that teachers indicated the program was designed for, was at odds with the realities of its enrollments. This is a point that can be made more generally about ESL as “a field” as well (cf. Duff, 2002; Faltis, 1999; Faltis & Wolfe, 1999; Harklau, 2000; Harklau, Losey, & Siegal, 1999; Leung, Harris, & Rampton, 1997; Nayar, 1997; Thesen, 1997).

Evident in the teachers’ representations of the ESLL program at Tradewinds was a consistent perspective indicating that putative “deficiencies” in L2 proficiencies were associated with corresponding deficits in students’ intelligence, character, and motivation. Together, with the assimilationist goals and low prestige of the program,
these representational practices were both constituted by and constitutive of linguist discourses of deficiency about ESLL at Tradewinds, ones that circulated among teachers, but which were evident in slightly different form in G1.5 students' representations of the program as well.

'Back to the 5th grade': G1.5 students talk about ESLL

G1.5 students' representations of ESLL were consistent with teachers' representations, if from a notably different perspective, and in this regard sounded on a number of similar, interdiscursive themes in the representations about ESLL discussed above (cf. Barker & Galasiński, 2001; Fairclough, 1995, 2001). In this section, my focus will not only concern the substance and semiosis of these students' representations of ESLL but also how G1.5 students deploy them in what I will argue are indexical identity performances of difference, used by these students to distinguish themselves from “real” ESLL students (i.e., newcomers, low-L2-English proficient students, and other non-G1.5 students), as well as to provide a rationale for their resistance to the ESLL program.

Indeed, these representations are part of the “shared repertoire” that Wenger (1998) maintains is criterial for a CoP, in this case, the oppositional G1.5 ESLL student CoP at Tradewinds (cf. Holmes & Meyerhoff, 1999). That is, these are social practices used by G1.5 ESLL students to produce their G1.5 community memberships, and, thus, are also constitutive of the G1.5 cultural productions of ESLL. Additionally, G1.5 students' representations of ESLL were important in that they drew on and reproduced the linguist discourses of deficiency about ESLL, which G1.5 students, by virtue of their connections to communities beyond ESLL, had access to and brought with them into
ESLL classrooms. As mentioned earlier, this highlights how G1.5 CoP in ESLL mediated the boundaries between ESLL and mainstream and Local communities, as well as the central role they played in bringing the linguist discourses of deficiency concerning ESLL into the ESLL classrooms, where indeed, they used them in their indexical displays of difference.

As expected for a “shared repertoire,” some recurrent themes concerning ESLL emerge in these students’ representations as shall become immediately apparent below, including in no particular order that the program was easy, undemanding, childish, remedial, repetitive, and stupid; that the program was “below” the regular or mainstream classes, on par with Special Education, and that this inferior position translated into a unique stigma and shame for those students enrolled in ESLL; that the program hindered students’ social advancement and academic achievement; and that the program was like jail, or a form of punishment, this in particular evident in much of the imagery used to describe trying to “get out” of the program. In this respect, the shared repertoire of G1.5 ESLL students’ representations of ESLL all centrally implicated the stigmatized status of ESLL at Tradewinds, and by extension, invoked the mainstream/ESLL hierarchy discussed above. Many of these themes are apparent in the following extract, where Laidplayer, a newcomer G1.5 9th grader from Palau, who had lived in the US for a few months at the time of this interview, but was a full participant in G1.5 community practices, states what was a widely expressed view among G1.5 students who participated in this study.
(8.8) *Low class* [SINT14: 675-684]

1. Mr. Talmy: What do you think regular or mainstream students think of ESL students?

3. Laidplayer: Low class.
   Mr. Talmy: Low class?

5. Laidplayer: Yeah.
   Mr. Talmy: Is it cool to be an ESL student?

7. Laidplayer: No. To me, no! But there's no choice, you know. I don't know why I came to this ESL stuff.

9. Mr. Talmy: Are you happy that you're in the ESL program?
   Laidplayer: Uh, no.

11. Mr. Talmy: Would you like to get out?
    Laidplayer: Yeah.

The mainstream/ESLL hierarchy is clearly implicated in Laidplayer's answer of "Low class." to my question about what he perceived "regular or mainstream students" thought about ESLL students (cf. Eckert, 1989, 2000; Milner, 2004). This was the primary question I asked students in formal interviews to initiate discussion about what they believed was the status of ESLL at the high school, and while it occasioned (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998) both identity categories, there was nothing in the question itself to implicate this hierarchy. Indeed, newcomers, low L2 proficient, and other non-G1.5 ESLL students restricted their answers to this question to a notably benign, matter-of-fact representation that mainstream students simply perceived ESLL students as "not being able to speak English." G1.5 students, in contrast, all spoke of what that *meant* in broader, social terms, that is, how being an ESLL student, which rather straightforwardly

---

6 I have represented my turns in interaction with the students as "Mr. Talmi" since this is the form of address that students (to my regret) were required to use with me (although most simply called me "Mister," as is common when students speak to male teachers in Hawai‘i), and thus in general terms, this is how I was known to them. Although this may seem an unusual convention, I do want to highlight the asymmetrical relations between the students and me since they were implicated doubly, both in terms of the interview as an interactional event, and in terms of the institutional setting (in which the interviews were also conducted). In my interviews with teachers, I use my initials, "ST."
translated into being low L2 English proficient, meant, according to them, being “low class,” was “not cool,” was “a bad thing.” As Judo, a 10th grade girl concluded, ESLL students were “one level down” to their “regular” peers because “they say ESL student have broken language” (SINT9: 229; cf. Mr. Day’s comments on language stigmatism). In these terms, G1.5 students not only drew on their sociocultural knowledge of the discourses of ESLL in circulation in the wider school context, but by signifying their familiarity with them, and using L2 linguistic and interactional resources with often notable expertise to reproduce them, indexed their differences from “real” ESLL students. That is, by invoking these discourses in the ways they did, G1.5 ESLL students not only signal how their representations are interdiscursively mediated by the broader discourses of deficiency concerning ESLL, they used the interview as a(n additional) forum in which to perform what I have glossed as their “G1.5” identities and cultural productions of ESLL (cf. Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Cameron, 2001; Holstein & Gubrium, 1997).

This is clear in Extract 8.8 as Laidplayer constructs ESLL from an explicit “mainstream student” standpoint as “low class,” and the mainstream as its implied corollary of “high class.” He then sets about distancing himself both in propositional and interactional terms from the low-prestige variant, and associating himself with the imagined “mainstream student” perspective. Crucially, he indicates no misgivings at all about this latter perspective, and all that it apparently signifies, instead making it clear in

---

7 These representations recall one ESLL B class session in which students had been assigned to read a fable entitled The untouchable (March, 1979), about a traveler who meets an “untouchable,” or outcaste member, and endeavors to find what makes them different. Following discussion of the story, Ms. Cheney, the ESLL teacher, jokingly asked the students what “caste” ESLL was in relation to the mainstream. G1.5 students laughed and virtually in unison shouted “untouchable!” (ELB22Ufn: 222-234) (cf. Milner, 2004).
this extract (and in the rest of the interview as well as other informal interviews and classroom interactions) that it is his association with ESLL that is the problem. The propositional content of “Low class.” invokes all manner of elitist, classist discourses, of course, and plays on the common theme in many (linguist) discourses on immigration, L2 learning, and assimilation as well, e.g., that L2-English-speakers are situated at the bottom of the social order, that English proficiency is a key to social mobility, and that lack of English proficiency is an index of social, linguistic, and economic ignominy (cf. Fairclough, 1995, 2001). Interactionally, Laidplayer does not elaborate his rather provocative reply in line 3 ("Low class.") or his abbreviated “Yeah.” in line 5, which signals an apparent belief on his part that he, in discussion with an L1 English-speaking male (me), does not need to (cf. the discourse marker “you know” in line 7 [Schiffrin, 1989]). When I ask in line 6 if it’s cool to be an ESLL student – in hopes of having him elaborate what is, to him, an apparently commonsense answer – he states, again in terms of a now-implied “mainstream student” perspective, “No.” Immediately afterward, he explicitly indicates that the “mainstream” perspective is shared by him through use of a first person pronoun, “To me, no!”, with an exclamatory intonation that indexes an affective stance of irritation: perhaps because he feels he has answered this question – from his perspective rather than the “mainstream student’s” suggested in the question – three times already. Indeed, the ironic tone and emphasis with which “Uh, no.” is uttered in line 10, together with the emphatic “Yeah.” in line 12 further underscore this point, as I persist in asking him questions that have answers that should, apparently, be self-evident to me by now (cf. Cameron, 2001, Chapter 10).
Also of note, in lines 7-8, following Laidplayer’s assertion that it is not at all cool to be in ESLL is his claim: “But there’s no choice, you know. I don’t know why I came to this ESL stuff.” As alluded to above, “you know” here signifies that “the hearer [Mr. Talmy] knows the background information and the speaker [Laidplayer] knows that” (Schiffrin, 1989, p. 268), and thus functions as an index by Laidplayer that he and I have shared knowledge, in this case that “there’s no choice” about his placement in ESLL. In fact, this was another common representational practice in the G1.5 CoP shared repertoire: that the responsibility for ESLL placements was due to some sort of external power these students could not control, that they were victims of circumstance, Byzantine testing and placement policies, and unfair bureaucracy. Other G1.5 students made similar references to not being able to “get out” of the program, to being “stuck” in it, references that signaled in their expressive value an almost prison-like entrapment and a corresponding inability to escape. Inevitably, students blamed their continuing ESLL placements on “the test,” that is, the Language Assessment Scales that the Tradewinds ESLL program was mandated to use to monitor student progress and base exit decisions upon. Students’ views about “passing the test” often suggested considerable confusion, contempt, and in some cases, cynicism: China, for example, a G1.5 9th grader (see below), asserted that the ESLL program purposefully retained students because “the more ESL student, the government pays the school more. . . . They probably want to keep us in and get more money” (SINT17: 620). Perspectives such as these derived in large part from a lack of transparency regarding the ESLL program’s mystifying (and mystified) testing and placement procedures, which invariably left students with more questions about their ESLL placements than answers.
In addition to "low class," G1.5 students also signaled their belief that the mainstream student perspective on ESLL students included that they were "stupid" or "dumb," as indicated in my discussion earlier, a representation that was nearly always accompanied by some reference to Special Education. Both points are exemplified in the following extract by Ella*, a 15-year-old G1.5 student who had traveled back and forth between Hawai‘i and American Samoa several times for her formal schooling.

(8.9) *Because they say it!* [SINT10: 349-358]

1 Mr. Talmy: What do you think regular students, or students in the regular classes, think of ESL?
3 Ella: Daet wi stuped. 
   *That we’re stupid.*
5 Mr. Talmy: Yeah?
7 Ella: Why do you think they think that?
   Kaz dei sei it!
9 Mr. Talmy: Why do you think people think that ESL is stupid?
   Kaz is da izi klaes. Ai dono. Is laik Speshal Ed klaes, daes wai. Ai dono!
   *Because it’s the easy class. I don’t know. It’s like a Special Ed class, that’s why. I don’t know!*

Similar to Laidplayer, Ella here invokes the mainstream/ESLL hierarchy, though in less metaphorical and much more expressive terms than "low class," when she states her belief that mainstream students think ESLL students are "stuped." Unlike Laidplayer, however, Ella does not explicitly distance herself from ESLL. In fact, she clearly identifies herself as an in-group member (through "wi" in line 3) of the ESLL student population, as distinct from mainstream students ("dei" in line 7). Yet Ella speaks in Pidgin, the L1 of a majority of Hawai‘i-born residents (including teachers and
mainstream students at Tradewinds). This particular L2 linguistic resource, which was often brought into play by G1.5 ESLL students in the production of Local identities, affiliations, and alignments (see Chapter 2), thus calls into question the clear-cut association implied by her self-categorization as an ESLL student, particularly in terms of the discourses and “official” cultural productions of ESLL students as cultural and linguistic Others (see above; Chapter 7). As Ella is orienting to her institutionally-imposed ESLL identity, she is at the same time undermining what it signifies, at least as it is known in the Tradewinds context: rather than an Outsider who straightforwardly “belongs to” a reductive, homogeneous conception of “her country and culture,” Ella is clearly signaling the complexity and hybridity in identity and affiliation that the discourses about ESLL students at Tradewinds invariably obscured (also see Pidgin use in Extracts 8.10 and 8.13 below). Yet she also indicates that she has been subject to these same discourses when she asserts in answer to my quite literally-interpreted question in line 6 that she knows mainstream students think ESLL students are stupid “Kaz dei sei it!” Ella thus here may be commenting less about her personal claims on or attachments to the ESLL identity category she has explicitly associated herself with, and more about how she is positioned as an ESLL student by those mainstream students in the wider institutional setting that my initial question has occasioned.

This may, at least in part, account for Ella’s notable irritation in the interaction represented in Extract 8.9, as evident through her minimal answers, emphatic intonation, and general stance of annoyance: that she’s representing the views of a mainstream student perspective about an aspect of identity that is institutionally ascribed to her, yet with which she personally does not affiliate. Indeed, earlier in the interview, she asserted
she did not like ESLL classes and did not think she needed them “Kaz ai spik inglish veri wel” (*Because I speak English very well*) (SINT10: 337). In addition, Ella’s irritation may also have been due to her evident discomfort with the formal interview format and with speaking with me one-on-one, especially about a perspective that concerned her putative “stupidity,” when we did not know each other very well.\(^8\) Whereas I argued that Laidplayer earlier did not provide elaboration about ESLL being “low class” because he was in discussion with a L1 English speaker he knew comparatively well and who (should have) had shared knowledge about this issue, Ella here makes no aligning moves; to the contrary, her performance from early on in the session signaled that she was uncomfortable with the interview, the audio-recorder, and/or talking on the record about ESLL to someone she was comparatively unfamiliar with. In fact because of her discomfort, this session was, compared to most of the others with G1.5 students, quite abbreviated. However, her comments remain illustrative of what G1.5 ESLL students frequently asserted were mainstream students’ perceptions of ESLL: that there was a low degree of challenge in the ESLL classes, which made them somehow synonymous with Special Education, and that the students enrolled in them thus lacked the cognitive capacity to study in “regular” classes.

In the following extract, Iwannafuckalot (IwannaFAL)\(^9\) speaks about this issue in more immediate terms. A 9\(^{th}\) grade G1.5 student who had moved from Vietnam to

\(^8\) The interview with Ella was conducted a few weeks after we had met. In contrast, the other G1.5 student interviews (with the exception of Ash’s) came between five months and two years after I had first met them.

\(^9\) This student’s choice of pseudonym warrants a footnote: he claimed it was a character’s name from the 1999 film *Austin Powers II: The Spy Who Shagged Me* (Lyons, Myers, Todd, & Todd, 1999). However, as I discovered after some checking, this is an apparent mis-remembering of the name of a female Russian character in that film named “Ivana Humpalot.” To minimize possible offense to readers while remaining true to my promise to students that I would use any pseudonym they selected, I will abbreviate this particular one to IwannaFAL.
Hawai’i when he was five years old, IwannaFAL displayed throughout my observations of his ESLL class a deep-seated antipathy toward ESLL, a program he had been enrolled in for his entire formal education. He would often enter his ESLL class and bellow some variation of “Welcome to Special Ed, where you don’t do shit!” (ELA42Xfn: 13), and frequently participated in G1.5 FOBeing practices of lower L2 proficient classmates. In a wide-ranging interview in which he talked about his aversion to ESLL, IwannaFAL asserted that the program was the same as Special Education because “{ESLL} pipo kant spik inglish an kaina lolo” (ESLL people can’t speak English and are kind of stupid). He then hinted at the personal stigma associated with the designation:

(8.10) *Shame* [SINT3: 322-337]

1 Mr. Talmy: Why is it so bad to be ESL here?
IwannaFAL: Am, pipo luk achi, laik, fani.
*Um, people look at you, like, funny.*

3 Mr. Talmy: Yeah?
IwannaFAL: Yeah.

5 Mr. Talmy: Why? What people?
IwannaFAL: Enikain – laik, smat pipo ((half laugh))
*Everybody – like, smart people.*

7 Mr. Talmy: Tell me about that. (. .) Tell me.
IwannaFAL: A:, ai dono.
*Oh, I don’t know.*

9 Mr. Talmy: You don’t know?
IwannaFAL: Yeah.

11 Mr. Talmy: Yeah? I mean, so, ‘cause I hear it all the time about ESL=
IwannaFAL: =Laik, shem yae?
*Like, it’s shameful, you know?*

13 Mr. Talmy: Wai? Wai so sheim.
*I: Why? Why is it so shameful?*
IwannaFAL: A:, laik, speshali eriwan tinkyu dam an staf.
*Oh, like, especially because everyone thinks you’re dumb and stuff.*

15 Mr. Talmy: Yeah?
IwannaFAL: Kaz yu lring al smal kid staf al da taim. An yu in hai skul.
*Because you’re learning children’s stuff all the time. And you’re in high school.*
This data extract comes toward the end of my interview, well after IwannaFAL had already established that ESLL was “bad.” As Laidplayer and Ella did as well, he clearly situates the identity category in relational terms within the mainstream/ESLL status hierarchy of the high school. He indicates it was a “marked” category when he states the perception that “people” looked at him “fani” because he was ESLL. His use of “pipo” (people) in line 2 likely refers to those outside of ESLL, that is, mainstream students (and teachers); in line 6, he clarifies this in answer to my question about “which people” when he says “enikain,” one of many “multifunctional words” in Pidgin (Sakoda & Siegel, 2003) that can be translated as “many kinds of (people),” but which here, according to a Pidgin speaker who reviewed the recording and transcript, more probably means “every(body)”; this reading is further supported by the subsequent use of “evriwan” (everyone) in line 14 (see Sakoda & Siegel, 2003, pp. 48-49, for more on “enikain”). IwannaFAL then further clarifies “enikain” (everybody) to mean “smat pipo” (smart people), the apparent implication being that people outside of ESLL – “everybody” – were smart, while those in ESLL (“nobodies”), at least in the eyes of non-ESLL people, were not. This is in fact a point he states explicitly in line 14 when elaborating why he felt “shem” (shame) about being in ESLL: “evriwan tink yu dam an staf” (everyone thinks you’re dumb and stuff). He goes on to assert that the shame he felt by being labeled ESLL, derived from “lrning al smal kid staf al da taim” (learning children’s stuff all the time), despite being in high school. This is a comment which evokes again other G1.5 students’ representations of ESLL as “childish,” “like kindergarten,” and “easy,” and thus the broader discourse of ESLL as education “lite.” These representations had sound empirical basis in that ESLL students were assigned to
read children's novels, complete simple grammar, writing, and vocabulary exercises, and wound up spending a disconcerting amount of class time drawing pictures and coloring with crayons for "project" artwork (see Chapter 7).

It is quite likely that the "shem" that IwannaFAL and other G1.5 ESLL students expressed about ESLL derived at least in part from the fact that they had remained in the program for such long periods, or, as in the case of Ioane, Computer, and others, had been returned to ESLL due to failing grades in mainstream classes. Presumably, they had seen a good number of their ESLL classmates from earlier years exit the program and move ahead into unmarked status as "regular" students while they had stayed "behind" in ESLL. Perhaps relatedly, that these students were apparently unable to "pass the test" leading to a program exit, despite often high degrees of L2 oral proficiency, may have been interpreted by students as a signal of "stupidity," another possible reason that students might make the connection between ESLL and Special Education (but see extract 8.13 below). Because students weren't explicitly instructed in the differences between (let alone the existence of) social and academic registers, genres, or discourses (cf. Schleppegrell, 2001; 2004) nor taught that L2 oracy did not equate with L2 (academic) literacy, orally competent students who failed the literacy components of tests may simply have believed they weren't smart enough to pass the test, rather than realized that they were simply lacking experience with the requisite L2 academic genres and print literacy practices being tested. Unfortunately, these suppositions remain at the level of speculation, for they are beyond the scope of this study. Regardless of the particular sources of the sentiment, however, "shame" was clearly part of the broader G1.5 discourses about ESLL at Tradewinds.
IwannaFAL’s views about the markedness of ESLL were shared by many other students. Jennie, for instance, a Korean G1.5 9th grader who had lived in Hawai‘i for two years maintained that she wanted to go to regular classes because she wanted to “be regular people.” (SINT11: 164). Laidplayer (see Extract 8.8), stated with a shake of his head that the ESLL label meant “I’m different, you know. Different.” (SINT14: 668). Similar to IwannaFAL, this difference conveyed stigma, to the extent that Laidplayer maintained he never told his (mainstream) friends he was in ESLL. Several ESLL students related anecdotes similar to Laidplayer’s, about the unique tensions they felt being ESLL among mainstream friends and acquaintances. Included among them was Maria, a 9th grader from the Philippines, who had lived in Hawai‘i for four years.

(8.11) *They don’t know* [SINT33: 832-846]

1 Mr. Talmey: What do you think students in regular classes think of ESL?
Maria: They tease! . . . Just ‘cause you’re in ESL, they think you’re stupid.
2 Mr. Talmey: They think that you don’t know anything.
Maria: Do people tease you about ESL?
5 Maria: They don’t know.
Mr. Talmey: (.) You don’t tell them?
7 Maria: They don’t ask.
Mr. Talmey: Do your friends know?
9 Maria: No.
Mr. Talmey: ( . . ) What happens when you’re talking during lunch or something and you’re going to class, and they say, “eh, wat klaes yu goin naw?”
11 hey, what class are you going to now?
Maria: I tell them the building. ((laugh)) I don’t tell them the class.
15 Mr. Talmey: You tell them SPEW, you don’t tell them the class.
Maria: Yeah.
17 Mr. Talmey: Ah. ( . ) So you’re ashamed?
Maria: Yeah.
19 Mr. Talmey: You’re ashamed of being ESL?
Maria: Ai sheim!
*I’m ashamed!*
Maria sounds on several of the same themes already discussed, including the mainstream/ESLL hierarchy, the stupidity associated with ESLL, and shame. She also indicates that mainstream students teased their ESLL counterparts, another point mentioned frequently in student interviews (see Chapters 9 and 10 for more on teasing). Of some note here is my surprise about what amounted to a “don’t ask/don’t tell” policy among her and her friends about her ESLL placement (cf. the question-initial pauses in lines 6 and 10); this hints not just at the stigma that ESLL could represent for G1.5 students, but the difficulties they could face in the delicate negotiation of their multiple and at times conflicting community memberships outside of ESLL. Indeed, many of the G1.5 students with Local friends and affiliations talked in similar ways as Maria about the problem of having a “marked” aspect of their identity made salient in an “unmarked” setting (a question I asked wound up asking in several follow-up informal interviews, after this one Maria). Students spoke not only of hiding their ESLL class enrollments from their friends, but more crucially of not being able to participate in Local peer discourses about mainstream teachers, assignments, class events, classmates (particularly those who were sexually desired), or classroom practices, important “insider” communication that simultaneously indexed and produced particular Local community memberships, and that according to these students, left them in a suddenly marginal position, unable to contribute.

For many G1.5 students who participated in this study, the stigma associated with ESLL and the apparent easiness of the classes served as rationales for an expressed desire to exit the program; this was, in fact, one of the clearest ways these students produced
their differences from non-G1.5 students. Central to this particular G1.5 discourse was the representational practice of being “held back” by their ESLL placements; that is, G1.5 students not only signaled an apparent conviction that they were “ready” – for some, well beyond “ready” – for the mainstream, but that their continuing ESLL placements were interfering with their social, academic, and L2 development. For them, and in terms that recall the arguments concerning linguistic segregation described above, ESLL was represented as a structural impediment to more challenging content and L2 learning opportunities, and an obstacle to cultivating friendships with mainstream students.

China, a G1.5 9th grader from Hong Kong, who had been going to school in Hawai’i for four and a half years, sums up this particular perspective in a discussion about why he was upset about his ESLL placement, especially after he had apparently exited the program in 8th grade, his last year of intermediate school.

(8.12) Nothing new [SINT 17: 483-510]

1 Mr. Talmy: Why were you upset {about being back in ESL}? Tell me about that. China: ’Cause, well, it’s gon make me – it’s not challenging! You just do the vocab test, like, you just pass it. And you do some book work, noun, pronoun, whatever. But, you know, other classes, it’s more challenging. They give you homework every day and everything.

3 Mr. Talmy: Yeah.

China: And it’s kind of hard, you cannot finish like in ten minutes like I do in ESLL classes. And you meet more friends that speak the language – English, and stuff. Communicate with homeworks and, you know, you make some more friends that way. But, yeah. In here, you can’t do the same. . . .

11 Mr. Talmy: So do you think ESL classes prepare you for other classes?

13 China: Before, it does. Like in elementary, it teaches us basic stuff, like “one, two, three,” or “Monday, Tuesday, Thursday” thing, which I already know. So that’s okay, like a review and pronounce it better.

Mr. Talmy: Uh huh.

17 China: Well, like after one or two year, I’ll be managing English pretty good, but I’m still in there. . . . And after a while, the thing is getting
slower and slower, they teaching like still almost the same thing. So, I’m kind of advanced, but I’m still stuck in the class, I learn nothing new.

China clearly here brings into play the mainstream/ESLL hierarchy noted above, and similar to Laidplayer and IwannaFAL, works in this interaction to align himself with what G1.5 students maintained was a mainstream student perspective about ESLL. In fact, through his particular use of L2 linguistic resources, China not only signals how his representations about ESLL are mediated interdiscursively by the broader discourses of ESLL in circulation at the high school, but he constructs a highly persuasive argument for himself, indicative of his and other G1.5 ESLL students’ L2 oral and interactional expertise (also see Chapter 9), whereby he positions himself in ways that suggest that he himself is a mainstream student who has been unwittingly “trapped” in (or in his case, returned to) the institutional category of ESLL. In support of his claim that ESLL was “not challenging,” China in lines 2-5 skillfully enumerates a list of apparently basic, regularly assigned activities – vocabulary tests, bookwork, some grammar exercises: “whatever” – using a series of simple declaratives in combination with the second person “you” and repetition of the adverb “just,” to emphasize the utter effortlessness of these tasks. In lines 13-15, he continues his exegesis when he speaks of how these classes at one time, that is, “Before,” helped him. “Before,” as it turns out, was “in elementary,” meaning elementary or primary school (China began school in Hawai‘i in the 5th grade), although there is evident polysemy between “elementary” as it denotes the adjective

---

10 As I discussed in Chapter 7, these activities were in fact curricular mainstays of ESLL classes, and indeed, if G1.5 students such as China did them at all, it was usually very quickly, much to the dissatisfaction of their teachers (see Chapter 9, “Worksheet Syndrome”).
"basic" and the compound noun "primary school" (where "basic" things are learned, anyway). Indeed, as China continues (lines 14-15), ESLL "before" did teach "basic stuff," like counting to three and listing the days of the week, which, as he says, "I already know," to the extent that ESLL, then as now, was a "review." China in these two segments of the interview extract has drawn his interlocutor into alignment with what are in fact categorical assertions (cf. Fairclough, 2001), such that one can only logically conclude that everything in ESLL is simple enough to complete in "ten minutes." The inevitable conclusion he reaches in lines 17-21 is that after a year or two in the program, "the thing getting slower and slower, they teaching like still almost the same thing" (see Chapter 9 and 10). Thus, his logically arrived-at coda: he was, after four and a half years, "stuck" in ESLL, learning "nothing new.", a point made by many other G1.5 students, in remarkably similar ways. ESLL, as represented here was a worthwhile program, so long as it remained directed at low L2 proficient newcomers to the US. On this point, these students were in agreement with their teachers.

Having established the outlines of, and distancing himself from, one end of the mainstream/ESLL hierarchy, China sets about constructing the other. This is initiated with the contrastive conjunction "but" in line 4, which is followed by the aligning discourse marker "you know" (see above; Schiffrin, 1989), and then "other classes, it's more challenging." "Challenging" is the operative difference here, the apparent dividing line separating the mainstream from ESLL. In contrast to his ESLL classes, homework in the mainstream is given "every day and everything." His use of "and everything" not only implies that difficult, daily-assigned homework is highly desirable, but that everything else associated with mainstream classes is, too, since it requires more time and
effort because “it’s kind of hard.” In lines 8-9 he elaborates more of what is desirable about mainstream classes, namely the social dimension, where he can “meet more friends that speak the language – English, and stuff,” friends who will apparently even collaborate with him on homework assignments. This, as he has already established, he cannot do in ESLL because it is too easy, there are apparently few friends that speak English, and there is no homework to collaborate on anyway. China’s comments above signify a romanticized, almost mythic view of the mainstream, one that was common among G1.5 students, although a few saw the mainstream in far less positive (if equally idealized) terms (cf. Extract 8.13 below).

The representation of an idealized mainstream, and the implied lack prestige associated with ESLL, is as I have argued throughout this chapter, suggestive of certain of the ways that the linguicism in the discourses of ESLL is interdiscursively mediated in students’ (and teachers’) representations, and thereby reproduced. In the extract above, China’s mention of meeting more friends “that speak the language – English” is a particularly clear manifestation of this, with use of the definite article and singular form of “language” here clearly reifying what should be “general knowledge,” that is, that “the language” is English, that the context in which it is spoken is monolingual, and that his (desired) mainstream “friends” are thereby monolingual English speakers. Further, this reification quite clearly works to downplay if not stigmatize his own multilingual capabilities as a speaker of Cantonese, English, and Pidgin; China here instantiates the mainstream/ESLL hierarchy in ways that suggest that English monolingualism is his desired goal.
In fact, nearly all of the G1.5 students who participated in this study expressed similar sentiments about the allure of the mainstream, where “learning more” – both in terms of English and subject-area content – was represented as a palliative to their problems with school, which ostensibly derived from their ESLL placements: as I discuss in more detail in subsequent chapters, however, the majority of these students were in fact performing remarkably poorly in their ESLL classes. G1.5 students offered many “reasons” for this, which were also common in the shared repertoire of the G1.5 ESLL student CoP: the work was too easy so they didn’t do it; they had become “lazy” because there was so little to do; they were surrounded by cultural and linguistic incompetents from whom they could learn little. Clearly missing from students’ representations about the ease and lack of challenge of ESLL was their own roles in ensuring that it remained just that; that is, as I indicated earlier, how their cultural productions of ESLL helped lead to precisely the sort of program they claimed to be resisting: dumbed-down, remedial, of little consequence to the rest of the school (see Chapters 9 and 10).

Although many G1.5 and non-G1.5 students indicated that they would like to leave ESLL, many others asserted that they wanted to remain enrolled in the program. Perhaps predictably, a majority of these students were low L2 proficient students, who stated a general if occasionally grudging endorsement of the reading and vocabulary work they were often assigned in their ESLL classes. As well, these students indicated that they preferred the comparative low-stress of the ESLL class, the fact that many of their friends were enrolled in the program, and that the classes gave them a chance to boost their grade point averages (GPAs).\footnote{It is important to remember that many facets of student performance in K-12 schools are regularly graded, and that GPAs are a commonly referred to indicator of academic ability. This is also true of ESLL,
More surprising among the students who wanted to remain in ESLL were those who were G1.5 and/or were advanced in the L2. Regine, for example, a conscientious, hard-working non-G1.5 9th grader who had come to the US from the Philippines a year earlier, in fact had asked to be enrolled in ESLL, even though she was deemed “exempt” from the program. Although she found her ESLL classwork to be overwhelmingly easy and often finished it weeks before it had even been assigned to the class, she maintained she wanted to stay in the program because she needed “those more higher grammars. And vocabs. Those high difficult English,” even though she admitted she wasn’t getting them in her ESLL class (SINT27: 363). Mack Daddy, a Chuukese G1.5 14-year-old who had been going to school in Hawai’i since the 5th grade, expressed less praiseworthy motives for wanting to remain in ESLL, despite his advanced L2 proficiency: the class required little effort, he could “have fun,” and it was easier to get better grades. Getting better grades (to enhance GPAs) was in fact a commonly stated reason among those students who indicated a preference for remaining in ESLL; this was in contrast to those who wanted to get out of ESLL, who overwhelmingly declared that they would take a lower grade in a mainstream class over a higher one in an ESLL or J-section class (see Chapter 9).

What is perhaps implicit in students’ expressed desire to remain in ESLL to keep up GPAs was an understandable fear of academic failure, which was most clearly asserted by students in regard to mainstream classes. In comments that signal this fear, an unfortunate reality as it turns out, since L2 learning frequently took a back seat to the quest for better grades. ESLL students at Tradewinds were keenly aware of the importance of GPAs for their futures, which for many included plans for attending college. The heavy emphasis on grades meant, however, that students would engage in cheating, plagiarism, and other forms of academic “dishonesty” in sometimes desperate bids to keep grades respectable. In another indicator of the program’s “ease,” (continuing) enrollment in ESLL and J-section classes was widely believed to be a more legitimate way to achieve this end.
yet which similarly evoke the idealized perspective of the mainstream discussed earlier,

Brahdah, a G1.5 10th grader of Filipino heritage who had been born and raised in 
Hawai‘i, discusses his desire to “wait” in ESLL, even though – or perhaps because – he 
had spent his entire school career in ESLL.

(8.13) Weit til leita [SINT4: 456-475]

1 Mr. Talmy: And you haven’t been able to get out {of ESLL} since?
"Since? No."

3 Mr. Talmy: How come?
Brahdah: Ai dono. Da tes. Kaz ai ful araun evri taim. ((laugh))
"I don't know. The test. Because I fool around every time I take it."

5 Mr. Talmy: You fool around every time? How come you fool around?
"Because I want to stay in the program. I haven't gone out there yet.
I'll wait til later."

7 Mr. Talmy: Go out where?
Brahdah: Go aut tu da chru kain klaesiz.
"Go out to the real classes."

9 Mr. Talmy: Da chru kain klaesiz?
Brahdah: The real classes?
"Yeah. The regular classes."

11 Mr. Talmy: The regular classes. So you want to stay in the ESL classes?
Brahdah: Yeh. (.) Kaz da {regular} inglish klaes, ai notis ai mai fren feiling dat o samting. So ai jas gon stei fo litel wail. Til ai go get (redi fo) ova der.
"Yeah. Because I notice all my friends failing in the {regular} English classes. So I'm just going to stay here for a little while. Til I'm (ready for) them."

15 Mr. Talmy: So you want to stay.
Brahdah: Yeah.

17 Mr. Talmy: Ah. (.) That's interesting. Okay. (.) See a lot of the people I talk to want to get out of ESL. But, um=
Brahdah: =Bat da mo dei get aut, da mo dei gon feil.
"But the more they get out, the more they're going to fail."

19 Mr. Talmy: At least that's what they say. They say they want to get out of ESL, but I don't know if maybe they actually want to stay?
Brahdah: Yeah.

21 Mr. Talmy: Yeah. The more they're gonna fail, as you say?
Brahdah: Yeah.
There is much to comment upon in Brahdah’s interview extract, including my own notable surprise that he wanted to remain in ESLL. Brahdah was one of the few students I was fortunate enough to observe in the first and (part of) the second years of my research. Based on my observations, and on his performance in his classes, I was quite certain that one of the last places he would want to be at school was in ESLL. Indeed, in a number of instances in this interview, and in frequent interactions in class, he maintained ESLL was a program for “foreigners,” that he did not really “fit” in it, and that didn’t tell his friends about being in ESLL for concern of being ridiculed. Thus, his assertion that he wanted to “stei” in ESLL “til leita,” and that to do so he “ful araun evri taim” on the tests that could lead to his program exit, caught me off guard. Although his claim about not trying hard may simply have been an excuse for poor test performance, and his expressed desire to remain in ESLL a smokescreen for his continuing inability to get out of the program, Brahdah’s views on ESLL and the mainstream offer some important insights into the linguist discourses about ESLL at Tradewinds. His representation of the mainstream as “chru kain klaesiz,” and thus, apparently, of ESLL as “not true” or “not real,” evokes the mainstream/ESLL hierarchy alluded to throughout this chapter. For him, the mainstream was the place where “al mai fren feiling.” Therefore, he wanted to “weit til leita” to “go aut der,” that is, “to stei fo litel wail” in

---

12 In fact, I had the opportunity to examine parts of Brahdah’s placement test for this school year: his performance on the oral component was exemplary, if abbreviated; however, his “essay” about “the most beautiful place I have ever visited” was remarkably informal, colloquial, and judging by the handwriting (which on other assignments was careful and neat) had been written in haste. Thus, there is some plausibility to his claim that he did not try his best on the test. Regardless, even if he had “passed” it, his GPA was so low that it almost certainly would have precluded his exit from ESLL.
ESLL until he was “redi.” Brahdah was not the only G1.5 student to indicate some trepidation about the mainstream: to my surprise, when two of Ms. Cheney’s most resistant students from ELA 1X found out they had exited the program, they looked concerned and worried aloud about leaving the program (ELA221Xfn: 424). As I discuss in more detail in Chapter 9, Benz, a G1.5 student in Ms. Ariel’s ELA 2W who had previously been mainstreamed, even requested to be put back into ESLL because he was failing in mainstream classes.

The imagery of the mainstream as “aut der” and of ESLL as a place where one can “weit til leita” recalls Ms. Frank’s earlier comments (Extract 8.2) about ESLL as a refuge of sorts, a “comfortable” place that sheltered students from the “real world” of content learning through an L2. Although clearly a central purpose of ESL and content-based ESL classes is to provide L2 and scaffolded content instruction in order to facilitate learning, it seems equally apparent that G1.5 students such as Brahdah may also wind up appropriating (and contributing to) elements of wider, linguicist discourses about ESL, which, as I argue in subsequent chapters, these students themselves deploy and reproduce in their indexical displays of difference in ESLL classes. His comment that he is “jas gon stei fo litel wail” speaks to just how deep-seated these fears might be: “litel wail” for Brahdah was going on 11 years at the time of this interview. Yet he insisted that his choice was a prudent one, for as he points out in line 18, the more ESLL students get out of ESLL, “da mo dei gon feil.”

Brahdah implicated the oft-cited easiness and lack of relevance of ESLL to mainstream classes as a source of his fear, maintaining that ESLL didn’t prepare students for “aut der” because “dei tich da hol klaes – laik riding, wi awredi no doz wrdz, laida”
(they teach the whole class – like reading, we already know those words, and stuff like that). He went on: "mai kansrn iz dat dei shud tich wat laik dei tich aut der so dat wi cud bi priperd jas in keis wi paes da tes" (my concern is that they should teach what they teach out there, so that we can be prepared in case we pass the test) (SINT4: 567-571).

Brahdah’s “concerns” speak to those voiced by many other ESLL students, namely that J-section classes were not comparable to their mainstream counterparts (e.g., were “watered down” versions of them), and that what was taught in ESLL classes bore little relevance to what was needed to succeed in classes other than ESLL. In this regard, they echo comments made by Faltis & Wolfe (1999) that “ESL lifers” may remain in ESL programs due to lack of or inadequate L1 and L2 English instruction, which leaves them “unprepared for the academic demands of high school and post-secondary education” (pp. 275-276; see Chapter 2). These are points already alluded to in Chapter 7, which I will also consider in more depth in Chapter 9.

It is important to bear in mind that the students I interviewed may have represented ESLL in the ways they did in an effort to provide me with answers that they believed I wanted to hear. Despite my injunction at the beginning of the interviews that there were no “correct” answers, the questions I posed, and my reactions and responses to their answers may have indicated to certain students where my purported interests lay. However, it is equally important to bear in mind that my questions were generally broadly phrased, were based on many months of classroom observation, and concerned matters I had observed students saying and doing often repeatedly. The issue about the stigma of ESLL, for example, was so clearly evident in classrooms that a challenge for me became how to frame questions in such a way as to not direct attention to my interest
in the topic. Thus, the questions I arrived at were bland and quite general, e.g., “do you like ESLL?” and “what do you think mainstream students think of ESLL?” In addition, I cannot be too sure how “acceptable” a negative reply about ESLL might be when it is put to an ESL researcher; indeed, it may be likely that students such as China’s views that ESLL was acceptable, but only as a program for newcomers, were made more for my benefit than anything else.

As described above, G1.5 students’ representational practices of ESLL concerned the easiness of the program, how childish it was, the stigma of being associated with it, its links to Special Education, how it hindered social and academic mobility, and was impossible to escape. The sheer number of overwhelmingly consistent representations of ESLL, and the similarity of the semiotic properties in them, indicate that students were drawing upon larger discourses about ESLL at Tradewinds, linguistic discourses of deficiency much the same as the ones evident in the teachers’ representations of the program. In contrast to the teachers, however, G1.5 students’ deployment of these particular discourses in their representational practices signify an added dimension, that is, that they use it (and as they do, reproduce it) as a means to index their differences from ESLL.

Discourse, deficiency, and difference

When speaking of “discourses” about ESLL at Tradewinds, I am referring to a Foucauldian (e.g., 1972) notion of the term used in “genealogical” discourse analysis (e.g., Carabine, 2001), critical discourse analysis (e.g., Barker & Galasiński, 2001; Fairclough, 1989, 1995, 2001; Gee, 1996), and many post-structuralist L2 studies (e.g.,
McKay & Wong, 1996; Miller, 2003; Pavlenko, 2002; Pennycook, 1994, 1998). Stuart Hall (1997a) has usefully characterized this notion of “discourse” as a way

of referring to or constructing knowledge about a particular topic of practice: a cluster (or formation) of ideas, images and practices, which provide ways of talking about, forms of knowledge and conduct associated with, a particular topic, social activity or institutional site in society. These . . . define what is and is not appropriate in our formulation of, and our practices in relation to, a particular subject or site of social activity; what knowledge is considered useful, relevant, and ‘true’ in that context; and what sorts of persons or ‘subjects’ embody its characteristics (p. 6).

Put in slightly more parsimonious, if less elegant terms, this conception of “discourse” refer[s] to a set of historically grounded statements that exhibit regularities in presuppositions, thematic choices, values, etc.; that delimit what can be said about something, by whom, when, where, and how; and that are underwritten by some form of institutional authority (McKay & Wong, 1996, p. 579; also see Fairclough, 1989, 1995; Foucault, 1972; Gore, 1993; Pennycook, 2001; Volosinov, 1973/1929; Wenger, 1998).

As I have indicated throughout this chapter, Tradewinds teachers’ and students’ representations of ESLL signify the mutually informing, interdiscursively mediated relationships between the semiotic properties of these representations and linguicism as manifest in what I have argued are the discourses about ESLL in circulation in the high school and wider society. ESLL, in the terms of these discourses, was the domain of newcomers, or to use a term used by many students, FOB: “fresh off the boat.” As I
discuss in Chapters 9 and 10, FOB as it was used at Tradewinds signified a recently-arrived cultural and linguistic Other of colossally uncool proportions. ESLL students were seen as lacking in traits that comprised “regular” students; apparent “deficits” in students’ L2 were equated with corresponding deficits in students’ character and intelligence, problems which ESLL would somehow correct (e.g., through “character education”). In addition to “handicaps” such as low L2 proficiency, poor character, and lack of intelligence, these students were also remarkably passive: it was the program, after all, that was conceived as the agent initiating and guiding these students’ “conversion” into regular students. In terms of these discourses, ESLL also was (at least) “one step down” from the mainstream, on par with Special Education; ESLL students were “marked” as essentially second class citizens. Little could be expected of students’ performance and perhaps as a result, ESLL was an “easy” program, with J-section classes serving as “watered down” versions of their mainstream counterparts and ESLL classes themselves bearing little relation to the teaching and learning that took place in (a valorized) mainstream. ESLL, in short, lurked near the bottom of the high school hierarchy, a hierarchy that was in fact institutionally encoded in the ESLL designations mandated state-wide: NEP, LEP, FEP, exit, and the final objective, mainstream. The elements of these discourses point toward the stigma of ESLL at Tradewinds and why so many students there spoke of some sense of “shame” with being associated with the program.

These discourses were constituted by and constitutive of, were interdiscursively mediated by, the linguicist discourses of ESLL in circulation at the high school. As I shall argue in Chapters 9 and 10, for a variety of reasons, and in a variety of ways, G1.5
students simultaneously drew on and contributed to elements of these discourses in their ESLL classes, in their unique, oppositional G1.5 cultural productions of ESLL. This suggests that just as G1.5 students would provide non-G1.5 students and teachers in their classes with access to these discourses as they went about their G1.5 CoP cultural productions of ESLL (see Chapter 9), that they themselves had been provided access to them themselves, either in earlier stages of their ESLL careers and/or in their Local communities outside of ESLL.

To give some indication of this process, I include below a data extract from a formal interview with Barehand, a 15-year-old from Korea who had lived in the US for three years and was an oldtimer, full participant in the G1.5 community of practice in Ms. Ariel’s ESLL A class. Here, he explains how he came into his understanding that ESLL was a stigmatized program and social category, which he had earlier not realized. This suggests that as a newcomer, Barehand had looked favorably on ESLL, and then gradually as he became apprenticed to the discourses of deficiency about ESLL, came to realize its marked position in the social hierarchy of his school, and simultaneously, took up social practices that would constitute a transformation of his ESLL student identity (Lave & Wenger, 1991), one which I have glossed as “G1.5 ESLL student.” Similarly, it also suggests that newcomers in classes with him at present will be provided access to that same discourses via Barehand’s and other G1.5 students’ indexical displays of difference in their cultural productions of ESLL, and thus themselves will come to similar “realizations” (these central issues are discussed in depth in Chapters 9 and 10), and quite possibly, their own transformations in ESLL student identities.
Immediately prior to the interview excerpt represented in Extract 8.14, Barehand and I had been talking about why it was “uncool” to be in ESLL, a program he maintained he strongly wanted to get out of.

(8.14) *Think the same way* [SINT21: 632-655]

1 Mr. Talmy: So ESL means you might be a FOB?
Barehand: Something like that. Kind of, I guess.
3 Mr. Talmy: Yeah. Who decides that meaning?
Barehand: I don’t know. I guess, like, people, other people say how ESL is gay, like that.
5 Mr. Talmy: Yeah.
7 Barehand: And then since I hang out with those kind of people, I think the same way ((laugh)) . . . ‘Cause when I first came to America and had ESL, I didn’t think, like – I didn’t thought if ESL is gay and stuff.
9 Mr. Talmy: Yeah.
11 Barehand: I thought it was like one of the normal classes.
Mr. Talmy: One of the normal classes.
13 Barehand: Yeah, I mean, like of course I gotta have that ‘cause I can’t speak.
Mr. Talmy: Right. . . Do you know when you first realized that it’s not cool to be ESL?
15 Barehand: Um, when I came to Mauka Intermediate {after one year in Hawai‘i}.
17 Mr. Talmy: When you came to Mauka. How – what happened?
Barehand: Um, my friends saying that ESL is dumb and is boring and stuff.
19 Mr. Talmy: Yeah.
Barehand: I think that’s the time.
21 Mr. Talmy: And that’s when you wanted to get out?
Barehand: Yeah.

Similar to the other G1.5 students above, Barehand was aware of the stigma associated with ESLL, encoded here in terms of ESL being “gay,” a highly pejorative and discouragingly ubiquitous word in the lexicon of boys at Tradewinds (ESLL and mainstream). What is of particular note is his representation about the locus of this

---

13 In another example of the many tensions I encountered daily at Tradewinds, my attempts at challenging the pejorative and homophobic use of the word “gay” there were often met by male students with sarcasm and derision. I came to realize that by challenging students about this, I was positioning myself as another
attitude: "other people" (line 4), "my friends" (line 18) – who had negative views about ESL and with whom he hung out (lines 7-8). He states (lines 8-9) that when he first came to the US, he didn’t think negatively about ESL – in fact he “thought it was like one of the normal classes” (line 11). He says that after a year in Hawai‘i, his friends at Mauka Intermediate, whom he earlier in the interview stated were Local Koreans (they didn’t speak Korean, “but still Korean, so...” [SINT 21: 482]), were “saying that ESL is dumb and is boring and stuff” (line 18). It was at this time that he realized ESL was not cool and that he wanted to get out.

What has been implied throughout this chapter regarding students’ perceptions of mainstream beliefs about ESL, of being considered “one step down” from the mainstream, of hiding ESL placements from Local friends, the hints of teasing, and so forth, is here stated explicitly by Barehand: that an important source of negative attitudes about ESL derived (at least in part) from beyond the program, in mainstream friendship networks and Local communities that many G1.5 students had ties to. This is one important way that the linguist discourses of deficiency about ESL were transported into and made manifest in ESL classes. Indeed, as I will argue in subsequent chapters, a central facet of G1.5 ESL student identity at Tradewinds was the repudiation of ESLL as represented so forcefully by the students whose interviews I have extracted above. Put another way, to be a G1.5 ESL student at Tradewinds involved not wanting to be in ESLL, often through the indexing of a Local or mainstream rather than “foreign” affiliation.

adult whose job it was to sanction problematic beliefs, and the language used to represent them. It is quite likely that this would have undermined my relationships with students, if not curtailed access to them. Therefore, although I frequently did give students (including Barehand) a hard time about this, I wound up holding my tongue about it far more often than I would have preferred. This interview is one such instance.
Becoming a G1.5 ESLL student at Tradewinds thus meant participating in a CoP that had as its goal the resistance of ESLL, invocation of the discourses of deficiency about ESLL, and of being ESLL. This was a CoP that was not always clearly salient in classes; it emerged at some points and waned at others, thus ESLL classes were not always distinguished by oppositional behavior. However, it was a CoP that could appear at any moment, and regularly did. Those students who did not engage in these practices, because they saw value in ESLL, for example, or were simply of an L2 proficiency level that denied them comprehension of the goings-on in classrooms, could be (and usually were) classed as newcomers or FOBs (who I shall simply call non-G1.5 students). Thus, G1.5 students played a pivotal socializing role in their ESLL classes, both for non G1.5 classmates and teachers, in effect, linking the ESLL program to broader mainstream and Local communities, and their linguicist discourses. Unfortunately, as has been alluded to above, this oppositional identity, and the various, often subtle ways it was manifested in classrooms, meant that more often than not, the potential means by which these students might exit the program were also undermined.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have examined teachers’ and G1.5 ESLL students’ representations of ESLL and of the mainstream in an effort both to situate the ESLL program in a broader school and societal context, and to see the mutually informing, interdiscursively mediated relationships between the semiotic and linguistic properties of these representations and linguicism as manifest in what I argue are the discourses about ESLL in circulation in the high school and wider society (Fairclough, 1989, 1995, 2001).
I have examined the discourses of ESLL in terms of teachers’ representations, of ESLL as a transitional program with assimilationist aims. I have also described how ESLL students were frequently represented in deficit terms in these discourses, with relative proficiency levels in L2 English coming to represent corresponding “deficiencies” in character, motivation, and intelligence. Thus, the purpose of ESLL was described as providing a “shelter” for students both as they learned the L2, underwent a personal transformation, and were therefore converted from “problems” to “regular” students: what I have termed a “conversion complex.” I have then examined G1.5 students’ representations of the stigma of ESLL at Tradewinds, arguing that these are also constituted by and constitutive of these deficit-oriented discourses about ESLL. I have posited that because G1.5 students tend to have greater connections to and thus apparent awareness of school circumstances beyond ESLL – that is, more Local friends and community affiliations – that they in turn bring elements of these discourses into the classroom in indexical displays of differentiation – that is in their G1.5 cultural productions of ESLL – where it is thereby reproduced.
CHAPTER 9. RESISTANCE, RELATIONALITY, AND COMPETING
CULTURAL PRODUCTIONS OF ESLL: GENERATION 1.5 COMMUNITIES
OF PRACTICE

Exercising various kinds of agency in an unequal setting where they lack formal authority, students also resist/engage/manipulate the teacher, the process, and the institution through their informal power. . . . Students are constructing the subordinate self at the same time that they are resisting and undermining it, while believing that their 'real selves,' 'real lives,' are somewhere else, not contaminated or controlled by this dominating process.

Shor (1996, p. 17)

[W]hen official channels offer only possibilities to participate in institutionally mandated forms of commoditized activity, genuine participation, membership, and legitimate access to ongoing practice . . . are rare. At the same time, schools . . . accord knowledgeable skill a reified existence, turning it into something to be "acquired" and its transmission as an institutional motive. This process generates pressures toward the trivializing decomposition of forms of activity. The result is a widespread generation of negative identities and misrecognized or institutionally disapproved interstitial communities of practice.

Lave (1991, pp. 78-79)

Introduction

To this point, I have examined ESLL at Tradewinds from a number of different perspectives. In Chapter 6, I located contemporary circumstances for second language education in Hawai‘i in historical and political context, describing the state’s long history of linguicism and linguicidal educational policy and practice. I also discussed the implications of recent national educational policy on ESL programs, teachers, and students, arguing that the No Child Left Behind Act has marked a profound shift away from an era in which bi- and multilingualism was (grudgingly) tolerated, if not promoted,
toward English monolingualism. As described in Chapter 7, ESLL at Tradewinds was “structurally produced” in terms of program organization and intra-institutional relationships as a marginal, low-prestige program that was unintegrated with the rest of the school. In terms of an institutionally-sanctioned ESLL identity position, these structural productions converged with an ambiguous ESLL curriculum centered around children’s novels, decontextualized grammar and vocabulary exercises, and exotifying, “multicultural” assignments, to position students as an undifferentiated group of recently-arrived, cultural and linguistic Others. In Chapter 8, I examined teachers’ and G1.5 ESLL students’ representations of ESLL and of the mainstream in an effort both to situate the ESLL program in a broader school and societal context, and to see the mutually informing, interdiscursively mediated relationships between the semiotic and linguistic properties of teachers’ and students’ representations and linguicism as manifest in what I argue are the discourses about ESLL in circulation in the high school and wider society (Fairclough, 1989, 1995, 2001).

What remains to be done is to examine how “ESLL” at Tradewinds— as a program, as a class, as a contested social identity category— was accomplished in the everyday life of ESLL classrooms, that is, how linguistic, discursive, and interactional resources were marshaled in this endeavor in the day-to-day interactions between teachers and students, and students and students. The next two chapters will be devoted to this effort. In this chapter, I will examine G1.5 students’ creative responses to curriculum and instruction in their ESLL classes, because although many students will produce practices and identities that are consonant with dominant definitions of particular schooled identities (e.g., “ESLL student”), many others will not, coming to relationally
define themselves against what they perceive those identities to be (Eckert, 1989, 2000; Gutierrez et al., 1995; Levinson & Holland, 1996; Levinson, 2001; Willis, 1977; see Chapter 3). As I have argued to this point, G1.5 ESLL students were precisely these students, whose often subtle, sometimes overt, but seemingly ever-present efforts at undermining local formal or “official” meanings of ESLL, and resisting socializing interactions that positioned them as ESLL, worked to significantly affect both local cultural notions of “ESLL” as well as ESLL classroom environments and learning opportunities. The twist here, if it can be so called, is that G1.5 students overwhelmingly represented their opposition to ESLL as stemming from a desire to join the school, yet being denied the opportunity to do so by the program that they were resisting (see Chapter 8). In addition, I shall discuss how resistance to these socializing interactions indexed on the one hand, “G1.5-ness,” and on the other, worked as an alternative, unofficial “curriculum” into which non-G1.5 students and teachers would be socialized.

In this regard, G1.5 students’ resistance to being positioned as “ESLL student” ultimately affected classrooms in terms of what was taught, how it was taught, who taught it, and what was available for learning, with the knowledge, orientations, and social practices of a broad-based G1.5 student “community of practice” (CoP) coming to assume varying degrees of dominance in ESLL classrooms, often alongside, occasionally in place of, but always in relation to “official” classroom CoP. As I will argue, the “joint enterprise” that many G1.5 students were “mutually engaged” in, and around which this CoP formed – and the “shared repertoire” of cultural forms and linguistic and interactional practices that simultaneously derived from and reproduced it (Wenger, 1998) – was the subversion of the official ESLL curriculum and the official conceptions
of ESLL that went along with it. Implicated in these efforts were students’ prior
(negative) experiences in ESLL classes, as well as their connections to communities
beyond the ESLL program, where ESLL was highly stigmatized, and where linguicist
discourses about immigrants, bi- and multilingualism were in circulation. This is not to
suggest causation, but is instead to take into account G1.5 students’ memberships in
multiple communities of practice, including their access to and histories of participation
in Local ones. Crucially, one of the pivotal roles the G1.5 students played in the ESLL
program at Tradewinds, what Wenger (1998, p. 108-110) has called “brokering,” was that
they brought with them or “imported” the knowledge and practices from these Local
CoP; indeed, they are what provided G1.5 students the means to index their difference
from ESLL newcomers and/or non-G1.5 ESLL students, to undermine or disrupt the
“official” meanings of ESLL to begin with.

Brokers, according to Wenger (1998) are crucial to the development,
maintenance, and evolution of CoP, as they transfer CoP knowledge and practices across
different and multiple CoP “boundaries”:

Brokers are able to make new connections across [CoP], enable coordination, and
... open new possibilities for meaning. ... [Brokering] involves processes of
translation, coordination, and alignment between perspectives. It requires. ... the
ability to link practices by facilitating transactions between them, and to cause
learning by introducing into a practice elements of another” (p. 109).

As I shall argue below, brokering was a prime function of G1.5 students as their
frequently oppositional participation in ESLL classes was mediated by their participation
in Local and mainstream CoP beyond it. Indeed, in certain classrooms, the oppositional
response to the structural and official cultural productions of “ESLL” was so powerful that it threw into question precisely which conception of “ESLL” – the school-ascribed one or the broadly oppositional one – was dominant.1 As will become clear below, this signals the often-ignored, taken-for-granted power that students can wield in the classroom, as well as dimensions along which students’ construct the terms and conditions of their own and others’ learning (Giroux, 1983a, 1983b; Lantolf & Pavlenko, 2001; McKay & Wong, 1996; McLaren, 1999; Norton, 2000; Norton Peirce, 1995a; Pavlenko, 2002; Shor, 1992, 1996; Siegal, 1996; Sizer, 2004; Willis, 1977).

**Performance strikes**

Among the more pervasive, subtle, and significant influences that students exerted in their ESLL classrooms derived less from what they did do than from what they didn’t, at least in terms of expected patterns of participation in formal classroom activities. In this regard, a construct that will prove useful in the discussion of students’ oppositional responses to ESLL curriculum and instruction is that of “performance strike.” Shor (1992, p. 20) characterizes the student performance strike as “an unorganized mass refusal to perform well, an informal and unacknowledged [classroom] strike” (p. 20). He argues that performance strikes are a manifestation of student resistance to the undemocratic, authoritarian, and dehumanizing processes of formal schooling – from imposed curricula that have little relevance to students’ lives, to domesticating, unilateral instructional practices, to standardized testing. He maintains that occasionally, student

---

1 To recap from Chapter 7, when talking about the “structural productions” of ESLL in the school, I am concerned with how ESLL is “produced” in terms of ESLL program organization, intra-institutional relationships, and curriculum. When discussing “official cultural productions” of ESLL in the school, I am concerned with how the structural productions of ESLL are instantiated in actual classroom practice.
performance strikes can be purposeful and organized responses to autocratic control. Usually, however, they are unspoken, indeliberate, and unreflected upon. In the latter, more common variety,

the students’ refusal to perform appears as low motivation, low test scores and achievement, and a ‘discipline problem.’ These manifestations of the performance strike keep authority at bay in class. They are ways to refuse cooperation with a system that invests unequally in students and denies them participation in curriculum and governance (Shor, 1992, p. 21).

Although the term “performance strike” may suggest simple passive participation or withdrawal from classroom life, in fact, and as I will describe below, the practices that went into them at Tradewinds often required active engagement, similar to what Kohl (1994) has characterized as “willed not learning,” and Eckert (1989, p. 181) as “learning not to learn.”

For applied linguistics, the notion of performance strike dovetails in important ways with Norton’s formulation of “investment” (Norton, 2000, 2001; Norton Peirce, 1995a). As discussed in Chapter 3, “investment” fundamentally reconceptualizes the construct of motivation as it has been used in (mostly social psychological) L2 research. Rather than seeing low student performance as the presumptive manifestation of low motivation, “investment” more radically implicates relations between learners and social contextual conditions. This highlights individuals’ relationships to and perspectives on the range of symbolic and material resources that are (potentially) available in a given context, how people evaluate the character and quality of those resources as having or not having, as contributing or not contributing to the sorts of cultural, linguistic, and
symbolic capital they desire or need. Thus, rather than “blaming” students for what might otherwise be conceived as an individual problem or deficiency, their investments in the L2, for example, or in the particular contexts in which the L2 is to be learned can be examined instead. In this view, low motivation as an explanation for student performance would be reconceived as a lack of investment in what is ostensibly being made available for learning; thus, a student’s failure to learn, resulting from low motivation, would be translated into a willed not-learning, or an outright refusal to learn, due to low investment in those circumscribed, reified forms of knowledge that are made manifest, for example, in the curricula of formal school settings (cf. Kohl, 1994; McNeil, 1986; Lave, 1991).

There were several dimensions of students’ oppositional responses to curriculum and instruction in the Tradewinds ESLL classes that can be subsumed beneath the rubric of student “performance strike.” In this chapter, I look in some detail through critical discourse analysis at several broadly-specified social practices, arguing that they are the emergent cultural forms of the G1.5 CoP mentioned above, a CoP that was evident to varying degrees in each of the eight ESLL classes that I observed in my two and a half years at the high school. These practices are:

“‘It’s at home’: Not bringing books to class”;

“‘Neva du am’: Not doing classwork”;

“‘Bell’s gonna ring!’: Starting late and finishing early”;

“‘I can’t speak English, man!’: Resisting and reproducing FOBeing”;

“‘A little bit more time’: Bargaining”; and
"'Minimum effort': Worksheet Syndrome."²

Following my discussion of G1.5 students' responses to curriculum and instruction, I will also look at their occasionally contentious relations with non-G1.5 students in the ESLL classrooms.

My discussion of students’ resistant cultural forms below is organized thematically, by the social practices just enumerated, as is common in ethnography (see, e.g., Eckert, 1989; Levinson, 2001; Willis, 1977). In order to see how these social practices are interactionally and discursively accomplished, my analyses of broadly-specified social practices below necessarily entail and therefore include microanalyses of language use and interaction in classrooms (see Chapter 3).³

By organizing and framing the analysis as I do, it may be construed that I am asserting a causal origin for student resistance, perhaps, or some sort of linearity in terms of its development. This is not the case. G1.5 ESLL student resistance at Tradewinds, in the form of performance strikes and other associated practices, and instructors’ responses in the form of defensive teaching, need to be seen as the complex social phenomena that they were, as dense sets of situated, mutually-informing practices, rather than as a series of discrete incidents that can be easily extracted from context and implicated as the

---

² Others include "'It's not copying, it's just changing an answer': Copying and cheating"; "'We already did that!': Repeated activities"; "'Done in 10 minutes': Finishing quickly"; "'Can I get a drink of water?': Cruising and cutting." In Chapter 10, I shall also consider some of the "defensive teaching" (McNeil, 1986; 2000) accommodations that attended and facilitated many of these practices, including "alternative assignments," "study hall," "floating deadlines," and "test preparation."

³ As I mention in Chapter 3, an important criticism of (critical) ethnography is that it has not attended to linguistic or interactional detail as much as it should. As indicated in Chapter 5, the same has been said of work in cultural studies more generally (Billig, 1997, 1997a, 1999b; Wetherell, 1998). Critical discourse analysis of interaction rigorously and demonstrably anchors claims in data, making analysis more accountable, and thus addresses criticisms made about "ideologically driven" analyses, "implicit assumptions" about language and interaction, and unsubstantiated conclusions in critical ethnographic and cultural studies research (Fairclough, 1989, 1995, 2001).
“source” of the problem. For this reason, although I single out or highlight for discussion particular constitutive components of performance strikes below (and defensive teaching accommodations in Chapter 10), they are all closely associated with each other. To emphasize these interrelations, and thus the broader contextual dimensions of these practices, my analyses of particular component practices will necessarily include references to others. This means that my analyses in the early going of this chapter will contain references to student/teacher practices that will be explicated later or in Chapter 10, just as student/teacher practices that I discuss toward the end of the chapter and in Chapter 10 will refer to those considered at the beginning of Chapter 9.

Organizationally, my discussion of G1.5 ESLL student CoP performance strike practices below is divided into two sections. In the first, I focus on the first-year ESLL teachers’ classrooms, since performance strikes in them manifested in qualitatively different ways than in Mr. Bradley’s classes. Following this, I briefly examine Mr. Bradley’s classes, where much of my discussion contrasts his (significantly different) responses to student actions with those of the first-year teachers. I argue that the differences in response to student performance strikes between Mr. Bradley’s and the first year ESLL teachers’ classes was in part due to differences in the teachers’ newcomer/oldtimer status as teachers, and resulted in classroom resistance that was far more subtle and indirect in Mr. Bradley’s classes than in the others. Regardless of the different manifestations of and responses to G1.5 student resistance, however, the results were similar both for first-year ESLL teachers and Mr. Bradley: an increasingly slowed-down, dumbed-down and academically inconsequential program that was precisely what the G1.5 students claimed to have initially been resisting (see Chapter 8). This therefore
highlights that the cultural productions of ESLL at Tradewinds were not simply one-way, top-down phenomena, nor were they mere reflections of negative societal valuations about immigrants, bilingualism, and non-native Englishes. Rather, they were jointly constructed by teachers and students in the social practices of everyday classroom life. Due to the much more overt character of student resistance in the first-year teachers’ classrooms (in general contrast to Mr. Bradley’s classes, where resistance was more subtly manifested), the data from these classes below and in Chapter 10 provide a compelling opportunity not only to examine the dynamics of ESLL classroom resistance, but also to reveal important dimensions of teachers’ accommodation of the G1.5 cultural productions of ESLL, just as Mr. Bradley’s responses reveal his resistance to them. These varied responses not only signify the degree to which students were involved in the co-construction of ESLL curriculum, but also how contested the cultural productions of “ESLL” were at the high school.

Resisting ESLL in newcomer teachers’ classes

One of the most striking findings from my research at Tradewinds was how similar the four classes taught by the first-year teachers that I observed were, even though the students and the teachers themselves in them were so different. Although the respective “supplementary” curricula that allowed these teachers to put their own personal marks on their classes differed (see Chapter 7; Appendices H-J), the social practices that I outlined above (and that I discuss in detail below) did not. In this regard, despite different groups of students with different demographic profiles, and despite differences in the first-year teachers’ age, gender, educational background, approach to
teaching, and previous teaching experience, the performance strikes and defensive
teaching accommodations that went along with them were nearly identical, resulting in
four classes that were remarkably alike.

In this regard, then, first-year ESLL teachers' classrooms were important sites of
and offered rich opportunities for examining student resistance, and student and teacher
socialization. Although students' resistant practices were apparent in all of the ESLL
classes that I observed, they were much less subtle in the first-year ESLL classes than
they were in Mr. Bradley's, were more wide-ranging, and more clearly revealed the
dynamics of the performance strike and attendant defensive teaching accommodations.
In short, they more evidently demonstrated the complex socialization processes that were
daily negotiated in the ESLL classrooms, here by newcomers in institutionally-sanctioned
roles of power, authority, and expertise (first-year ESLL teachers), and oldtimers who
were cast in hierarchically subordinate positions of novices or learners (G1.5 ESLL
students). This particular circumstance thus also helpfully illuminates the situated
learning perspective informing this study, especially as it relates to an institutional
setting: that the relations of oldtimer/newcomer, expert/novice, full participant/legitimate
peripheral participant, and teacher/student do not neatly or even necessarily map onto one
another as might otherwise be assumed (cf. Lave, 1991; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger,
1998; Wenger & Snyder, 2000), and therefore, that (language) socialization is an
inevitably contingent, bidirectional process (He, 2003; Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991). This
latter point is, as discussed in Chapter 3, particularly important: although language
socialization researchers have long maintained the bidirectionality of socialization
processes (see, e.g., Ochs, 1986; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a), this has largely been
asserted, if not assumed, in actual studies. This is likely due to the fact that much of this research, concerned as it has been with children and their caregivers, has tended to “emphasize the efforts made by the experts (e.g., mothers, other caregivers, teachers) to socialize the novices (e.g., children, students)” (He, 2003, p. 128; also see Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002, p. 341; Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991, p. 151; cf. Poole, 1992) (see Chapter 3). This reason alone makes analysis of the first-year ESLL teachers’ particular circumstances compelling, all the more so when it can be compared with circumstances in an experienced teacher’s classroom such as Mr. Bradley’s.

The first-year teachers and their classes

In contrast to L2 studies (but see, e.g., Johnson, 1996), a considerable literature has accumulated in education about the many difficulties facing first-year teachers in K-12 schools. This literature ranges from “nuts-and-bolts” instructional manuals (e.g., Kelley, 2003), to more in-depth theoretical treatments, primarily in the case study research tradition (e.g., Bullough, 1989; Klugman, 2001a, 2001b; Kowalski, Weaver, & Henson, 1994; Roehrig, Pressley, & Talotta, 2002). In the well-known case of a first-year 7th grade teacher, for example, Bullough (1989) extrapolates three broadly-defined developmental stages in a beginning teacher’s first year in the classroom: “fantasizing,” or the idealized anticipation of teaching; “survival,” in which the fantasy “crumbles” in the face of actual teaching experience, or what Klugman (2001b, p. 153) calls the enactment of unfamiliar “scripts and choreographies” of schooling; and “mastery,” when the teacher gains control over early problems and develops self-confidence in the
Bullough (1989) notes that the transitions endured in the first year of teaching, particularly between the fantasy stage, which lasts until shortly after teaching has begun, and the survival stage, which begins and usually ends within the first few months of teaching, are exceedingly difficult, and result from what he aptly calls the "culture shock" that stems from the mismatch between one's romanticized image of teaching and the realities that are ultimately encountered. It is a difficult period, he argues, in which teachers can "[give] in to student pressures and [lower] . . . standards," (Bullough, 1989, p. 27), or, to use McNeil's (1986) term, resort to "defensive teaching"; first-year teachers are, thus, particularly susceptible to the influences of students as "socializing agents." As Bullough (1989) concludes:

[T]he power of students is not always so obvious; at times it is subtle, often unnoticed. Of particular importance to beginning teachers is [students'] influence as socializing agents . . . . [T]hrough playing out an internalized student role, a role taken for granted, young people press teachers to conform to their own expectations of what is appropriate teacher behavior. Teachers who demand too much or even too little will find themselves in a struggle over who will establish and control the classroom learning climate (1989, p. 8).

However, just as G1.5 students complicate the construct of "length of residence," the first-year teachers in this study complicate what precisely is "first year." Although Ms. Cheney, Ms. Ariel, and Mr. Day were each in their first year at Tradewinds, all had

---

4 A final stage, "impact," in which teachers have "mastered the skills of teaching" and "are capable of articulating the grounds of their expertise," i.e., in terms of classroom practice, is reserved for experienced teachers (i.e., those no longer in their first year) (Bullough, 1989, p. 17).

5 McNeil (1986), however, makes very clear that experienced teachers will fall victim to defensive teaching, too, e.g., due to "burn out" and/or long-term experience in the bureaucratic organization of formal school settings, which center on management and control (cf. Becker, 1995/1972; Sizer, 2004/1984).
taught previously. Ms. Cheney had several years of secondary teaching experience in a private school, Ms. Ariel been an instructional aide in a public school ESL program for a number of years, and Mr. Day had been a public school industrial arts teacher for some time before arriving at Tradewinds. Thus, all were "newcomers" to Tradewinds, and for Mr. Day and Ms. Cheney, were newcomers to ESL, but none were newcomers to K-12 teaching itself. Nonetheless, all three admitted to some degree of "shock" when they first began teaching at the high school, and all described this as stemming primarily from the heterogeneity and large numbers of ESLL students they were assigned to teach (see Chapter 7). Also contributing to the challenges they faced was that all were hired to teach on comparatively short notice, with Mr. Day hired just days before the beginning of school, and Ms. Cheney hired some weeks into a school year already underway. In this regard, each of these teachers admitted to some degree of feeling overwhelmed at the beginning of the school year. Still, it is not entirely clear how certain aspects of first-year teachers' experiences as described in the educational literature might apply to these teachers. Regardless, the findings from these studies are important to bear in mind in the discussion below.

Before embarking on that discussion, I will briefly review information from Chapter 5, regarding the first-year ESLL teachers' classes that I observed:
Table 9.1. First-year ESLL teachers’ classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course name</th>
<th>Section code</th>
<th>Duration of observation</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Total hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESLL A</td>
<td>ELA 1X</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Ms. Cheney</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESLL A</td>
<td>ELA 2W</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Ms. Ariel</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESLL A</td>
<td>ELA 2X</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Mr. Day</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESLL B</td>
<td>ELB 1U</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Ms. Cheney</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ms. Cheney’s classes. Ms. Cheney’s ELA 1X and ELB 1U were observed in the first year of the study, and thus, the data from these classes take form in field notes from classroom participant observation. ELA 1X was by far the largest and most overtly noncompliant of all the ESLL classes that I observed. It averaged more than 30 9th and 10th graders over the course of the year. Half were Pacific Islanders (Micronesian or Polynesian), one third were from China, with the remainder from Japan, Korea, and the Philippines. Approximately half of the class had lived in the US for two years or more, with most having gone to school in Hawai‘i, and for the Micronesian students, Guam, or the Northern Mariana Islands, for five years or more. Most of the East Asian students were more recent arrivals to the US. L2 English proficiencies ranged from absolute beginners (mostly students from China, a few from Micronesia) to advanced speakers, with five of the Micronesian students (all boys, all from Chuuk) with interrupted formal educations and low levels of L1/L2 print literacy and L2 oral proficiency.

Ms. Cheney had two PTTs for this class in addition to me, but still struggled to get much approximating classwork accomplished, except toward the end of the year.

---

6 “Total hours rec” = Total hours of classroom recordings (including student-carried recordings); “Total hours obs” = Total hours of classroom observation (including all classroom and student-carried recordings).
when a different grouping arrangement was implemented. There were a number of reasons for the difficulties in this class beyond its size and diversity, including G1.5 students, who often disrupted the class with complaints about class work and Ms. Cheney herself, and the students with interrupted formal educations, who quite understandably did not respond well to most of the whole-class activities, which were geared to L2 proficiency levels far beyond their own.

Just as ELA 1X was the most noncompliant class that I observed, Ms. Cheney’s ELB 1U class was the most accommodating, no doubt due to its smaller size (second year ESLL classes were invariably smaller than the ESLL A classes), and that students had already been at the school for a year. This class averaged 20 members over the school year. One third was Micronesian (all Marshallese), another third was Chinese, with the remaining third consisting of students from the Philippines, Vietnam, and Iran. Most of these students were 10th and 11th graders, with three in the 12th grade. Approximately one-fifth of the students were generation 1.5 (G1.5), with lengths of residence ranging from two years to 12, with one student who had been born in Hawai‘i. Ms. Cheney had one PTT in this class in addition to me.

As I indicated in Chapter 7, Ms. Cheney’s classes were the most variable in terms of curriculum and instruction, evidencing what Kadooka (2001, pp. 28-29) has called “an absence of [curricular] continuity.” There were various reasons for this, including, as I came to realize from preliminary data analysis, student performance strikes and the defensive teaching accommodations. Indeed, my initial formulations of the practices in the ESLL classes that I enumerate below were significantly influenced by my observations of these two classes. In addition to those practices, however, students, many
of them G1.5 students, engaged in a range of sometimes startlingly antagonistic classroom behavior, primarily in terms of mocking and swearing at the teacher.

To give some indication of the tenor of these more overt behaviors, in an early observation, a Samoan student from another class walked in, introduced herself to me, and as she was leaving pointed at Ms. Cheney, seated a few feet away, and emphatically stated, "nobody likes her." Moments later, Karen*, a G1.5 Chuukese student who had grown up in Guam shouted across the class to a friend, "Fuck you, Kate!" Ms. Cheney warned her with, "You could get a referral for that," to which Karen responded with a middle finger salute (ELA11Xfn: 138-146). On another day, Ms. Cheney told Tina* to throw away the candy she was eating. Tina glared at her and Ms. Meredith, one of the class PTTs, repeated the command. Still Tina refused to comply. Ms. Cheney repeated the command again, at which point the student threw the candy on the floor. Ms. Cheney then turned to the class and said, "Guys, we have the perfect lesson for you today, on sanitation." She then asked Ms. Meredith if she wanted to teach that lesson, to which the class replied with a resounding, "Yes!" (ELA12Xfn: 262). After spending one class on a reading concerning the environment (about "dirty snow" in Sweden), Ms. Cheney asked her students, "What did you learn from this?" Anna*, another G1.5 student from Micronesia, shouted out "Nothing! We don't learn nothing in this class!" (ELA21Xfn: 65-69). Weeks later, Ms. Cheney was explaining the instructions for a newspaper article on "tongue-clipping" in Korea. As soon as she had finished, Kate, a Samoan G1.5 student abruptly asked, "Are you done!?" (ELA 22Xfn: 24). Such behavior was not limited to the G1.5 students, either: toward the end of the school year, Fan Buo*, a low

---

7 Getting a referral meant being sent to a counselor or vice-principal for some form of punishment.
L2 proficient student who had recently arrived from China responded after Ms. Cheney stopped to help him with a cloze worksheet on “American vacationers” by making a face and sticking his tongue out at her (ELA22Xfn: 69).

Students in ELB 1U tended to be less overtly oppositional than in ELA 1X, although they still challenged Ms. Cheney. Several students on occasion made it clear that they “hated” the class or her by expressing the sentiment directly to her (e.g., ELB12Ufn: 18; ELB21Ufn: 660). Others routinely challenged instructions for assignments, as in the following instance, during a grammar exercise in which students were to write sentences incorporating a list of 21 “modifiers” (a list of adverbs and adjectives) listed on the board:

(9.1) Hell no! [ELB22Ufn: 86]

1 Ms. Cheney: I want you to just write eight words per sentence, one for each modifier.
3 Iris*: ((turns to look at Mr. Talmy; shakes her head))
   Rose*: ((shakes her head))
5 Ms. Cheney: So that’s eight words for each sentence, one sentence for each modifier. So 21 sentences.
7 Donna*: HELLL NO!
   Ms. Cheney: ((pause)) So please take out a sheet of paper and get to work.

Similarly, immediately prior to a spring vacation, Ms. Cheney outlined the homework students were to complete. Before she could finish students were shouting “What!” and “That’s no vacation!”

8 Discourse analysis is reserved for audio-taped interaction (see below), not for instances that were recorded in field notes, as in Extracts 9.1 and 9.2.
In another class, which Ms. Enders covered as Ms. Cheney had a meeting, Iris was asked to read the morning bulletin to the class:

(9.2) No. [ELB21U: 447-455]

1 Ms. Enders: Who wants to come up and read the bulletin?  
Ss: ((silence))
2 Ms. Enders: Iris?  
Iris: No.
3 Ms. Enders: You don’t want your oral points?  
Iris: No.
4 Ms. Enders: You don’t want to participate?  
Iris: No.
5 Ms. Enders: Okay, who wants to?  
Ss: ((silence))  
((Ms. Enders reads the bulletin))

Behaviors such as these clearly troubled Ms. Cheney, and she dealt with them variously, often by ignoring them, occasionally with a reprimand, and in a few instances, by handing out a referral. But in many regards, these overt acts were easier to contend with than students’ more subtle withdrawal, in the form of performance strikes, from participation in the formal “official” ESLL curriculum (see below).

Ms. Ariel’s class. Ms. Ariel’s ELA 2W class averaged 30 students over the course of the year, most of whom were 9th graders, with a handful of 10th graders and one student in the 12th grade. About one third of the class was Micronesian, most of whom were Chuukese and were considered to have “interrupted formal educations”; another third consisted of Cantonese and Mandarin-speaking students from Hong Kong, China, and Taiwan; the rest of the students came from American Samoa, the Philippines, Korea, and Vietnam. Four of the students had lived in the US for seven years or more, eight had lived in the US for between two and five years, with the remainder arriving in the US
from one to six months before the start of the school year. About a third of the class, then, were G1.5 ESLL students. This same third was also highly proficient in oral L2 English and in their L1s, though the longer-term Chinese and Vietnamese learners reported that their L1 literacy was poor. Another third of the class was near or at very basic levels of oral and written L2 English ability, with two of the Chuukese students unable to write in their L1. The remaining students were at various levels of L2 English proficiency between the advanced students and the beginners. As in all the ESLL classes I observed, and particularly in the first-year ESLL teachers’ classes, the corps of G1.5 students wielded considerable power in this class, as I describe in more detail below.

Mr. Day’s class. Mr. Day’s ELA 2X also consisted of approximately 30 students over the course of the school year. Of all the ESLL classes that I observed, this class had the highest overall level of L2 English proficiency, with only five students who were L2 English beginners. One third of the class were from the Pacific Islands (Chuuk, Palau, the Marshall Islands, Tonga, and Samoa), one fifth were Cantonese speakers, another fifth were from the Philippines, with the remaining students from Vietnam, Korea, and Hawai‘i. Approximately one-third of this class was G1.5 as well, five of whom had lived in the US for seven years or more (two were born in Hawai‘i; one had been in Guam schools since the 2nd grade); and six of whom had lived in Hawai‘i for between two and five years, with Laidplayer, a unique full participant in G1.5 CoP having arrived in Hawai‘i a month before the school year started. Of the non-G1.5 students in this class, most had been in the US for shorter periods, from one month up until two years.

Having provided some brief contextual information about the first-year ESLL teachers’ classes, I now consider the main resistant practices in them.
'It’s at home': Not bringing materials to class

One of the most fundamental ways that students undermined ESLL curriculum and instruction in all four of the first-year ESLL teachers’ classes I observed was by simply not bringing their assigned materials to class. Although this may seem a minor, if notably symbolic practice, as more and more students took it up over the course of a school year, it came to significantly disrupt teachers’ plans for what could be accomplished in class (see Chapter 10). This particular manifestation of student performance strike occurred with any number of classroom materials and for any number of “reasons”: worksheets that had been given out in one class were “forgotten” for the next, class projects that had been worked on in previous classes had to be begun again since they had been “lost” the period before, assigned textbooks were “too heavy” to bring to school, and so were left “at home.” This practice predictably resulted in a steady stream of reminders, entreaties, and threatened sanctions from teachers as they attempted to induce students to bring the materials needed to accomplish the “official” ESLL curriculum to class.

As I shall describe in this section, the consequences of this particular practice were most keenly and widely felt with regard to the children’s literature, the centerpiece of the ESLL curriculum, since the majority of ESLL assignments and activities involved and/or derived from these books (see Chapter 7). At the beginning of each quarter,

---

9 “It’s at home” was uttered by many students including CKY (ELA32Wmd6: 1889) in response to a question from his teacher about where his reading book was (see Chapter 10).
10 This was also true of each J-section class that I observed, but not in the Health classes (although Health textbooks were not given to students to take home). I should also note that I had first-hand experience with this practice myself as it pertained to the student assent and parental consent forms that were necessary for participation in this study. Inevitably, it was G1.5 students who lost or forgot them; a few (e.g., China, Raven, Barehand, CJ, and others) needed upward of 10 replacement copies before they finally turned them in to me.
students would be assigned one copy each of the book that was to be read for the term. Class sets of these texts were limited in number, which meant that as increasing numbers of students did not bring their books to class, teachers had to resort to other instructional options, including assigning students to work in pairs or small groups so that books could be shared, planning alternative activities in place of those for which the children’s books had ostensibly been forgotten, and ultimately, refusing to sign out books to students at all (see Chapter 10). Thus, although subtle, leaving books at home was an important component of student performance strikes in ESLL classes, one which significantly contributed to an inexorable “slowdown” that was evident in them.

To give some indication of the dynamics of this particular practice, and at the same time to examine certain ways that G1.5 students marshaled linguistic and interactional resources in the broader endeavor to resist curriculum and instruction in ESLL classes, I next provide an extended analysis of interaction in Mr. Day’s ELA 2X class. This interaction (represented in Extract 9.3) occurred with about five weeks left in the school year, and concerned Mr. Day questioning two 9th grade G1.5 students (Jennie and CJ) about not bringing their books to class, a query he had made earlier to at least two other students. The interaction begins approximately 10 minutes before this particular (extended) class period was to end. The lesson to this point had consisted of a 15-item vocabulary quiz that students had been given 45 minutes to study for and complete, and a 21-item grammar exercise on negative forms of “have to” [e.g., “1. He has to work late tonight. (does not have)” (Dixon, 1956, p. 34)] that had been allotted 30 minutes (see Appendix J.1. for a sample exercise from this book). Following
this, in an defensive teaching accommodation that I call “study hall” (see Chapter 10), students were to have been doing “book work,” that is, working individually to read and/or complete one of a number of vocabulary, summary, and reading comprehension question exercises from that quarter’s book, *Sadako and the thousand paper cranes* (Coerr, 1977). The class was noisy as most students were packing up belongings and talking to friends, getting ready for the class to end, even though 10 more minutes remained in the class period (see “Bell’s gonna ring!” below). Jennie, a Korean girl who had lived in the US for two years, and CJ, a Filipino boy who had moved to Hawai’i seven years earlier, were sitting at their desks, quite evidently not doing the assigned book work. Standing close by was Iwannafuckalot (IwannaFAL), a Vietnamese 9th grade boy who had lived in the US since he was five years old, who shortly before the interaction that follows had himself been asked by Mr. Day why he was not doing book work.

(9.3) *Bring your book* [ELA42XmdS15: 1972-1996]  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr. Day:</th>
<th>Jennie:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Where’s your work.</td>
<td>I don’t know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>At home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>What do you expect to do in class?</td>
<td>Nothing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>And you think that’s okay.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>What do you do in your other classes?</td>
<td>Work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

covers ripped off, bindings broken, large numbers of pages missing, and other evident kinds of abuse or vandalism. In fact, at the end of the school year, I found filed in several students’ classroom folders, in which all classwork was to be kept, numerous errant pages from these books.  

12 As indicated in Appendix A, these length of residence figures were calculated from the beginning of this particular school year; the interaction in Extract 9.3 occurred approximately seven months later.  

13 This was a student-carried recording; IwannaFAL carried the mini-disc recorder during this class session.
11 Mr. Day: So how come in my class you don’t work?
Jennie: (3) I did. I did the grammar (and the quiz).
13 Mr. Day: Yeah, I know, but (you’re/we’re) supposed to be doing other work
yae {yeah}, it’s a long period. You have to get book work done, class
work, all this type of stuff. You should be reading the book, yae
{yeah}. (4) So you need to do five assignments. (3) One vocabulary,
two summaries, and two {sets of comprehension} questions. Five
assignments. On Tuesday {next class}. And bring your book.
19 ((turns to address CJ)) So how are you?
CJ: Awesome.
21 Mr. Day: Where’s your folder?
CJ: I put it back there.
23 Mr. Day: You do any work today?
CJ: Yeah.
25 Mr. Day: (What work?)
CJ: Uh::, the quiz.
27 Mr. Day: The quiz? Yeah you had to do the quiz. Did you finish the grammar?
CJ: (. ) No.
29 Mr. Day: Did you do any book work?
CJ: (. ) My book is at home. I do it at home.
31 Mr. Day: You bring your book to class everyday.
CJ: Okay.
33 Mr. Day: It fits in the pocket. You put it right here. ((gestures to a pocket on
CJ’s backpack ))

Jennie, CJ, and IwannaFAL were three of the approximately two-thirds of the students in
ELA 2X who had not brought their books to this class session, which by this point in the
school year was a not uncommon proportion. By initiating the interaction as he does,
with a reprimand in the form of the question, “Jennie where’s your work?”, Mr. Day
assumes his situational identity (Zimmerman, 1998) as teacher, with the “role-given
right[s] to speak at any time and to any [student]” that attend it (Cazden, 2001, p. 82; also
see Ainsworth-Vaughn, 2001, pp. 461-462; Fairclough, 1989, pp. 134-136), and calls
attention to the evident problem that a student (Jennie) doesn’t have any work on her
desk when she is expected to.14 Jennie’s response in line 2, “I don’t know,” suggests indifference, not exactly an anticipated response from a student to a teacher who has asked this question, particularly since it is not accompanied by any sort of elaborating explanation.15 However, after a slight pause, Jennie amends her answer to Mr. Day to indicate that she had in fact been doing work earlier. Mr. Day’s question in line 3, about where Jennie’s copy of *Sadako and the thousand paper cranes* is, suggests that he is more interested in the book work assignments that students are to be doing now rather than what they were assigned to do earlier (i.e., the vocabulary quiz and grammar exercise). Mr. Day thus casts Jennie’s missing book as a problem, indeed the likely source of Jennie (and possibly CJ and IwannaFAL) not doing the book work as she (they) had been instructed to do. Mr. Day’s orientation to Jennie’s missing book as problem continues in line 5, when he asks, in reply to her admission that her book is at home, “What do you expect to do in class?”

There is some ambiguity as to whether Mr. Day’s question in line 5 is rhetorical or not, and Jennie’s response in line 6 does not clearly indicate how she has interpreted

---

14 Zimmerman (1998) distinguishes between three types of identities in talk: *discourse identities* are the identities participants in an interaction assume turn by turn as they engage in talk (e.g., speaker/listener, questioner/answerer, etc.); *situational identities* are the broader more constant identities specific to settings and/or situations (e.g., mother/daughter, doctor/patient, teacher/student); and *transportable identities* a broader category still of identities that “travel with individuals across situations” (p. 90) (e.g., those relating to age, race, sex). In line 1, e.g., several different identities are (potentially) in play: Mr. Day’s discourse identity as questioner (which changes in line 2 to answer recipient), his situational identity as teacher (which invokes, and is relationally defined by, Jennie’s as student), and his transportable identity as a male (which may or may not be salient in the interaction). I should note that the changes I have made to teachers’ identities, in an effort protect confidentiality, are to aspects of their “transportable” identities.

15 However, Jennie’s response here may have taken this form because finishing class early, sometimes by as much as 20 minutes, was a common practice in the ESLL classes (see the “Bell’s gonna ring!” practice below) – in fact, much of the class was at this time getting ready to go. It is also important to bear in mind that CJ and IwannaFAL were both co-present in this interaction; Jennie’s response may thus have been shaped for whatever reason by an awareness that they were listening in. See below for more on this point.
it. Rhetorical questions are interrogative in form but not function and are used “to assert something without anticipating a response from the listener” (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999, pp. 265). Although it appears likely given the context that Mr. Day is asserting that little if any book work can be done without the book, it may also be a “real” question in an attempt to gain additional information (cf. Ainsworth-Vaughn, 2001). Regardless, Jennie’s minimal response in line 6, “Nothing.,” is of considerable interest. For one, she appears to have revised her earlier position of having done work in the class earlier; either that, or characterized the work that she had done then (the grammar and vocabulary) as insignificant. In addition, if Jennie has oriented to Mr. Day’s question as if it were rhetorical, then that she has provided a response, when one is not expected, seems unusual, especially because it is a ready admission of precisely what Mr. Day has indicated is problematic (i.e., that Jennie is doing “nothing”). If, however, she has oriented to the question as “real,” her answer also seems unusual: “nothing” is hardly what “good” (ESLL) students would or should do in class, at least in view of normative conceptions of “appropriate” student participation (cf. Fairclough, 1989, p. 135) and the “official” cultural productions of ESLL (see Chapter 7), yet her notably brief answer is uttered as if it is. Absent an elaboration or “account,” which as Ford (2001; 2004) has demonstrated, is the “recurrent and normative” pattern following “disagreeing actions” such as this, Jennie gives her answer as if no further elaboration is

16 However, Mr. Day made frequent use of rhetorical questions as an indirect means to scold the class or lecture students on “appropriate” classroom behavior. E.g., to a noisy class during a group correction activity: “Shh! Do you think that Joyleen feels like you’re showing her respect when she’s about to help you out studying on the test and you can’t listen?” (ELA31Xmd2: 1143). To a class that was not cooperating during a vocabulary quiz: “Were you guys listening to these words when I went over them? […] What were you doing for the past 15 minutes before we started {the quiz}?" (ELA32Xmd8: 2233). See Extract 9.7 for a brief discussion of how G 1.5 students responded to what many perceived as the “childishness” of this particular type of teacher talk.
needed; as if it is, in other words, acceptable and expected.\textsuperscript{17} Thus, regardless of whether Jennie has interpreted the question as rhetorical or information-seeking, her answer in line 6 is an apparent index of resistance: perhaps to the book work, perhaps to the children's book it derives from, perhaps to Mr. Day's questioning about it, and/or, perhaps, to the normative "official" ESLL student identity he has implicitly referenced, that is, of a compliant, accommodating student who has brought her book and is doing her work, in evident contrast to Jennie. This is a resistance that contravenes the ideologies, values, and norms of social and linguistic hierarchy that inhere in formal (ESL) educational settings (cf. Fairclough, 1989, 2001).

Mr. Day's reply in line 7, in the form of an uninverted question "And you think that's okay.", is initiated by a coordinating conjunction. Schiffrin (1987, pp. 146-147) is useful in discussing how "and" can function as a discourse marker in sequences such as the one in lines 5-7:

A: QUESTION 1
B: ANSWER 1
A: "And" + QUESTION 1

Essentially, Mr. Day's question in line 7 ("And you think that's okay.") requests continuation and elaboration from Jennie regarding her answer ("Nothing.") to the question in line 5 ("What do you expect to do in class?"). As Schiffrin (1987, p. 146) notes, "[c]ompliance with this request will have the effect of expanding information" from the initial answer ("Nothing."). However, Mr. Day's question in line 7 is in the form of an uninverted yes/no question. Uninverted, or "statement-form" questions such

\textsuperscript{17} My thanks to Hanh Nguyen for her insights on this particular point.
as this convey a sense “that the speaker who poses the question is anticipating a confirmation” of the statement (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999, p. 214).

Because this is a yes/no question, the “request for elaboration” signaled by “And” in line 7 is therefore correspondingly circumscribed (cf. Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999, pp. 216-217). Since the question is also uninverted, the request for elaboration becomes further circumscribed, to the extent that it is transformed into a call for (dis)confirmation. Interestingly, Mr. Day’s intonation here slightly falls, too, when intonation for (inverted and uninverted) yes/no questions more commonly rises. While this may be an example of him accommodating to Pidgin, something he increasingly did over the course of the school year,¹⁸ it may also have been a falling intonational contour in standardized English – which would signal a stance of stronger expectation or even impatience regarding the anticipated confirmation (Celce-Murcia, Brinton, & Goodwin, 1996, p. 202). In effect, Mr. Day has foregrounded what is in this context a considerably problematic assertion for a student to make to a teacher – it essentially repudiates the classroom enterprise and the teacher’s authority and expertise that go along with it – and is (quite strongly) seeking additional comment about it.

Significantly, rather than answer Mr. Day’s question, Jennie remains silent. Had she confirmed and/or elaborated on “Nothing” as requested, she risked the potential of an escalated confrontation with her teacher. By remaining silent, she simultaneously resists Mr. Day’s request for an answer, remains in tacit agreement with her earlier, rather

¹⁸ Whereas the intonational contour for yes/no questions in standardized English (SE) generally rises, with questions ending on a high pitch, in Pidgin it falls, with questions ending on a low pitch (Sakoda & Siegel, 2003, p. 30). Because the intonational contour in line 7 falls, Mr. Day may indeed be accommodating to Pidgin, which was not his L1, in what is perhaps an aligning move. This is supported by his use of (what I interpret to be) the discourse particle “yae” (yeah) in lines 14 and 15 (cf. Sakoda & Siegel, pp. 91-92). Although impossible to confirm, since both of these features could be SE or highly acrolectal elements of Pidgin, it may be further evidence of Mr. Day’s (language) socialization (see Chapter 10).
loaded assertion, and avoids a confrontation about it (Fairclough, 1989, p. 136). With no answer to this question apparently forthcoming, Mr. Day asks another in line 9, one which seeks similar elaboration, although now in a specifically comparative manner, regarding what Jennie does in her other classes. (Extract 9.3 is repeated below for the reader’s convenience).


1 Mr. Day: Jennie where’s your work.
Jennie: I don't know. (3) I've been doing it.
3 Mr. Day: Where's your book?
Jennie: (1) At home.
5 Mr. Day: (2) What do you expect to do in class?
Jennie: Nothing.
7 Mr. Day: And you think that’s okay.
Jennie: (2)
9 Mr. Day: What do you do in your other classes?
Jennie: Work.
11 Mr. Day: So how come in my class you don’t work?
Jennie: (3) I did. I did the grammar (and the quiz).
13 Mr. Day: Yeah, I know, but (you’re/we’re) supposed to be doing other work yae {yeah}, it’s a long period. You have to get book work done, class work, all this type of stuff. You should be reading the book, yae {yeah}. (4) So you need to do five assignments. (3) One vocabulary, two summaries, and two sets of comprehension questions. Five assignments. On Tuesday {next class}. And bring your book.
19 ((turns to address CJ)) So how are you?
CJ: Awesome.
21 Mr. Day: Where’s your folder?
CJ: I put it back there.
23 Mr. Day: You do any work today?
CJ: Yeah.
25 Mr. Day: (What work?)
CJ: Uh:, the quiz.
27 Mr. Day: The quiz? Yeah you had to do the quiz. Did you finish the grammar?
CJ: (. ) No.

19 Fairclough (1989, p. 136) notes that silence is a “weapon for the less powerful participant [in an institutional encounter], particularly as a way of being noncommittal about what more powerful participants say....”
Contrary to "Nothing." Jennie in line 10 states that she in fact does do "Work." in her "other," non-ESLL classes. Again, this is a notably brief utterance with no follow-up or elaborating explanation, and is a clear index, along with her other minimal responses to this point in the interaction, of an uncooperative stance. Here Jennie has, in effect, rejected any implication that the putative "problem" of her not doing work in ESLL class has to do with some sort of problem with her. Instead, she indirectly shifts the burden of responsibility for doing "nothing" onto the ESLL class, and by extension, Mr. Day. She has, in other words, rejected the implied identity of "deficient" student he has projected for her, and in doing so implicated an alternative "deficient" identity, this one for the ESLL class or perhaps even Mr. Day. The contrast between doing work in "other" classes and not doing it in ESLL also implicitly references the mainstream/ESLL hierarchy, and, of course, the marked status of ESLL within it, as discussed in Chapter 8.

In asking for an elaboration in line 11—"So how come in my class you don't work?"—Mr. Day acknowledges the contrast Jennie has just made about working in "other" classes but not in ESLL. By introducing the determiner "my" in this turn, however, he personalizes the interaction. Whereas in line 5 he asked what Jennie could expect to do "in class," in line 11 this is reformulated as "in my class": the interaction has therefore ceased to be about any ESLL class; it is now about Mr. Day's class, about Mr. Day as teacher. Mr. Day has (again) upped the interactional ante by explicitly
invoking his identity as teacher, and the power asymmetries that come with it in the
school and classroom context. He has oriented to his student’s interactional resistance
and escalated the risk for her to maintain it.

Jennie’s pause in line 12 is loaded with possibility. She could have used this
opening in the interaction, for example, to air some of her grievances about ESL being
like Special Education, complaints she had made both to other students as well as to me
(and which worked to index her identity as G1.5; see Chapter 8). She might have
asserted that she found the children’s books too easy, perhaps, or the classwork irrelevant
to what she was doing in her other classes, as she stated in informal and formal
interviews. Or she could have escalated the confrontation by implicating Mr. Day
himself as the reason she did “nothing” in the class. However, rather than directly
answer Mr. Day’s question, Jennie opts instead to reject its underlying premise.
Returning to the position she outlined for herself in line 2, she reasserts that she had
indeed done some work earlier: the grammar and (possibly) the vocabulary quiz. Her
stress in “I did,” indexes an affective stance of some exasperation, if not irritation,
perhaps because Mr. Day has pushed the interactional envelope this far, even though she
had emphasized earlier that she had done work. Thus, she indicates that she will work in
Mr. Day’s class, that she will work for Mr. Day, that in fact she has done work for Mr.
Day earlier in the class. This shifts the implication for her not working at this particular
moment from Mr. Day as teacher, to the ESL classwork that she (and CJ and
IwannaFAL) are supposed to be now doing: the book work that is based on the
children’s book *Sadako and the thousand paper cranes*; in other words, the central component of the ESLL curriculum (see Chapter 7).\(^{20}\)

In this respect, it is no coincidence that Jennie has not done the book work assignments from *Sadako and the thousand paper cranes*, just as it is no coincidence that the assignments she *has* done are the vocabulary cloze quiz and the grammar transformation exercise. As I describe in more detail below, these are manifestations of what I call “Worksheet Syndrome,” whereby students who would otherwise tend not to do assignments such as the book work *would* do simple activities such as decontextualized vocabulary and grammar exercises. Why this was – that is, whether it was due to substantial experience with and preference for worksheet assignments in earlier years of schooling, or whether there were other motives – can only remain at the level of speculation. However, the net result was the same: minimal practice with L2 English literacy forms and practices of the sort that might, for example, help students exit ESLL.

In lines 13-14, Mr. Day indicates that he recognizes Jennie has done the work from earlier in the class, but that this is not enough: “Yeah, I know, but (you’re/we’re) supposed to be doing other work yae {yeah}, it’s a long period.” There is a distinctly less confrontational tone in this turn, indicated by his confirming “Yeah, I know,” his use of what I take to be the Pidgin discourse marker “yae,” which doubly serves to “soften a comment” (Sakoda & Siegel, 2003, p. 92) in terms of the meaning/function of the marker and the codeswitch itself, and the explanation “it’s a long period” in the final position of

\(^{20}\) I should note that Jenny’s response in line 12 (“I did!”) is an example of the defensible “fall-back” explanation for interactional resistance that I discuss in more detail in the analysis of Extract 9.4 below, which many G1.5 students employed, primarily by orienting to the literal meanings of utterances, rather than their implicative or illocutionary meaning.
the sentence. Indeed, analysis of Mr. Day’s talk in this turn indicates a curious interdiscursivity, between a strongly directive, demanding “teacher discourse” authorized by the institutionally ascribed relationships of teacher/student – cf. “supposed to” (line 13), “You have to” (line 14), “You should be” (line 15), “you need to” (line 16), “bring your book” (line 18), in addition to the enumeration of the “other work” students are to be doing – and a private or conversational discourse – cf. the discourse marker “I know” (line 13), the two codeswitches to “yae” (line 14 and line 15), the explanatory “it’s a long period (line 14), and the colloquialism “all this type of stuff” (line 15). The hybridity indicated in this interdiscursivity suggests some ambiguity in terms of Mr. Day’s situational identity of teacher. It is suggestive of what I will be arguing in various ways is the bidirectionality of (L2) socialization processes, that is, in this particular case, of Mr. Day’s socialization into the G1.5 cultural productions of ESLL, linguistically realized here in the aligning discourse markers, codeswitches, and colloquialisms that he uses as he accommodates G1.5 community practices.

Of interest in Mr. Day’s list of assignments in lines 14-19 is precisely how many of them there are: with the exception of the vocabulary that was quizzed earlier in the period, they represent the full number of book work assignments that had been given during this particular quarter, and to date, Jennie had done none of them. Neither had CJ, and IwannaFAL had not done the latest vocabulary exercise, summary assignment, or set of comprehension questions. Nearly all of the two-thirds of the students who had not brought their books to class this period had not done some combination of these assignments either. “Not doing work,” an important component practice of the student performance strike, and one that was closely associated with “not bringing materials,” is
considered in more detail farther below, as is one of the "defensive teaching"
accommodations that went along with it, the "floating deadline," in Chapter 10. This
latter practice is alluded to here in line 18 when Mr. Day says "On Tuesday.": the next
time the class will meet. Mr. Day is instructing Jennie to have these book work
assignments done by then; she will not, however, and neither will most of the rest of the
class. This in turn will lead to another "defensive teaching" accommodation, what I term
"study hall," where students are provided class time to complete what had originally been
assigned as homework. In fact, as mentioned above, the interaction in Extract 9.3
occurred toward the end of one such "study hall" session. Mr. Day's particular interest
about the book work assignments here is no doubt motivated by the fact that he had
explicitly set class time aside for students to do what was originally assigned as
homework. His closing comment to Jennie in line 18, "And bring your book.", indicates
that on Tuesday, the next class meeting, students can similarly expect a "study hall"
session concerning book work. Each of these practices is echoed in the remainder of the
interaction, as Mr. Day turns to address CJ (lines 19-33): CJ's book is "at home," he has
not done the assigned grammar transformation exercise or the book work, he has only
(partially) done the vocabulary quiz, and Mr. Day has responded similarly with the
promise of the "study hall" and "floating deadline" accommodations in the next class (see
Chapter 10 for more on teachers' defensive teaching accommodations).

Before concluding this section, it is worthwhile pointing out that Jennie was one
of a number of more recent or newcomer G1.5 students who quite clearly moved in this
class from legitimate peripheral participation (LPP) in G1.5 community practices at the
beginning of the year, toward full participation at the end of the year. At the beginning of
the year, Jennie did much of the work she was assigned and my field notes and recordings have few instances in which she overtly contested ESLL classroom instruction. However, as the school year wore on, she became increasingly less compliant in class and her performance in the class dropped precipitously, with her grades falling from a B in the first quarter to a C in the second, a D in the third, and at last, an F in the fourth and final quarter (see Chapter 10 for more on G1.5 students’ grade drop-off).21 Perhaps not coincidentally, she had befriended IwannaFAL in this class (they shared a Life Sciences class into which both had been mainstreamed),22 who, it should be remembered, was co-present in this interaction, along with CJ. Indeed, CJ’s responses to Mr. Day in Extract 9.3 can be seen as a far more experienced oldtimer G1.5 student engaging in the same practices as Jennie, but more skillfully: the minimal responses, the lack of elaboration, the evasiveness, the defensible “fall back” explanations (he did the quiz, he does his bookwork at home). Thus, in addition to Jennie’s production of G1.5 student identity, this interaction may also represent an instance of a G1.5 apprentice demonstrating her L2 linguistic and interactional competence under the watchful gaze of G1.5 oldtimer peers. Both of these students’ participation in these particular G1.5 community practices in this extract therefore not only serve to (re)produce the G1.5 CoP, but also work as socializing resources for each

21 Obviously, it is foolhardy to draw too many conclusions about socialization (or anything else) from students’ academic grades. However, grades do provide some indicators of school performance, and are of interest at least because the level of difficulty of the class in question actually got easier over the course of the year, rather than more difficult (see below; Chapter 10).

22 As I mentioned in Chapter 7, some students in the Life Sciences J classes were mainstreamed (into the Life Sciences C-track class) by their teachers at the beginning of the year, without the approval of Mr. Anderson. Each of these students did comparatively poorly in these classes, which all represented as much more difficult than the J Life Sciences class. However, when I asked them if they would prefer to remain in the mainstream Life Sciences class and get lower grades, or return to Life Sciences J and get higher grades, every one of them stated a preference to remain in the mainstream classes.
other, for IwannaFAL, for Mr. Day, and any other students who were peripheral participants in this interaction.

As I have argued in this section, the practice of “not bringing books to class” was an important element of student performance strikes in the ESLL classes at Tradewinds. On the one hand, it can be interpreted as a symbolic practice indicative of the relative importance or relevance of ESLL as a class, as a curriculum, and as a program, to the very students it was intended to serve. It can also be seen as an assertion of these students’ power, or at the very least, as a pointed reminder by them of the limits of the power of the school: that a material and symbolic piece of the institution – one which was, as the centerpiece of the ESLL curriculum, a physical manifestation of educational, societal, and language ideologies about language education, immigrants, ESLL, and language minority students – was under their control (cf. Fairclough, 1989, 2001).

Beyond its symbolism, this practice had a tangible impact on ESLL classrooms, as Ms. Ariel, Mr. Bradley, Ms. Cheney, and Mr. Day at various points over the school year went so far as to refuse to check out books at all in order to ensure that there would be enough books during class time, meaning that the book readings, which had previously been assigned as homework, came to be done in class, with Ms. Ariel, Ms. Cheney, and Mr. Day for the better parts of three quarters not assigning any homework besides vocabulary study for quizzes as well. Thus, this affected not just G1.5 students, but non-G1.5 students, too. In all four ESLL teachers’ classes, defensive teaching accommodations such as floating deadlines, alternative assignments, study hall activities, and so on meant that increasing time was spent in class on what had previously been assigned as homework, with a corresponding decrease in time spent on other activities
(see Chapter 10). Gearing instruction for the rising number of students who participated in performance strikes in the ESLL classes meant that the curricular and instructional pacing of these classes subtly yet relentlessly slowed down over the school year for all involved, to the point that (with the exception of Ms. Ariel's class, where projects filled the void) little beyond the bookwork assignments for the children's novels came to be done in them. This was significant because, as discussed in Chapter 7, these books were below grade level, sometimes by as much as six or seven years for some students; were of a singular genre, which many students recognized as "children's books" and which bore little relevance to other genres encountered in non-ESLL classes; and had largely mechanical activities deriving from them that involved rote memorization of vocabulary, short answers to comprehension questions, and written summaries, with little attempt at reformulating or synthesizing the information that was to be summarized (cf. Schleppegrell, 2001, 2004). As the "official" curriculum thereby grew increasingly restricted, a space in the formal schooling enterprise opened up, which allowed an alternative and "unofficial" curriculum, constituted by and constitutive of G1.5 students' resistant practices, to develop (see more below; Chapter 10).

In terms of the cultural productions of ESLL, then, one primary student response to a curriculum centered on below-grade-level children's literature was simply not to bring these books to class, which as the practice extended and became more widespread, seriously affected what could and could not be accomplished in class. By not bringing to class one of the central curricular means by which the formal, or "official" productions of ESLL could be realized, G1.5 students simultaneously undermined it and asserted an alternative cultural production, one constitutive practice of which was leaving books "at
home." As more students took up this practice, using the L2 linguistic and interactional resources needed to accomplish it, the more this particular CoP was produced; the more this CoP's particular cultural productions of ESLL were instantiated, the more it came to transform local meanings and manifestations of "ESLL students."

'Neva du am': Not doing classwork

Not bringing materials was actually one facet of and fed into a larger social practice that essentially defined the student performance strike: not doing assigned classwork or homework (see Chapter 8 for student representations of this practice). "Not doing classwork" could manifest in a number of ways: from not bringing the required materials to class, which meant that any class work that was based on them was potentially compromised (see above; Chapter 10, "Alternative assignments"), to not having done the homework that was necessary for a lesson to proceed (see Chapter 10, "study hall"), to actively refusing to participate in classroom activities. In this section, I will consider this last practice.

One of the hallmarks of the performance strike in the Tradewinds ESLL classes was its subtlety and indirect character (cf. McNeil, 1986; Shor 1992). However, on occasion it would manifest in a much more openly confrontational way. This was particularly the case when students would opt not to participate in a classroom activity in which the teacher had actively recruited student participation, e.g., in teacher-fronted activities or those that involved teacher participation in some way, regardless of whether

---

23 "Neva du am" (I never did/do it/them) was articulated by Ioane when I asked her what she thought of the book Shiloh (Naylor, 1991), which was assigned in Mr. Day's class: "Ai neva du am kaz ai wazn inchres in dat stuped buk (I didn't read it since I wasn't interested in that stupid book) (SINT15: 90)."
homework or some sort of other (student) preparation had been required. Instances such as these would necessitate a much more active refusal to participate than the more subtle forms of withdrawal that the study hall activities described above afforded.

This more active and conflictual type of practice is illustrated in Extract 9.4, which is taken from a “discussion group” activity in Ms. Ariel’s ELA 2W class. The “discussion” here was supposed to be an oral review of *The Wanderer* (Creech, 2000), one of the children’s novels that had been assigned in the class. This particular discussion group was comprised almost exclusively of G1.5 students, because several had already read (reportedly in the 6th or 7th grade) the original book that Ms. Ariel had selected for the quarter, *Bud, not Buddy* (Curtis, 1999). Thus, the class was essentially divided among G1.5 and non-G1.5 students, who were reading the latter book. Notably, both books had been assigned the previous quarter, but Ms. Ariel had largely stopped assigning them and the associated book work activities with about six weeks left in that quarter, in favor of alternative activities such as projects (see Chapter 7). This particular class session was the third in the new, week-old quarter, and the second in which the books from the previous quarter had been revisited. Ms. Ariel had split the class and asked each group to orally review the comprehension questions from the very first

---

24 In fact, the increasing incidence of study hall activities may have resulted from a desire to minimize these sorts of confrontations (cf. McNeil, 1985; Sizer, 1984/2004; see Chapter 10).

25 Ms. Ariel told me she had spent considerable time over the winter vacation preparing the curriculum for the coming quarter (she had even drawn up a syllabus: see Appendix 1.2), during which she had hoped to have the entire class read one book (*Bud, not Buddy*), a story about a 10-year-old boy, rather than two books (as had occurred in the previous quarter; this had impeded her options at alternating student-group arrangements). She was thus evidently frustrated when she found that a significant number of (G1.5) students had already read *Bud, not Buddy*, something she learned when Raven loudly proclaimed, “That book sucks!” (ELA41 Wfn: 29). In this regard, G1.5 students’ experiences in ESL classes in earlier years wound up contributing to their being placed in the same reading group in this one.
reading assignment of the previous quarter (i.e., from three months earlier). *The Wanderer* group consisted of the following students, sitting in an oval:

- China, a 9th grade boy from Hong Kong who had lived in Hawai‘i for four and a half years;26
- Raven, a 9th grade boy from Taiwan who had lived in Hawai‘i for eight years;
- Ash, a 9th grade boy from Hong Kong who had lived in Hawai‘i for eight years;
- Benz, a 9th grade boy from Korea who had lived in Hawai‘i for two years;
- Barehand, a 9th grade boy from Korea who had lived in Hawai‘i for three years;
- CKY (CampKillYourself),27 a 9th grade boy from Vietnam who had lived in Hawai‘i for nine years (and who had been shuffling a deck of playing cards intermittently throughout the class period);
- 618, a 9th grade girl from China who had lived in Hawai‘i for four years; she was both a legitimate (if more peripheral) G1.5 CoP participant, but also an occasionally marginalized one (likely due to her lower L2 proficiency);
- Sou Li*, a 9th grade girl from China who had lived in Hawai‘i for three months. Sou Li was an L2 English beginner; at Ms. Ariel’s request, 618 often worked with her and served as a language broker (something 618

---

26 As indicated in Appendix A, these length of residence figures were calculated from the beginning of this particular school year; the interaction in Extract 9.4 occurred approximately six months later.

27 “CampKillYourself” is a punk-metal skater band that is associated with the movie *Jackass* (Jenner, Knoxville, & Tremaine, 2002).
was regularly asked to do with newly arrived Chinese students in this class). Sou Li’s presence in this group, which stems from her connection to 618, is thus interesting in that she was one of the few students in the class who had completed the classwork she had been assigned, even if she did not have the L2 oral proficiency (or perhaps, the will, considering her interlocutors) to talk about it.\textsuperscript{28}

Just prior to this interaction, Ms. Ariel had spent approximately seven minutes trying and failing to get the discussion in this group going about the following questions, which concerned Sophie, a 13-year-old girl and main character of \textit{The Wanderer} (see Appendix I.4 for a sample questions worksheet):

1. Where will Sophie and the crew of \textit{The Wanderer} go on their journey, and how long will the trip take?

2. Each character chooses to teach a lesson on board the ship that eventually helps each or all of the crew members. What skill would you choose to teach, and how might it help others on the voyage?

3. What is Sophie’s story? Why is she so attracted to the open ocean? Is it unusual for a thirteen-year-old to be the only female on the boat? What does this mean? (ELA41 Wdoc: L).

\textsuperscript{28} Because Sou Li regularly completed her classwork, her grades in Ms. Ariel’s class tended to be “B’s,” much higher than those of the G1.5 students. In one noteworthy instance, Ms. Ariel recruited Sou Li to point out to China, Ash, Benz, and Barehand that she had gotten a much better quarter grade than they had, despite her beginning L2 English proficiency. Predictably, the G1.5 students responded with some outrage. Ms. Ariel replied, with Sou Li at her side, “Yeah, and she doesn’t even speak English. I mean, a little bit only. But she works very hard.” (ELA42WmdSI2: 1300).
In the interaction that follows, Ms. Ariel makes another attempt at generating discussion, this time by suggesting some ways that the students might approach answers to the questions in #3, about Sophie's “story” and why she's attracted to the ocean:

(9.4) Cards  [ELA42WmdS11: 565-593]²⁹

1  Ms. Ariel:  You have to think about Sophie’s personality.  (4) You have to think about what you’ve read.  China, why is she so attracted to the ocean?
3  That’s going to have a lot to do with your own (.) thoughts [and (inaudible)]
5  China:  I think it’s quiet and peaceful.  (3) And dolphin is [really nice].
7  Ms. Ariel:  Many people have started on the second set of questions?  (1) (Anyone?)
9  Ms. Ariel:  Okay.  Finish the first three (.) before you start the second [set].
11  China:  (with heavy sigh)  Okay, and they're essay style questions.  ((to CKY))  And don’t bring your cards in future, please.
13  China:  ((with falling intonation))  YAE CKY.  YEAH CKY.
15  Ms. Ariel:  I’ll throw them away.
17  China:  Are you looking at me, Miss?³⁰  Ms. Ariel:  Okay, I’m gonna go see what they’re do:in:g {in the other group},
19  Benz:  ’K.
21  China:  'K.
23  Benz:  Bye.
25  Ms. Ariel:  Up to you.
27  Benz:  Bye.
29  China:  Ba’bye.
31  Barehand:  (inaudible)

²⁹ China was carrying the mini-disc recorder for this class. I was off to the side of the room working with several Micronesian students at this point, and so was not able to detail the proxemics or kinesics of the interaction in field notes. Ms. Ariel’s departure following China’s turn in line 29 is audible in the recording, as is CKY’s card dealing in line 38. I also saw CKY shuffling the deck of cards earlier in the class.

³⁰ Most students at Tradewinds addressed their teachers using the generic titles of “Miss” (for women) and “Mister” (for men), minus surnames. This is a practice that is common in K-12 schools in Hawai‘i.
In her first turn, Ms. Ariel addresses the group with a series of directives about how to answer the questions in #3 above; the modality in this turn is consistent with her situational identity of teacher. The first two directives, “You have to think of Sophie’s personality. (4) You have to think about what you’ve read.”, indicate on the one hand an orientation that the students have done the reading, and on the other, that their lack of participation to this point is a result of not understanding how to answer the questions.

Whether this is Ms. Ariel’s actual orientation or an indexical one that signifies that students should have done the reading (cf. Extract 9.3 above) is not clear, though by this point in the school year, it is likely Ms. Ariel would anticipate that these students (with the exception of Sou Li, and possibly 618) had in fact not done the readings.

Following the two directives in her first turn, Ms. Ariel appears to ratify China as a participant in interaction with her question, “China, why is she so attracted to the ocean?” However, in the context of the two preceding utterances and the one that comes after (“That’s going to have a lot to do with your own (. ) thoughts”), and judging by the lack of wait time for China to answer, it is apparent that Ms. Ariel’s question is not a “real” information-seeking question, but is more likely an implicative move meant to
return a probably inattentive China (and possibly other students in the group) to the task at hand. However, shortly thereafter, as Ms. Ariel continues to elaborate her directives, China answers her “question” as if it is legitimate, although in a hyper-cheerful tone of voice, with two sentences of nonsensical information that do not concern Ms. Ariel’s question, Sophie, or the book. This is indicative of a shift in “footing” (Goffman, 2001/1981), with China animating a caricatured, compliant child, perhaps the sort of audience he believes *The Wanderer* is intended for. China’s “answer” in lines 5-7 thus suggests his understanding that Ms. Ariel’s question is not “real,” and therefore, a notably self-referential awareness that he is not complying with an institutionally-sanctioned expectation of “appropriate” student participation. China appears to be indexing subtle and ironic mockery, possibly of the activity, of the book, and of Ms. Ariel herself, and thus the ideologies of schooling and language and the formal cultural productions of ESLL that each of them manifest and represent.

This is a skillful form of resistance that, considering the context, requires substantial linguistic and interactional acuity. Ms. Ariel’s attempt to have China pay attention to the instructions she was giving about the classwork she wanted done – perhaps, to get him back “on task” – is an assertion of her situational identity as teacher. Yet China does not orient to it. Instead, he orients to her *discourse identity* as questioner. By doing so, he makes relevant his discourse identity as question-recipient/answerer rather than the situational (and subordinate) identity of student that Ms. Ariel relationally projects for him (by assuming her identity as teacher). China thus cleverly keys a resistant frame (Goffman, 1974) in terms that are interactionally consistent with the discourse identity of “answerer,” which a literal interpretation of Ms. Ariel’s “question”
would allow, but which is, in fact, incompatible with the situational identity of student. Put another way, China has oriented to the locutionary, or literal, meaning of Ms. Ariel’s “question” rather than its illocutionary force. Thus, China has recourse to a defensible “fall-back” explanation for his utterance (e.g., “You asked me a question.”) (also see Jennie’s response of “I did!” in line 12 of Extract 9.3; CJ’s of “Uh::, the quiz.” and “I do it at home.” in lines 26 and 30 respectively of Extract 9.3; and Benz’s in line 21 and 23 of this extract, which I discuss below). China’s “answer” in lines 5-7 may also serve as a performance of mock (or mocking) pragmatic incompetence, of not being able to distinguish a “real” question from an attempt to get him to pay attention. In this respect, he may also be projecting here (plausibly for his G1.5 classmates’ enjoyment) the identity of an iconic cultural and linguistic neophyte, a “real” ESLL student, that is, a “FOB.” Therefore, his actions here also implicate the mainstream/ESLL identity hierarchy discussed in Chapter 8 and Chapter 10. This particular interactional practice, then, is an example of a student’s appropriation of a practice common in the structural and official cultural productions of ESLL, and that is “FOBeing.”; G1.5 appropriations of FOBeing were important aspects of G1.5 community practices, as I discuss more below and in Chapter 10.

In lines 8-10, Ms. Ariel does not address China directly about his utterance. However, coming as it does just prior to her “and” and an additional (inaudible) utterance in lines 3-4, she appears to orient to it as interruptive. This is indicated by Ms. Ariel’s own overlap of China’s turn (at “really” in line 6), and her lack of uptake of China’s “response” (cf. Wooffitt, 2001, pp. 52-53). In this turn, Ms. Ariel shifts the topic from the first set of reading comprehension questions (extracted above) to ask if anyone has
started the second set of questions. After a short pause, in which no answer is forthcoming, she then (possibly) asks “Anyone?” The likelihood that no one has, which is hinted at here, is then confirmed by a male student in line 11: “No.” After a long, two-second interval in which no one contributes an alternative answer, Ms. Ariel says, “Okay.” She then utters two imperatives, “Start on them today. Finish the first three (. . .) before you start the second set.”, which, as in the modality in her first turn of this interaction, are consistent with her situational identity of teacher.

What is not apparently consistent with the situational identity of teacher, however, is Ms. Ariel’s “Okay.” In line 12, which works here as a pre-closing device (Condon, 2001; Schiffrin, 1989; cf. line 20). That Ms. Ariel is about to close this particular topic without responding to no one having started the second set of questions is of note, particularly considering that the first set of questions had been assigned fully three months earlier; this session was, as I already indicated, to be a review of those questions. The lack of a rebuke here, in addition to the lack of acknowledgement of China’s earlier mocking turn in lines 5-7, particularly when contrasted with the two imperative directives in the rest of line 12 and 13, are suggestive of Ms. Ariel’s accommodation of G1.5 community practices: in this case, of “not doing classwork” (see farther below for more on Ms. Ariel’s responses in this interaction).

As Ms. Ariel finishes her instructions in lines 12-13, China lets out a heavy sigh, an audible, and considering the context, a highly marked signal of annoyance that Ms.

---

31 Because Ms. Ariel, like all the first-year ESLL teachers (in contrast to Mr. Bradley), had a flexible deadline policy for the book-related classwork, the second set of questions were never formally “assigned” on a specific date. However, about two weeks after the first set of questions for *The Wanderer* had been assigned (three months prior), Ms. Ariel had started to conduct in-class discussions of the second set of comprehension questions (the ones she references in lines 12-13).
Ariel, once again, does not address. Instead, in her next turn, she reminds the students that the comprehension questions are “essay style” questions. This reminder may well be intended for those G1.5 students who frequently wrote, when they wrote at all, brief answers to these questions and others, often one or two sentences (see “Worksheet Syndrome” below). Ms. Ariel then addresses CKY about a deck of playing cards he evidently has in view, and with another imperative (mitigated by sentence initial “And” and the concluding “please.”) instructs him not to bring them to class again. Card playing (e.g., rummy, poker) was a common sight at Tradewinds, an activity that many Local students engaged in during lunch or recess, in friendship groups scattered around campus.

China’s loud “YAE CKY” in line 17 shows additional dexterity in his use of linguistic and interactional resources, similar to his “answer” from lines 5-7. His utterance is syllable-timed, with a falling intonational contour, both indicators of a switch to Pidgin, and is spoken loudly; this particular voicing signifies another shift in footing, with China here animating, once more in highly ironic, hybrid terms, a discourse of student alignment with the official cultural productions of ESLL, yet one which, because it takes form in Pidgin, at the same time indexically undermines them (see Chapters 7-8). Thus, in propositional terms, this utterance could be construed as a helpful or supportive move. In this respect, it provides China with the necessary defensible “fall back” explanation should Ms. Ariel address him about it (e.g., “I was just trying to help.”). However, that a student would offer such help to a teacher, which by extension would suggest a belief that she might need it, is another subtle affront to Ms. Ariel, here the implication being that she lacks power in her situational identity of teacher. China’s
actions here further underscore his mocking stance and the resistant frame he has keyed, and signal not only hybridity in identity, but work as indexes solidarity with CKY and the other G1.5 ESLL students who are co-present. They also work as socializing resources for these students, not just through the L2, but in particular, to use the L2 in this particular sort of G1.5 cultural production of ESLL.

Ms. Ariel again does not address China here, instead continuing her warning to CKY about the playing cards, this time with an ultimatum that she will throw them away if he brings them in future. China then significantly raises the stakes when his indexical resistance becomes denotative; there is no shift in footing here, making this utterance much more confrontational than those earlier: here he directly challenges Ms. Ariel, using not only the pronoun “you,” but her form of address, “Miss,” about an apparent act she is in the process of carrying out, with a tone that could be easily interpreted as defiant. Coming on the heels of Ms. Ariel’s latest assertions of her situational identity as teacher (in her instructions to the students in lines 12-13, and her twin warnings to CKY in lines 15-16 and line 18), it seems that China is pressing her as teacher to respond to him explicitly, as she hasn’t yet in this interaction despite the increasingly overt disposition of his challenges. (Extract 9.4 is repeated below for the reader’s convenience).
(9.4) *Cards* [ELA42WmdS11: 565-593]

1  Ms. Ariel: You have to think about Sophie’s personality. (4) You have to think about what you’ve read. China, why is she so attracted to the ocean?
3  China: That’s going to have a lot to do with your own (. ) thoughts [and (inaudible)
5  China: [((cheerful voice)) I think it’s quiet and peaceful. (3) And dolphin is [really nice.
7  Ms. Ariel: many people have started on the second set of questions? (1)
9  (Anyone?)
11 ?MS: No.
13 Ms. Ariel: (2) Okay. Start on them today. Finish the first three (. ) before you start the second [set.
15 China: [((heavy sigh)) Okay, and they’re essay style questions. ((to CKY)) And don’t bring your cards in future, please.
17 China: ((with falling intonation)) YAE CKY. YEAH CKY.
19 Ms. Ariel: I’ll throw them away.
21 China: Are you looking at me, Miss?
23 Ms. Ariel: Okay, I’m gonna go see what they’re doing {in the other group},
25 Benz: ‘K.
23 China: ‘K.
23 Benz: Bye.
25 Ms. Ariel: Up to you.
25 Benz: Bye.
27 CKY: ((laugh))
27 China: Ba’bye.
Barehand: (inaudible)
29 China: ((cheerful voice; syllable-timed)) Hav a nais dei. Have a nice day.
((Ms. Ariel gets up and leaves))
Raven: ((laugh))
31 China: ((laugh))
Benz: Okay.
33 China: Okay so=
Barehand: =Get out=
35 China: =So cards.
37 China: [Cards.
CKY: ((starts to deal the cards))
However, following China’s direct challenge, “Are you looking at me, Miss?” in line 20, Ms. Ariel once again does not address China. Instead, she announces to the group, “Okay, I’m gonna go see what they’re doing,” in reference to the (non-G1.5) group that is reading *Bud, not Buddy* on the other side of the classroom. She utters this as if the students have the choice to have her remain with their group, marked by the sound stretches in “do:in:g” and the continuing intonation, rather than as a simple declarative; this interpretation is supported by Ms. Ariel’s subsequent utterance in line 24, “Up to you.” However, similar to China’s walk of the interactional tightrope earlier, Benz’s uptake is to the propositional content of the utterance rather than its illocutionary meaning, and he gives a quick confirming response. This would likely be an acceptable answer for a student to make if Ms. Ariel’s statement was a literal indication that she was going to go see what the others were doing; however, it is not acceptable if it is taken as Ms. Ariel has evidently intended. Benz’s quick delivery in line 21 (”K”) and his equally quick follow-ups of “Bye.” in line 23 and line 25 (which are themselves more explicit indexes of a resistant stance) signal that, like China earlier, he understands the illocutionary force of Ms. Ariel’s initial statement in line 20, and that he is therefore aware that he is not complying with an institutionally-sanctioned expectation of “appropriate” student participation. Thus, like China, Benz indexes a stance of mocking resistance, but one which gives him recourse to a defensible “fall-back” explanation should Ms. Ariel challenge him on it (i.e., that he oriented to Ms. Ariel’s utterance in line 20 as an indication that she was going to the other group). In this regard, these students’ actions appear to be performed with some awareness that Ms. Ariel does indeed have the institutionally ascribed power to write a referral, call campus security, and have them
escorted to the vice-principal for punishment. This therefore highlights the skill that is required in their delicate balancing act of indexing resistance on the one hand and not being punished for it on the other, the linguistic and interactional expertise that was necessary lest these students wind up, e.g., suspended for insubordination.\textsuperscript{32} In this respect, student resistance in the broadly specified practice of not doing work, and other resistant social practices, required for their achievement considerable L2 linguistic, pragmatic, and interactional expertise, expertise that was fundamental to the production of these practices, the identity performance of “G1.5 student,” and participation in and the (re)production of the G1.5 CoP. That is, it is unlikely that an ESLL student with lower L2 proficiency and/or less experience with these sorts of performances would have the requisite linguistic resources and cultural knowledge needed to accomplish them. Thus, “neva du am”, “it’s at home”, and other central social practices in the G1.5 CoP index specific forms of cultural and linguistic competence that set these students apart from their non-G1.5 classmates. In this regard, these students can be seen as differentiating themselves as ESLL students (once again) in ways that the school, the ESLL program, and the curriculum never did.

Following the three turn exchange by Benz and China in lines 21-23, (‘K.; ‘K.; Bye.), Ms. Ariel now explicitly indicates that these students have a choice to keep her in their group, which as already mentioned, removes any uncertainty as to the illocutionary meaning of her statement in line 20. This also effectively derails any recourse to a “fall-back” defense for the boys. However, despite the now clarified meaning of that utterance (made clear by Ms. Ariel’s “Up to you.”), Benz in line 25 iterates “Bye.” for a second

\textsuperscript{32} See below for a discussion about plausible reasons why Ms. Ariel did not give these students referrals for their behavior here. Also see Extract 9.6 for her later censure of them.
time. Since there is now no mistaking Ms. Ariel’s inferred meaning, Benz’s responses make explicit his orientation to the resistant frame keyed by China earlier. Benz’s is a highly marked response given the context, one that, put in terms of politeness theory, has achieved the status of a bald, on-the-record threat to Ms. Ariel’s “face” (Brown & Levinson, 1999/1987). Indeed, it is a response that is so marked that it engenders a laugh from CKY. Following this, China joins Benz with his own even more marked response of “Ba’bye.” Following Barehand’s inaudible utterance (which may or may not represent another G1.5 student joining China’s and Benz’s activity), China then one-ups himself in line 29 with another ironic, hybrid utterance “Hav a nais dei.”, that is also a strikingly bald, on-the-record face threat. China has subverted not only Ms. Ariel’s attempt to assign classwork, but her offer to help do it, and in doings so, he and then Benz have essentially commanded Ms. Ariel to go away, and done so immediately after she has invoked her situational identity as teacher through the warning to CKY about his playing cards. These students have not only flouted interactional conventions for “appropriate” student participation (cf. Fairclough, 1989), but have challenged Ms. Ariel to do something about it.

Instead, Ms. Ariel again does not respond, but gets up and leaves for the other group. Following her departure, Raven laughs, as does China, both a coda to their just-completed performance, and quite possibly as “knowing laughter,” an index of their orientation to G1.5 community membership (Wenger, 1998, p. 125). Benz then utters “Okay.” followed by China’s “Okay so” which, in contrast to Ms. Ariel’s “Okay.” in line 12, both signal a transition in discourse “from off-task or off-topic talk back to on-task or on-topic talk” that is, to “mutually understood and expected business at hand,” (Condon,
2001, p. 509). It is telling, of course, that this “off-task or off-topic talk” from the preceding interaction involved the bookwork from the children’s novels – the formal or “official” ESLL curriculum – and the “mutually understood and expected business at hand” is, as China states in line 38, card playing, the very activity which Ms. Ariel has just taken two turns to explicitly warn is forbidden. The latched and overlapped utterances in lines 34-37 highlight the cooperative, joint production of discourse here (Cameron, 1999), and the joint orientation to the mutually understood task at hand: a forbidden practice in class, one which, perhaps not coincidentally, is undertaken daily during non-instructional time by Local students throughout the school.33 In this respect, these students have performed identities that index their Local affiliations and orientations, their experiences and histories of participation in CoP beyond Ms. Ariel’s ESLL classroom – that is they have produced their “G1.5-ness” by participating in G1.5 community practices and thus (re)creating the G1.5 CoP. There are several indicators that they have engaged in shared practices of a (G1.5) CoP (see Wenger, 1998, pp. 125-126): a shared way of doing things together (China’s and Benz’s resistance; card playing); sustained mutual relations that are harmonious (the G1.5 students’ intra-group relations) and conflictual (the G1.5 students’ relations with Ms. Ariel); mutually defined identities (indexed variously through the contributions of China, Benz, Raven, CKY, and Barehand); inside jokes and knowing laughter (CKY, Raven); short cuts to communication and a shared discourse “reflecting a certain perspective on the world”

33 On certain occasions, e.g., class sessions immediately prior a long vacation, when quarter exams and other end of term activities had been completed, that teachers would allow students to play cards in class. Significantly, however, the interaction represented in Extract 9.4 occurred in the third class session of a new quarter (the fourth and final quarter of the school year).
(latched and overlapped utterances; a joint orientation to and production of particular discursive practices).

These students have interactionally negotiated a space for themselves within the ESLL instructional setting to "not do work," and in doing so have participated in and (re)produced their identities as (what I have termed) G1.5 students through G1.5 community practices. "Not doing work" very clearly signaled not doing a specific type of work, that is, the children's book assignments and other manifestations of the formal ESLL curriculum. Clearly, however, this particular practice did involve work, a lot of it as well, much in the dangerous interactional interstices described above, between engaging in resistance without being removed for punishment from the classrooms needed to perform it in. As already described, this required considerable expertise in the use and manipulation of L2 resources, itself criterial in G1.5 CoP participation and identity production; this expertise was also served in terms of how it was variously realized in interaction, as socializing resources for these and other students (and teachers) in the G1.5 cultural productions of ESLL. In this regard, G1.5 students drew upon and used the linguistic resources that they did have, that is, their oral English proficiency, to get out of doing work that was at least ostensibly designed to help them with the language practices they were less strong in and needed in order to exit ESLL and succeed in the mainstream: L2 academic print-literacy practices (see Appendix M for examples of G1.5 students' literacy practices on course assignments). Of course, an obvious argument can be made that children's novels will not (necessarily) provide students with access to those practices anyway, an argument I make in Chapter 7. This therefore points to some of the inevitable consequences that can derive from students' low investment in materials and
curriculum, if students view them as lacking relevance and the cultural, linguistic, and symbolic capital they desire. It also points to another manifestation of social action that these students engage in that may actually work to keep them in ESLL. Just as not bringing materials, not doing work, and other component practices of the G1.5 student performance strike will result in lower course grades, which will increase the likelihood of these students remaining in ESLL, so will the lack of engagement in the literacy practices these students need in order to score high enough on the ESLL placement tests to exit the program. Thus, as Shor (1992) has noted, performance strikes and other forms of resistance may well work to deny school authority, but they can also deny linguistic and academic development: they are “complex way[s] of sabotaging oneself and authority at the same time” (p. 137). In this respect, these students' engagement in G1.5 community practices work to reproduce the very social hierarchies and educational ideologies that they resist (cf. Fairclough, 1989, 2001; Willis, 1977).

Before concluding analysis of this data segment, I would like to comment briefly on Benz’s, China’s, and Ms. Ariel’s participation in the above interaction.

Benz’s participation in the interaction in Extract 9.4 is interesting in terms of what it reveals about students’ interactional and denotative resistance in ESLL classes. It is also interesting in that of all the ESLL students that I met over the course of my research at Tradewinds, Benz was the only one who had been in mainstream classes, and then *himself* requested to be placed into ESLL. At the beginning of the school year, he was struggling getting Ds in mainstream classes, which as he reported in his interview, were “hard.” After speaking with his counselor, he switched into a full course of ESLL and J-section classes, including Ms. Ariel’s ELA 2W, about three weeks into the school year.
Benz, who had lived in the US for approximately 2.5 years at the time of this interaction, had previously been an ESLL student in intermediate school; this is quite possibly one reason that when he went into Ms. Ariel's class, and befriended Barehand, he moved quickly and easily from legitimate peripheral participation in G1.5 community practices to full participation. Thus, quite incongruously, soon after he had arrived into the ELA 2W class, he invoked and participated in many of the practices discussed above and in Chapter 8 in a stated effort to “get out” of ESLL, the program he had only recently requested to be returned to.34 This not only points to how certain G1.5 representational practices were constitutive of a G1.5 CoP, but also the comments made by Brahdah in Chapter 8, about waiting til “later” to exit ESLL, and Faltis & Wolfe (1999), regarding the unique problems that “ESL lifers” face in mainstream classes precisely because of their experiences in ESL programs (cf. Duff, 2002; Harklau, 1994a; Miller, 2003; Norton, 2000, 2001; Ruiz de Velasco et al., 2000; Toohey, 2000; Wong Fillmore, 1991, 1992). It is also indicative, as with Jennie in Extract 9.3, of a more peripheral participant engaging more fully in G1.5 CoP practices. Indeed, Benz's rather surprising “Bye.” in line 23 is perhaps suggestive of a less interactionally competent G1.5 participant in that it is less deft, and more bald, than usual G1.5 student interactional resistance; for example, there is no “fall-back” defense available here. This is also suggested in Benz's “What?” in line 36, which implies that he is less familiar with the “mutual business at hand” – card playing – than more oldtimer G1.5 CoP participants (e.g., CKY, Barehand, China).

34 In his interview, Benz maintained he wanted to “get out” of ESLL because “it's like, shame to be in ESL.” When asked why, he replied “I don't know - you know like Local people? They think I'm dumb 'cause I'm in ESL and J classes.” When asked what he learned in ESL, he replied “Nothing. Nothing at all.” (SINT20: 432). Of note, however, is that he (like the other G1.5 students) did not implicate his own actions (or lack there of, in terms of resistance and performance strikes) in learning “nothing” (see below).
Also important to note here is China’s participation. It may be presumed that China’s confrontational behavior above may have been influenced by the presence of the mini-disc recorder he was wearing for this class session: that he was “performing” for the benefit of a researcher (me) and a wider research community, and that the recorder and the lavaliere mic attached to his collar provided him not only with an additional audience, but a license to perform, as well as some measure of “protection” from censure (i.e., that any responses to his provocation of Ms. Ariel would be recorded). This may in fact be the case, at least partly. Indeed, on the four occasions when he carried the recorder (three times in Ms. Ariel’s class [once with a substitute teacher], and once in Mr. Bradley’s class), he would at times explicitly reference me as audience, by providing some form of meta-commentary about the class, Ms. Ariel, another student, or himself. For example, shortly after the interaction in Extract 9.5 concluded, as he was playing cards with the others, he spoke directly into the mic attached to his collar:

(9.5) *So fucking boring* [ELA2WmdS11: 597]

1 China: It’s 10.45. We watch – reading *The Wanderer.* And I’m not reading. It’s so fucking boring. {In Language Arts J class, also with Ms. Ariel} we read *Holes.* And I read it like four times, you know, since, like 7th grade. And it’s really boring, too. So, yeah.35

---

35 China, Barehand, CKY, and a few other students in ELA 2W also had 9th grade Language Arts J with Ms. Ariel. For reasons I was never able to ascertain, the curriculum in that Language Arts J class was similarly structured around children’s novels, e.g., *Holes* (Sachar, 1998), even though the mainstream counterparts of these classes had a prescribed – and different – curriculum (tied to content and performance standards). In fact, students in both of Ms. Ariel’s classes (ESLL and Language Arts J) were often given virtually the exact same lesson, prompting her on numerous occasions to tell the handful of students that had both classes that they needed to either repeat a given activity from the Language Arts J class or work independently while classmates in the ESLL class completed it. Several substitute teachers for the ELA 2W class complained about this arrangement, as did the students.
China's comments are clearly addressed to me, perhaps as an explanation for his participation in the interaction represented in Extract 9.4, which indicates an orientation to the recording as a forum for public display.\textsuperscript{36} However, he and other G1.5 students engaged in these and similar actions when I was not recording as well (and according to Ms. Ariel, when I wasn't present in the classroom). Therefore, the presence of the recorder may well have \textit{promoted} this particular performance in that it provided an additional "audience," but it was one in a long line of similar performances staged by China and other G1.5 students when no recorder was present as well.

Ms. Ariel's participation above also warrants comment. Just as I contend that the students' participation above was not significantly different from their usual patterns of participation when I was not recording the class, I also assert that Ms. Ariel's participation was not much different. Although she did state to me on several occasions a concern that she might sound "mean" on the recordings (see Chapter 5), Ms. Ariel rarely confronted or rebuked her students in class, and when she did, it was usually mildly, as in fact she did do later this class period (see Extract 9.6). Ms. Ariel's lack of uptake of G1.5 students' resistance was thus rather common, a point that the students were well aware of, and quite probably used to their advantage. However, earlier in the school year, Ms. Ariel had responded to these sorts of behaviors with a flurry of punitive student referrals to counselors and the vice-principal. Yet this had the unintended consequence of earning her a reputation among the security staff and oldtimer teaching colleagues as being too

\textsuperscript{36}China's comments to me here also implicate aspects of the researcher/student-participant relationship. His informality, most clearly indexed in his use of the expletive intensifier, signifies a degree of familiarity if not comfort with me that I went to great lengths to promote with all students. It is also suggestive of a level of trust that I tried to cultivate with students, i.e., that I would not (indeed, could not) get them into trouble for various "infractions" (e.g., swearing, cheating) that I witnessed or heard (see Chapter 5). Both points suggest a relationship with students that Mr. Day once characterized as that of an (adult) friend and/or counselor (cf. Eckert, 1989; 2000).
quick to resort to this action, and thus, unable to handle problems with students on her own. Mid-way through the first quarter of the year, she indicated to me some frustration with this developing reputation and what she saw as an inadequate and unsupportive response from the administration. Thus, caught in this unfortunate position, one brought about by G1.5 students participation in resistant practices, Ms. Ariel adjusted her reactions to them by essentially ignoring them, unless they reached a point that she apparently believed went too far. Judging by the comparative infrequency of uptake and/or remediation of these actions, this was, despite students’ seeming diligent persistence, a point rarely reached.

However, the students in the interaction represented in Extract 9.4 evidently did reach this point, as later in the class period, while this same group of students was sitting and talking (rather than discussing the reading comprehension questions), Ms. Ariel approached to tell them to quiet down.

(9.6) Back to talking [ELA42WmdS11: 624-629]

1 Ms. Ariel: It’s too loud over here. ((to China and Benz)) And I’m this far from sending you two guys out. Because I don’t like the way you were talking to me earlier and sassing. That is totally unacceptable.
3 Ash: ((to China, re: Benz)) He didn’t even say anything to her.
5 Ms. Ariel: Yeah he did.
Benz: What did I say?
7 Ms. Ariel: ((to Ash)) Mind your own business. ((to China and Benz)) Okay? If you want to go to the principal’s office, keep up the noise. Okay?

37 Ms. Cheney also had trouble with this issue, and reported her belief mid-way through the school year that the school security staff had stopped talking to her. The first-year teacher in Bullough’s (1989) case study reported a similar feeling of being essentially left to fend for herself by the school administration. Bullough (among others) has strongly (and perhaps obviously) recommended a mentoring system to counter such circumstances, one which by and large did not exist for the first-year ESLL teachers at Tradewinds. This was due, at least in part, to the inordinate number of responsibilities that the other ESLL teachers (including Mr. Anderson) had at the school (cf. Harklau, 1994a; Chapter 7) which was itself compounded by the school-wide shift to NCLB-mandated standards instruction, as well the implementation of the new English proficiency tests that were being used at the high school (see Chapter 5).
Just keep it up. I promise. I’m not – not feeling patient today. ((She leaves)).

Okay. Back to talking.

Even as Ms. Ariel was scolding students, threatening them with a referral, G1.5 students engaged in similar forms of interactional resistance, with Ash here taking up a version of the “fall back” explanation that Benz “didn’t even say anything” to Ms. Ariel – which he didn’t, at least in this interaction. Similarly, once Ms. Ariel has left after giving them an explicit warning about being sent to the principal’s office because she is “not feeling patient today.”, Raven signals a return to talking, which is precisely what brought Ms. Ariel over to them in the first place.

The interaction represented in Extract 9.4 is representative of a number of practices that went into the G1.5 student performance strike and cultural production of ESLL: the derailment of the official lesson of the day, the challenge of their (newcomer) ESLL teacher’s authority, the corresponding undermining of the curriculum as a manifestation of the structural productions of ESLL, and the educational and societal ideologies about ESLL that were constitutive of and constituted by it. Specifically, here, students interactionally negotiated a space within which they could “neva do am” – not do work – and what’s more, they did it in class, in an interactional event that included their teacher. As I have indicated, this was, given the circumstances, an altogether risky endeavor to undertake, one which required a considerable mastery of L2 linguistic and interactional resources to accomplish, yet one which transpired countless times in various forms in the ESLL classes I observed. As I have argued, participation in practices such as these simultaneously indexed and produced G1.5 community membership, and
resulted in the reproduction of the G1.5 CoP. Participation in these practices also served as socializing resources both through the L2 and to use the L2 for other (G1.5) students who were co-present. In addition, it worked to destabilize the formal or "official" cultural production of ESLL, thereby underscoring the contingency and bidirectionality of socialization processes. Faced daily with widespread participation in practices such as these, and administratively alienated as a result of them, it is little wonder that the first-year ESLL teachers resorted to the defensive teaching accommodations that attended and facilitated these practices, as I discuss in more depth in Chapter 10.

I now turn to another manifestation of the G1.5 student performance strike, which was also associated with not doing work: starting late and finishing early, which I subsume beneath the rubric of "Bell’s gonna ring!"

‘Bell’s gonna ring!’: Starting late and finishing early

Starting class late and finishing class early was another common, if uniquely temporally-oriented performance strike practice in the first-year ESLL teachers' classes. Despite its pervasiveness, this was actually rarely explicitly negotiated in interaction: students (and later, teachers) simply would not start the lesson until ten or 20 minutes into the class, and similarly, would stop doing whatever the class had been assigned and pack up belongings ten, 20, or in extended class periods, even 30 minutes early (cf. Extract 9.3). This served as another means by which G1.5 students claimed school instructional time intended for formal, "official" curricular activities, and made it their own.

This practice is explicitly if fleetingly referenced in Extract 9.7, an interaction that occurred with just over ten minutes remaining in one of Mr. Day’s classes. Students to
this point in the period had been assigned a 21-item grammar exercise from Dixon (1956) on “negative forms” (see Appendix J.1), and been given 10 minutes to complete it. Following this, students were provided with a “study hall” (independent seat work) activity in which they were to have been working on a project for an upcoming open house at Tradewinds, and/or vocabulary, reading comprehension questions, and/or summaries for previous reading assignments of Shiloh (Naylor, 1991) (see Appendix H.5).

The interaction below involves Laidplayer, a 14-year-old 9th grader from Palau who, according to information he provided in a formal interview with me, had moved to Hawai‘i a month prior to the start of school after failing entrance exams for high school in Micronesia. Laidplayer was an interesting student-participant. Of all the Micronesian students who participated in this study, he was the one who most clearly downplayed his Pacific Island heritage (he rarely sat or interacted with the other Micronesian students in class), and he actively cultivated associations with other, non-Micronesian students, particularly with Locals (especially Ioane), and other G1.5 ESLL students (especially IwannaFAL). Laidplayer was highly proficient in spoken and written L2 English, as well as Pidgin, and spoke both with no phonological features that might mark him as a second language learner. When I first met him, I was astonished to learn he had only lived in the US for one month, not only because of his L2 proficiencies, but also his hip-hop style and dress, which indexed a Local identity much different from many of his newcomer ESLL peers. As I came to learn, Laidplayer had extended family living in Hawai‘i, with whom he had a strong connection, and who provided him with the resources and investments to act, sound, and appear – to be – Local. Laidplayer was also one of the few students in
this study who most clearly moved from newcomer ESLL student status at the beginning of the year to legitimate peripheral participation and then full participation in the G1.5 CoP. Indeed, although he claimed to have had no idea what “ESL” meant when he first arrived and was placed into the Tradewinds ESLL program, by the end of the year he was participating in a wide range of resistant practices that were indexical of a G1.5 CoP oldtimers. Similarly, just as with other G1.5 ESLL students, his grades in Mr. Day’s class followed an analogous downward trajectory as his participation in G1.5 practices increased: in the first two quarters of the year he earned Bs; in the third his grade fell to a D, and in the fourth, finally, he received an F (see Chapter 10 for more on this phenomenon).

Prior to the interaction represented in Extract 9.7, Laidplayer had not been doing his assigned classwork. He had spent more than 45 minutes on the 21-item grammar exercise, despite the ten-minute time-limit that Mr. Day had given (cf. “floating deadlines” in Chapter 10), even though he had demonstrated on numerous occasions broad metalinguistic knowledge of and facility with English grammar (in fact, he corrected Mr. Day’s grammar instruction on more than one occasion). He had then spent the remainder of this extended class period talking with Ioane, then IwannaFAL, and then finally, had fallen asleep. Mr. Day had woken him twice to this point in an effort to get him to do some work beyond the grammar exercise (cf. “Worksheet Syndrome” below). Mr. Day had then negotiated with Laidplayer about completing a reading summary assignment for *Shiloh* which was overdue. However, as the interaction below commences, Laidplayer still had not gotten to work on it, and instead, was playing with his wristwatch and continuing to chat with IwannaFAL, who was seated beside him.
This interaction illustrates and references a number of (ongoing) performance-strike practices in Mr. Day’s class and their consequences for the ESLL curriculum and larger classroom culture discussed to this point. In response to Mr. Day’s inquiry regarding the status of his summary, Laidplayer shakes his head no, that he hasn’t
finished his summary. This is of note since earlier in the class period, after Mr. Day woke Laidplayer from his sleep for the second time, they had both agreed that Laidplayer needed to work on his summary (Mr. Day had brought Laidplayer’s classroom folder to him; students were given manila folders to file completed class work in, which remained in the classroom). Yet Laidplayer not only provides no elaborating “account” for his disagreeing action in line 2, as is normatively expected (Ford, 2001, 2004), his disagreement itself is not even uttered (cf. Extract 9.3). Mr. Day then approaches Laidplayer, exhorting him to finish the summary because “it’s due today!” At this point in the semester, however, as in the other first-year ESLL teachers’ classes, it was widely understood in Mr. Day’s class that deadlines were “flexible” (see Chapter 10), thus ostensible extrinsic motivators like “due dates” went largely unheeded. Mr. Day then employs a tactic that he put to use in a number of instances when G 1.5 students were engaged in “off-task” behavior, asking Laidplayer if he needs “help”: “I know, you want me to sit down and read the book with you.” This was a generally successful strategy Mr. Day used to counter G 1.5 students’ efforts to not work, at least in the short term, possibly because it played on these students’ oft-cited aversion to “childishness” in the ESLL classroom. 38 Mr. Day then indeed pulls up a chair and sits down next to Laidplayer, but instead of reading the book with him, asks what is wrong.

In line 6, Laidplayer answers by explaining what is apparently wrong: his watch needs fixing. This answer is interesting in that fixing a watch is certainly not what

---

38 Mr. Day’s classroom talk was sprinkled with an array of features that all the G1.5 students in the class variously found “erkin” (irritating), evidently because they indexed childishness (e.g., scolding and giving directions indirectly through question forms (cf. Extract 9.3); referring to time deadlines as “it’s due when the big hand gets to the three [four, etc.]”; repeatedly saying “Shh!” to quiet students during whole-class discussion; and prosody that frequently seemed geared for young children rather than teenagers). As Ioane put it to her friends Marnie* and Laidplayer in one class: “Ho, dis gai erkin! Takin laik bebi tak!” (Damn, this guy’s irritating! He talks like baby talk!) (ELA42XmdS19:3542-3546).
Laidplayer has been assigned (and twice been singled out for explicit reminding) to do by his teacher. In this regard, his answer is a likely manifestation of G1.5 students’ general resistance strategy, the defensible “fall-back” explanation elaborated above, in that he addresses the locutionary meaning of his teacher’s question, “what’s wrong?” rather than its likely illocutionary force (i.e., “why aren’t you working?”). Mr. Day’s uptake in line 7 appears as an aligning move, in that he accepts this new (off-topic) subject as a legitimate one for discussion. Following Laidplayer’s explanation of “what’s wrong” with the watch – “It’s too big.” – there is a long, three second pause which signals that this particular topic may well have run its course. This returns the participants to the original topic that frames this interaction, indeed, that has motivated it: why Laidplayer is not doing the reading summary work during class time as he has been told (repeatedly) to do.

At this point, in line 9, IwannaFAL loudly proclaims, “Oh: man, the bell’s gonna ring!” This is an obvious signal that instructional time is about to come to an end, one as clear as the bell ringing itself, which marks a shift in students’ tightly regimented daily schedule from “school time” to “student time” (cf. Hull & Schultz, 2002). The timing of the utterance here is interesting in two senses: first, that it comes during the lengthy between-turn pause in line 8, and second that it comes with more than ten minutes left in the class period. IwannaFAL is likely listening in on the interaction between Mr. Day and Laidplayer, next to whom he is sitting, clearly within earshot of what is being discussed (cf. his turn in line 29). Of course, it is impossible to ascertain if IwannaFAL’s utterance is meant as some sort of “answer by proxy” (from an oldtimer G1.5 ESLL student) to Mr. Day’s overarching question about why Laidplayer (a newcomer G1.5
ESLL student) is not doing his assigned work. Equally impossible to determine is if this is an example of an oldtimer helping out a newcomer by offering him the additional linguistic resources with which to negotiate an interactional difficulty (i.e., helping him to explain why he is not doing work to a teacher who has just asked him about it).

Regardless, IwannaFAL has strategically reoriented the interaction toward the issue of instructional time ending, which might, if there were teacher uptake, let Laidplayer off the hook of having to explain himself. As I have alluded to earlier, this was one of the functions of this particular practice, to provide a defensible rationale for not doing assigned work at the temporal edges of classroom lessons, should the need arise for one. However, as I have also indicated, this was in fact infrequently invoked directly in interaction, despite classes starting later and later as the school year went on and finishing earlier and earlier. Regardless, it gave these students (and their teachers) a(nother) back-up excuse for the further truncation of the institutional time allotted to formal, “official” class curriculum and instruction, and in its stead, the expansion of time that could be set aside for (and that was constitutive of) participation in G1.5 community practices and cultural productions of ESLL.

A female student’s high-pitched and elongated “What::?” in line 10 marks IwannaFAL’s statement as unusual and/or inaccurate, a point Mr. Day himself addresses in line 11: “Oh no, you got about 10 minutes before we’re outta here.” Mr. Day rejects IwannaFAL’s assertion that the bell’s gonna ring soon, or at least soon enough to warrant the wrap-up of any official classroom activities being engaged in, which was the whole point of the practice. By doing so, he explicitly removes recourse to this practice, at least at this moment in the interaction, as a viable excuse for Laidplayer (or IwannaFAL for
that matter) not to be doing work. Following Laidplayer’s apparent evaluation of this development ("Shit."), which he overlaps in line 12 (and which receives no uptake from Mr. Day), Mr. Day broaches the subject he had come to talk to Laidplayer about, when he says in lines 13-14, “why don’t you try get it done. That way you won’t have to do it at home.” This is essentially an entreaty to Laidplayer, with an incentive (that echoes the “It’s at home” practice in ironic ways) tacked on, versions of which are repeated no less three other times (lines 3-4; line 16; lines 21-22) in this 30 turn interaction. This signals a clear frustration that Mr. Day and other of the first-year ESLL teachers encountered over the course of the school year, one which no doubt contributed to the defensive teaching accommodations: what to do when large numbers of otherwise bright and inquisitive students increasingly withdraw from formal classroom and curricular life and begin to fail across the board, on assignments, quizzes, and projects that only weeks earlier they had been passing. Mr. Day is indeed pressing Laidplayer to do some work, but he can also be seen as imploring a student whom he knows is more than capable to write a summary about 22 pages of a children’s book, to do it – less, perhaps, to enforce his authority here and more to avert another of his G1.5 students’ downward trajectory to “failure,” at least as defined in official terms in Mr. Day’s class, the ESLL program, and Tradewinds High School (cf. Lave, 1991).

Laidplayer’s overlapped rejoinder in line 15 is pivotal in the interaction and for my purposes here, divides analysis between the “finishing class early” practice and a more general discussion of the rest of the interaction. Laidplayer answers not only the question/suggestion in line 13 but the question in line 5 about “What’s wrong?” (and perhaps, according to G1.5 students, what was wrong with the ESLL program itself).
With the exclamatory intonation of “So IZI!” (So EASY!), use of the sentence-initial degree modifier “so,” which is common in Pidgin, and the volume of the following “izi,” Laidplayer strongly highlights and orients Mr. Day toward a problem that is far more substantial than how much time remains for the class session. Here, he invokes a primary representation about ESLL, made by G1.5 and non-G1.5 students alike, about the program being too easy, childish, and irrelevant (see Chapter 8), also something he said to me numerous times in informal and formal interviews. What’s more, he does so here and in much of the remainder of the interaction in Pidgin, itself indexical of someone who is not an archetypal ESLL student, who hybridizes and complicates, and thus undermines the official cultural productions of the ESLL student as a cultural and linguistic Newcomer capable only of reading children’s novels. Laidplayer has made clear that the reason he is not doing work right now is not because his watch is too big, not because the bell’s going to ring, not because he left his book at home, but because the work is too easy, and quite possibly because, as he has learned in quite immediate terms, *Shiloh* indexes childishness and lacks the cultural and symbolic capital that he desires in his effort “not to lose or whatever” in his competition with his Local cousins (see note 39). In this regard, in a slight variation to Jennie in Extract 9.3, Laidplayer has also shifted any putative problem or deficiency for not doing the classwork from himself to the material, and by extension to Mr. Day, a first-year industrial arts teacher with no

---

39 Indeed, with specific regard to *Shiloh*, the book that he was currently not writing the summary for, Laidplayer related the following episode, which occurred with one of his Local cousins, with whom he was living as he was going to Tradewinds (I only provide the English gloss of Pidgin here): “... I took the book home and I was reading it, right? And my cousin goes, ‘Hey, Shiloh! I remember that book!’ And I’m like, ‘Yeah? From 7th grade?’ ‘No, from 6th!’ And I’m like ((laugh)) ‘Oh, okay!’ ((laugh)) I was – I was really mad, you know? ... Like, ‘cause you know, I want to compete with my cousins, you know? I don’t want to lose or whatever.’” (SINT14: 640-642). Several of the other G1.5 students related stories with Local friends or family similar to this one.
ESLL background and no formal ESLL curriculum to work with, who had learned he would be teaching ESLL just days before the school year began.

However, the unfinished construction that follows “So IZI!”, that is, “Ai jas –”, mitigates the exclamation preceding it by again implicating Laidplayer as responsible for not doing the work, rather than Shiloh and/or Mr. Day. In line 16, Mr. Day implores Laidplayer twice more with “So do it now!”, as if it being “so easy,” as uttered by Laidplayer in line 15, is reason in and of itself to complete the classwork. This also indirectly references the tacit agreement in defensive teaching noted by McNeil (1986), that in exchange for student compliance, demands on course work are reduced. Yet here, Laidplayer is stating that because demands are reduced, he will not comply. Whether this is the case or is another discursive practice intended not to do any work cannot clearly be determined, though it may well be that it is some combination of the two.

Following this, Laidplayer reveals that in fact he can’t do the assignment that he and Mr. Day earlier agreed he would do since he hasn’t yet completed the reading assignment that is supposed to be summarized. Following Mr. Day’s reply, that he does have to read the chapters before he can write a summary about them, Laidplayer states in a loud, but non-confrontational tone: “WEL ai don RID DIS BUK wen ai get hom, ai dono wai.” (“WELL I don’t READ THIS BOOK when I get home, I don’t know why.”). In this, he relates the same information he gave in his formal interview with me about not reading the book at home, but he does not reveal the episode about being “mad” after finding out that his cousin had read Shiloh in the 6th grade (see note 39). Thus, his “ai dono wai” is interesting in that he has a chance here to offer a highly plausible rationale

---

40 The formal interview with Laidplayer took place five weeks after the interaction represented in 9.7 was recorded.
for not reading *Shiloh* at home – that his cousins tease him about it, since they read it in the 6th grade – a rationale more powerful than how much time remains in the class, for instance – yet he does not opt to take it. Laidplayer’s utterance in line 20 also works once again to implicate the book as the source for his not doing the work related to it, first with an unequivocal statement “I don’t read this book when I go home,” which implies Laidplayer’s purposefulness, agency, and choice in not reading, followed by “I don’t know why.”, which casts responsibility to some outside force perhaps: the book itself.

Mr. Day then tries a slightly different tack in trying to get Laidplayer to do the work: if he doesn’t do it at home, “Then why don’t you do it in class while I’m here making you, that way you can get it done.” Mr. Day has proceeded from an extrinsic motivator in line 3 (“it’s due today!”), to an incentive in lines 13-14 (“That way you won’t have to it at home.”), to reasoning here in lines 21-22. This reasoning indirectly references the defensive teaching accommodation of the study hall activity I will discuss in more depth in Chapter 10: Mr. Day has made class time available for work that was once assigned as homework since students have consistently had trouble turning it in; yet students – here most obviously, Laidplayer – still are not using this accommodation to get the work in, despite the extra time and it being “so easy.” The final lines of the interaction, in which Laidplayer mentions a particular time when he does read *Shiloh*, concludes with a final scatologically-oriented signal of Laidplayer’s assessment of the book, which IwannaFAL affirms. It is worthwhile pointing out that after Mr. Day left, neither boy engaged in the work that had just been under discussion, as they instead packed up their belongings to leave.
As I have described, “Bell’s gonna ring!” was an additional practice that G1.5 students engaged in to claim school time and make it their own. Although rarely invoked in discourse, as students (and later teachers) simply took up the practice by starting class later and finishing earlier, it was available at the temporal edges of instructional time as a “reason” for not engaging in work, just as students worked at increasingly expanding those edges. In Ms. Cheney’s classes, for example, on occasion the only thing that was accomplished was the reading of the morning bulletin, or the completion of an administrative task such as reviewing who still had books checked out to them from previous quarters. Ms. Ariel’s students frequently were finished with work and “ready to go” with upwards of half an hour remaining in the class period as were students in Mr. Day’s class. This was an additional way for students to engage in performance strike practices which undermined the formal, “official” cultural productions of ESL.

In the next section, I turn to a notably different form of interactional resistance that G1.5 students participated in, that of “FOBeing.”

‘I can’t speak English, man!’: Resisting and reproducing FOBeing

As I argued in Chapter 7, ESL students were structurally positioned in various ways through the ESL curriculum at Tradewinds as cultural and linguistic Others, what many G1.5 students referred to as “FOB” or “fresh off the boat” (see Chapter 2, 7, 8), a structural manifestation of a practice that was also common in the official cultural

---

41 This sentence was spoken by Andrea, a Chuukese 9th grader, in Ms. Cheney’s class, on my very first day of fieldwork at Tradewinds. Andrea had out a stack of cards which she had been told by Ms. Meredith, the PTT to put away. She had replied “‘But they have English on them! I have to have them because ‘I can’t speak English, man!’” (ELAIIXfu: 31). This last sentence was strongly emphasized, and accented in what I later determined was “Mock ESL” (see below). Just after she uttered this, Andrea glanced sideways at me with a wry smile. A portion of this section appears in slightly different form in (Talmy, 2004a).
productions of ESLL, and that is FOBeing. As I have already described earlier, FOBeing is the positioning of ESLL students (in this case) as cultural and linguistic exotics, or Others (Said, 1978), only in terms that were unique to the ESLL program.\(^{42}\)

In this section, I examine one extract (Extract 9.8) in which FOBeing occurs when Ms. Ariel is giving instructions to students regarding a class project that is grounded in a exotifying, nationalist language ideology (Woolard, 1998) that associates language, nationhood, and identity in one-to-one association: the Pop-up Holiday Project. Following analysis of this interaction, which involves the means by which two G1.5 students, China and Raven (see Extract 9.4 above), resist this positioning, I examine a second extract (Extract 9.9) in which the same two students make a play on FOBeing, by projecting a caricatured version of this subject position, this time through the strategic use of a mock language variety similar to but also different from Mock Spanish (Hill, 1998), Mock Asian (Chun, 2004), and Mock Filipino (Labrador, 2004), which I call “Mock ESL.” G1.5 students’ appropriation of FOBeing practices, primarily through the public teasing and humbling of lower L2 English proficient students by their more proficient classmates, was repeated countless times in the ESLL classes I observed at Tradewinds, and cut across cultural and linguistic backgrounds, race and ethnicity, gender, and age. It was one of the primary ways that students indexed their differences from “real” ESLL students as they produced and reproduced the linguicist discourses and ideologies

---

\(^{42}\) What makes FOBeing a uniquely ESL phenomenon is that a) by definition ESL programs serve (language) minority populations that tend not to be mainstream populations, and b) ESL as a field was built up around the practice, with long histories of Othering and exotification in service of colonialism, missionizing, and mercantilism in the global spread of English (Canagarajah, 1999; Pennycook, 1994, 1998, 2001; Phillipson, 1992).
manifested in the mainstream/ESLL hierarchy that pervaded the Tradewinds ESLL program.

In the first extract (Extract 9.8), I focus on the ways that ESLL students were positioned in interaction as FOB. FOBeing worked to reify idealized, stereotypical imaginings of students’ pasts over their present circumstances, denying students the possibilities of more complex, hybrid, and shifting affiliations and identities in favor of an enduring, exoticized nostalgia. As analysis of Extract 9.8 in Ms. Ariel’s class indicates, G 1.5 students resisted FOBeing — that is, being cast as “forever foreigners” (Tuan, 1998), or being continually “put back on the boat” (Talmy, 2001a) — and in the process, renegotiated the terms and boundaries of what ESLL would signify (i.e., not them).

Useful in this argument is a notion that I introduced in Chapter 8, and that is of “identity markedness.” The notion of markedness, which derives from linguistics, as applied to identity “describe[s] the process whereby some social categories gain a special, normative status that contrasts with the identities of other groups, which are usually highly recognizable” (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 372). Unmarked identity categories are thus “less recognizable as identities” than marked ones because they appear “natural”: they are “the norm from which all [other identity categories] diverge.” Markedness therefore “implies hierarchy” (p. 372; cf. Bourdieu, 1991).

As I have already suggested, at Tradewinds, one such “highly recognizable,” or “marked” identity was “ESLL student.” Its unmarked counterpart was “regular” or “mainstream student”; these correspond with a “non-native” and what Leung, Harris, & Rampton (1997) have called “the idealised native speaker.” As Bucholtz & Hall (2004)
note, “marked identities are also ideologically associated with marked language: linguistic structures or practices that differ from the norm.” In this regard, the role or function of language in identity hierarchies is analogous to its “symbolic power,” as theorized by Bourdieu (e.g., 1991), whereby it works to locate speakers in social hierarchy. At Tradewinds, many of the ESLL students spoke a marked variety of the dominant code; it is what marked them as ESLL to begin with. That is, they were identified at Tradewinds by their linguistic “deficiencies,” how they “fail[ed] to measure up to an implied or explicit standard” (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 372).

Also useful in this discussion is the concept of linguicism, already discussed in Chapter 6. To recap, linguicism is the “[i]deologies, structures, and practices which are used to legitimate, effectuate, regulate, and reproduce an unequal division of power and resources (both material and immaterial) between groups which are defined on the basis of language” (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000a, p. 30). Linguicism is a more sophisticated, socially acceptable form of racism and classism: as openly race- and class-based arguments of superiority and inferiority have waned in government, business, education, and popular discourses, it has been “necessary to find other criteria which [can] continue to legitimate” inequity (Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 1994, p. 104).

As described in the chapters above, linguicism at Tradewinds took many forms; in this section, I focus G1.5 students’ resistance to the formation of a linguicist identity hierarchy, with a marked “non-native” English speaker counterposed against an unmarked “native” English speaker. I argue that due to a “nationalist language ideology” (Woolard, 1998) that was in play at the high school, an ideology in which language, culture, nation, and people were mapped onto one another in one-to-one correspondence,
this identity hierarchy came to signify not only "native"/"non-native" English speaker and mainstream/ESLL, but also US-American/Other, familiar/exotic, in-group/out-group, us/them (also see Leung, Harris, & Rampton, 1997; Thesen, 1997). I argue that the marked variants of these hierarchicalized, dichotomous identities converged in the subject position of FOB. In Extract 9.8, I illustrate how this subject position takes shape at Tradewinds as well as student resistance to being positioned as FOB. Resistance to such positioning holds the promise for a rejection of the linguicist discourses and ideologies that constitute FOB, the practice of FOBeing, and the mainstream/ESLL hierarchy they are part of; as I discuss farther below and in Chapter 10, it also holds the possibility for its reproduction.

The structural productions of FOBeing: The Pop-Up Holiday Project

As described in Chapter 7, projects in Ms. Ariel's class generally took two to three weeks of class time to complete. Most involved a considerable amount of artwork, with drawings, collages, and the like counting for one-third to one-half of the project grade; a one- or two-page written summary and an oral report generally counted for the remainder. Over the course of the year, students were asked to complete numerous projects; for my purposes here, I focus on one, the Pop-Up Holiday Project. I have selected this project because it is representative of others that students were asked to complete in the ESLL classes. It is also indicative of the ways that the structural and official cultural productions of FOBeing could be instantiated, that is, how students came to be positioned in these classes, and as the data below demonstrate, it typifies how some students resisted that positioning.
The Pop-Up Holiday Project came toward the middle of the school year. Students were to choose a holiday “from their own country or culture” and write a short summary about it. This would be attached to the back of a “pop-up” scene, a kind of diorama that students were to create that signified the holiday somehow, e.g., a depiction of a setting with a jack-o-lantern to represent Halloween. The project was an attempt by Ms. Ariel to cultivate student pride in “their” cultures, as well as awareness of those of their classmates, with what she believed were high-interest, high-relevance topics. In this, it was one of scores of assignments in Tradewinds ESLL classes that attempted to promote the significance of and an appreciation for multiculturalism. Yet, despite the best intentions of the ESLL teachers, this turned out to be a narrowly conceptualized multiculturalism, remaining at what Banks (2001) calls the level of “contributions”: a superficial focus on heroes, holidays, customs, and food; a conception of culture as a static corpus of values and beliefs; and a conflation of country, culture, language, nationality, and identity. It was a brand of multiculturalism in which ESLL students were repeatedly evoked as stand-ins for “their countries,” representative experts on “their cultures.” This approach to multiculturalism was one which many of the students in the ESLL program, particularly the G1.5 students, were plainly familiar with and which some openly resisted (also see Nieto, 1992). In these terms, then, the Pop-Up Holiday Project was one manifestation of the structural production of ESLL, instantiated in an official cultural production, that is, in the project assignment itself. Put another way, it is an example of the structural and official cultural productions of FOBeing.
Resisting FOBeing: Christmas and New Year’s

The following extract comes from the first day that the Pop-Up assignment was introduced. Ms. Ariel is giving the instructions, and as a model is holding her own Pop-Up depicting El Día de los Muertos, the Mexican holiday of The Day of the Dead. The class is very noisy, as it has been all period, with students talking and laughing.

(9.8) Can I do Christmas? [ELA32Wmd3: 899-915]

In her first two turns (lines 1-3, 6-9), Ms. Ariel gives a summary of the instructions she has just given (prior to this extract) about the Pop-Up Project. In doing so, she “keys” the frame (Goffman, 1974) through which the rest of the interaction can be understood.
Students are to choose a holiday “from their own country or culture” and either research it, or use what they already know to write a report about it. Use of the third person possessive “their” in Ms. Ariel’s first turn positions those to whom it refers (“everyone in the class”) as members of an out-group (cf. Barker & Galasiński, 2001), people who are not present, who are in some “other” place, speaking some “other” language, who are Others. It also implies an in-group, Ms. Ariel’s, to which they do not belong. The switch in the same turn to second person “you” (line 3), which continues into lines 6-7, transforms the instructions of the project into something more immediate: rather than an “other” person’s country or culture, it is now “yours.” This conflates and unifies the referents for “other” and “you”; they are the same, and are evidently distinct from Ms. Ariel’s implied me. The switch to the second person additionally foregrounds the hierarchy of the teacher-student relationship, as the teacher makes a provision for students about the assignment. It also foregrounds the dichotomous hierarchies summarized in Figure 9.1. The power differential is further highlighted in lines 6-7, where the second person is combined with copula + going to (gonna) to form two directives: “you’re gonna show us” and “you’re gonna write.” The teacher is not only giving instructions to students about the assignment, but is assigning them the subject position from which to carry it out.
Just what kind of subject position students are being assigned is signified by Ms. Ariel’s choice of *El Dia de los Muertos* as a model Pop-Up: a holiday that is unique, that is particular to a “culture or country,” and that is not of the US. However, it appears there is a tension here that calls into question the implied equation of holiday = culture = country = language = student. Ms. Ariel is from the US, not Mexico, as the students well know; if she were to follow her own instructions, she might have made a Pop-Up of, say, the Fourth of July or Presidents Day. The possibility for multiple, shifting, or fractured (dis)affiliations, for interests and identities that are not determined by race, ethnicity, language, nationality, or place of birth is furthered by her recognition that students may actually need to research the holiday: the referent for the possessive in “your culture or country” is thus ambiguous.

This ambiguity becomes resolved, however, over the course of the interaction as Ms. Ariel repeatedly refuses to ratify Raven’s and China’s bids of Christmas and New Year’s as “acceptable” holidays for the project. She does not address their suggestions in
lines 4 and 5, and then indirectly rejects them by deferring authority to the “assignment sheet” in lines 14 and 21. Finally, use of the contrastive conjunction “but” in line 23 signals a negative response to Raven’s repeated request to do Christmas in line 22. It becomes clear she is indeed referring to “other” kinds of holidays from “other” kinds of places, with “othered” kinds of students as their representatives: simply put, Christmas and New Year’s belong to her, not them; these holidays are unmarked. This point is reinforced by Ms. Ariel’s recognition in line 3 that students “might already know about” the holiday. Because Christmas and New Year’s don’t qualify as acceptable choices, though most (if not all) of the students “know about” them, it is clear that what is sought is a unique holiday that students have some sort of special insider knowledge of, knowledge unavailable to Ms. Ariel or others since they do not “belong” to that culture; Ms. Ariel is engaging in FOBeing. In fact, through her use of El Dia de los Muertos as a model, Ms. Ariel positions herself as the sort of exoticized Other she envisions for her students. This is underscored by the appropriation of student subjectivity in the switch to the first person plural “we” in lines 8-9 (“Afterwards, we’ll share with the class, we’re gonna report”) and again in line 12 (“This is what we’re doing”). Ms. Ariel’s example includes a model Pop-Up Holiday Project, as well as a model identity students are expected to assume.43

By offering “Christmas” and “New Year” as viable candidates for a holiday Pop-Up, China and Raven initiate a challenge to Ms. Ariel’s FOBeing practice, either to being positioned as FOB or to the FOB subject position itself; it is a challenge that builds over

43 Indeed, later that class period, after discovering that many students intended to do New Year’s and Christmas for their Pop-Up projects, Ms. Ariel reminded the class that “this holiday is something from your own culture, your own country. Unless you were born here, in this country, then choose one from your own, okay? It’ll be much more interesting that way.” Eddie then replied “Christmas.” (E132Wmd3: 966).
the course of the interaction. Raven’s interjected aside of “yeah, Christmas” in line 4 comes as Ms. Ariel pauses between sentences in her first two turns. The timing of the utterance, combined with his quick, ironic delivery, implies that Raven knows where this assignment is going: there is no ambiguity for him about the kind of holiday Ms. Ariel is looking for, and it isn’t Christmas. Raven’s utterance suggests a subtle mockery of Ms. Ariel’s FOBeing, specifically, her claim on Christmas and New Year’s as “belonging” to her in-group, and points to his rejection of his placement in a FOB out-group. It also signals an attempt to reposition himself as a member of a different in-group, that is, of the G1.5 ESLL student CoP. China immediately takes up Raven’s aside with an exuberant “New Year!” However, Ms. Ariel does not address them, and until line 19, China and Raven take no further steps to resist the FOBeing, either by rejecting the FOB subject position, or claiming an alternative (G1.5) one for themselves.

Ms. Ariel’s repeated and increasingly firm responses in lines 12, 14, 21, and 23-24, suggest that she senses a building resistance: in line 12, following Eddie’s protest about the artwork component of the project (“Can we just write it?”), she responds to him, and perhaps to Raven and China as well, that the terms of the assignment are not open for negotiation, repeating a form of “this is the assignment” twice before deferring to an external authority (the assignment sheet) in line 14. China seems to recognize Ms. Ariel’s growing defensiveness with his acceptance in line 19 (“Okay.”) of her injunction (repeated in lines 17-18) that the holiday be “from where you, you come from.” His “I’m not gonna argue” serves as an attempt to align himself further with her and distance himself from those who presumably are “arguing”: likely Raven and/or Eddie. The message communicated is that he is being serious, not antagonistic. The continuation of
that sentence ("I'm just, can I just do Christmas?") reveals what he's serious about: he wants Ms. Ariel to accept his (new) proposal of Christmas, which echoes Raven's, as a legitimate choice of holiday "from where you, you come from." In this, he joins with Raven in challenging Ms. Ariel's exclusive claim on Christmas (and New Year's), as well as contesting his placement in an FOB out-group. China and Raven have performed an alternative (G1.5, or non-FOB) subject position here, one that is defined in part by China and Raven through their denotative and interactional resistance to being positioned as FOB. Ms. Ariel responds with another deference of authority to the assignment sheet. Raven then echoes China's request in line 22 ("Miss, can I do Christmas?") to which Ms. Ariel invokes the assignment sheet's newly revealed "requirement" that students must choose holidays from "your country."

China and Raven not only challenge Ms. Ariel's FOBeing here in terms of being positioned as FOB in this interaction, but more broadly their opposition works to subvert the conflation of language = culture = nationality = identity. It could be argued that they are seeking the promise that Ms. Ariel's choice of El Día de los Muertos held, however remotely and however briefly, that identity may include, for Raven, Taiwan, and for China, Hong Kong, but also other possibilities beyond those stereotypically associated with race, language, or place of birth.

As it turns out, approximately half of the class wound up completing the Pop-Up project, despite over two weeks of class time spent preparing for it. Most reported on New Year's, but as it was celebrated in "their" countries. China's presentation was one of several on Chinese New Year's, though he did not do the artwork and his "report" was

---

44 It is worth noting that China's choice of pseudonym exemplifies and mocks this one-to-one association.
simply downloaded from the internet. Raven was ultimately allowed to do Christmas, but refused to present his extremely abbreviated Pop-Up orally.

The inclusion of New Year’s and Christmas might be seen as a “victory” of sorts for Raven and China: they succeeded in getting these accepted as holidays “from where you come from.” More to the point, they indexically differentiated themselves from the FOB subject position held out for them in the assignment and by Ms. Ariel, that is, in this particular manifestation of FOBeing, and in doing so, both denotatively and interactionally performed (what I have glossed as) their non-FOB, G 1.5 ESLL student identities. In doing so, their participation in these practices serves as a socializing resource for other (G 1.5) students, both through the L2 and to use the L2, in this particular sort of G 1.5 oppositional cultural production of ESLL. Additionally, China and Raven’s resistance here signals the contingency of socialization processes, as these processes do not necessarily or inevitably proceed along lines of a priori categories of hierarchical or institutional status or age (cf. Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991; Chapter 3). Yet at the same time, although these students’ resistance has the potential to reject FOBeing

---

45 China’s report is available at <www.educ.uvic.ca/faculty/mroth/438/CHINA/chinese_new_year.html>. I confirmed this with a web search of a unique phrase from his presentation, which went: “Chinese New Year start (.) with a new moon on the first day of the new year’s and ends on the full moon 15 days later. The fifteenthist [sic] day of the new year is called the (.) lantern festival? Which is celebrate at (.) night when lantern display and child – children carry (. ) lan(.(.)ter in a (.) para - parade. The Chinese calendar is” - ((stops and exclam in frustration)). ((inaudible)) Um. Um. Okay, wait. ((reading)) “The Chinese calendar is based on the combination of lunar and solar movement. The lunar (.) cycle is about 29.5 day in order to catch up with the solar calendar of the – calendar the Chinese insert an extra month once every few year. This is the same of added an extra day of the leap year. This is why according to the solar calendar, the Chinese New Year fall on a different date each year.” ((holds up a red envelope)) And, um, this is like a red pocket? And um, you put money in and like when you visit people’s home or whatever they give you one of these to your children or – to, you know, wish you luck and have a ( ) educate – a good education I guess. And that’s about it. (ELA32Wmd5: 1466)

46 Raven’s summary for his Christmas presentation (which he did not read) was: “The holiday is a very important holiday. This holiday is on December 25 (inaudible). This legend is passed down from generation to generation (inaudible) a fat man in red clothes. He is called Santa Claus. If you’re naughty, he’ll not give you any presents under your Christmas tree (ELA32Wmd5: 1551-1555). These students’ “presentations” can clearly be seen as manifestations of performance strike practices.

47 For most students in the class, Christmas and New Year’s were, indeed, celebrated in “their” countries.
as it is enacted here, unfortunately, as I describe in detail below and in Chapter 10, it ultimately is one that works to reinscribe it.

**FOBeing through "Mock ESL"**

In Extract 9.9, the same two students involved in Extract 9.8, China and Raven, make a play on the practice of FOBeing, in an instance in which they project their own caricatured FOB subject position through the voicing of a language variety similar to what Chun (2004) has called “Mock Asian”: what I have labeled “Mock ESL.” Similar to Mock Spanish (Hill, 1998) and Mock Filipino (Labrador, 2004), Mock Asian is an indexical discourse used to mark stereotypical Otherness; in the case of Mock Asian, a monolithic, racialized, pan-Asian identity. Chun (2004) notes that Mock Asian is less commonly voiced in public, particularly by non-Asians, when compared to Mock Spanish, which as Hill (1998) and Zentella (1994; 2003) amply demonstrate has variously entered “mainstream” popular discourses, e.g., “no problemo [sic],” “hasta la vista, baby,” “no way, José.” Although Mock Spanish, Mock Filipino, and Mock Asian have been associated with linguicism and racism, Chun (2004) argues that the comparative lack of Mock Asian voicings is “because of the more overtly racist implications” of this particular mock variety (p. 263).

“Mock ESL” is similar to Mock Asian, Mock Spanish, Mock Filipino, and other mock varieties, but is distinguished by its greater relational range and lack of racial, ethnolinguistic, or L1 specificity. That is, a Chinese American whose L1 is English can cross into Mock ESL and index a pan-Foreigner/ESL student, rather than an “Asian” (in the case of Mock Asian), a “Latino” (in the case of Mock Spanish), or a “Filipino” (in the
case of Mock Filipino), just as can a Chuukese whose L1 is Nomoi and whose L2 English proficiency is advanced (cf. Andrea’s utterance in the title for this section, above Extract 9.8). Indexing a pan-Foreigner identity in this way precisely highlights what makes linguicism distinct from racism, classism, and other forms of discrimination, while at the same time indicating how its effects can be so similar (cf. Phillipson, 1992; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000a, *inter alia*).

The phenomenon of mock language, particularly that which is uttered by someone who is not a member of the ethnolinguistic group (stereotypically) associated with that ostensible variety (e.g., non-Latinos voicing Mock Spanish, non-Asians voicing Mock Asian) has been discussed by a number of scholars. Goffman (1974), for example, talks of "say-fors" in which someone

acts out – typically in a mannered voice – someone not himself [sic], someone who may or may not be present. He puts words and gestures in another's mouth. However, serious impersonation is not involved, since no effort is made to take anyone in . . . . At the center is the process of projecting an image of someone not oneself while preventing viewers from forgetting even for a moment that an alien animator is at work (Goffman, 1974, p. 535).

Goffman identifies “stereotyped accents” as well as “ethnic and racial accents, national accents” as typical say-fors, but notes that while “[t]here seems no final reason why an individual should not take off on himself . . . presumably this occurs, but not commonly” (p. 535). Rampton’s work (1995; 2001 *inter alia*) on language “crossing” and “styling the other” (1999, p. 421) is similarly concerned with how “people use language and dialect in discursive practice to appropriate, explore, reproduce or challenge influential
images and stereotypes of groups that they don't themselves (straightforwardly) belong to," just as Bucholtz (1999b), Hill (1998), and others are. However, as Chun (2004) points out in her study of the revoicings of Mock Asian by the Korean American comedian Margaret Cho, there is less research that concerns language crossing practices that are not quite so "straightforward," e.g., when someone who is "Asian," at least according to US racial ideologies that associate phenotypical traits with racial categories, engages in the use of Mock Asian speech (but see Labrador, 2004, for a discussion of Mock Filipino in Hawai‘i). In this case, there is language crossing but not the symbolic crossing of racial boundaries that is usually indexically linked with it. Instead, in this instance, the Asian "animator" (Goffman, 1974) – Margaret Cho in Chun’s (2004) case – “perform[s] the speech of a racialized other who is not necessarily a racial other” (Chun, 2004, p. 264, emphasis in original). Chun’s (2004) argument is that Cho’s revoicings of Mock Asian entail social critique of an “orientalizing Asianness (Said, 1978), that [Cho] lifts from its racist context and asks her audience to join in objectifying, scrutinizing, and critiquing” (Chun, 2004, p. 283).

Although the student China, who is Chinese, performs the language crossing into the mock variety below, I argue that this is an instance of Mock ESL rather than Mock Asian (a la Margaret Cho) since it explicitly references ESL students, not all of whom, obviously, are “Asian.” Although China utilizes several of the phonetic, phonological, syntactic, and discourse features of Mock Asian that Chun (2004, pp. 268-272) has painstakingly catalogued, China is not invoking a specifically Asian identity in his voicing in Extract 9.9 (in contrast to Margaret Cho) but rather a general, pan-Foreigner/ESL student one. This is not to say that Mock Asian (and in a few instances,
Mock Filipino) was not performed at the school; in fact, it was, by both Asian and non-Asian students. However, those instances explicitly referred to “Asians” in some way: for example, Benz, in (L1 Korean) conversation with Barehand, referred derisively to several of the Chinese students who were speaking L1 Cantonese in the class in a highly marked nasal tone with the nonsense syllables, “hongwang honghong” (ELA42WmdS12: 1349), and Ash, a Chinese G1.5 student, “apologized” to his teacher for speaking Cantonese by saying in high-pitched, Mock-Asian inflected speech: “We don know how speak English! We Chinese!” (ELA42Wfn: 1677). However, these instances were different from those in which Mock ESL was uttered, even if much of the latter variety was marked by features of Mock Asian (or Mock Filipino). In this regard, one of the primary features of Mock ESL, the reference to a broadly specified Foreigner, is another index of the mainstream/ESL identity hierarchy discussed above and in Chapter 8, one that served as another tool in the arsenal of performance strike practices utilized by G1.5 students in their subtle undermining of the official G1.5 cultural production of ESLL.

The interaction represented in Extract 9.9 occurred on a class day in which Ms. Ariel was absent. In her place was Ms. Jackson, who frequently worked as a substitute teacher for the Tradewinds ESLL classes. The lesson plan was written on the whiteboard at the front of the room, but it was for Ms. Ariel’s 9th grade Language Arts J class, not her ESLL classes:

1. Article review - make scrapbook
2. Grammar book p. 27, 28, Practice quiz #s 37, 38, 39
3. Journal entry. Freewriting: You pick something that you want to write about.
   Got something on your mind? Write it down.
4. *Holes* (ELA42WmdS10: 79-84)

However, Ms. Jackson explained, students in the ESLL classes were to work in their journals for this (short) period, writing the same prompt as in #3 from the Language Arts J class instructions written on the board: “You pick something that you want to write about. Got something on your mind? Write it down.” After that, students were to continue to work on the comprehension questions for their children’s books which were read the previous quarter (see Extract 9.4). Apparently unbeknownst to Ms. Jackson was that a handful of students in the Language Arts J class (for which the lesson plan on the board was written) also were in the ESLL A class that followed it, including China, who figures prominently in the interaction below. Therefore, students who had both classes were to write on the same journal prompt twice, if indeed, this can be considered a journal “prompt” in the first place (cf. LeNoue, 2000). As the interaction commences, the class has just started, and Ms. Jackson is giving the instructions for the class session to the students.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ms. Jackson:</th>
<th>China:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>So, today we are going to be doing our journals. (3) You need to write a journal entry about ((points to board))</td>
<td>Free[writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ms. Jackson: Students! Pay attention!</td>
<td>[freewriting. Shh!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>China: ((loud groan)) Ahhh!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ms. Jackson: Okay. You pick something that you want to write about. ((pointing to board; reading)) “Do you have something on your mind? Write about it. Write it down.” Okay? So this, I will give you until=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>=Like, half hour we need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ms. Jackson: No, 10.30. {15 minutes}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>China: No, half hour.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48 China carried the mini-disc recorder for this class session.
In her first turn, Ms. Jackson goes over the instructions for the class session with the students, specifically that they’re to write in their journals (rather than do the first two assignments listed, which are for the 9th grade Language Arts J class). As she gestures to the lesson plan written on the whiteboard, and points to “Freewriting,” China utters the word just before she does. Ms. Jackson then continues with three short rejoinders to the class, which is still very noisy, to be quiet. When she finishes, China lets out an anguished groan (line 6), possibly because he just completed the 9th grade Language Arts J class that this particular lesson plan was intended for, and so had already been assigned this same journal prompt.49 Ms. Jackson then elaborates on the instructions by reading the rest of the journal prompt. Subsequently, in lines 9-10, just as she is about to give the students a time deadline for the assignment, China overlaps with his own deadline of half

49 I do not know whether he completed it. I am also unsure if during this class, Ms. Jackson realized that a number of students from the Language Arts J class were also in the ESLL A class; however, in an interaction some weeks after the one in Extract 9.9, in which she scolded some of the ESLL students because they were talking during a movie that they had also seen in the earlier Language Arts J class, it did not appear that she was aware of it.
an hour. This is the opening move of a social practice that was common to the G1.5 CoP: what I call bargaining, a practice I describe in more detail below, that many G1.5 students would participate in, in order to negotiate assignment requirements down and increase the time allowed to complete them (see below for a more detailed discussion). However, Ms. Jackson in line 12 is firm that a deadline until 10.30, or fifteen minutes, is sufficient. China responds in kind, with an equally firm “No, half hour.” Ms. Jackson then elaborates that “15 minutes should be sufficient.” China overlaps with a shouted “25! 25.”, but again, Ms. Jackson is firm with her one word repetition: “10.30.” She then goes on to give an explanation of why a shorter deadline is necessary since this class is not “So (hot)!" as China interjects, but is “early release, right? We have to hurry.” At this point, China overlaps most of Ms. Jackson’s last sentence with a series of false starts, “Yeah, but – but – but –” that finally results in “But we ESL student!” ([bʌ wij iʃəl stuːdən]), a high-pitched, syllable-timed utterance with a light, nasal tone, an absent copula, and final /t/ and /ts/ deletion for “but” and “students,” respectively (cf. Chun, 2004, pp. 270-272). The contrastive conjunction “but” functions to counter the assertions Ms. Jackson has made that “15 minutes should be sufficient.” to do the assignment, and that this time limit is necessary because “today is early release, right?” Following the contrast is China’s apparent rationale why 15 minutes is not sufficient: “because we ESL student.” which is, as just noted, uttered in a way that indexes low L2 proficiency, newcomer status, that is, “FOB-ness.” Through this particular manifestation of FOBeing, crossing into and using Mock ESL, China projects a caricatured FOB identity, a powerless, cultural and linguistic naïve who simply cannot complete the freewriting in the assigned 15 minutes, who requires
more time because he does not have the requisite L2 proficiencies to do it otherwise. This projected subject position is similar to the one that McKay & Wong (1996) make note of in their discussion of the ways that ESL students were discursively positioned at their junior high school research site, that is, as “candidate[s] for cognitive overhaul and rescue” (p. 590). In this regard, through his use of Mock ESL, China mocks (and parodies) the Tradewinds iteration of this subject position as it is produced through ESLL “multicultural” curriculum and instruction (e.g., as represented in Ms. Ariel’s instructions for the Pop-up Holiday Project in Extract 9.8). In this instance, however, China has subtly turned the tables in his particular invocation of this identity, focusing on the putative linguistic “deficits” that such an identity connotes, rather than its cultural “uniqueness.” This can thus be seen as a veiled gibe at the instructional activity that he has been given 15 minutes to complete, which is essentially the journaling equivalent of busywork, and requires no (L2) instruction at all: a “freewriting” prompt about “something on your mind” – an activity that, incidentally, China has already been assigned in the previous Language Arts J class. In addition, and perhaps obviously, China’s use of Mock ESL is part of a broader effort to claim more institutional time for the expressed purpose of completing the freewriting assignment, time which, however, will no doubt be used to engage in other, non-school-oriented tasks. China’s index of this caricatured FOB subjectivity thus operates on a number of levels as a subtle form of resistance: as a means to “bargain” for more time, as a mockery of the “official” ESLL student identity often projected in ESLL classes, as incisive commentary that teachers who co-construct this FOB identity often focus on cultural Otherness rather than L2 learning needs, and as a comment on the quality of the freewriting assignment itself. It
also indexes in a novel way the linguicist mainstream/ESLL identity hierarchy mentioned above and introduced in Chapter 8, with the marked, low-prestige ESLL student counterposed against an implied mainstream student.

In line 21, Raven explicitly states (in Pidgin) what China has implied in the preceding utterance: "Wi, wi so dam!" (We're, we're so dumb!), which is evidently why, as the caricatured ESL students invoked by China's Mock ESL, they need the extra time. The quick uptake on Raven's part is indicative of the short cuts to communication and the orientation to a shared discourse that Wenger (1998) speaks of as criterial for a CoP. This CoP is also encoded in the pronoun "we"; of note, however, is that despite the "we" that situates Raven and China in the same CoP/in-group, Raven's utterance is spoken in Pidgin. This then works as a not-so-subtle hint to Ms. Jackson that China may well be joking, that is, that his Mock ESL is indeed "mock." However, the potential for keying humor through Mock ESL is likely lost in the ambiguity of a context where some people very likely speak a variety akin in whatever way to Mock ESL: that is, an ESL classroom comprised ESLL students. This is a circumstance that is no doubt exacerbated when the interlocutor is a substitute teacher such as Ms. Jackson. In this regard, then, it is not entirely surprising that Ms. Jackson does not orient to any implied irony or humor in China's or Raven's utterances in lines 19-21; in fact, in line 22, she responds as if these are honest expressions of these students' feelings, when she replies with an evident tone of concern, "That's okay!" China then continues with his Mock ESL crossing when he says "We no English!" (wij now iyjIjS]). Given the context, and China's use of Mock

---

50 It is clear in the recording that Ms. Jackson does not orient to the difference between China's non-Mock ESL utterances in the interaction prior to line 18, and the Mock ESL utterances that follow it.
ESL, I have chosen to represent the word [now] as “no”; however, it is conceivable that China has uttered, “We know English,” instead, which if the case, would be an extremely ironic and astute (and poetic) play on words. Regardless, the continued projection of the FOB subjectivity indexed by China’s Mock ESL continues, here with an explicit link now between “no English,” being “dumb,” and “ESL students.” Through this particular iteration of FOBeing, China and Raven have articulated what is implied in the discourses about ESLL at Tradewinds (see Chapter 8) and the mainstream/ESLL identity hierarchy: that lack of L2 proficiency is conflated with lack of intelligence, that is, FOBs not only can’t speak English, they’re stupid as well. In line 25, Raven gives a far more direct hint to Ms. Jackson that he and China have keyed a mocking frame with his humorous “How do you spell ‘A’?”, and at last she appears to catch on; instead of addressing them, she returns to the class and commands them to begin the freewriting assignment, repeating her earlier deadline of 10.30, or 15 minutes.

By projecting the FOB identity as they do, both through crossing into Mock ESL and in statements that denote and connote the conflation of low L2 proficiency with low intelligence, China and Raven relationally index their difference from FOB. That is, their participation in the practice of FOBeing indicates, as in all other G1.5 community practices, that these students have the L2 linguistic and interactional acuity to put on a display that in essences mocks themselves at an earlier stage in their L2 development; this ability marks them as non-FOBs, or more specifically, produces their identities (in my terminology) as G1.5 students. Put another way, by participating in FOBeing, they have claimed for themselves a set of discursive practices commonly associated with a
"mainstream" subject position; they have positioned themselves as having the expertise to engage in these practices, and at the same time, as G1.5 students, to subtly mock them.

These boys’ actions have the potential to lead to a social critique of the racializing, essentializing, and linguicist ideologies that inform the FOB subjectivity, which their actions here parody. In a related argument, Chun (2004) makes a strong case for such a critique with Margaret Cho in that Cho takes an explicit stance critical of these and other practices and ideologies throughout her performances. As Chun (2004, p. 276) maintains, however, “[t]he legitimated performance of a debased racialized variety by a person who can speak the socially powerful [variety] ultimately maintains the hierarchical relationship between the two.” It is only through the contextualization of Cho’s revoicings that “an interpretation of social critique is possible,” for example, in terms of how she positions herself as an anti-racist, “paralinguistic cues that align her against rather than with [a Mock Asian] text, and an ideology of legitimacy that assumes that an in-group member would have neither the intention nor the power to oppress her own community” (p. 286, emphasis in the original). Although there is potential for such critique in China and Raven’s actions in Extract 9.8 and 9.9, in that they appropriate elements of a hegemonic discourse about ESLL students and use if for their own purposes, it ultimately it appears that they are less critiquing the FOB subjectivity than indexing their difference from it in the concurrent effort to bargain for more time. In other words, their FOBeing does not challenge the exotifying and essentializing discourses and ideologies that ultimately lead to the positioning of students labeled “ESLL” at Tradewinds as cultural and linguistic Others. Absent a critical commentary of some kind, they are instead simply relationally setting themselves apart from it (see
Chapter 10 for elaboration on this point). Thus, their FOBeing in fact reinscribes the same exotifying, essentializing discourses and ideologies that constitute the FOB subject position they are mocking, and in this regard, it reproduces rather than dismantles the mainstream/ESLL identity hierarchy in the wider school context.  

This is not to blame China and Raven for not taking the extra step here. In fact, absent some sort of apprenticeship into more constructive uses of the resistant social practices they engage in (Freire, 1993; hooks, 1994; Willis, 1981), it is hardly surprising that their actions are less transformative than they themselves might even wish. This is particularly the case given their histories of participation as ESLL students in Hawai‘i public schools, and all that entails in terms of first-hand, ongoing experiences with linguicist, racist, and xenophobic ideologies, and practices such as FOBeing that instantiate them.

To conclude this section, then, I have examined in some detail how students labeled as “ESLL” at Tradewinds were positioned as cultural and linguistic Others in a practice I call “FOBeing,” both by their teacher and in terms of the curriculum she was teaching, i.e., the Pop-up Holiday Project. I have described how two G 1.5 students resisted that positioning and then appropriated the FOBeing practice themselves through the use of Mock ESL and negative comments about ESLL. I have concluded that although there was potential for social critique latent in these boys’ actions, in fact, they wound up reproducing the same sorts of values and relations that FOBeing created.

---

51 I discuss the implications of this on non-G1.5 students’ participation in ESLL classes, not just in G1.5 community practices, but in the practices of the official ESLL CoP as well.
In the next section, I turn to another common practice in the G1.5 cultural production of ESLL, one that is referenced in the interaction in Extract 9.9 above, and that is “bargaining.”

'A little bit more time?': Bargaining

As has been suggested in several of the interactions discussed to this point, bargaining among the G1.5 students in the ESLL classes was widespread. It was most common in terms of negotiating deadlines with teachers since all of the ESLL teachers had flexible time deadlines for quizzes and other assignments, ostensibly to provide additional time for lower L2 proficient students to complete whatever work had been assigned (cf. Extract 9.9). It is therefore unsurprising that G1.5 students might attempt to exploit this flexibility; as I discuss in Chapter 10, it may also be unsurprising that it was accompanied by the defensive teaching accommodation of the “floating deadline” (also see Extract 9.3 above). Both contributed to the ongoing slow-down evident in all the ESLL classes over the course of the school year, and both also contributed to the production of an ESLL program that was precisely what the G1.5 students claimed to be resisting: an easy and unchallenging program in the high school.

Bargaining as another practice that contributed to the “dumbing down” of the ESLL program was used not just to haggle extra time for assignments, but also to negotiate assignment requirements down so they were “easier.” Vocabulary assignments

---

52 The quote in the title of this sub-section comes from Benz, who asked Ms. Ariel, "Miss, can you give us, like, a little bit more time?" in order to "study" for a 15-item vocabulary quiz. The students in this class had already bargained for fifteen minutes for vocabulary study; Benz was asking for more. In fact, the quiz they were asking for more time to study for had originally been scheduled two days prior, but the students had successfully bargained its postponement until this class session. Ms. Ariel replied, "You have until 10.35 (the originally allotted 15 minutes). Period. That’s it. 10.35. You guys had all week." (ELA32Wmd3: 813-814).
would be negotiated down from 15 words to ten or, in Ms. Cheney's class, even five. Vocabulary quizzes in Ms. Ariel's class which at the start of the year consisted of spelling, definitions, and use of the words in sentences, at mid-year consisted of two of these components (definitions and usage), and then at the end of the year were not given at all, while in Mr. Day's class the quizzes at years end consisted only of definitions. Grammar exercises were similarly negotiated down in both Ms. Cheney's and Mr. Day's classes, as were requirements for activities such as the projects and the bookwork summaries in Ms. Ariel's class (e.g., groups of students began to be able to complete and present projects and summaries rather than just individuals).

In Extract 9.10 and Extract 9.11 are excerpts from one of the milder, less contentious examples of bargaining, in this case not of the requirements for an assignment or the time to complete it, but of an entirely different (and easier) assignment altogether. Although these two excerpts of interaction only hint at the linguistic resources that were often marshaled for bargaining, they do on the one hand suggest some of the dynamics involved in this practice and on the other, some of the (unforeseen) consequences of it. In this latter regard, they also rather ironically highlight elements of the ESLL classes that many of the G1.5 students singled out as sources of indignation, that is, a propensity for childishness. Finally, the interaction in Extract 9.11 suggests one way that G1.5 newcomers were able to appropriate elements of G1.5 community practice and develop identities of G1.5 participation, specifically with regard to the act of an oldtimer's "brokering" (Wenger, 1998), an important G1.5 role that I have referenced earlier.
Both of the interactions represented in Extract 9.10 and 9.11 occurred in the same class period, shortly after Halloween. Extract 9.10 took place about half way through the class: to this point, students had been given 10 minutes to complete a grammar exercise (the very first one they had been assigned from Dixon, 1956; see Appendix J.1), but they had taken 20 minutes instead. Following completion of the grammar exercise, Mr. Day spent another 20 minutes correcting it with the class. The interaction in Extract 9.10 occurs at this point in the class session, just after the grammar exercise has been corrected and just before a whole-class reading exercise of a vocabulary list for James and the giant peach (Dahl, 1961), the book that the class had been assigned for the quarter (see Appendix J.3 for a sample vocabulary list).

(9.10) Of course!  [E132Xmd4: 703-714]

1  Mr. Day:  Alright. (1) Shhh. Everyone listen up and follow along. We’re gonna go over this {the vocabulary list} together. And then afterwards, u:mm (3) we’re gonna do a little bit uh, we’ll talk a little bit about our Halloweens, maybe we’ll do a little writing activity.

3  CJ:  [Oh no. Laidplayer:  )[(loud groan)) Ahh!

5  ?MS:  [O:::]h Mack Daddy:  [I wanna have fun!

7  Mr. Day:  Fun? DJ?:  Yeah.

9  Mr. Day:  Okay. Mack Daddy:  Draw monsters and all that.

11  Mr. Day:  Draw monsters. Okay, I’ll do that. We’ll do that instead. But when you draw the monster, you have to describe it with words too. That’ll be fun.

13  Mack Daddy:  Of course!

15  Mr. Day:  Alright.
Mr. Day’s first turn concerns the shift in instructional focus from one activity, the just-concluded grammar correction exercise, to the next, a presentation of the 15 vocabulary words. In lines 2-4, he indicates what the class will do after the vocabulary read-through: “And then afterwards, um (3) we’re gonna do a little bit uh, we’ll talk a little bit about our Halloweens, maybe we’ll do a little writing activity.” It is apparent from the extended turn-holder “um”, the pause of three seconds, the false start “we’re gonna do a little bit uh,” and the reformulation that follows, “we’ll talk a little bit about our Halloweens”, that Mr. Day has probably not planned an activity, or at least not decided on one, to follow the upcoming vocabulary exercise, a point underscored in the final clause, both by the adverb “maybe” and then the entirely different modality to be engaged in the prospective activity (from talking about Halloweens to doing “a little writing activity”). Perhaps sensing this indecision, two G1.5 students, CJ and Laidplayer (and possibly a third in line 7), express their displeasure about the proposed activity(ies), and are quickly overlapped by Mack Daddy, a G1.5 student from Chuuk, who declares, “I wanna have fun!” Of interest here is the straightforward sentiment expressed by Mack Daddy, which usually was not evident in other students’ attempts at bargaining; generally, instead of stating forthrightly that they did not want to do class work, initiating moves in the bargaining practice generally involved claims that the requirements for an assignment were too onerous: one page was too long for a summary, surely half a page would suffice; 15 words were too many, how about five; the reading assignment for James and the giant peach was too long to complete by Friday, perhaps next Wednesday instead. Yet also of note here is Mr. Day’s uptake in line 9, which immediately follows Mack Daddy’s announcement, when he simply says “Fun?” There is no protest, no
censure, no attempt to parry the bargaining move, which might be expected of a teacher interested in defending his assignment. Indeed, after a student (possibly DJ, a newcomer G1.5 student whose participation in G1.5 practices was peripheral) seconds Mack Daddy's statement, Mr. Day in line 11 accedes to their request.

The bargaining here is thus notably abbreviated, possibly because Mr. Day has not decided on an activity yet, possibly because it is the day after a holiday, possibly because at least four students have come out so quickly opposed to what was evidently an ambiguous idea to begin with, possibly because at this point in the school year, Mr. Day was already showing clear signs of being worn down by and accommodating to G1.5 students’ performance strike practices. In line 12, Mack Daddy, a gifted cartoonist who often spent substantial amounts of class time drawing, elaborates what he means by “fun” when he says “Draw monsters and all that.” In lines 13-15, Mr. Day agrees to Mack Daddy’s suggestion with “Okay, I’ll do that. We’ll do that instead.” He then adds on a requirement: “you have to describe it with words too.” This proviso is an indication that Mr. Day appreciates that simply drawing pictures of monsters is not an entirely appropriate activity for high school ESLL students. With this addition, it is suggested, the assignment will be acceptable from an educational perspective and will, at the same time “be fun.” Mack Daddy then utters an emphatic “Of course!”, although whether this is in confirmation of Mr. Day’s stipulation about the new writing component or that the

53 Regarding this latter point, it is arguable that the new grammar component of this class (using Dixon, 1956), which began on this very day, was a manifestation of defensive teaching as well. See “Worksheet Syndrome” below. Also, it’s worth pointing out that this class came early in the 2nd quarter of the school year. Mr. Day had just weathered a widespread and rather stunning manifestation of the student performance strike on the 1st quarter end-of-book exam, which resulted in a majority of the class receiving Ds and Fs on the test. This despite five class periods spent on test preparation, which included passing out the actual final exam as a “study guide” prior to its administration (see Chapter 10; Appendix J.4).
new activity will “be fun” is unclear. Mr. Day’s reply in line 17, however, suggests that it is the former.

Although the comparative ease with which this new assignment is bargained is not entirely indicative of other bargaining efforts, the main features of the practice are apparent: an opening move or moves indicating a problem with the assignment that is to be or that has already been assigned (lines 5-8 above); some form of uptake about the problem by the teacher (line 9); an alternative or alternatives offered by the student(s) (line 12); and then some form of acceptance, usually with additional requirements provided by the teacher to ensure that it meets “academic” standards (e.g., the vocabulary should be 10 words instead of five; the summary three-quarters of a page rather than half; the James and the giant peach reading due next Monday rather than next Wednesday). Also clear is the apparent “flexibility” of the ESLL curriculum which can accommodate an assignment such as this so easily.

Interestingly, however, this particular instance of bargaining satisfied few of the G1.5 students in Mr. Day’s class because it wound up involving an activity that was much-scorned by nearly all of the G1.5 students in the ESLL classes I observed, one which evidently indexed childishness: artwork. As described in Chapter 7, artwork in the ESLL classes took many forms, from decorating classroom folders (in which students kept assignments) each quarter to drawing and coloring for project assignments (cf. Kadooka, 2001, pp. 30-31; also see, e.g., Appendix I.3). This was not an issue for students such as Mack Daddy who enjoyed art and/or did not mind engaging in such activities; it was a problem, however, for (the majority of) other G1.5 students, as is suggested in Extract 9.11.
The interaction represented in Extract 9.11 occurs just after the vocabulary list has been discussed as a whole-class activity (i.e., after the activity that immediately followed the interaction in Extract 9.10). Mr. Day has spent about one minute passing out blank paper from his computer printer to the students for drawing, as well as a selection of crayons and colored pens and pencils. There have been some questions from students as to what they are to do next, and now, as Mr. Day finishes distributing the art materials, he gives the class the instructions for the activity that was just bargained for in Extract 9.10.

(9.11) Scary picture  [ELA32Xmd4: 735-754] 

1 Mr. Day: Now. This is what I want you guys to do. 
Ioane: (((loud groan)) Ahhh! 
3 Mr. Day: This is what I want you guys to do. 
Sky Blue: Nothing. Thank you. 
5 Mr. Day: First thing=
Sky Blue: =Nothing.= 
7 Mr. Day: =We are going to spend fif[teen min]utes – 
CJ: (((loud groan)) Ahhh! 
9 Mr. Day: So when the big hand gets to the eight. I want you to take just a little bit of time, I want you to draw (.) a scary (.) picture. 
11 ?Ss: ((several overlapping exclamations of surprise, dismay, amusement)) 
Bush: ((laughing)) Waak go mou-hung ge gwaai-mat! 
Let's draw a scary monster with no chest! 
13 CJ: Mister, this is dumb, man! 
Michelle: Puk-gaai a::!
Fuck! 
15 Tony: Puk-gaai, sei la! Waak-wa la?! Lei dou ong-geui ga!
Fuck, go to hell. Drawing?! Are you stupid or what! 
Joyleen: I'm bad in drawing Mister! 
17 CJ: ((sounding frustrated)) Mister! 
Mack Daddy: Sca::ry.

54 My thanks to Andrew Wong for the Yale transcription of the Cantonese data, and for double-checking the English translations.
Mr. Day completes the distribution of paper, pens, pencils, and crayons, and as he does, cues the class in line 1 as to what he wants them to do for the activity.\textsuperscript{55} He contends with four interjections from students before he finally gets to his instructions in lines 10-11: first from Ioane, who groans in line 2, then twice from Sky Blue, a more peripheral G1.5 participant from Macau who had lived in the US for 3 years, and then from CJ (I address Sky Blue’s participation in this interaction below). Finally, in lines 9-10, Mr. Day tells the class that he wants them “to take just a little bit of time” – that is, 15 minutes, or, as he’s says in line 9, “when the big hand gets to the eight” – in order “to draw (.) a scary (.) picture.”

As mentioned earlier, Mr. Day’s chosen style of giving time deadlines, as in line 9 (“So when the big hand gets to the eight.”), was a common one he employed, and was not, I believe, meant to be insulting in any way. However, nearly all of the G1.5 students I spoke with in his class mentioned this and/or other features of Mr. Day’s teacher talk that they found childish. Of interest here is the hedging regarding the time deadline in lines 9-10 “I want you to take just a little bit of time”, which although a not-uncommon technique that teachers employ to mitigate the time demands made of students, here may also signal an awareness that spending 15 minutes “to draw (.) a scary (.) picture” might not be considered an ideal use of classroom time.

Indeed, as soon as Mr. Day utters the last two words of line 10 (“scary (.) picture.”), there is an outbreak of overlapped, mostly indecipherable exclamations from students that variously signal surprise, dismay, and amusement. In line 12, in L1

\textsuperscript{55} Worth noting is that virtually all of the G1.5 students that I saw doing (required) artwork in the ESLL classes I observed refused to use crayons, preferring instead to use colored pens or pencils. Occasionally, this was specified verbally, e.g., as CJ said in one of Mr. Day’s classes, “I don’t wanna use crayons. You get colored pencils?” (ELA31Xfn: 287).
Cantonese, Bush suggests to his friends (Sky Blue, Michelle, and Tony, who were all sitting together, as usual) that they draw a picture of a monster with no chest. This is followed closely by CJ, who in line 13 calls out loudly, “Mister, this is dumb, man!” After this, Michelle, a 9th grader from China who had lived in Hawai‘i for a year, utters “Puk-gaa a::!” {Fuck!}. Then Tony, who had lived in the US for two years, indicates a similar attitude of incredulity about the assignment, also in Cantonese. Joyleen, a G1.5 student from Chuuk then calls out to Mr. Day as well to say she is not good drawing, followed by a louder and more insistent “Mister!” from CJ. Mack Daddy concludes the extract with the fitting coda of “Sca::ry.”

Returning briefly to Sky Blue’s participation in the interaction in Extract 9.11: in line 4, he follows Mr. Day’s second voicing of “This is what I want you guys to do.” with “Nothing. Thank you.” This an apparent reference to the class work that Sky Blue evidently considers is (not) assigned in the ELA 2X class (a sentiment he had expressed in prior class sessions many times), and in certain respects is similar to what Sky Blue’s classmate Jennie said in the interaction represented in Extract 9.3 (Mr. Day: “What do you expect to do in class?” Jennie: “Nothing.”). It is loudly uttered on the recording, clearly audible across the classroom; there is no qualification here either, no defensible fall-back should Mr. Day decide to speak to Sky Blue about what he has just said. However, Mr. Day provides no uptake, instead continuing in line 5 with an enumeration of what he wants the students to do, “First thing”; but here Sky Blue latches Mr. Day’s turn and repeats “Nothing.” However, Mr. Day continues with his instructions and Sky Blue’s contribution goes unaddressed.
Sky Blue’s participation in the interaction above is of note not only for the bluntness of his comments, but for his role as a “broker” (Wenger, 1998, pp. 108-110) between a small friendship network of L1-Cantonese-speaking peers (who included Bush, Michelle, Tony, and another Chinese non-research-participant) and the G1.5 CoP in the class. Wenger & Snyder (2000, p. 142) distinguish between CoP and “informal networks” or “friendship groups” (Wenger, 1998, p. 123), with the latter often comprised of acquaintances who come together out of some form of affinity or association. In contrast to CoP, however, these (smaller) groups “are not very steady and do not build up into conversations, relationships, enterprises, and shared histories that are distinct from broader participation” in the group (Wenger, 1998, p. 124). CoP, on the other hand, are distinguished by the three primary criteria discussed in Chapter 3, that is, a group of people who come together in mutual engagement in a joint enterprise and who develop a shared repertoire of practices for that enterprise that are unique to the community. In terms of scope of analysis, informal networks or friendship groups as analytic categories would be located toward the narrowly-defined, micro, local levels, whereas, as Wenger (1998, pp. 124-126) states, CoP are mid-level analytic categories, with nations or cities or institutions at the broadly-defined, macro levels (see Chapter 3).

As a broker between the G1.5 CoP and his peer group, Sky Blue elaborates both the role of G1.5 students in ESLL classes as well as the function of brokering. That is, G1.5 students not only brokered ESLL with Local/mainstream communities, but also within the ESLL classroom itself. Here Sky Blue provided his friends here with “the forms of participation that are structured to open [a CoP] to nonmembers” (Wenger, 1998, p. 100), primarily in terms of his L1 use. Although Bush, Tony, and Michelle were
peripheral members in the G1.5 CoP, only Sky Blue had the L2 skills requisite to participate fully in its practices; Bush, Michelle, and Tony lacked oral L2 fluency, and Bush and Michelle in particular were highly sensitive about their L2 pronunciation (since they were teased by G1.5 students about it; see below; Chapter 10), which meant that they rarely participated orally in L2 English in the class, instead opting to conduct much of their oral interaction in the L1 (cf. Miller, 2003, pp. 107-108). Thus, all three did not have “enough legitimacy to be treated as potential members” (Wenger, 1998, p. 101) of the G1.5 CoP in the class – at least in terms of their L2 proficiency – by G1.5 students such as CJ, IwannaFAL, Jennie, Ioane, Joyleen, Computer, Laidplayer, Mack Daddy, and the others, whose advanced L2 proficiency enabled them to participate in G1.5 practices to begin with. That is, Bush, Michelle, and Tony were peripheral members of the G1.5 (and official class) CoP in Mr. Day’s class simply by virtue of their presence in the class; however, they were not legitimate peripheral members in view of their low L2 proficiency – indeed, they did not have the access to many G1.5 community practices by virtue of their low L2 proficiency (since they could not understand them). Thus, Sky Blue’s memberships in both the G1.5 CoP and the friendship group enabled his role as broker, which not only provided access, but the necessary “legitimacy” for Bush, Michelle, and Tony to legitimately peripherally participate in G1.5 community practices – but crucially, in their L1 (cf. Wenger, 1998, pp. 100-101). Thus it is interesting that after Sky Blue indexed resistance in lines 4 and 6, that in lines 14 and 15, Michelle and

---

56 As I discuss in more depth below and in Chapter 10, G1.5 students needed not only ESLL curriculum and classrooms to perform their identity work, but also, crucially, non-G1.5 students; students such as Tony, Michelle, and Bush thus served as an additional resource for this identity work, particularly their (much lower) L2 oral production, which not only gave them “audible identities” (Miller, 2003; 2004) of FOBs but contained many errors which G1.5 students delighted in pointing out for ridicule, and to index their difference and distinctly “generation 1.5-ness.” See below.
then Tony state theirs, in Cantonese. In these terms, Bush’s utterance in line 12, which is clearly out of the realm of G1.5 community practices, is perhaps indicative of his peripheral, newcomer status.

As it turned out, despite continued reminders about what Mr. Day called “step two” of the scary picture activity – that is, the writing component of the exercise – students, perhaps predictably, took more than the 15 minutes allotted to draw their pictures and, also perhaps predictably, were allowed to finish the class working on them. “Step 2” was to be saved for next class, although Mr. Day worried aloud if students would remember to bring their pictures for it. Most did not, as it happened, and so the writing activity was never completed. Thus, the (extended, 90+ minute) period in which Extracts 9.10 and 9.11 occurred involved the completion of a 22-item grammar exercise on pronouns (e.g., “I met Mr. Smith on the street yesterday. (him)” [Dixon, 1956, p. 2]), oral discussion of 15 vocabulary words,57 and a picture drawing activity that had Mr. Day call out to his 14-17 year-old students when the final bell rang: “Alright, let’s put away our crayons!” (ELA32Xmd4: 847) and a few moments later, “You’re excused, unless you’re still coloring!” (ELA32Xmd4: 855). Thus, the majority of G1.5 students’ displeasure with the artwork notwithstanding, their bargaining in this instance led to precisely what it normally led to: a much easier activity, more time to complete it, and a uniquely G1.5 cultural production of ESLL.

57 Those words (drawn from James and the giant peach) were: enormous, spectacles, peculiar, crouching, immediately, peacefully, precious, disappeared, horrible, ramshackle, ridiculous, impossible, twisting, marvelous, wonderful.
What I have termed "Worksheet Syndrome" was actually a set of associated practices with origins and histories that extended far beyond the G1.5 students in this study, centrally involving what McNeil (1986; 2000) has called "school knowledge." School knowledge is that reified course "content" "which serves the credentialing function of the school but which does not provide students with the rich knowledge of the subject fields nor with opportunities to build their own understandings of the subject" (McNeil, 2000, p. 12; cf. Lave, 1991; Wenger, 1998). It is an inevitable product of compulsory US public schools' bureaucratic organization, which McNeil (1986; 2000) argues, is primarily concerned with management and control. "When the school’s organization becomes centered on managing and controlling, teachers and students ... fall into a ritual of teaching and learning that tends toward minimal standards and minimum effort" (McNeil, 1986, p. xviii). Part of this "ritual" involves "defensive teaching" (see Chapter 10) which entails (among other things) teachers "controlling" the knowledge that students have access to, "in order to control the students" (p. xx). This is accomplished, McNeil (1986, pp. 157-190) notes, through the fragmentation, mystification, omission, decontextualization, and simplification of subject matter (cf. Anyon, 1980; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Bowles & Gintis, 1977), such that course content is reduced to lengthy lists, incomprehensible "facts," dates to be memorized, or in ESLL classes, discrete grammar points, vocabulary lists, and short answer comprehension questions. Thus it can be argued that school knowledge is that uniquely

---

58 Ms. Ariel most clearly became concerned with what she called the "minimum effort" of her G1.5 students in the second semester of the year, when she began grading for it. See Appendix M.1 for an example.
specific form of knowledge that derives from the world outside the school, but which, in its final decontextualized, worksheet form, bears little resemblance (or relevance) to what it purports to be about. Although McNeil’s analysis primarily involved the lecture format, similar arguments concerning school knowledge and knowledge control can be made of the reams of multiple choice, fill-in-the-blank, and short-answer worksheets that ESLL students at Tradewinds were assigned in their ESLL classes (cf. Hargrove, 2003; Appendices I-L).

There were two primary manifestations of Worksheet Syndrome that most clearly bear on my argument regarding the G1.5 performance strikes in the ESLL classes. First, when G1.5 student did do their assigned classwork and submitted it in their ESLL classes, what was overwhelmingly turned in was the vocabulary lists, grammar exercises, and other types of worksheets or worksheet-style assignments (cf. Extract 9.3). Second, G1.5 students’ performance on those non-worksheet assignments that they completed (e.g., the “essay style” comprehension questions and summaries related to the book work) showed the same features evident on the worksheet assignments, e.g., one-word or one-phrase answers which minimally answered questions, notably abbreviated journal entries and summaries, and so on. I shall briefly discuss both of these points next.

As evident in Extract 9.3, in which Jennie was not doing the comprehension questions and summary for the children books, but had done the grammar exercise from Dixon (1956), the work that G1.5 students overwhelmingly did turn in, in their ESLL classes was the worksheets, or worksheet-style assignments such as vocabulary lists. A clear, emblematic example of this is in Appendices M.2-M.5, a G1.5 student’s work from one of the Holiday units out of the Celebrate with us book (Kennedy, 1995) regarding the
Memorial Day holiday. In Appendix M.2 and M.3, two of the pages devoted to short answer, true/false, and fill-in-the-blank questions, the student has done (most of) the work. But in M.4 and M.5, two of the pages in the unit that are devoted to writing are entirely blank. This is a pattern in virtually all of the holiday units (for example) for the G1.5 students. Similarly, the classwork folders for other G1.5 students have far more vocabulary and grammar exercises in various stages of completion and far fewer comprehension questions, summaries, journal entries and other writing assignments. For example, many G1.5 students' class/homework folders from the latter two quarters of the school year contained only grammar and vocabulary exercises. Others contained a few comprehension question and summary assignments, but they tended to be only minimally completed (see Appendix M.6 and below for a discussion of this). More examples can be seen in Appendices M.7-M.15: in M.7 is a journal entry from a G1.5 student on “Things I wish teachers knew about students from my country,” a two-sentence tautology that took this student about one minute to complete (and was found on the floor after class). Appendix M.8 is different journal entry, this one by another G1.5 student on “If I had a million dollars.” Appendix M.9 contains one of several blank journal entries from another G1.5 student, and M.10 is a vocabulary list from still another. Appendices M.11 and M.12 are other comprehension question assignments from two different G1.5 students and M.13, M.14, and M.15 are grammar exercises from three others, M.13 in list form, and the other two in complete sentences, a policy that Mr. Day implemented in the second semester. Finally, Ms. Ariel’s “Final Exam” in Appendices I.8-I.10 attest to the

59 Unfortunately, I have not included the pseudonyms of the students whose work is reproduced in Appendix M since it may make them identifiable.
60 Because of this provision, many G1.5 students in the class began to copy sentences for the grammar exercises in as quick and efficient a manner as possible: all of the first words for each item, then all of the
extension of Worksheet Syndrome to tests (in contrast to the end-of-book tests, no matter how formulaic they were, cf. Appendix J.4), even though this final exam actually became “optional” (see Chapter 10).

Much of the G1.5 student work in Appendix M hints at the second manifestation of Worksheet Syndrome and that is that the features of this practice, the brief answers, the seeming aversion to any form of extensive writing, extended to writing assignments and other “non-worksheet” types of activities. One page summaries, journal entries, project assignments, and other activities that called for more substantial written output were completed (when they were written at all) in one, two, or three sentences; one paragraph instead of three; a half page rather a whole one. As mentioned earlier, it is difficult to speculate why this was. Students may have had substantial experience with worksheets from earlier years of schooling, and therefore maintained a preference for them at Tradewinds. Worksheets, or writing assignments that were treated like worksheets, may also have served a minimally time-and labor-intensive purpose as defensible “fallback” explanations, should G1.5 students be reproached by teachers for “not doing work” [cf. Jennie’s “I did. I did the grammar (and the quiz).” and CJ’s “Uh::, the quiz.” in Extract 9.3 above]. Or Worksheet Syndrome may have been another symbolic demonstration concerning G1.5 students’ estimation of the official curriculum and coursework of the ESLL program. Despite this, the consequences of Worksheet Syndrome were significant for these students. As more and more students wrote less and less and/or turned in only worksheets rather than writing assignments, teachers began accommodating by increasing the number of worksheets and decreasing both the number second words, all of the third words, etc., until each of the sentences was complete. This pattern is most clearly visible in Appendix M.15, particularly the last third of the worksheet (also see Appendix M.14).
of and the demands made on extended L2 composition assignments. The grammar work in Mr. Day's ELA 2X, which ultimately became one of the central curricular components in his class, is a case in point, as are Ms. Ariel's decreased demands for writing and summary assignments (e.g., groups of students could turn in writing assignments rather than individuals) and Ms. Cheney's virtual abandonment of coursework involving more than a paragraph. The net result was that G1.5 students, a population that a growing research literature indicates has complex and compelling L2 writing needs (Bennett et al., 2000; Ferris et al., 2004; Harklau, Losey et al., 1999; LeNoue, 2000; Talmy, 2001a; Thonus, 2003), engaged in minimal practice with L2 English literacy forms and practices of the sort that on the one hand would better serve them both in school and future jobs, and on the other, might help them, however negligibly, exit ESLL, either in terms of the added practice they would have with writing, or at the very least, in better ESLL grades.

Finally, it is important to consider another consequence of Worksheet Syndrome, one which had to do with teachers' attitudes, beliefs, and expectations of G1.5 students. As the quote in the title for this subsection indicates, a frequently-made representation by teachers about G1.5 students' writing was that it was the result of "minimum effort."

This explanation, of course, implicates students' (low) motivation as the putative "problem" for their (lack of) written work, and thus, the students themselves (Norton, 61 In a telling extract from a formal interview regarding the grammar book component, Mr. Day stated: "If I have them do easy, easy homework, where they, you know, copy things out of grammar books, they'll do it, that's the only thing they'll do, the grammar book. I put it in the grade book to kind of reinforce skills, it seems to be the only thing they're taught how to do, can do well, can do regularly, they all have this grammar book, it's probably the only thing they've been taught out of, from my understanding. They're so comfortable with it! . . . Teachers are comfortable giving it, because the students are comfortable doing it. I -- maybe that's one of the reasons they have such a hard time, you know, outside of grammar exercises, like doing English, and speaking English, and reading. I don't know, because it's different. It's not repetitive like that. It's not the same structure over and over again, you just fill this word in or that word in, I mean, they make it very easy, so you don't have to think. Maybe that's the problem, where the students just aren't trained to think as much." (TINT09: 388-396).
This explanation was similar to one I found made in a study at a community college, in which I was a co-researcher, that also concerned G1.5 students (Bennett et al., 2000; Talmy, 2001a, 2001b). In that study, teachers, counselors, and administrators (TCAs) at a Hawai‘i community college represented G1.5 students as engaging in “oppositional” behaviors in class – of being generally more “resistant” than their international student classmates – yet when it came to the G1.5 students’ academic work, including their writing (which was represented as poor), TCAs implicated low motivation, cognitive deficit, and cultural and linguistic deprivation as explanations, with no consideration that these students’ academic performance may have been the result of low investment or even resistance itself. Thus, it is important for educators to recognize that student work such as that represented in Appendix M may be less indicative of students' academic (or worse, cognitive) abilities than of their responses to materials, curriculum, and instruction that for them lacks the cultural, linguistic, and symbolic capital they need or desire. Nonetheless, Worksheet Syndrome is one of the G1.5 student performance strike practices that perhaps most obviously illustrates some possible student reasoning behind these behaviors as well as the self-defeating, social reproductive consequences they could have.

Summary

To this point in the chapter, I have considered six main features of the G1.5 student performance strike which were central in the G1.5 students’ cultural productions of ESLL.
"It's at home": Not bringing books to class" concerned the practice of students leaving materials “at home,” in particular, the children’s books that the ESLL curriculum was centered around. This, I argued, simultaneously functioned as a rationale of sorts for not doing work in class, and a symbolic gesture about the putative status of this particular curricular element.

"Neva du am": Not doing classwork” was a larger practice that the “‘It’s at home” practice was part of. In this particular section, I examined how students more directly negotiated not doing work in class, focusing in particular on the “defensible fall-back” explanation as a linguistic and interactional resource that G1.5 students deployed in their performance of G1.5 identity, which simultaneously produced their G1.5 community membership.

"Bell’s gonna ring!": Starting late and finishing early” was a practice that occurred on the temporal margins of ESLL classes, a practice which actually involved the expansion of those margins, from five minutes, to 10, to 20, and in some instances, 30 minutes, as well as providing another defensible fall-back rationale for not engaging in the official business of ESLL curriculum, instruction, and structural and cultural production.

"I can’t speak English, man!": Resisting and reproducing FOBeing” concerned how G1.5 students resisted one manifestation of the structural and official cultural productions of ESLL, what I have glossed as “FOBeing,” or the positioning of students labeled “ESLL” as exoticized cultural and linguistic Others. G1.5 students did this by refusing to assume subject positions made available to them in a class project that required students to report on holidays from “their cultures or countries.” Instead, they
argued to report on "unmarked" holidays such as those also found in the teacher's in-group: Christmas and New Year's. These same students then went about performing their own version of FOBeing through the projection of a language variety I call "Mock ESL."

"A little bit more time": Bargaining was present to varying degrees in all of the practices reported in this chapter. In this particular section, however, I examined how one G1.5 student engaged in a minimal bargaining exchange with his teacher to get an entirely different activity accepted for class, one involving drawing pictures of monsters. I then discussed how other G1.5 students reacted (negatively) to this activity since it indexed childishness, one of the strongest and most routine complaints that G1.5 students made of ESLL.

Finally, in "'Minimum effort': Worksheet Syndrome" I discussed how students submitted more worksheet assignments than non-worksheet (e.g., writing) assignments, and when they did turn in the latter type of coursework, that it exhibited many of the features found on the worksheets. In this regard, I considered how Worksheet Syndrome may well have functioned as another manifestation of the defensible "fallback" explanation that G1.5 students frequently employed in ESLL classes, or, possibly, another symbol of how they valued the ESLL curriculum and instruction. I focused on certain consequences of this practice, from the increase in worksheet-related assignments to teacher representations about these students' motivation, as well as how Worksheet Syndrome might affect these students' L2 literacy development.

As I've attempted to make clear in this chapter, each of these practices spanned different classes, in different years of the study, with different students, and different
teachers. I have argued that these practices were central to and emblematic of G1.5 students' performance strikes in the ESLL classes, and thus the production of the G1.5 CoP and the uniquely G1.5 cultural productions of ESLL. They were among the “shared repertoire” of primary cultural forms and linguistic and interactional practices that G1.5 students “mutually engaged” in, and around which the G1.5 CoP formed, in the “joint enterprise” of undermining and destabilizing the structural and official cultural productions of ESLL (Wenger, 1998; Wenger & Snyder, 2000; see Chapter 7), and the ideologies about ESL and immigrants that they were constitutive of and constituted by (Fairclough, 1989, 1995, 2001). As G1.5 students engaged in these practices, they simultaneously worked to subvert the official or formal conceptions of ESLL, produced their differences from normative conceptions of “ESLL student,” indexed membership in the G1.5 CoP, and reproduced it.

These students’ participation in G1.5 CoP practices was at times so pervasive that it was unclear which CoP, the “official” one or the G1.5 one, was “hegemonic” in a given ESLL classroom (cf. Lave, 1991, p. 79). That is to say, the G1.5 cultural productions of ESLL threw into question what precisely were the “target” community, cultures, and social practices – what the “language, tools, . . . symbols, well-defined roles. . . . tacit conventions, subtle cues, untold rules of thumb” (Wenger, 1998, p. 47) – that ESLL students were ostensibly being socialized into (cf. Duff, 2002, 2003). What’s more, the broad circulation of G1.5 cultural productions in ESLL classrooms served as socializing resources through and to use language, not just for (G1.5 and non-G1.5) students, but for teachers as well (also see Chapter 10); these considerations thoroughly complicate presumptions that language socialization necessarily proceeds inevitably and linearly
along lines of *a priori* categories of hierarchical or institutional status or age (cf. Duff, 2002, 2003; He, 2003; Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991; see Chapter 3). Contingency and bidirectionality in socialization processes – indeed, what community practices and norms those processes ostensibly were comprised of and derived from – were thus centrally implicated in the G1.5 cultural productions of ESLL.

Put in slightly different terms, the G1.5 CoP provided a broad context within and against which other G1.5 students, non-G1.5 students, and teachers could participate in G1.5 community practices, from positions of legitimate peripherality to increasingly full participation. As G1.5 students took up these performance strike practices, their effects on classroom instruction were felt by all the students, G1.5 and non-G1.5 alike, with many in the latter group coming to gradually participate in them as well, through, e.g., decreasing participation in official classroom activities. Thus, indeed, the performance strike became a mass refusal to perform well, on the parts of both students and teachers, a collective disengagement in official teaching and learning, such that the ESLL program became precisely what it was that G1.5 ESLL students claimed to be resisting: an easy, dumbed-down, academically inconsequential program that had little relevance in terms of students’ L2 learning needs or goals and/or formal school preparation (cf. Shor, 1992).

In these terms, G1.5 students can be seen as “brokers” (Wenger, 1998), powerfully and pivotally *mediating* official ESLL CoP and (Local) CoP outside of ESLL, where discourses of deficiency about ESLL were in circulation (see Chapter 8). The G1.5 CoP was thus one of those “misrecognized or institutionally disapproved interstitial communities of practice” that Lave (1991, p. 79) speaks of as developing in institutional settings, a very particular sort of hybrid community where members (by my definition),
had memberships in communities formed by histories of participation in Local settings and with Local populations, as well as a conflicting but *compulsory* membership in a community that had formed around the institutionally-mandated identity category of "ESLL." In terms of these particular interstices, then, it is hardly surprising that discourses and practices from CoP that were more valued by G1.5 members were brought into the compulsory, low-prestige CoP setting, particularly when those discourses and practices were aimed at or directed against it.

In this section, I have focused on G1.5 students’ resistance to ESLL curriculum and instruction in the first-year teachers ESLL classes. In the next section, I consider it in Mr. Bradley’s classes, where it manifested in far more subtle and indirect ways, for reasons that will become apparent. Finally, having considered G1.5 and I shall consider the G1.5 CoP, particularly in terms of its relations with non-G1.5 students.

**Resisting ESLL in an oldtimer teacher’s classes**

As asserted earlier in this chapter, student resistance in Mr. Bradley’s classes was remarkably different in degree and tenor than in the first-year ESLL teachers’ classes. I would like to argue this is because of a number of teaching practices he had developed over the years in response to cultural productions of ESLL that ran counter to his own vision of what ESLL was and should be. In this regard, it is important to remember that Mr. Bradley was a teacher of more than 10 years, who had substantial coursework and background in L2 teaching and learning, and that the classes that I observed of his were all ESLL B and C classes, which were invariably smaller than the ESLL A classes. Mr. Bradley also always had at least one PTT in his class, and, it should be remembered, he
was a co-author (if one can author something unwritten) of the ESLL curriculum. He was also conversant in a number of different L2s. All of these factors meant that his classrooms were qualitatively different from the first-year teachers’, as I shall discuss below.

I would like to preface my discussion here with a brief meta-commentary about how Mr. Bradley fits into my research findings. Since I first began conceptualizing how to represent the findings of this study, I have struggled with how I might equitably include Mr. Bradley’s classes.

Mr. Bradley’s approach to teaching was, in his own words, a “tough love” approach, developed over the years in response to what he saw were the dwindling expectations for and academic performance of his ESLL students. I say this here because his classes included what to me was some notably harsh treatment of students. Students in his classes were often subject to what might be characterized as verbal mistreatment and intimidation. On the other hand, Mr. Bradley could demonstrate remarkable kindness and generosity; he was also a clearly gifted teacher, and many students liked and respected him. His classes were strict and regimented; he got things done across the board much more than in the first-year ESLL teachers’ classes, yet it was clear to me that it came at a considerable cost, primarily to students’ dignity and their privacy. As a teacher and a researcher, and on top of it, a criticalist, I found myself in a position second only to the students’ in terms of discomfort, observing treatment that often seemed unkind on the one hand, and on the other, relying on Mr. Bradley, who in characteristic contradiction, welcomed me warmly into his classrooms, provided an astonishing degree
of access, introduced me to other teachers that Mr. Anderson did not know as well, and, over two and a half years of research, became close colleagues, indeed, friends with me.

For these reasons, I include a general discussion of findings from Mr. Bradley’s classes below, but only as a means to illuminate those above, in terms of the particular manifestation and the effects of G1.5 CoP practices in his classes. I do not think that by using Mr. Bradley only as a counterpoint to the first-year ESLL teachers that I take away from the main findings represented to this point in the study. I do think that by including a more in-depth, comprehensive analysis, I would do more damage than good, and would possibly violate the spirit of my agreement with Tradewinds High School, the Tradewinds ESLL program, Mr. Anderson, and Mr. Bradley. This is an ethical dilemma that I realize may not have a satisfactory solution for anyone.

Before embarking on this discussion, I will briefly review information from Chapter 5, regarding Mr. Bradley’s classes that I observed (one semester each)

Table 9.2 Mr. Bradley’s classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course name</th>
<th>Section code</th>
<th>Duration of observation</th>
<th>Total hours Rec (^{62})</th>
<th>Total hours Obs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESLL B</td>
<td>ELB 2Y</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESLL B</td>
<td>ELB 3W</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESLL B</td>
<td>ELB 3X</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESLL C</td>
<td>ELC 1V</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{62}\) “Total hours rec” = Total hours of classroom recordings (including student-carried recordings; see Chapter 5); “Total hours obs” = Total hours of classroom observation (including all classroom and student-carried recordings).
ELC IV. All of Mr. Bradley’s classes were smaller than the first-year teachers’ classes. Of them all, ELC IV was the smallest of the ESLL classes that I observed, with approximately 15 students. Most were 11th and 12th graders, who could be evenly divided among Chinese, Filipino, Micronesian, and Korean, with a Vietnamese and South Asian enrolled as well. Nearly all of these students had lengths of residence over two years and were G1.5 students, and with a three or four exceptions, most seemed resigned to their ongoing placement in ESLL.

ELB 2Y. There were just under 20 students in this class, including three (Brahdah, Romeo, and Ben) who I had observed the year before in Ms. Cheney’s ELA 1X class. Most of the students in this class were 10th graders, nearly two-thirds of whom were Chinese, with the remainder from the Pacific Islands and Philippines. Many of the Chinese students were recent arrivals to the US with low levels of L2 proficiency. About half of the class had lengths of residence in the US for over two years.

ELB 3W & 3X. Both of these classes also had just under 20 students, several of whom I had observed in Mr. Day’s and Ms. Ariel’s classes. The majority of students in both classes had lived in the US for two years or more. In ELB 3W, about one-fifth of the class were Chinese, about 1/3 from the Philippines, with the remainder coming from Korea and Micronesia. In ELB 3X, the proportion was about the same for Chinese students as in ELB 3W, with another third from the Pacific Islands, and the remainder from Vietnam and the Philippines.
Contending with resistance: An oldtimer teacher responds

As alluded to above, Mr. Bradley's responses to the various student practices that went into performance strikes were notably different in important respects from those of the three first-year ESLL teachers that I observed. As already discussed, the first-year teachers' "defensive teaching" responses can be seen as indicative of their uptake of and participation in the larger G1.5 cultural production of ESLL (see Chapter 10). As an oldtimer teacher, however, Mr. Bradley had developed a range of strategies for contending with oppositional student behaviors such as those of the G1.5 student performance strikes. In this regard, the contestation over the cultural production of ESLL in Mr. Bradley's classes was far more subtle and contingent than in the first-year teachers' classes, as Mr. Bradley "resisted" G1.5 students' attempts at undermining official cultural productions of ESLL, particularly as manifest in a curriculum of which he was a principal author, and a program in which he had over 10 years invested.

Mr. Bradley responded firmly to virtually anything other than full compliance with his expectations for appropriate classroom behavior and participation. As a result, his classes were the most teacher-centered of all the ESLL and J-section classes that I observed, characterized by strictly enforced rules and tightly controlled opportunities for student-student interaction. When he was unhappy with student participation, for example, if classes got too noisy or students refused to work in ways that he wanted them to, he would resort to a number of increasingly effective, if intimidating, techniques to ensure greater alignment with his expectations for performance. Beyond classroom rules and the tight controls he set for classroom interaction, these techniques ranged from simply raising his voice to criticizing students' actions, berating the students themselves,
bullying them, and finally, embarrassing them, most often by singling them out for ridicule (e.g., about their L2 proficiency or pronunciation), "outing" private information about them (e.g., their grades, personal and/or family information), and/or calling students' families during class time to complain about behavior, in earshot of the entire class. Indeed what underlay these practices was that all were public, and all therefore held the strong likelihood for humiliation.

I do not wish to belabor these points for reasons already discussed, and so will give only a brief indication of them below. To do this, I use two primary data extracts (Extract 9.12 and Extract 9.15) from an ESLL B class I observed in the final semester of fieldwork (ELB 3X), which between them contain a mild if representative array of the practices just described. I also include data from another class in Extracts 9.13 and 9.14, which are used to elaborate subsidiary points. The interactions in Extracts 9.12 and 9.15 both come from the same class session, in fact, the same class activity, just a few minutes apart.

This particular class session came about three weeks into the school year, and so students and teacher were still in certain respects getting to know one another. The lesson involved a worksheet "paragraph development" exercise entitled "Agriculture, Aquaculture, and Lots of Aloha" (see Appendix K.1 for the worksheet). This was a three-paragraph reading passage about the Hawai‘i economy comprised of 14 sentences that had been separated and randomly reordered (a "sentence scramble" exercise). Each sentence was labeled a letter of the alphabet from A-N. Students were to put these sentences back into the correct order, to reconstitute the original 3-paragraph reading passage.
The first interaction from this class, represented in Extract 9.12, comes just after Mr. Bradley has gone over the instructions for the exercise with the class. He has paused to help a very low L2 English proficient Chinese boy named Ho Yin* (a "rock") in L1 Mandarin, as he did on certain occasions. He is just now turning back to address the class about how he wants students to write the title of the worksheet on a blank piece of paper (they are to recopy the sentences in the correct order). As he does, JohnyBoy, a Pohnpeian G1.5 10th grader who had lived in the US for four years asks to go and get a drink of water.

(9.12) Like ESL students! [ELB51Xmd1:479-489]

1 Mr. Bradley: I want the title, ["Agriculture" –
JohnyBoy: [Eh Mister Bradley, drink watah?
Hey Mister Bradley, can I get a drink of water?

3 Mr. Bradley: No.
JohnyBoy: Please?

5 Mr. Bradley: No. When I teach, you don’t drink water. After I finish teaching, you may. That is not respecting me. (2) Okay? ((to the class)) Alright!
Paragraph number one, five spaces in, let us indent. ((writing “indent” on the board)) Okay? Do not write this {“indent”} now, just indent.
((writing on the board)) “When (1) you (1) think (3) of (. . . ) Hawai‘i” (2) and you copy {the rest of the sentence from the worksheet}. Copy, copy, copy, copy, copy, copy, copy, copy, copy. ((writes ellipsis on board)) And the last word will be “exotic foods.” ((writes “exotic foods” on board)) (5) Can do?

?Ss: ((monotone)) Yes.

15 Mr. Bradley: Very good. (3) Okay. Genie, what is the second sentence? What letter?

17 Regine: Um:: (5)
Mr. Bradley: ((sees some Ss are not writing the sentences)) COME ON! COPY COPY COPY!!

Mack Dogg: “E.”

21 Mr. Bradley: You don’t COPY, we’re not going lunch. (1) I’m teaching you form. (1) I’m teaching you structure. (1) I’m teaching you topic sentence. And supporting sentences. You guys are just sitting there! (2) Don’t act dumb, like ESL students! (8) ((goes to monitor students. Stops at Ho Yin)) Excuse me? (8) Indent. Ho Yin. (2) Okay. Go. Copy.
Several features of Mr. Bradley’s methods of controlling classes and wielding authority are evident here. In line 2, JohnyBoy asks to get a drink of water, another commonly employed practice G1.5 students used to claim instructional time as their own: it often served as the premise to take a stroll around campus or visit friends in other classes (from anywhere between 10 minutes to entire class periods). In contrast to all of the first-year teachers, who usually let students go for a drink of water or take a bathroom break when they asked, Mr. Bradley had a firm rule that limited such breaks to one or two minutes; in fact, he would at times follow students to the water fountain or the bathroom to ensure that they returned to class. In line 3, his response to JohnyBoy is a flat rejection and his lack of “account” (Ford, 2001; 2004) after such a disagreeing action indexes his situational identity of teacher: as the teacher, he does not need to give an elaborating explanation. JohnyBoy has already clearly oriented to this identity, and its implied corollary of student in line 2 when he asked for permission, even if it did come as Mr. Bradley was speaking to the class. In fact, his use of Mr. Bradley’s form of address plus surname is marked here, as virtually all students that I knew at Tradewinds called their teachers only “Mister” (for men) or “Miss” (for women), excluding surname. This is no doubt in response to Mr. Bradley’s firmly stated rule that students address him
appropriately." JohnyBoy’s “Please?” in line 4 further indicates his orientation to Mr. Bradley’s position as teacher and authority, and his as student, as well as the possibility that his initial request was denied due to some problem with its formulation, that is, that it was perhaps not polite enough to warrant granting. Mr. Bradley again says “No.” in line 5, but this time offers an elaboration: the denial apparently has less to do with politeness than with “respect”: “When I teach, you don’t drink water. After I finish teaching, you may. That is not respecting me.” Mr. Bradley has replied with a decisive set of contrasts that emphasize his power and JohnyBoy’s lack of it, encoded most obviously in pronoun use and the habitual factual conditional constructions (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, pp. 548-549), which highlight his agency and eliminate JohnyBoy’s (or perhaps more aptly, leave it under his control): “When I teach, you don’t drink water. After finishing teaching, you may.” Mr. Bradley has assumed his role as teacher and taught JohnyBoy – and the rest of the class, in front of whom this interaction is being carried out – about appropriate behavior and participation from students. He has suppressed the possibility for participation in a common G1.5 community practice in this instance, and thus, any corresponding disruption in his particular cultural production of ESLL.

Lines 6-12 are spent modeling the activity he wants students to do. Mr. Bradley is at the board, copying the first sentence from the worksheet onto an outlined sheet of “paper” on the board. Students are to indent five spaces in, and then copy the following sentence from the worksheet, “When you think of Hawaii, you probably think of beautiful islands where tourists wear necklaces of orchids, swim near sandy beaches, and

---

63 In another ESLL B class, for example, when Tommy, a low L2 proficient boy who had lived in the US for two years asked for Mr. Bradley’s assistance by calling out “Mister. Mister.” he turned on him and shouted “I have a name! You want me to call you ‘eh boy’!?" (ELB41Yfn: 383).
eat exotic foods.” This exercise, which quite unproblematically plays on Hawai‘i’s (neo)colonial legacy as an exotic playground and Pacific military-industrial outpost, also ironically invokes another common practice employed by G1.5 (and other) students and that was copying.64 As I indicated in Chapter 7, one of the ongoing battles ESLL teachers waged in their classes, particularly for the summarizing and other writing assignments, was to get students to write whatever it was that had been assigned, “in their own words” (cf. Pennycook, 1996). Here, on a “paragraph development” exercise, students were in fact being told precisely to do what was ordinarily forbidden. In this respect, this exercise is reminiscent of “controlled composition” exercises (see, e.g., Raimes, 1983, for a discussion) from the 1950s and 1960s, in which students’ L2 writing instruction consisted of copying sentences word for word, an obvious manifestation of the behaviorist audiolingual movement predominant in L2 studies at the time (cf. Mr. Bradley in lines 21-23) (see, e.g., Celce-Murcia, 2001, for a brief overview).

Important to point out is Mr. Bradley’s question “Can do?” in lines 12-13, and the students’ monotone answer “Yes.” in the following line. This is a representative example of one way that Mr. Bradley attempted to control interaction, specifically through the use of comprehension checks from students about instructions that he had given. His teacher talk is replete with such checks, which usually consisted of either “can do?”, an apparently condensed form of “can you do that?”, or “yes or no?” On the first days of class, students were instructed to answer these questions, essentially told that they were

64 I distinguish here between the copying practices of G1.5 students, who copied even though they had the requisite experience with L2 English print-literacy practices necessary to accomplish the ESLL writing assignments, and those non-G1.5 students (i.e., the “rocks”) who copied because they did not have the necessary experience (i.e., could not read or write in the L2 to a degree that would allow them to complete these assignments), and who copied in order to keep up their grades.
not rhetorical features or discourse markers to be ignored, but legitimate questions that
required responses. This thereby reinforced first, the power that Mr. Bradley had in
requiring answers to these questions, and second, the position of his students as being
ESLL students and potentially lacking the L2 proficiency to comprehend. In this respect,
he highlights his position as an expert of the L2, and his students as novices. On
numerous occasions during Mr. Bradley’s classes he would utter “can do?” or “yes or
no?” and receive no answer, at which point he would repeat the question louder, shout,
and/or scold the class. For example:

(9.13) *Yes or no! [ELB51Xfn: 154]*

1 Mr. Bradley: Listen up. We have a big problem. Mr. Kent and Mr. Bradley just
spent an hour with the principal. We have a big problem. ESL
students aren’t scoring high enough on reading tests. You’re
reading at the second and third grade level. What grade are you?

Ss: Tenth. Yes or no?

7 Mr. Bradley: YES OR NO!

Ss: Yes.

9 Mr. Bradley: That’s a big gap. 65

Thus, in line 14 of Extract 9.12, Mr. Bradley receives the answer to his “Can do?”
question, in a notably mechanical, monotone tone of voice, uttered by a handful of
students (all that was usually needed). Although these were Yes/No questions, in fact,
the only legitimate answer to them was “Yes.”, for a “No.” reply would potentially invite

---

65 This interaction came as a result of the Tradewinds test scores on the NCLB-mandated HCPS/HSA test
scores. See Chapter 6 for more discussion.
unwanted attention from Mr. Bradley as to why whatever was being checked had not been understood or had been rejected.\footnote{In fact, in all my data, I only found one instance in which a student uttered “No.” to one of these requests, and that was China, in the final semester of research. Mr. Bradley was telling the class how to write a summary for the children’s books, and told them to “see a picture of your summary in your head. I should make you draw a picture for each summary, make you draw a picture as you read.” As several students sighed and groaned, Mr. Bradley followed up: “Isn’t that a good idea? Yes or no.” China replied “No.” There was no uptake however, as Mr. Bradley continued, “Your paragraph should create a picture for your reader.” (ELB51Wf: 287).}

In line 15 of Extract 9.12, Mr. Bradley evaluates his students’ “reply” as “Very good.” Following a question to Regine\footnote{Regine, a non-G1.5 student with advanced L2 proficiency, was the other student besides Benz who had requested her ESLL placement. Unlike Benz, however, Regine was happy with her ESLL classes even though she admitted they were too easy for her.} (whom Mr. Bradley called “Genie”), which she does not yet have the answer to, Mr. Bradley sees that some students are not copying the sentences as they are supposed to be doing and shouts “COME ON! COPY COPY COPY!” Mack Dogg then attempts to answer (incorrectly as it turns out) the question Mr. Bradley put to Regine, but Mr. Bradley remains oriented to the students who have not complied with his instructions. Here, he sends a clear signal to them and to anyone else who may be thinking of not copying the sentences in the correct order as they’ve been told that “You don’t COPY, we’re not going to lunch.” This was a common threat Mr. Bradley made, and he was not reluctant to follow through on it (for the earlier or later classes, the threat was that students couldn’t go to recess, their next class, or home). I came into his class many times only to find an entire class doing work, or more likely, being scolded for much if not all of a lunch hour (or following class session, or recess, or for substantial periods of time after school).

Following this threat, Mr. Bradley enumerates what he is teaching them through this activity, again explicitly orienting to his teacher identity and projecting for the
students their expected roles as students and what they should be learning: “I’m teaching you form. (1) I’m teaching you structure. (1) I’m teaching you topic sentence. (1) And supporting sentences.” As discussed in Chapter 7, this also highlights the focus of much of the explicit writing instruction in the ESLL classes at Tradewinds, that is, attention to form, structure, and formulae, particularly at the paragraph level.

Mr. Bradley then employs another strategy that he used to maintain control in his ESLL classes, a put-down about ESL students, again aimed at anyone who is (or is thinking about) “just sitting there,” possibly entertaining thoughts of not learning “form, structure, and topic sentence”: “Don’t act dumb, like ESL students!” Put-downs about ESLL and ESLL students occurred with regularity in Mr. Bradley’s classes, usually when he perceived that a large proportion of the class had not complied with what they had been instructed to do. These put-downs nearly all made some reference to ESLL students’ intelligence (e.g., “Hey! Act educated! [ELB42Yfn: 174]), character (e.g., “You guys are a bunch of lazy bums.” [ELC12Vfn: 216]), or something less definable (e.g., “This class shits!” [MSCLU4fn: 221]), and all played on the same set of dualisms in the mainstream/ESLL hierarchy described in the discussion of FOBeing above and in Chapter 8. Mr. Bradley, however, was unique among the ESLL teachers in that he was the only one to explicitly invoke the usually latent discourse of ESLL students’ stupidity, here very clearly counterposed against mainstream students’ intelligence, and to do it not to repudiate the discourse, but to use it for his purposes, that is, classroom control. In effect, Mr. Bradley here deploys the same linguicist discourses about ESLL circulating in the school, ones which conflate (L2) English proficiency with intelligence, that as a result associates ESLL with the equally devalued Special Education – the same discourses that
G1.5 students brought into their ESLL classes (see below) – to bring about student compliance with his particular cultural production of ESLL. Although he stated to me that he resorted to these tactics as a way to motivate his students, the net effect was that he (re)instantiated these discourses, legitimated them, providing them with additional currency, which would ensure their continued circulation.

As in Extract 9.12, Mr. Bradley’s ESLL put-downs could be directed at an entire class; they were most “effective,” however, when they were directed at individual students, such as in Extract 9.14. Here, IwannaFAL is standing in front of the class being scolded for not having completed homework, in this instance, memorizing part of Martin Luther King’s speech, “I have a dream.” He has uttered two sentences from the speech, incorrectly, and worse, has not completed the poster artwork that was to accompany his reading.

(9.14) How long you been here!? [MSCLU4fn: 209-223]

1  Mr. Bradley: Why you don’t do your homework?
   IwannaFAL: ((silence))
3  Mr. Bradley: How long you been here!?
   IwannaFAL: Uh:: Eight years.
5  Mr. Bradley: Eight years. Eight years and you’re still in ESL. Are you proud?
   Do you like ESL so much you don’t want to leave?!
7  IwannaFAL: No.
   Mr. Bradley: Come here. ((shows him her gradebook)) See your B? It’s now a D. You know, you’re gonna be in ESL two more years! You’re gonna be in here til you graduate. You gon be in ESL ten years. Break the world record! Ten years in ESL!”

Beneath the explicit vilification of ESLL and IwannaFAL, which again, to give Mr. Bradley the benefit of the doubt (without condoning these actions), was likely uttered
more to “motivate” IwannaFAL than to denigrate ESLL (cf. the threatened reduction of
grade), lies the discourse of transformation and change discussed in Chapter 8. “ESLL
student” as a subjectivity is constructed both here and in Extract 9.12 (lines 23-24) as
being deficient, as candidates not only for “cognitive overhaul and rescue,” but character
and moral development. More of this type of performance is found in Extract 9.15
below, although in a slightly different form.

In the remainder of his last turn in lines 25-30 of Extract 9.12, Mr. Bradley
continues to circulate around the class, monitoring students’ progress on the assignment
and indexing through his word stress, volume shifts, and repetitions, an affective intensity
that over a class period could become wearing and anxiety-inducing. In this respect, such
intensity markers may also have functioned as subtle classroom control mechanisms
themselves: students might have complied and/or resisted in more subtle, less overt ways
just so Mr. Bradley would maintain a less explosive demeanor; regardless, his classes
were in fact much quieter than the first-year ESLL teachers’ classes. Mr. Bradley
concludes the interaction in Extract 9.12 with a public comment to Mr. Kent, his PTT,
that is a not so subtle gibe at those first-year ESLL teachers from whom these students
have evidently learned so little.

More of Mr. Bradley’s tactics of control are evident in Extract 9.15. This is a
rather long extract and the methods used in it, primarily performed to humiliate a student,
are rather transparent, so my analysis will not be extensive. However, it aptly
summarizes some of the risks awaiting G1.5 students should they attempt to participate in
some of the practices elucidated above, and thus may help to explain why overt
manifestations of the G1.5 cultural productions of ESLL were far less apparent in Mr.
Bradley’s classes than in the others’. This does not mean that resistance did not take place, it did, but covertly, more safely, and with similar if less dramatic consequences.

The interaction represented in Extract 9.15 occurred several minutes following the one in Extract 9.12, after Mr. Bradley had concluded his instructions for the “Agriculture, Aquaculture, and Lots of Aloha” worksheet, monitored student progress for a short while, and then determined that the questions were too difficult. He has now told the class that they will read through the sentences together, and determine which one of three thematic categories he has written on the board that they belong to, “Tourism,” “Military,” or “Other.” This will, according to Mr. Bradley, help them as they “write” the three paragraphs from the sentences on the worksheet. The interaction involves Kemo*, a Chuukese 9th grade boy who was a recent arrival to Hawai‘i, and who had lived in Guam for a period of time I was not able to determine. He was cheerful and polite and playful in class, with L2 proficiency that generally allowed him to participate orally in classroom activities although his L2 oral ability was by no means advanced. Sitting next to him was Jerry* a Southeast Asian G1.5 9th grader who had lived in the US for 10 years, who seldom came to class.

The interaction begins as Mr. Bradley has turned from the board to address the class about sentence A from the worksheet. Jerry has just thrown a wadded piece of paper (hard) at Kemo, and the paper has skittered away from Kemo onto the floor.
Mr. Bradley: KEMO! THROW that rubbish away! Throw it.
Kemo: (3) It’s his. ((gestures to Jerry next to him))

Mr. Bradley: I don’t care, throw it.
Kemo: Okay.

Mr. Bradley: Else I’m gonna make you eat it.
?Ss: ((laugh))

Mr. Bradley: I’m giving a very important lesson!=
Kemo: =I know.

Mr. Bradley: And you’re not paying attention. How dare you. (2) How dare you!
Kemo: Excuse me.

Mr. Bradley: If you’re gonna do that, don’t come. Don’t come to my class. (2)
You understand? Don’t come.

Kemo: ((contrite)) Yeah. (. .) I understand. ((gets up and throws paper
away)) Sorry. I understand.

Mr. Bradley: You don’t mean it. Your sorry is (. .) bullshit sorry. (3) OKAY!
KEMO! READ! A. (3) Read!

Kemo: A?
Mr. Bradley: Yeah, stand up and read.

Kemo: Ahh. ((gets up)) ((reading)) “The United States Pacific Command is
( .) centered in Hawai‘i.”

Mr. Bradley: Good. Is THIS tourism or military?
Regine: Military.

Kemo: ((sits down)).
Mr. Bradley: STAND UP! DID I SAY SIT DOWN?

Kemo: Oh! ((stands up fast))
Mr. Bradley: Is this TOURISM or military?

Kemo: (2) Military.
Mr. Bradley: Good boy. So we put A, here ((writes “A” under the “Military”
category on the board)). CONTINUE, Kemo!
Kemo: (Shoot.)

Mr. Bradley: B.
Kemo: ((reading)) “Other service industries are a big part of Hawai‘i’s
economy, too.”

Mr. Bradley: Okay. Is that tourism or is that military or is that something else?

Kemo: (3) I don’t understand.
Mr. Bradley: I give you three choices. Is it tourist, defense, or something else?

Kemo: (6) Other.
Mr. Bradley: Good boy. So you put “B” here ((writes “B” under the “Other”
category on the board)) KEMO! CONTINUE!

Kemo: (5) [C.

Mr. Bradley: [I’m making you learn. Okay?
Kemo: I know.

Mr. Bradley: Go.
Kemo: ((reading)) “Tourism is (. .) Hawai‘i’s (. ) leading industry.”
Mr. Bradley: Good. Is that here, here, or here ((pointing to the three categories on the board)).

Kemo: (12) Military.

Mr. Bradley: (2) Class, is he smart or stupid?

JohnyBoy: Stupi::d.

?MS: ((laugh))

Kemo: ((sits down)).

Mr. Bradley: Class? ((To Kemo)) STAND UP! Stand up. Read! “Tourism…”

Kemo: ((stands)) ((reading)) “Tourism is Hawai‘i’s leading industry.”=

Mr. Bradley: =Okay, where do we put that, here, here, or here? ((tapping the three categories on the board))

Kemo: Tourism.

Mr. Bradley: Thank you. Smart boy. D.

Kemo: ((reading)) “But there is much more – uh – there’s much more to Hawai‘i’s economy than tourists.”

Mr. Bradley: Where do we put that? (7) READ IT again. READ it again. (3)

I’m TEACHING you how to think. Okay?

Kemo: Yeah.

Mr. Bradley: READ IT AGAIN!

Kemo: ((reading)) “But there is much more to Hawai‘i’s economy than tourists.”

Mr. Bradley: Is it here, here, or here? ((tapping the three categories on the board))

Kemo: Military.

Mr. Bradley: (2) Read it again! (2) Read it again.

Kemo: ((reading)) “But there is much more to Hawai‘i’s economy than tourists.”

Mr. Bradley: Okay, where do you want to put that?

Kemo: Um::: (3)

Mr. Talmy: Kemo, look at the last word, what’s the last word?

Kemo: Oh. Tourist?

Mr. Bradley: Good! Tourist. Okay, Class! ((To Kemo)) Now you may sit down.

After catching Kemo (but not Jerry) in the act of “not paying attention”, Mr. Bradley commands him to throw the offending object (the wadded-up piece of paper) away. In line 5, Mr. Bradley makes what might be a hyperbolic threat about forcing Kemo to eat the paper if he doesn’t comply, a threat that several students in line 6 treat as humorous. At this point in the interaction, Mr. Bradley could just as well continue with his read-through of the worksheet sentences, but instead in line 7 he points out to Kemo
the error of his actions while he was “giving a very important lesson!” Thus he makes clear that he has not keyed a humorous frame, a point that Kemo seems well aware of as he latches Mr. Bradley’s answer with a quick “I know.,” uttered, perhaps in an effort to forestall the impending confrontation. In this regard, although it was still just a few weeks into the school year, students in Mr. Bradley’s classes were already well-aware of the potential for these events, no doubt from learned from experience as well as from Mr. Bradley’s reputation in the school.

Unfortunately for Kemo, Mr. Bradley presses on with the scolding, accusing him directly of not paying attention, an affront he counters twice, with increasing volume and intensity, with “How dare you. How dare you!” Kemo again acknowledges his error in line 10, with “Excuse me.”, but Mr. Bradley continues, telling him in lines 11-12 not to bother to come to class if he is going to engage in non-compliant behavior such as this. This was a challenge that Mr. Bradley would make on occasion to students, essentially daring them to drop out of his class (or school) unless they obeyed him, a challenge that on occasion students unfortunately followed through on (see below). Mr. Bradley underscores his seriousness in line 13 with the comprehension check “You understand?” Kemo’s tone of voice in his reply is indexical of contrition, and as he gets up to throw the paper away, he apologizes explicitly, repeating for a second time in line 14 “I understand.” However, Mr. Bradley rejects his apology as insincere: “Your sorry is ( . . ) bullshit sorry.” Having observed four of Mr. Bradley’s classes to this point in the study, the use of the expletive was a sure sign to me (and no doubt Mr. Kent, the PTT, and many of the students) that Kemo was about to be in for a rough time.
After a pause, Mr. Bradley in lines 15-16 returns to the instructional activity at hand: the reading of the sentences on the worksheet. Only now, rather than reading through the sentences as a class, he selects Kemo to do it instead. It is quite clear from the volume, emphasis, timing, repetitions, and intonation of his utterance here (as well as those that follow) that Kemo is about to be (further) singled out, and that "reading" is being readied as a form of retribution. This was another tactic that Mr. Bradley used to maintain control of student actions in his class: the ever-present threat of being held up for ridicule should one not perform to expectations for "appropriate" ESLL student conduct (also see Extract 9.14).

Kemo is indeed singled out when he is told to stand to read sentence A – no one to this point in the class period had been told to stand while speaking – and it appears he is aware of this with his "Ahh." in line 19. After he more or less successfully completes the reading, Mr. Bradley in line 21 evaluates Kemo’s contribution as "Good." Mr. Bradley then continues the "initiation, response, feedback" (IRF) participation structure68 with "Is THIS tourism or military?" However, Regine provides the answer to this question, not Kemo. Apparently believing his participation in this activity has finished, likely because another student has claimed the floor and completed the "response" turn in the participation structure, Kemo sits down, but does so before Mr. Bradley has provided a comment, either on the response or that Regine has provided it instead of Kemo. Immediately, Mr. Bradley shouts at Kemo "STAND UP! DID I SAY SIT DOWN?", the

68 A “participation structure” is the “patterned arrangements of interactional rights and responsibilities that frame the taking of turns among a group of participants in a particular interactional event or activity” (J. K. Hall, 1998, p. 287). The IRF (or IRE, “initiation-response-evaluation”) participation structure remains among the most common classroom discourse structures, consisting of a teacher's initiating move (e.g., nominating a student; posing a question to a student), the student’s response, and the teacher’s follow-up comment about that response (see Cazden, 2001; Mehan, 1979).
clearest signal to this point that this “activity” is serving some other purpose besides
determining which sentences should be grouped where. Kemo utters a surprised “Oh!”
and immediately rises. Mr. Bradley then repeats the question he initially posed in line 21,
only with slightly different intonation now: “Is this TOURISM or military?” In line 27
after a short pause, Kemo utters the correct answer, the same one that Regine provided in
line 22. Only now, Mr. Bradley completes the third turn of the three-part IRF sequence
with his evaluatory feedback, uttered in what might be construed as condescending terms:
“Good boy.” Mr. Bradley has asserted his authority significantly here. He has indicated
that no answer is correct or incorrect unless it has his imprimatur: Regine and Kemo
provided the same (one-word) answer, but because Regine was not ratified by Mr.
Bradley, her contribution did not qualify as an answer. Through this assertion of
authority, Mr. Bradley has also invoked a number of overlapping hierarchies, both in
direct and indirect indexical terms, which position Kemo in starkly asymmetrical terms
below him: not just as a (“non-native English-speaking,” “foreign,” ESLL) student who
participates at Mr. Bradley’s desire in the (English-medium) IRF, but through an
ostensibly approving evaluation that is reminiscent of one given to young boys or dogs
(see below).

Mr. Bradley in line 29 then commands Kemo to “CONTINUE,” and in line 30,
Kemo again signals an awareness (as he did in line 19) that Mr. Bradley likely has other
goals in mind for this interactional display. He continues with the reading of sentence B,
but struggles with its classification, taking a total of nine seconds (three in line 35, six in
line 37) to come up with the answer. Again, Mr. Bradley evaluates the reply with “Good
boy.” He then commands him to again “CONTINUE!” After another lengthy five-
second pause in line 40, Kemo begins to read sentence C, but is overlapped by Mr. Bradley, who points out to Kemo the newly amended goal for this exercise: indeed, it is not about classifying sentences, it is “I’m making you learn.” What he is making Kemo learn is clear: that it is not acceptable to “not pay attention,” or “disrespect” Mr. Bradley (from Extract 9.12), or not comply with his expectations for student participation; that he has the power in the classroom, not Kemo, Jerry, or any other (G1.5) student. If one does not pay attention or if one disrespects him or in some other way resists or makes claims to the forms of power he views as rightfully his, they will be singled out for just this sort of public punishment.

The form that this punishment will take is signaled in the next sequences in the interaction. Sentence D poses more of a challenge for Kemo both in terms of reading and classifying. After reading it with more marked disfluency, he pauses for fully 12 seconds (line 47), after which he guesses the wrong category for the sentence. Mr. Bradley now has precisely the material he needs for Kemo’s “learning” to take place; indeed it is likely why he has commanded Kemo to “CONTINUE” in the first place, that is, to keep him going until he has stumbled in his L2 oral production. Now, he invokes his audience, the “Class,” drawing them into alignment with him as co-arbiters of Kemo, crucially not of Kemo’s performance, but his intelligence: “is he smart or stupid?” This is another instance of conflating L2 proficiency with intelligence at Tradewinds (see Chapter 8).

---

69 I say this having observed numerous other instances in which students were similarly pushed beyond their L2 capabilities and/or capacity for stress, after which L2 production became noticeably more disfluent.

70 In fact, I prefer to interpret this as a play on the practice at Tradewinds of conflating L2 proficiency with intelligence, an invocation of it in order to make a point, rather than an “accurate” expression of Mr. Bradley’s views on ESLL. I prefer this interpretation only because I witnessed Mr. Bradley’s occasionally vociferous defense of ESLL students to non-ESLL program staff. In addition, in an instance in which a G1.5 student called a classmate “stupid” Mr. Bradley said “Excuse me? What did you say? Only I can say
and it further keys the frame of display, of performance: Kemo is being made an example of, both for his “benefit” and for that of the class. JohnyBoy utters the obvious answer to Mr. Bradley’s question here, with equally obvious enjoyment: “Stupi::d.” Thus, following from Mr. Bradley’s comment in Extract 9.12 (“Don’t act dumb, like ESL students!”), Kemo is being singled out and held up for class ridicule as an ESL student: he is being FOBed. Mr. Bradley is in effect communicating the message to Kemo and to the class “do this again, and I will do this to you.” “This,” unfortunately, involves FOBeing, and thus draws heavily on the linguicist discourses about ESLL in circulation at Tradewinds (e.g., ESLL student = stupid) and interactionally, relies on students’ lower L2 proficiency, status, and power, each of which are utilized so that Mr. Bradley can make his point. This is arguably a form of interactional bullying that communicates his ability (and will) to turn an everyday instructional activity into a very public rebuke about morality and manners, power and position.

By drawing on linguicist discourses and ideologies about ESLL, Mr. Bradley not only reproduces but authorizes them, providing a “lesson” for students, including G1.5 students such as JohnyBoy, that it is acceptable and appropriate to have them circulating in the ESLL classroom. Indeed, JohnyBoy’s utterance in line 49 (“Stupi::d.”) and possibly the laugh from the male student that follows it, can be seen as instances of (G1.5) students being apprenticed into the sorts of practices they themselves invoke and draw on in their production of G1.5 CoP membership, which are based on the mainstream/ESLL identity hierarchy and which also work to reproduce it. This is a point that I elaborate in the section following this one, in which G1.5 students engage in a

‘stupid.’” (ELB42Yfn: 164). However, I realize that regardless of intention, the consequences of this practice are the same, as I argue below.
number of similar sorts of interactions whereby they participate in similar practices as Mr. Bradley’s above.

After Mr. Bradley has publicly and explicitly made his apparent point for this “lesson” – Kemo is stupid for having transgressed classroom rules – Kemo sits down, perhaps a sign that he recognizes the lesson has ended. In line 52, however, Mr. Bradley, addresses the class once again, possibly to get more evaluations from them of Kemo’s answer and/or intelligence. He then sees Kemo has sat down, without permission, and again loudly commands, “STAND UP! Stand up. Read!” Again, Kemo stands and again, repeats the sentence that he has misclassified. In line 56, he corrects his mistake, and Mr. Bradley now evaluates him not as “Good boy.” (as in line 28 and line 38), but as “Smart boy.” Mr. Bradley is once more communicating his power as teacher to be able to redesignate a student just moments ago called “stupid” by “the Class.” as a “smart boy.”

Kemo is told to read sentence D next, which he does but again with more difficulty than the previous sentences. After being asked to classify the sentence, he once more pauses for a very lengthy period, this time seven seconds. Mr. Bradley does not wait for him to answer, but orders him to read the sentence again: “READ IT again. READ it again.” After a pause of three more seconds, Mr. Bradley again orients Kemo to the amended goal of the lesson: “I’m TEACHING you how to think. Okay?” After Kemo responds, Mr. Bradley repeats loudly, “READ IT AGAIN!” After misclassifying the sentence, Kemo is again ordered to read the sentence once more and attempt to classify it. As he pauses in line 72 to provide an answer, I call across to room to him, “Kemo, look at the last word, what’s the last word?” With his “Oh.” indicating a “shift in orientation” to information (Schiffrin, 1989, pp. 73-74), Kemo then utters the “correct”
answer, at which time Mr. Bradley ends this lesson with a pointed “Now you may sit down.” to Kemo.

My comment to Kemo in line 73 came because I had become uncomfortable with what was happening in the interaction represented in Extract 9.15 (my field notes included the bracketed observation, “this is criminal.”). This was not a role I often took as publicly in Mr. Bradley’s classes, perhaps for apparent reasons, and it was one I did not have to take much at all in the first-year ESLL teachers’ classes. But here, I felt intervention was needed. The entire purpose of the activity had been perverted: there was no instruction or discussion about the meaning of the sentences, which students were having difficulty with and which prompted this review activity to begin with. Nowhere in the interaction in Extract 9.15 is there any recognition that Kemo may not be able to classify these sentences because he could not understand them, even though in line 35 he clearly states “I don’t understand.” Indeed, his humiliation was based on and extended by the assumption that he did not have the L2 proficiency to participate adequately, that he would make a mistake if pushed long and hard enough. Thus, in Mr. Bradley’s instantiation of this particular iteration of the mainstream/native-speaker–ESLL/non-native speaker hierarchy, Kemo’s L2 proficiency is being used against him. Judging from Mr. Bradley’s demeanor at the time, it did not appear that this “lesson” was going to end anytime soon. I felt it needed to end, and frankly, I was relieved that Mr. Bradley opted not to continue it.

As the (comparatively mild) interactions represented in the extracts in this section suggest, (G1.5) student participation in Mr. Bradley’s classes was notably different than it was in the first-year teachers’ classes. These interactions should also give some
indication as to why this was. The sorts of G1.5 CoP practices so clearly evident in all of the first-year ESLL teachers classes that I observed were not nearly as apparent in Mr. Bradley’s classes, due not only to a teacher-oriented classroom in which nearly all interactional opportunities were tightly-controlled, but also because of the general threat of consequences that hung over the class should Mr. Bradley’s rules and expectations for appropriate student participation be violated: threats of lowered grades, calls home, staying in for lunch or after school, insults, the kind of humiliation endured by Kemo – in short, Mr. Bradley’s willingness to invoke his power as classroom teacher, adult, expert in English and to do so in terms that drew on and reproduced the mainstream/ESLL identity hierarchy and the linguicist discourses that constituted it.

This not to suggest, however, that resistance did not occur in Mr. Bradley’s classes. As I have alluded earlier, beneath the surface of an obedient and efficiently running class were more subtle manifestations of student performance strikes, all much more indirect and “off-the-record.” There were few of the more direct confrontations in practices such as “neva du am” and “bell’s gonna ring,” but they were still apparent: students might do the in-class work, but “forget” the homework; they might leave their materials on their desks until the end of class rather than pack them up early, but still would not do work toward the end of class. There were also other more underground manifestations of G1.5 student performance strikes such as copying and cheating in Mr. Bradley’s classes than in the other ESLL classes. I observed numerous instances of G1.5 students copying (but skillfully modifying) the summary assignments, for example, from classmates who had done the assignments. In the final semester of research, for example, China, Barehand, and Benz, among other G1.5 students who were in Mr. Bradley’s class
and had the previous year had Mr. Day or Ms. Ariel as teachers, all turned in more classwork in one quarter in Mr. Bradley’s class than they had the entire year in the first-year ESLL teachers’ classes. Yet the bulk of this material was copied, China’s primarily from Bush and 618, Benz and Barehand’s work from a newcomer Korean girl.\(^{71}\) I also observed rampant cheating in Mr. Bradley’s classes on the vocabulary quizzes and other tests, from crib sheets to copying neighbors’ papers, likely because in comparison to the first-year ESLL teachers, he was not as generous in providing additional test preparation (see Chapter 10) or extra time to complete tests in.

Another important manifestation of G1.5 student performance strikes in Mr. Bradley’s classes involved cutting class, that is, simply not showing up. This was perhaps the “safest” practice in terms of not being accountable to Mr. Bradley’s punishment, at least if one’s returns to class were sporadic, but it was also the one that had the most serious consequences, ranging from phone calls home to threatened legal problems.\(^{72}\) This practice is implicated in Mr. Bradley’s comment to Kemo in lines 12-13 of Extract 9.15: “If you’re gonna do that, don’t come. Don’t come to my class. (2) You understand? Don’t come.” Indeed, several ESLL students took up this challenge and stopped coming to Mr. Bradley’s class, and therefore faced the possibility of dropping out of school entirely.

\(^{71}\) I first learned of China’s copying when I asked him what he thought of the reading books in Mr. Bradley’s class (compared to the year previous) and he noted: “I didn’t really read the book.” When I asked how he could do the book work (which he had been turning in regularly), he replied, “The summary and vocab I got is some from 618 and Bush.” (ELB52Wfn: 130-137). Comparison of selected assignments from these students confirms this. Interestingly, and in a way that lends some further support to my thesis about more “underground” resistance here, the modality for this informal in-class interview was not oral, as virtually all of my informal in-class interviews in the first-year ESLL teachers’ classes were, but was a series of scribbled exchanges on a note that China and I passed back and forth during the class period, as Mr. Bradley was teaching.

\(^{72}\) Truant students can be referred to family court in Hawai’i, where they may be placed under court supervision to ensure school attendance or (rarely) face placement in a detention home.
Thus, although resistance in Mr. Bradley’s classes was less overtly apparent than it was in the first-year ESLL teachers’ classes, it was still in evidence. This was also manifest in the consequences of resistance on classroom instruction: beyond the transformation of lessons into episodes such as IwannaFAL and Kemo had to endure above, Mr. Bradley also wound up not checking out his books, just as all the other ESLL teachers I observed, in response to too many students leaving their books at home, losing them, and so forth. Thus, just as in the other teachers’ classes, instruction in Mr. Bradley’s classes slowed down as increasing amounts of class time were spent on work that had originally been assigned for homework, especially the reading of the children’s books and the associated book work. One of the clearest signs of the effects of students’ subtle resistance in the class involved one of Mr. Bradley’s valued performances of a number of choral readings – including Martin Luther King, Jr.’s I have a dream speech (see Appendix K.2) and a performance piece entitled “Remembering...” (see Appendix K.9), which consisted of poems written by 6th graders about the attacks of September 11, 2001 – at a Tradewinds Open House event in the third year of research. Too few students had memorized their parts, and in a moment of anger (that students would variously experience for a number of class sessions afterward), Mr. Bradley cancelled the ESLL students’ participation in the program.

G1.5 and non-G1.5 students: Peripherality vs. marginality

Although my focus in this chapter has been on G1.5 students, teachers, and how the G1.5 community practices affected both teachers and classroom processes, I do not mean to suggest that only teachers and G1.5 students were participants in (or targets of)
socializing processes. As I also discuss in Chapter 10, non-G1.5 students, too, as legitimate peripheral participants to G1.5 community practices were obviously involved as well. However, in distinction to the teachers, the effects of G1.5 community practices, beyond the obvious outcomes for all class participants of the slowing down of the curriculum, the increase of the worksheets, the reduced demands, and so on, was less noticeable for many non-G1.5 students than for teachers, primarily because their tenuous, peripheral, mostly non-participation in G1.5 community practices was characterized by ambiguity. There were a number of possible reasons for non-participation, from orientations that were more consistent with and accommodating of the formal enterprise, values, and goals of the ESLL program and the school (cf. the Jocks in Eckert, 1989; 2000; or the ear’oles in Willis, 1977) to L2 English proficiencies that were simply too undeveloped to participate meaningfully in any L2 English interaction in the classroom or outside it. An additional reason had to do with the interactional risks that attended participation, not just in G1.5 community practices, but in the “official” CoP as well, that is, in any L2 oral production in the ESLL classes. The G1.5 ESLL student identity was relationally defined not only in terms of the ESLL program, the exotifying curriculum and so forth, but also the “real” ESLL students, those students whom the G1.5 members needed to perform their “difference” from, in order to be different, that is, to be the group that I have labeled “G1.5” (cf. Barth, 1969; Chapter 8). This need for G1.5 students to have non-G1.5 students in order to take up a practice in which they could relationally distinguish themselves from them – specifically, through the practice of FOBeing – resulted in many non-G1.5 students being kept at times in positions of marginality in ESLL classrooms, which thereby undercut efforts they may have made to participate,
particularly orally, in ESLL activities. In short, G1.5 ESLL students’ needs for a relational Other to perform their identity work against as they participated in another practice that produced G1.5 community membership impeded many non-G1.5 students’ full participation in virtually any public classroom L2 oral practices.

I will illustrate this phenomenon below, as well as in a related, more extended discussion in Chapter 10. However, before doing so, it is important to pause briefly to consider the differences between peripherality and marginality in communities of practice theory.

As discussed in Chapter 3, non-participation in community practices is an essential component for learning in CoP theory: it is through legitimate peripheral participation, an enabling form of non-participation, that participants can observe, interact with oldtimers, and over time be apprenticed into and appropriate community practices, such that newcomers become fully participating CoP members. This is not to say that people are full participants in each one of the many CoP that they are members of, or that they are members of the many more CoP that they come into contact with. People have various degrees and relations of participation in the different CoP they are members of, just as they are “constantly passing boundaries” of CoP they are not members of, “catching, as [they] peek into foreign chambers, glimpses of other realities and meanings” (Wenger, 1998, p. 165).

Notions of peripherality and marginality proceed from non-participation. The difference, as Wenger (1998, p. 166) puts it, is in terms of “the context of trajectories that determine the significance of participation”: 
Newcomers, for instance may be on an inbound trajectory [in the CoP] that is construed by everyone to include full participation in its future. Non-participation is then an opportunity for learning. Even for people whose trajectory remains peripheral, nonparticipation is an enabling aspect of their participation because full participation is not a goal to start with. . . . Whether non-participation becomes peripherality or marginality depends on relations of participation that render non-participation either enabling or problematic (Wenger, 1998, pp. 166-167).

Thus, in contrast to peripherality, marginality is a disabling form of non-participation, and results when peripheral participants are prevented or denied from full participation in a community’s practices, e.g., by the CoP full participants (cf. Norton, 2001). In an effort to more clearly elaborate these distinctions, Wenger (1998) continues with a discussion of “four main categories” of CoP participation:

- full participation (insider);
- full non-participation (outsider);
- peripherality (participation enabled by non-participation, whether it leads to full participation or remains on a peripheral trajectory);
- marginality (participation restricted by non-participation, whether it leads to non-membership or to a marginal position) (Wenger, 1998, p. 167).

In order to illustrate further the contrast between peripherality and marginality, I turn next to the following two sub-sections. In the first, I briefly consider an interaction in which a legitimate peripheral newcomer in the ESLL classroom has her participation in G1.5 community practices enabled, such that she can be termed a newcomer G1.5 student. This is followed by a series of interactions concerning students I term “non-G1.5
students,” in which legitimate peripheral newcomers in the ESLL classroom have their participation in G1.5 community practices denied, indeed, who are used by G1.5 students to index difference, and thus are cast into marginal positions in the classroom.

*Peripherality*

The interaction in this section highlights non-participation as an enabling form of CoP apprenticeship. Interestingly, it concerns an oldtimer G1.5 ESLL student (Ioane); a more recent newcomer G1.5 student who has moved to full participation in G1.5 CoP practices over the course of the year (Laidplayer); and a legitimate peripheral newcomer G1.5 student named Marnie. In it, Laidplayer and Ioane teach Marnie about selling batteries and “trading” lunch tickets, two practices that some Local students engaged in at Tradewinds to make money.

At the time of this interaction, Marnie, a 16-year-old 9th grader from American Samoa, had been at Tradewinds for approximately six months. Her L2 oral proficiency enabled her to participate in most classroom activities, but not much more beyond that, and her infrequent public attempts through the year to display her L2 competence in interaction had seldom met with success. In an interview with me, Ioane stated outright that Marnie was a FOB, but that because she was from Samoa, Ioane, as a Tongan, felt a strong affinity with her, particularly because they were at this point in the school year, the only two Polynesian girls in the class. For this reason, Ioane seemed to take Marnie

---

73 Once again, to underscore how length of residence can be a misleading criterion of affiliation or G1.5 community membership: Marnie and Laidplayer arrived in Hawai‘i within one week of one another, although Laidplayer was by far the more engaged participant in G1.5 practices. See Chapter 2 for more discussion of this point.
under wing and mentor her in the ways and wherefores of G1.5 ESLL student life, even though other G1.5 students (particularly Laidplayer) found Marnie "erkin" (irritating).74

The following interaction takes place in Mr. Day’s class, just after students have been given a grammar assignment from Dixon (1956). Mr. Day is passing out the remnants of these by-now tattered books to students, but at this point in the term, enough of them have been destroyed that there is no longer an adequate number for the students to use individually, meaning that students must now share. Ioane, Laidplayer, and Marnie are sitting in a group toward the back of the hot and noisy classroom waiting for Mr. Day to pass out books to them.

(9.16) Batteries [ELA41XmdS10: 653-700]75

1 Laidplayer: Mistah, ai laik wan buk!
   Mister, I want a book!
   Mr. Day: You like one?
3 Laidplayer: Yeah, it’s kinda hot.
   Mr. Day: (I don’t have) one for you, I don’t have any extra. Why don’t you try share with, uh Marnie or something? (1) Or Ioane’s sharing, too.
5 Laidplayer: ((high pitched, child-like voice)) She’s mean to me::!
   Mr. Day: You can share with IwannaFAL.
   Laidplayer: ((fast; hustler’s voice)) Mistah, ai get badariz, yu laik bai.
   Mister, I have batteries, do you want to buy some?
7 Laidplayer: ((inaudible)
   Mr. Day: (.) No thanks. I have [(inaudible)
   Laidplayer: [It’s only fifty cents for two! I mean – yeah?
9 Mr. Day: (.)
   Ioane: I like – oh::
11 Laidplayer: ((shows a small box of batteries)) I buy it for only five dollars.
13 Mr. Day: Five dollars?
   Laidplayer: I bought this for like twelve dollars, you know.
15 Ioane: [Weit, ai laik bai badariz, Laidplayer!
   Wait, I want to buy some batteries, Laidplayer!
   Mr. Day: [(inaudible)

74 In apparent exchange for this mentorship, Ioane indicated that Marnie would provide her with occasional homework or classwork assignments which Ioane would then copy and turn in for class credit. Ioane also asserted that Laidplayer did the same for her, at least occasionally (SINT15: 96).
75 Laidplayer carried the mini-disc recorder for this interaction.
17 Laidplayer: Fo ril!
      Really!
   Mr. Day: I don’t need batteries.
19 Ioane: Fifty cents for two?
 Mr. Day: Laidplayer.
21 Laidplayer: Shutz.
    Mr. Day: Laidplayer. Why don’t you try work with someone. If there’s too
    many people here, you can work with IwannaFAL, yae {yeah}?
23 Laidplayer: Yeah. IwannaFAL! ((Mr. Day walks away))
25 Ioane: ((to Marnie, holding one of the batteries)) With this I get to listen to
    the CD player when I (inaudible).
27 Marnie: Give me that! (inaudible)
 Laidplayer: It’s AA batteries, Duracell. ((quoting voice)) [“Long lasting power::”
29 Ioane: [inaudible] (3)
 Laidplayer: ((to Sharon)) Batteries. I sell this today. I’m gon sell –
31 Ioane: No, chrai laik, laik, wach. Ai tel eribadi at skul, (inaudible) ai go
    ((innocent voice)) “oh, Laidplayer’s selling batteries, fifty cents for
    two.” Ho, yu get mani, laik dat.
33 Laidplayer: Tch. ((sing song)) [Aweso::me!
35 Ioane: [Yu get mani laik dat. [(inaudible)
                You'll make money like that.
    Mr. Day: [(approaching, to nearby
37 students)) Why don’t you guys try and finish (inaudible)
    Marnie: Even there a lot of, um, Samoans [(inaudible)]?
39 Laidplayer: [Yae, kaz yu no, dei get CD pleirz
                at skul.]
        Yeah, because you know, they
        have CD players at school.
41 Ioane: Yu get chok mani wit dat.
        You’ll make a lot of money with that.
 Laidplayer: Set! ((coins clinking on desk: Marnie and Ioane buy batteries))
43 ((low-pitch, giving batteries)) Two for Ioane::, two for Marnie.
    Marnie: Oh, (inaudible)?
        Because they’re looking for batteries. What. They’re gonna buy
        them.
 Laidplayer: ((laughs))
47 Ioane: Oh, even lunch tickets!
 Laidplayer: Lunch, oh yea::h!
49 Ioane: That’s the number, the number one is this. ((pulls out lunch ticket))
 Laidplayer: [Oh, yeah?
51 Marnie: [Yeah.
Laidplayer: Bat lanch tiket, dei treid, yae? Dei treid [fo dala. 
*But lunch tickets, they trade them, right? They trade them for dollars.*

Ioane: [Yae. Dei tres fo dala. Yeah. They trade them for dollars.

Selling AA batteries to friends and classmates was a relatively common practice among some Local students at Tradewinds, which according to Laidplayer and Ioane, was also a very lucrative one since so many students brought to school CD players, MP3 players, and mini-disc players that ran on them.\(^76\) In fact, having a CD player, MP3 player, and/or mini-disc player and bringing it to school, inevitably tucked into backpack, with ear-bud headphones draped over shoulders or inconspicuously pushed into ears was itself indexical of a mainstream or Local style, if not identity, as it was one of the ubiquitous accessories that helped to comprise an archetypal mainstream student “uniform” (see below) (cf. Eckert, 1989; 2000). Here then, Laidplayer is performing one of GI.5 students’ emblematic roles as brokers in the ESLL classroom: signifying connections to communities and community practices from beyond the ESLL classroom, and introducing them into it.

In line 8, Laidplayer brings the batteries to Mr. Day’s attention with his “Mistah, ai get badariz, yu laik bai?”, which given the instructional and interactional context, as well as the style in which it is uttered, seems marked to the extent that it is humorous. Laidplayer is here orienting Mr. Day to both the material and symbolic aspects of this particular practice, not just in terms of the batteries, but in his switch to Pidgin: he is

---

\(^{76}\) Because I used a mini-disc recorder for recording classes, I was frequently approached by students who a) wanted to examine the MD technology, and/or b) wanted to “borrow” batteries. In a number interviews, too, after the session had finished, I was asked for batteries with the stock phrase, “Mistah, ai laik badariz.”
indexing difference from the structural and official cultural productions of ESLL student identity, that is, he is being a G1.5 ESLL student. Mr. Day indicates he is not interested, which might be viewed perhaps as figurative rejection of Laidplayer’s identity claim as well. However, Ioane, is interested, as her self-interruption and change of state token “oh” in line 11 indicates. She orients to a box of batteries that Laidplayer shows and then in line 15, informs him that she wants to buy some, noting with some surprise in line 19 the price that he has set. Laidplayer continues to interact with Mr. Day, who by line 22, has indicated the inappropriateness of the topic by uttering in a serious tone of voice Laidplayer’s name twice (lines 20, 22). In line 21, Laidplayer provides some uptake, as he also does in line 24, after Mr. Day, no doubt sensing that the batteries will become a distraction, suggests Laidplayer go to work with IwannaFAL.

Given my emphasis in this section, what is of particular interest in this interaction begins in line 25. Here, Ioane begins an explanation to the G1.5 CoP initiate Mamie about the purpose of the batteries that Laidplayer is selling, that is, “With this I get to listen to the CD player”. In this regard, she is orienting Mamie to a social practice that she (an oldtimer G1.5 student) commonly participates in and that is indexical of Local or the mainstream (and thus, not of ESLL). She is also pointing out Laidplayer as the literal and figurative “source” of this practice, that is, as offering for sale the means by which these CD players are powered. Following Mamie’s turn in line 27, where it appears (given Laidplayer’s response in line 28) that she asks what the batteries are, or are for, 77 In an animated informal classroom interview about selling batteries, Laidplayer informed me that other students charged 50 cents each for batteries, but that that was “a rip-off.” Instead, he said, he sold them for 25 cents each, which because it was such a bargain, ensured a steady stream of satisfied customers. My suspicion is that the batteries were stolen – cf. the question about the cost of the batteries in lines 12-14 – but that is only speculation.
Laidplayer joins Ioane in the role of teacher, or G1.5 oldtimer, explaining that “It’s AA batteries, Duracell.” He then references his familiarity with a well-known slogan used to advertise this brand: “Long lasting power.” This once more signals Laidplayer’s links to linguistic and cultural resources beyond the ESLL program, in this instance in terms of US pop-cultural knowledge as represented in TV commercials.

Following an inaudible utterance from Ioane in line 29, Laidplayer again explains that they’re “Batteries.” but now goes on to clarify what he will do with them: “I sell this today. I’m gon sell–”. He thus explicitly refers to another indexical practice, one which was, at least from my observations, even more specific to mainstream/Local communities than simply listening to CD players alone. As Laidplayer pauses in mid-sentence, Ioane then retakes the floor in lines 31-33, switching into Pidgin as she describes a hypothetical situation as a means to better explain the purpose of Laidplayer’s battery sales: to make money. This, as Ioane emphasizes, is easy to do when selling batteries so cheaply: “Ho, yu get mani, laik dat.” (Damn, you’ll make money, like that). Following Laidplayer’s positive evaluation of this prospect in line 34, Ioane repeats it (line 35). The repetitions, her emphasis and intonation, and the switch to Pidgin index an affective stance of strong approval, and her use of “will” is an epistemic index of certainty that suggests that her knowledge is based on long-term or repeated first-hand experience. Ioane’s utterance here accomplishes much: it indexes her own memberships and histories of participation in Local and mainstream CoP, and thus her non-ESLL (and what I am glossing as G1.5) social identity, as well as her standing as an oldtimer in the G1.5 CoP; it is a sign of strong approval to Laidplayer, a newcomer G1.5 full participant, that participation in this particular practice is commensurate with the joint enterprise and mutual engagement of
the G1.5 CoP (i.e., that it indexically differentiates G1.5 students from newcomer/non-G1.5/FOB ESLL students), and thus is a (possibly new) constitutive practice of its shared repertoire; and it provides Mamie with important G1.5 cultural knowledge she can draw on should she choose to participate in G1.5 community practices and perform a G1.5/non-ESLL identity. This is precisely the sort of enablement that Wenger (1998) speaks of in terms of CoP peripherality (rather than marginality).

In lines 36-37, Mr. Day approaches a group of G1.5 students nearby with a directive, which provides a reminder that this interaction is taking place during official classroom instructional time, albeit a “study hall” activity. This highlights one of the many roles that study hall served, here, providing a space in which socializing interactions such as the one in Extract 9.16 could occur (see Chapter 10).

In line 38, Mamie asks a question which indicates that she still has not quite understood the purpose behind the selling of batteries, a point underscored previously by Laidplayer’s and Ioane’s (repeated) explanations (lines 28, 30, 31-33, 35) as well as farther below (lines 39, 45). In line 39, for example, Laidplayer overlaps Mamie’s question with his own switch to Pidgin “Yae, kaz yu no, dei get CD pleirz at skul.” (Yeah, because you know, they have CD players at school.); thus, Mamie’s question appears to have been about Samoans needing batteries. Ioane reiterates in line 41 about the money Laidplayer can expect, “Yu get chok mani wit dat.” (You’ll make a lot of money with that). Both Marnie and Ioane then buy batteries but in line 44, Marnie again asks a question, suggesting that she still doesn’t understand what the batteries are for. And Ioane again explains in line 45, “Kaz dei lukin fo badariz. Wat. Dei gon bai am.” Laidplayer then laughs, possibly at the thought of making “chok mani,” possibly because
Marnie, a newcomer ESLL student, is having such difficulty comprehending this particular social practice.

In line 47, Ioane suddenly changes subjects from batteries to lunch tickets. Selling lunch tickets – or to use the terminology of Local/mainstream students at Tradewinds, “trading” lunch tickets – was a practice that many students receiving free or reduced price lunch participated in, in order to make money. Students who received free or reduced price lunch in public schools came from low-income families. They would receive their lunch tickets in weekly allotments, and those students who wanted to engage in “trading” would walk up and down the lunch line during lunch period offering them for a dollar.

In line 48, after Ioane has changed subjects from batteries to lunch tickets, Laidplayer utters “Lunch, oh yea::h!” Laidplayer’s “oh” here functions as a “recognition display” (Schiffrin, 1989, p. 91), that is, a recognition of familiar information, only here, Laidplayer appears only to have oriented to “lunch” rather than “lunch tickets.” Thus, the approval he indexes through his intonation and vowel stretch seems to be about lunch as an event, or more probably about food for lunch (a common topic of conversation in all the classes I observed), not lunch tickets as a means to make money. Thus, after Ioane exclaims that lunch tickets are “number one” in line 49 and extracts one from her pocket, Laidplayer in line 50 says “Oh, yeah?” This is a qualitatively different “oh”, however,

78 According to the Food and Nutrition Service (2004, p. 2), the branch of the US Department of Agriculture responsible for overseeing the National School Lunch Program, students who come from families that are at a poverty level of $24,505 or lower for a family of four receive free lunch; students from families that are at a poverty level between that and $34,873 for a family of four receive reduced price lunch (the maximum charge for which is 40 cents). Many of the ESLL students qualified for the program; according to one of the part-time temporary teachers, however, many of the newcomer, mainly non-G1.5 students did not know this. Therefore, that Ioane and Laidplayer are discussing this at all is further indicative of their connections to Local/mainstream communities.
from that in line 48, one which signals a shift in Laidplayer’s orientation to information (Schiffrin, p. 74): he has seen the lunch ticket and now indicates an understanding that the talk is not about lunch but about them. Thus his “yeah?” here is indexical of Laidplayer’s comparative newcomer status as a G1.5 CoP full participant, returning him to a less knowledgeable status, an apprentice still learning; it appears he didn’t know that lunch tickets were “number one.” Marnie’s overlapping “Yeah.” is interesting here in that it is an epistemic index of certainty, whereas Laidplayer’s in line 50 clearly is not, though Marnie’s participation in and knowledge of G1.5 community practices is far more peripheral and tenuous than Laidplayer’s. In line 52, however, he reclaims his relative position, however, when he asks Ioane, in Pidgin, to confirm (and in the process display his knowledge) that “Bat lanch tiket, dei treid, yae? Dei treid fo dala.” (But lunch tickets, they trade them, right? They trade them for dollars.) even using the correct terminology of “trade” rather than “buy,” which was uttered (in Pidgin, as “bai”) just a few short turns earlier (line 45). Ioane overlaps his utterance with “Yae. Dei tred fo dala.” (Yeah. They trade them for dollars.), which thereby reestablishes the hierarchy of oldtimer and newcomer, with Ioane as the G1.5 community master (at least in this triad), Laidplayer as the apprentice engaging in full community participation (to the extent that he has brought in a (new) practice from the Local/mainstream communities), and Marnie, the legitimate peripheral newcomer.

As Wenger (1998, p. 100) notes, “[p]eripherality provides an approximation of full participation [in a CoP] that gives exposure to actual practice.” In the interaction represented in Extract 9.16, Marnie is provided such approximate participation, with her engagement in this particular practice carefully scaffolded by Ioane to the extent that she
goes so far as to buy two of the batteries that Laidplayer is selling, even when it is apparent that she is unsure why she is buying them (cf. lines 44-45). This is clearly an enabling form of peripheral participation in G1.5 community practices. It makes available to Marnie crucial cultural knowledge that gives her a sense of how the community operates – in terms of this practice, that it takes place as it does during class time, how oldtimers talk and interact, and so forth – all of which are facilitative of increasing participation in the G1.5 CoP. Evident in this data extract as well is the bolstering of Laidplayer’s emergent identity as a G1.5 ESLL student, as he helps to initiate a newcomer into G1.5 community practices, and receives further instruction (i.e., regarding the lunch tickets) about Local and mainstream CoP. And finally, Ioane’s identity as a G1.5 ESLL student and her membership in the G1.5 CoP is reproduced in relational terms here, as she works to apprentice these two newcomers into G1.5 CoP life. In these terms, the role of legitimate peripheral participation for the reproduction and transformation of CoP is apparent.

The next sub-section provides a strong contrast to the enabling form of participation provided to Marnie in her position of peripherality, and the disabling forms of participation indicative of marginality outlined below.

**Marginality**

My argument in this section concerns how G1.5 students worked to keep non-G1.5 students in more marginal positions, certainly in terms of the G1.5 CoP, but also in the official CoP of their ESLL classroom. They did so primarily through their indexical performances of difference from non-G1.5 students, that is, in terms of FOBeing,
positioning classmates as FOBs which thereby relationally distinguished the G1.5 students as non-FOBs.\textsuperscript{79} As Raven and China’s performance of Mock ESL above suggested, much of these performances of difference concerned putative disparities in students’ L2 English proficiencies (cf. Miller, 2003, 2004); however, they also involved aspects of students’ dress and style. In these respects, G1.5 students were pivotal in bringing into the ESLL classrooms the mainstream/ESLL hierarchy, and the linguicist ideologies and discourses that comprised it.\textsuperscript{80}

This point is illustrated in the FOBeing practice in Extract 9.17, which is taken from Mr. Day’s class. At the time of the interaction, the class was doing a whole-group discussion of vocabulary words. Students had been assigned to write one sentence for one of the 15 words, and Mr. Day was calling on those students to read their sentence for the word they have been assigned.\textsuperscript{81}

The interaction takes place just as Mr. Day calls for a sentence from someone who was assigned the word “moment,” in this instance, Bush. As I mentioned above, Bush was a non-G1.5 student who was a member of a small friendship group in Mr. Day’s class comprised of L1 Cantonese speakers. Bush was a capable student, who regularly received A’s and B’s in his classes (and as such was a sometimes unwilling source for a considerable amount of the homework that was copied in the ESLL classes).

\textsuperscript{79} See the section above on the topic of FOBeing; also see the discussion of Extract 9.11, regarding Sky Blue, Tony, Michelle, and Bush.

\textsuperscript{80} This is not to suggest that all advanced L2 proficient students were automatically G1.5 students, of course (see Chapter 2); indeed there were several students in each class who were more advanced in the L2 and were not G1.5 students, but were more oriented toward accommodating the structural and official cultural productions of ESLL. In the classes I observed, they were most often from the Philippines (e.g., Regine, Raul, Kenlyn, Tiare) and Hong Kong (e.g., Jeanie, Kitty, Ben), among others.

\textsuperscript{81} At the start of the year, this activity involved students writing sentences for all of the 15 vocabulary words. By this point in the school year, this exercise was down to students writing a sentence for one word. By the end of the year, this activity had largely been abandoned and Mr. Day was providing the sentences.
However, in contrast to his advanced L2 print-literacy abilities, his oral L2 English provided him unique challenges, particularly in terms of pronunciation, which was sometimes difficult to comprehend. Also involved in the interaction is Mack Daddy, the G1.5 student from Chuuk who had lived in the US for five years.

(9.17) *I don speak no Inglich*  [ELA32Xmd7: 2007-2017]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FSs:</th>
<th>((overlapping talk)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mr. Day:</td>
<td>“Moment”! Who’s doing “moment”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bush:</td>
<td>((raises hand))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Day:</td>
<td>Alright good Bush, go. ((to the talking girls)) Hey! Sh!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mochenia:</td>
<td>((inaudible))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bush:</td>
<td>((reading from his paper)) (“The murderer have used a few moment to kill four little girl and buried her.”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bush:</td>
<td>(1) A few moment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Day:</td>
<td>((Goes over to look at Bush’s paper)) (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mack Daddy:</td>
<td>((Mock ESL; low nasal monotone)) I don speak no Inglich.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Day:</td>
<td>Excuse me, Mack? ((to Bush; reading what Bush wrote)) “A few moment.” So that would be S, “a few moment.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to Raven and China above, Mack Daddy here makes use of Mock ESL, but in contrast to Raven and China, whose use of Mock ESL was a diffuse parody of *all* ESLL students (and of Ms. Ariel’s FOBing practice) that was not aimed at any particular student, here it is directed at Bush, whose “heasurable identity” (Miller, 2003; 2004) is being transformed by Mack Daddy into an index of FOB. Bush’s pronunciation of his sentence is difficult for Mr. Day to understand (as it was for me when transcribing it). However, Mr. Day makes no attempt at clarifying Bush’s utterance, instead going right over to Bush’s desk to look over his shoulder at what he wrote. The absence of any
type of repair initiation from Mr. Day is quite possibly a result of previous attempts he had made with Bush in which it was still unclear what had been said even after two or three or more repair attempts. Thus, Mr. Day may be trying to minimize the likelihood for more miscommunication here, and perhaps, embarrassment for Bush, by simply walking over to Bush’s desk. However, this movement in itself is marked, perhaps as marked as an extended repair sequence might have been, and during the interval in which it takes place, Mack Daddy utters his Mock ESL phrase in a low nasal monotone: “I don speak no Inglich.”

Mack Daddy’s positioning of Bush as FOB through his indexical use of Mock ESL also casts Mack Daddy himself as a non-FOB, that is, as someone who “can speak English,” and has the linguistic and interactional expertise to mock someone who is less proficient in English about it. This particular manifestation of FOBeing, that is, that targeted a specific student, was among the clearest and most explicit instances of these students’ attempts at differentiating themselves from non-G1.5 classmates. It was also among the most transparent instantiations of the mainstream/ESLL hierarchy, only this time, of course, with G1.5 students in the superordinate position. However, while other G1.5 practices primarily concerned ESLL curriculum and instruction, this one directly involved a classmate, and a linguistic resource (a mock language variety) that was taboo (cf. Mr. Day’s mild rejoinder in line 12). For this reason, instances of G1.5 students’ publicly FOBeing classmates through the use of Mock ESL were comparatively infrequent, even if other forms of FOBeing were not. Thus, Mock ESL was not itself a requisite element for performing FOBeing: any way of pointing out some “marked”

---

82 In this respect, G1.5 FOBeing practices were similar to – indeed, were appropriations of – how Mr. Bradley would humiliate students by pointing out their L2 and other (personal) inadequacies.
infelicity about a classmate, be it in terms of L2 oral production or the "uncool" sneakers they were wearing, anything that sounded or looked "foreign," would suffice.

There was thus a virtually limitless array of behaviors, styles, practices, and more that was potentially available for FOBeing and thus for non-G1.5 students to be potentially marginalized. Any oral L2 utterance was available, of course, with errors and mistakes in grammar and vocabulary the ripest sources of ridicule, in addition to pronunciation that contained features that were indexical of a "non-native" speaker, as indicated in Extract 9.17.

L1 use, too, was available for FOBeing, particularly among the Micronesian and Chinese students. With the exception of Ms. Ariel, each of the ESLL (and J-section teachers) that I observed had English-only policies, themselves explicit instantiations of language ideologies and clear indications of the linguicism that pervaded the high school and the ESLL program (cf. Auerbach, 1993, 1995; Woolard, 1998), although only Mr. Bradley's was strictly enforced. As it turned out, many of the G1.5 students wound up most often as the "enforcers" of the English-only rule, in itself an interesting point which on the one hand suggests their socialization into English-only language ideologies, but perhaps is also indicative of their desire to keep classroom oral interaction in terms that favored them, i.e., in English. This is not to suggest that G1.5 students were not proficient in their L1s and/or did not use them, of course. For the former point, many of the more recent G1.5 students in particular were proficient in their L1s (e.g., Laidplayer, Benz, Barehand, Sky Blue, Jennie), although those who were longer-term G1.5 students tended to be L2 English dominant (e.g., CKY, CJ, Brahdah, IwannaFAL, Ioane) and less

---

83 As it was, L1 use was comparatively infrequent in his class anyway, likely as much a result of his English-only rules as his proficiency in several of the students' L1s.
proficient in L1. Regarding G1.5 L1 use, many did use L1s in class, often to exclude the
teacher (cf. Miller, 2003). However, it should be noted, these same students might also
castigate lower L2 English proficient students who spoke L1 in class when it suited them,
e.g., when an opportunity for FOBeing arose.84

Some evidence of FOBeing as it related to L1 use is apparent in Extract 9.18,
which occurred in Mr. Day’s classroom during a study hall activity. Sky Blue, Michelle,
Tony, and Bush had been talking and laughing in L1 for much of the class. As I
mentioned earlier, these students often used L1 Cantonese in class, and in the past had
been scolded for it by Mr. Day, for it violated the (rarely enforced) classroom English-
only language policy. Mr. Day hears them after a particularly loud exchange and calls
over to them to speak English.

(9.18) Chinatown [ELA41XmdS10: 1135-1140]85

1 Mr. Day: English!
   IwannaFAL: English, man! [No Chinatown! Yeah Mister!
3 Sky Blue: [But Mr. Talmy said I can say anything in any
   language.
5 Mr. Day: Who said that?
   Sky Blue: Mr. Talmy.
7 Mr. Day: Yes. But that’s his rules. My rules are English. Especially when I
   hear that you guys are being rude.
9 Sky Blue: We’re not! Ask Michelle! Ask her.
   Mr. Day: You need to fix this because there’s been lots of complaints of yelling
11 [and if you guys’re speaking a foreign language
   Laidplayer: [They’re not supposed to sit together.
13 Mr. Day: how do I know what
   you’re saying?
15 IwannaFAL: Yeah, Dog.86

84 The clearest case of G1.5 students both using L1 and then criticizing classmates for using L1 involved
China, Ash, and 618. When it suited the two boys, they would speak L1 Cantonese with 618; however,
when they wanted to FOB her, they would tease her about either her L2 mistakes (see below) or her L1 use.
85 Laidplayer carried the mini-disc recorder for this class session.
Mr. Day: (inaudible) That’s why we speak English, ‘cause that way if we’re making (inaudible) English only. Otherwise we have issues. You guys can do it. English only.

19 CJ: No spik Chainiz, yu gaiz betah spik inglish!
*Don’t speak Chinese, you guys need to speak English!*

Although there is much in this extract to discuss, I will restrict my commentary to FOBeing. FOBeing here is perpetrated most clearly by IwannaFAL in his use, as an epithet, of “Chinatown” in line 2. This was a comparatively common use of the term, actually, particularly in Mr. Bradley’s classes, where it was similarly used (by Mr. Bradley) to silence his Chinese students’ L1 use. It also extended beyond “Chinatown” to include “Micronesia” (for Micronesian students) and (less commonly) “Korea” (for the Koreans). It is no coincidence that Sky Blue responds for his friendship group in line 3, as he was a G1.5 member and had the most advanced L2 proficiency among them. Interesting in his response is his explanation that he was authorized to use his L1 by me. This is an instance not only of the “fall-back” defense explanation, but also of how some (G1.5) students would play me against their teachers, which in a handful of instances led to some tensions between the teacher and me.87 Other evidence of FOBeing besides IwannaFAL’s comes from Laidplayer in line 12, when he says “They’re not supposed to

---

86 I don’t believe IwannaFAL was being disrespectful with the term “Dog.”; he used it with other students (and me) as a general, informal address term. It is not clear in the data how Bush, who likely would not have known about this particular usage, interpreted it.

87 This was one such instance and I had to underscore to Mr. Day that although I had said such a thing to Sky Blue (weeks before), it had been in specific reference to carrying the mini-disc recorder: I told students that they could speak in any language they liked while carrying it. (Sky Blue was not carrying the recorder for this class session). Also, I should note that I had spoken to Mr. Day about the rationale behind his English-only policy, and he maintained it was primarily so that the Chinese students would be less noisy, as they could at times become quite boisterous when they spoke in the L1. Indeed, translations of the L1 Cantonese data in Mr. Day’s class indicated that much of the discussions among Sky Blue, Bush, Tony, Michelle, and another Chinese student were completely unrelated to class activities, with topics ranging from the card game Magic to music and movies, comic books, gossip about friends and teachers, and homework in other classes.
sit together.”, from CJ in line 19: “No spik Chainiz, yu gaiz betah spik inglish.”, and, clearly, from Mr. Day himself. This indicates another way that linguicism that was manifested in ESLL curriculum and instruction, here in terms of English-only classroom language policies, could facilitate and authorize G1.5 community practices such as FOBeing.

Laidplayer’s comment “They’re not supposed to sit together.” allows further comment about L1 use in the ESLL classrooms. Laidplayer here refers to a seating chart that Mr. Day had developed midway through the school year to contend with a number of student-grouping arrangements that were disruptive to classroom instruction. Earlier he, like Ms. Cheney and Ms. Ariel, had allowed students to self-select their seating placements in class, which had resulted in student cliques and little interaction outside them. It had also resulted in a considerable amount of L1 from the Chinese students and the Chuukese. Miller (2003) has argued that practices such as student L1 use in this type of context may represent elements of defensive compensation created as a response to a lack of viable social relations in schools. In other words, if you can’t establish meaningful relations with members of the mainstream discourses, you will use other means to represent who you are, within your group and to others – and you will remain at the margins (pp. 107-108)

Miller goes on to assert that a group of Chinese students who remained in L1-speaking peer groups in her study did so because “the lack of viable communicative interactions with English-speaking students meant that the only chance these students had of ‘being somebody,’ . . . was to be somebody in the Chinese group” (p. 108). Miller’s discussion
of the students in her study resonates with the discussion of marginality made above, and in this case, particularly for students such as Bush, Michelle, Tony, and other non-G1.5 students with lower L2 proficiency. The potential for being “FOBed” by G1.5 students, either through Mock ESL or other means, for being singled out and ridiculed or humiliated in front of the teacher, friends, the whole class was a latent, ubiquitous potentiality that may have led students such as them opting to remain peripheral – and generally more silent – participants in the (official and G1.5) classroom CoP. Bush, for example, who was an excellent student and gregarious outside of class, rarely spoke L2 English in class. Tony and Michelle, who were also the occasional targets for FOBeing, also rarely spoke L2 English in class, with Michelle seeming inordinately concerned with her L2 pronunciation. Thus, their comparative L2 silence may have stemmed from them simply not wanting to be “FOBed.”; in contrast, the substantial amount of their classroom L1 use may have been indicative of them turning to one another in order to “be somebody” in Miller’s (2003) terms – “somebodies” who were fully competent in the language they spoke, and thus were less exposed to the sorts of ridicule and teasing that could potentially occur by being “FOBed” in L2 English. Even though L1 use could be targeted for FOBeing (as it is in Extract 9.18), it was a qualitatively different sort of experience for those being FOBed since it was inevitably a group rather than an individual who was singled out. These points may help to explain

---

88 I suspect that one reason Bush refused to carry the mini-disc recorder for me despite the interest he showed in my research and in the mini-disc technology had something to with his self-consciousness about his L2 pronunciation.

89 In one instance she spent more than five minutes with me as I repeated the word “hammock” for her (at her continuing request) so that she could say it “correctly” for the sentence she had composed (“I sleep on a hammock”) in the same (public) vocabulary exercise as in Extract 9.16 (ELA32Xfn: 1865).
why the students in the Cantonese friendship group continued to sit together and speak L1, despite the seating chart Mr. Day had devised.

Regardless, it is in this respect— that FOBeing classmates required for its accomplishment a relational Other that was not a children’s book or a childish instructional practice, but a fellow student— that G1.5 students could work to deny many non-G1.5 students from participation in (official and G1.5) ESLL practices, and leave them in a marginal position in the ESLL classroom. Indeed, and crucially, the G1.5 CoP would not exist as a meaningful CoP without students such as Bush, against whom Mack Daddy would not otherwise be able to define himself as a non-FOB, that is, to relationally position himself as “different” (Barth, 1969).

FOBeing, be it through Mock ESL or L1 use most often involved full-class displays for their full effect, but not always. The interaction in Extract 9.19, for example, occurs during a pair work activity in Ms. Cheney’s ELA IX class that had Andrea*, a Chuukese G1.5 girl who had grown up in Guam and Saipan unhappily paired with Jing Yang*, a quiet non-G1.5 9th grade boy who had arrived from China a year earlier. Just as Andrea is about to (reluctantly) sit down to work with him, she turns to Ms. Meredith, the (Mandarin speaking) PTT and asks if he speaks English.

(9.19) Great! [ELA11Xfn: 240-241]

1 Andrea: Does he know how to speak English?  
Ms. Meredith: Why don’t you ask him?  
3 Andrea: ((turns and sits down across from Jing Yang)) HI, I’M ANDREA. DO YOU KNOW HOW TO UNDERSTAND ENGLISH?  
5 Jing Yang: ((shakes his head))  
Andrea: ((laugh)) Great!
As soon as Andrea said this, Jing Yang crossed his arms and looked away, and quite understandably would not participate in the rest of the activity.

Students such as Jing Yang also dressed in a notably different style from G1.5 students, which could also be held up for ridicule. Many G1.5 students wore the requisite, tacitly approved “uniform” for Local students at Tradewinds: for girls, mostly tight low-rise jeans, tank-tops and platform slippers, for the boys, shorts or jeans that sagged below the hips, loose-fitting t-shirts advertising surf-shops, the Gap or Old Navy, or emblazoned with Pidgin-inspired Localisms such as “Pilau mout,” “Went stay go,” and “Eh! No get nuts!,” as well as slippers or expensive Nike or Adidas sneakers. In contrast, non-G1.5 students might appear in class in flared acid-washed jeans or dark cargo pants, Keds sneakers or deck shoes, and t-shirts with incomprehensible slogans such as “26 monita,” “Sensibility!” or “RESEARCH ON@TOUCH JEANS! SHRTIVAL.” They might have their hair dyed or spiked or gelled, which, according to one student was their attempt to “look Local.” Their backpacks tended to be more worn and not the brand names such as Jansport or Da Kine preferred by Local students. In fact, in my interviews with students, in answer to my question about what a “FOB” was and how to tell if a person was or was not one, every G1.5 student first mentioned personal appearance, clothing, and style. Some also related their own experiences as FOBs, when they first arrived in the US, wearing “tight Korean shorts” (Benz) and “orange pants” (China).

Although many of G1.5 students’ FOBing practices were directed at non-G1.5 students, they were also occasionally directed at more legitimate peripheral G1.5 students themselves. This underscores the tensions that attended the move to full participation in
G1.5 community practices for the lower L2 proficient and/or newcomer G1.5 community members, as well as the ambiguity that characterized their relationships to and memberships in a community that would on occasion target them for ridicule. This is illustrated most clearly in 618’s tenuous participation in G1.5 community practices in Ms. Ariel’s class, which I will briefly illustrate in the next data extract.

In Extract 9.20, Ms Ariel is leading the class through a group correction activity of a vocabulary quiz that has been taken earlier in the period. She has collected students’ papers and redistributed them, so students are peer-correcting these quizzes. As it happens, Nat*, a G1.5 student from the Marshall Islands who had lived in Hawai‘i for over 8 years, has 618’s quiz. Earlier in the correction, he had singled her out publicly about a mistake on the quiz (she had written the definition for “automatically” as “to happy or do instantly without thinking” instead of “to happen instantly or do without thinking.”). This had been greeted by Nat, Barehand, Benz, Raven, China, Maria, and Eddie with some laughter, and 618 had protested loudly and with some surprise to Nat about his public teasing of her about it.

In this extract, as the vocabulary correction is winding down, the class has come to the word “falter.” Six of the Micronesian students in the class are off to the side chatting among themselves (they had not been given the vocabulary quiz and instead worked with me on a verbs worksheet, which we had finished some time ago). As was often the case in Ms. Ariel’s classes, classical music was playing softly in the background.
(9.20) Unskradily [ELA32Wmd6: 2144-2160]

1. Ms. Ariel: Does anyone have an answer for number 14 {“falter”}?  
   Raven: Yes, “hesitate”!
   Eddie: “Hesitate.”
3. Ms. Ariel: Or “to move unsteadily”? Either of those will work.  
   Nat: How about “unskradily”? {/Unskradily/} “Unskradily.”
4. Ms. Ariel: ((laugh))  
   Nat: “Unskradily”!
5. Ms. Ariel: I think ((laugh))
6. 618: [((laugh))
   Ms. Ariel: [((sounding offended)) Hu:]?
7. Ms. Ariel: [what they meant was, “unsteadily.” You know what? This is what I – everyday, this is what I correct! And I try to figure out “okay, what did that person mean?”
8. ?Ss: ((laugh))
9. Ms. Ariel: So I try not to grade them on spelling, on the [definitions, mistakes]
   China: [Skradily? (inaudible) (laugh)]
10. Ms. Ariel: want to know if they know the meaning.
11. Raven: Missed [(it)!
12. Ms. Ariel: [So I try to decipher what they meant.
13. China: [Miss! Miss!
14. So wait, you correct 618’s paper every day?
15. 618: Unskradily ((laughing)) [Skradily? (inaudible) (laugh))

Nat initiates the FOBeing of 618 here in line 6, with the absurdly “incorrect” part of the definition for “falter,” (which I have represented as) “unskradily” (for “unsteadily”) which he utters twice. Because he has previously brought another error in the paper to the attention of the class – and in response to China’s request of “Who did that?” identified 618 as the person whose paper he is correcting – it is clear that the person that Nat is here singling out (again) is 618. What is interesting both here and with the earlier “mistake” is that both are written, not uttered by 618, and minimally involve misspellings: “to happy” earlier, and here, “unskradily,” which may in fact be a simple
misreading of 618’s handwriting. This suggests on the one hand, how easily an FOBeing episode might be initiated, that is, the negligible pretext needed for a G1.5 student to instigate one, and on the other, Nat’s disposition toward FOBeing 618, at least in this instance, evident in his exaggerated voicing of what could be a case of a transposed or illegally-written letter or two, and which may in fact be a result of his mistake (i.e., not reading 618’s writing correctly) not 618’s. In this regard, Nat’s voicing of 618’s mistake is another instance of Mock ESL.

In line 7, Ms. Ariel laughs, and so in effect this FOBeing practice can already be considered a success. The “mistake” has been pointed out, the inadequacy of the L2 laughed at, the “foreignness” of its putative “speaker” held up for all to ridicule. Again, Nat repeats the Mock ESL utterance with apparent enjoyment, and again Ms. Ariel laughs, this time as she is mid-sentence. Several students join her in her laughter now, at which point, 618, sounding piqued, exclaims “Hu::h!” Ms. Ariel offers no uptake for 618, however, instead continuing with the sentence she initiated before she laughed, an ostensible “explanation” about what the student who was mistaken “really” meant. There has been no consideration that the “mistake” may be more a result of Nat’s misreading and/or intent to engage in FOBeing, or, the actuality of it as an instantiation of Mock ESL. Instead, Ms. Ariel explains in lines 13-15, “This is what I – everyday, this is what I correct! And I try to figure out ‘okay, what did that person mean?’” The form and substance of Ms. Ariel’s utterance here, in addition to her laughter earlier, works to align herself with those who engage in FOBeing: she does not rebuke the act of singling out someone’s putative L2 mistake for ridicule; she offers her own experience contending “everyday” with similar mistakes instead; and tellingly, she attributes these mistakes to
that person,” which as becomes evident shortly after this turn, refers to an FOB. In fact, she has legitimated FOBeing, at least this particular instance of it, by providing Nat uptake to his utterance and then elaborating on it, and doing so in the same humorous frame keyed by him (cf. students’ laughter in line 16). Ms. Ariel goes on to explain that because of mistakes such as this, she does not “grade them on spelling.” (line 17), instead opting to see “if they know the meaning” (line 20), by trying “to decipher what they meant.” Ms. Ariel’s use of the 3rd person pronouns “they” and “them” in these turns, rather than, say, the second person, signals that she is talking to Nat, China, and Raven about lower L2 English proficient students – FOBs – not them, about precisely what the G1.5 students have singled out for FOBeing here, even as those “FOBs” are co-present in the classroom and listening in.

In line 18, China overlaps and joins in the FOBeing with a loud and pointed “Mistake!” In line 21, Raven also appears to contribute with “Missed (it)! and in line 23, China continues, now uttering 618’s name as he does when he says, in obvious reference to Ms. Ariel’s “everyday, this is what I correct” (lines 13-14), “So wait, you correct 618’s paper every day?” The implication here is that 618’s L2 is so obviously full of mistakes and “non-native-isms,” and thus is so indexical of her FOB-ness, that it is exemplary of what Ms. Ariel struggles with “everyday” in correcting her students’ work. Nat repeats “unskradily” twice more, laughing, as Ms. Ariel, again with no uptake, simply moves on to find the answer to the next sentence in the vocabulary exercise.

As I have argued earlier and will be discussing in more depth in Chapter 10, this extract is suggestive of the contingency and bidirectionality of (L2) socialization processes, that is, in this particular case, of Ms. Ariel’s socialization into the G1.5
cultural productions of ESLL, linguistically realized here in the interdiscursive tensions between an evident “teacher discourse” authorized by the institutionally ascribed relationships of teacher/student – cf. Ms. Ariel’s opening and concluding turns in the extract, both initiating moves of the IRF participation structure, as well as her feedback turns in lines 3 and 5 – and a far more informal, casual discourse which includes her laughter in lines 7 and 9, her confiding “explanation” about “them” in lines 13-15, 17, 19-20, and 22, and her lack of uptake or rebuke about the teasing. This latter, informal discourse is one that is fundamentally aligned with the G1.5 cultural productions of ESLL, here manifest in a rearticulated in-group/out-group dualism, the former now including G1.5 students participating in the FOBeing and Ms. Ariel, the latter including 618 and the other “real” ESLL students, or FOBs.

This extract therefore highlights some of the tensions for students in ESLL classes in which students of dramatically varied L2 English proficiency levels studied together. Here, 618, a legitimate peripheral G1.5 student who at times engaged in FOBeing herself (see Chapter 10), is the target of FOBeing. That such a student could be singled out for humiliation by her fellow (more L2 proficient) G1.5 community members as they went about differentiating themselves and constructing linguicist identity hierarchies in the class, hints at the potential for such an event to occur to non-G1.5 students, particularly the lower L2 English proficient ones. Such a potentiality created a classroom culture in the ESLL program in which there could be deeply personal consequences for taking the risk to speak publicly in the L2. This was a risk and a potentiality that was no doubt compounded when there was such overt teacher uptake and participation in G1.5 community practices as in the interaction represented in the extract above.
To sum up, FOBeing was pervasive in the ESLL classrooms. It was manifested variously in a curriculum that, for example, required students to represent “their cultures and countries,” and that explicitly taught about the US (e.g., the holidays worksheets) (see Chapter 7). It was also manifested in instruction, as teachers implemented curriculum and enforced and elaborated its provisions in specific assignments that positioned students as cultural and linguistic Others. As I have demonstrated in this section, it was also manifested in G1.5 students’ appropriation and unique respecification of FOBeing practices. This was accomplished through singling out for ridicule a newcomer and/or lower-L2-proficient non-G1.5 student – and even more peripheral G1.5 students such as 618 – through practices such as Mock ESL, teasing about L1 use, mistakes and inadequacies in the L2, especially in terms of syntax and pronunciation, as well as style and appearance that were that were all somehow (made to be) indexical of FOB-ness. Because these particular G1.5 community practices required not books or curriculum or instructional practices but fellow classmates in order to be accomplished, I have argued that G1.5 FOBeing worked to marginalize the students who were the putative targets for FOBeing, by creating a classroom atmosphere in which the possibility of being targeted for FOBeing was omnipresent in virtually all classroom activities and practices. This is not to suggest all non-G1.5 students were in fact marginalized: just as G1.5 students resisted official classroom socializing efforts, some non-G1.5 students in turn resisted G1.5 classmates’ attempts at FOBeing, especially those students who were more oriented to the school and ESLL program (and accommodated the structural and official cultural productions of ESLL), and those (particularly Chuukese students) who simply appeared to ignore them or be segregated from them (see Talmy, 2005). This led
to some understandable tensions in the class between G1.5 CoP members and non-G1.5 students.

Regine, an advanced L2 English proficient non-G1.5 student from the Philippines, spoke of an aspect of these tensions in notably personal terms. She had arrived at Tradewinds mid-year after transferring from another high school in Hawai‘i. She claimed she had left that school because she had been repeatedly teased by Local Filipino boys there about being a recent arrival to the US. As she put it, “They were teasing me like, ‘oh, you just came – oh, you came from Philippines, yeah? You have accent like this.’ And it made me feel bad.” She stated that the students at Tradewinds were much “nicer,” but did point out that CJ’s teasing not only of her but of other non-G1.5 students in Mr. Day’s class made her angry. Later, when I asked her about the languages she spoke with other Filipino students in the class, we returned to the subject of CJ.

(9.21) A good way [SINT27: 293-312]

1 Mr. Talmy: What language do you speak with CJ?
Regine: Um, he’s Ilokano. CJ Ilokano.

3 Mr. Talmy: So you speak Ilokano with him?
Regine: Um, yeah. But, yeah. Sometimes, you know – ‘cause he said “oh, speaking like, Ilokano is so” (. .) I don’t know, he’s – I don’t know. He’s ashamed. He’s – I don’t know. He’s not ( .) real Filipino. I mean, he born – he was born in Philippines, but he think, um, it’s cool to be, like, to be more American. You know? I don’t know.

9 Mr. Talmy: And what do you think about that?
Regine: That’s – I don’t kn:::w. (((frustrated gurgling sound))). It’s hard to explain. It’s like – I feel angry. And – I hate him. I hate those kind attitude. Attitude. ‘Cause – I don’t know – I just love being Filipino.

13 Mr. Talmy: You love being Filipino. So you’re proud about being Filipino.
Regine: Yeah, I’m proud.

15 Mr. Talmy: Yeah.
Regine: ((laugh))

17 Mr. Talmy: So how do you feel about people who aren’t proud? Who are ashamed?
Regine’s notable frustration in attempting to articulate (in English) her feelings about CJ, an oldtimer G1.5 student from the Philippines who had lived in Hawai‘i for seven years, speaks to some of the deeply felt tensions among G1.5 and non-G1.5 students in the ESLL classes. G1.5 students might mock non-G1.5 students for not being “American” enough, not sounding “native” enough, not fitting in enough; non-G1.5 students’ rejoinders involved issues of authenticity and belonging, pride vs. shame: difference for Regine was something to appreciate rather than condemn and she expressed little patience for CJ’s and other G1.5 students’ FOBeing ways. Thus, although the potential for FOBeing was latent in all the ESLL classes, not just by teachers but by G1.5 students, it was not a foregone conclusion that all students were marginalized by it. Nonetheless, it created a climate in which speaking the L2 in class could be a much more daunting task than it otherwise would be.

G1.5 students’ appropriation of FOBeing was the most transparent and most explicit manifestation of these students’ indexical performance of difference from that population I have glossed as non-G1.5 students. It is also the clearest means by which
they instantiated the mainstream/ESLL identity hierarchy in the ESLL classes, and the 
linguicist discourses that constituted it. In the context of the mainstream/ESLL hierarchy,
G1.5 ESLL students' FOBeing also reveals a central dynamic in the identity work that 
got on in the ESLL classrooms, specifically in terms of these students' repudiation of 
one subject position – ESLL/FOB – and the claims they made on another – mainstream /
/Local. The outlines of this dynamic are schematically (and simplistically) represented in 
Figure 9.2, in which the linguicism I have argued is in circulation in the wider societal 
(Chapter 6), school (Chapter 7), and classroom (Chapters 7, 8, 9, 10) contexts is 
reproduced by G1.5 students in their various cultural productions of ESLL, as they work 
to differentiate themselves from the “real “ESLL students and make claims on 
mainstream identities.

Figure 9.2. Identity hierarchies and G1.5 ESLL student FOBeing
The generation 1.5 community of practice and cultural productions of ESLL

I have argued that the stigmatization of ESLL as a program and as a social category at Tradewinds High School is both emblematic and a manifestation of wider linguicist discourses circulating in contemporary US society. In Chapter 6, I located linguicism in an historical perspective in Hawai‘i as well as in terms of US educational and language policy, with specific regard to K-12 education, as a means to situate present-day circumstances of the ESLL program at Tradewinds in context. In Chapter 7, I located linguicism in terms of ESLL program organization, its intra-institutional relationships, and in the ESLL curriculum. Although I have asserted otherwise throughout, what may have resulted from a reading of those two chapters is the notion that the stigmatization of ESLL was a top-down, unidirectional phenomenon, which extended from macro-level policies and practices down to the micro-level of the classroom, a mere reflection of negative societal valuations about immigrants, bilingualism, and non-native Englishes. Such a view would presume that the structural productions of ESLL, and the “official” cultural productions that result from their instantiation in social practice, were foregone conclusions, were simply accommodated and negotiated by agent-less actors living out predetermined roles.

In this chapter, I have complicated if not entirely undermined that notion by demonstrating that in fact social structure as manifest in language and educational policy and practice, in school organization and curriculum, in classroom activities and instruction, is never guaranteed because it is mediated by agents who are multiply situated in historical, political, and social contexts. In this respect, the stigmatization of
ESLL, as a program and as a social category at Tradewinds, was a collaborative achievement, jointly produced by teachers and students alike in the social practices of everyday classroom life, in a range of socially situated cultural productions of ESLL.

As discussed in Chapter 7 and Chapter 8, as well as throughout this chapter, the structural productions of ESLL and the “official” cultural productions of ESLL were of a more or less undifferentiated group of recently-arrived, cultural and linguistic Others, or FOBs. Students were “FOBed” variously in terms of curriculum and instructional practice: the lack of curricular continuity in the ESLL classes indicated that students had not had much previous schooling in the US that could be usefully or dependably incorporated into class instruction. The use of materials that were well below grade-level and that had tangential relevance to (mainstream) high school academics or L2 learning not only signified (and reproduced) the ESLL program’s lack of integration with the rest of the school but also that ESLL students could not meet the linguistic demands of on-grade-level material, or the substantive and conceptual demands of it either, and that this would likely continue to be the case as students were not provided adequate access to the L2 or print-literacy practices they would need to succeed outside of ESLL. Materials such as the children’s novels in the ESLL curriculum also signaled an apparent supposition that students wouldn’t have read such books in earlier grades, perhaps wouldn’t mind or wouldn’t understand what the intended audience for these books was, and wouldn’t have connections to the wider school population, who most likely would. The use of activities, materials, and projects that many G1.5 students maintained they had completed in earlier grades, sometimes repeatedly, further indicated that ESLL students were conceived as recent arrivals, as did the implicit assumption (evident, e.g., in the
“project” assignments) that students both knew about and identified with the cultures, customs, and languages of “their” countries, and would be amenable to efforts to incorporate them into classroom instruction. And finally, ESLL placement policies and curricula signaled that ESLL students were essentially the same, with negligible differences in L1 and L2 proficiencies, educational backgrounds, or needs. As I argued in Chapter 6, this was a conception that was also advanced beyond local levels, at the level of national educational policy, that is, in terms of how ESLL as a category of learners was (and remains) conceptualized in the No Child Left Behind accountability framework. These were some of the many aspects of the structural and official cultural productions of ESLL that contributed to the stigmatization of ESLL in the wider school context.

In this chapter, I have focused on the ways that the structural and official cultural productions of ESLL were contested, undermined, and in the instance of FOBeing students, appropriated by G1.5 ESLL students, arguing that indeed, the joint enterprise that many G1.5 ESLL CoP members were mutually engaged in, and around which their CoP formed was the subversion of the formal ESLL curriculum, the structural and official cultural productions of ESLL that went with it, and potentially, the linguicism that informed them all. By examining the shared repertoire of cultural forms that developed through a number of the social practices that G1.5 CoP members participated in – namely not bringing materials to class, not doing work, bargaining, Worksheet Syndrome, starting late and finishing early, and various manifestations of FOBeing – a markedly different though relational cultural production of ESLL emerges.
The G1.5 ESLL student cultural productions of ESLL centrally concern the dramatically differentiated population that is subsumed beneath label “ESLL,” one that consists not only of newcomers, but long-term learners of ESL; not only of low L2 English proficient students, but advanced ones; not only of students with strong affiliations to and expertise in their putative L1s and countries of origin, but those who do not, some of whom, indeed, were born and grew up in the US; not only of students with attenuated access to non-ESLL communities, but those with multiple memberships in Local and mainstream CoP; not only of students who have benefited from continuous formal educations in their L1s, but those whose L1 development was interrupted early in their formal schooling, those who did not have the opportunity to continue developing their L1 and grade-level content knowledge due to the lack of bilingual education, those who began learning the L2 early on and function perfectly adequately in oral L2, but who struggle with L2 print literacy practices, as well as those students with interrupted formal educations altogether, who not only had difficulties with L2 reading and writing, but L1 print literacy as well. In short, G1.5 cultural productions overwhelmingly complicate the neat and orderly structural and official cultural productions of ESLL at Tradewinds – and the ESLL policy formulations of the Hawai‘i and US Departments of Education – which are informed by and rely on linguicism, simplistic and essentialistic conceptions of one nation/one language, “limited English proficiency,” indeed, of “ESLL.”

Through the G1.5 CoP cultural production of ESLL, G1.5 students provided a broad and diffuse context within and against which other students could participate in G1.5 community practices. Indeed, the results of G1.5 student practices on curriculum and instruction, that is, the inexorable slowing down of the ESLL classes, the easier
assignments, the reduced demands, the increased number of worksheets, the relaxed deadlines – the lowered expectations – can be seen as indicative of the influence of G1.5 socializing processes for non-G1.5 ESLL classmates as well as teachers (see Chapter 10). This is a dynamic which turns on its head the commonsense relations of teacher/expert/oldtimer and student/novice/newcomer, as well as the putative roles of “socializer” and “socializee” (cf. Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; He, 2003; Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991; Lave, 1991; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). In the ESLL classroom world, the oldtimers were the G1.5 students, the newcomers non-G1.5 students, and in the first-year ESLL teachers’ classes, the teachers themselves. As more and more students took up participation in G1.5 CoP practices, as the performance strikes became broader and more sustained, it became unclear which CoP, the “official” one or the G1.5 one, was “dominant” in a given ESLL classroom (cf. Lave, 1991, p. 79). That is to say, the G1.5 cultural productions of ESLL threw into question what precisely were the “target” community, cultures, and social practices that ESLL students were ostensibly being socialized into (cf. Duff, 2002, 2003). Contingency and bidirectionality in socialization processes – indeed, what community practices and norms those processes ostensibly derived from – were thus centrally implicated in the G1.5 cultural productions of ESLL.

This is also not to suggest that the G1.5 CoP cultural productions of ESLL simply replaced the official cultural productions of ESLL either. Indeed, the G1.5, particularly as a relational CoP, involved highly contested (and contestable) practices, ones which were inevitably tied to the structural and cultural productions of ESLL (cf. R. Williams, 1977). In this regard, there was always already bidirectionality in socializing processes:
there may have been a slowing down in the ESLL curriculum, but the ESLL curriculum was still in place; bargains may have succeeded (although occasionally, they did not), but students were still (not) doing something relating to official ESLL classroom business; the instructional time of ESLL classes may have been reduced through the starting late and finishing early practice, but there was still instructional time; G1.5 students may have appropriated FOBeing practices embedded in structural and official cultural productions of ESLL, but they thereby reproduced them; classwork may not have been completed or turned in, but as a consequence, students received poor grades, earned the label of low-achieving, and “failed” (cf. Lave, 1991; McDermott, 1993; O'Connor, 2001, 2003).

In these terms, as mentioned earlier, G1.5 students as “brokers” (Wenger, 1998, pp. 108-110) can be seen as mediating official ESLL CoP and (Local) CoP outside of ESLL, where linguicist discourses about ESLL were in circulation. For ESLL classrooms, then, G1.5 students worked to provide unique access for non-G1.5 class members to the (Local) communities within which circulated discourses and identities that these newcomer students otherwise might not have developed contacts with or connections to. Unfortunately, the discourses and identities that the G1.5 ESLL students provided access to overwhelmingly tended to be disparaging, those informed by linguicism and assimilationism. Therefore, the consequences of G1.5 students’ socializing encounters in ESLL classes extended far beyond mere resistance and the concomitant slow-down effects on curriculum and instruction. They introduced newcomer students to the full range of these ideologies, often in immediate and deeply personal terms, through G1.5 iterations of FOBeing practices, that G1.5 students themselves appropriated from the structural and official cultural productions of ESLL.
Absent some form of critical engagement with them, any emancipatory potential in G1.5 CoP participation was transformed into self-defeating, self-sabotaging practices (Shor, 1992).

Indeed, although G1.5 students’ cultural productions of ESLL were different from the structural and official cultural productions of ESLL – they opposed and subverted them, after all – all unfortunately, and ironically, resulted in the same cultural and social reproduction of ESLL. That is, although G1.5 students challenged the official cultural productions of ESLL in various and creative ways, they did not challenge the underlying linguacist ideologies and beliefs, the negative valuations of ESLL, of immigrants, of “non-native-ness” that informed them. Instead, they simply challenged their association with them though indexical performances of difference from non-G1.5 students – who were thereby positioned as the “real” ESLL students, the “real” FOBs, that the ESLL program should be serving (instead of them).

G1.5 students efforts to reject the exotifying and demeaning practices of the structural and official cultural productions of ESLL at Tradewinds, and to relationally define themselves as distinct from them were, on the one hand, important forms of resistance. This was resistance in which subjectivity was appropriated in the face of a stigmatizing, institutionally imposed social identity category, the reductive, orderly equation of language = country = culture = people was challenged, and the warm superficiality of an exotifying multiculturalism was subverted. It was resistance that highlighted agency and the possibility, or rather, the inevitability of (G1.5 students’) multiple, complex, and frequently incongruous cultural and linguistic affiliations, of ambiguity and hybridity in identity. It was resistance that worked to provide G1.5
students with a hard-won “space” of their own, interactionally carved out within the institution that mandated their placements in a program that conflicted with and seemed so fundamentally at odds with who they wanted to be. This was a space in which they could be different from, perhaps even briefly free of, the official cultural productions of the ESLL student, a space where the inevitable tensions and contradictions in their social identities were not smoothed over by a network of hegemonic discursive practices that positioned and represented them simply and easily as Other people, from Other places, with automatic affiliations to “their countries and cultures,” and a uniform set of pre-specified L2 learning needs that children’s novels, decontextualized vocabulary and grammar exercises, and artwork would apparently address.

Yet this G1.5 student resistance was predicated on and thus ultimately reproduced the very linguicism constituting the exotifying, Othering, FOBeing practices of the formal cultural production of ESLL that was resisted in the first place. This was most clearly apparent in G1.5 students’ appropriation of FOBeing practices, and the corresponding redefinition of FOB to include not them, but non-G1.5 students. Thus, although these students’ resistance held the potential for challenging and rejecting linguicism, assimilationism, and the reification of English-only as manifested in ESLL educational policies, ESLL curricula and instruction, and in everyday interaction between ESLL teachers and students, their respecification of FOB in student-student interaction wound up reproducing them.
Conclusion

In this chapter, I have examined some of the central social practices that G1.5 ESLL students participated in to produce the G1.5 CoP in ESLL classrooms. I have argued that this CoP had as its goal the subversion of the official formal ESLL structural and cultural productions. I have argued that the consequences of the CoP on ESLL classrooms were significant, leading precisely to what it was that G1.5 students claimed it was that they were resisting about ESLL to begin with: a slowed-down, dumbed-down class that was of little academic consequence to non-ESLL classes at Tradewinds. This perpetuated the unique stigma of ESLL at the high school; indeed, it helped to perpetrate it.

I have also considered how an oldtimer ESLL teacher’s responses to student performance strike practices in her class differed considerable from those of the first-year ESLL teachers’ classes. I have argued that these differences ultimately forced more overt resistance in Mr. Bradley’s classes “underground,” and that therefore, such resistance, which was much more subtle, still led to the inexorable slow down and reduction of expectations that characterized the other ESLL classes that I observed at Tradewinds.

Finally, I have briefly considered relations between G1.5 and non-G1.5 students, arguing that G1.5 as a CoP was based on keeping non-G1.5 students from developing alternative identities or participation in either G1.5 or official CoP practices. In these terms, the G1.5 CoP worked to reproduce the linguicist discourses and ideologies that constituted FOB, the practice of FOBeing, and the mainstream/ESLL hierarchy they were part of.
In Chapter 10, I continue the discussion, focusing primarily on ESLL instructors’ defensive teaching accommodations of ESLL G1.5 practices, which, I shall argue, will ultimately lead to the cultural and social reproduction of ESLL.
CHAPTER 10. DEFENSIVE TEACHING, ACCOMMODATIONS, AND THE CULTURAL AND SOCIAL REPRODUCTION OF ESL/L

Schools are lousy places to learn, precisely because we establish them without considering the circumstances under which other ways of proceeding, perhaps less organized, might be more efficient, more humane, or both. . . . I do not suggest that students learn nothing in school, only that they typically learn what the school does not intend to teach. . . .


Curriculum is . . . the community of practice itself.

Wenger (1998, p. 100)

Introduction

In Chapter 9, I examined the substance and dynamics of G1.5 ESL/L students’ cultural productions of ESL/L, arguing that these students’ often subtle, sometimes overt, but seemingly ever-present efforts at undermining local formal or “official” meanings of ESL/L, and resisting socializing interactions that positioned them as ESL/L, worked to significantly affect both local cultural notions of “ESL/L” as well as ESL/L classroom environments and learning opportunities. I also discussed how G1.5 ESL/L student resistance to local formal or “official” cultural productions of ESL/L indexed on the one hand, “G1.5-ness,” and on the other, worked as an alternative, unofficial “curriculum” into which non-G1.5 students and teachers would be socialized.

In this regard, G1.5 students’ resistance to being positioned as “ESL/L student” ultimately affected classrooms in terms of what was taught, how it was taught, who
taught it, and what was available for learning, with the knowledge, orientations, and social practices of a broad-based G1.5 student “community of practice” (CoP) coming to assume varying degrees of dominance in ESLL classrooms. As I argued, the “joint enterprise” that many G1.5 students were “mutually engaged” in, and around which this CoP formed – and the “shared repertoire” of cultural forms that simultaneously derived from and reproduced it – was the subversion of the official ESLL curriculum and the official conceptions of ESLL that went along with it. Implicated in these efforts were students’ connections to communities beyond the ESLL program, where ESLL was stigmatized and linguicist discourses were in circulation, and where the program lacked relevance and the cultural, linguistic, and symbolic capital these students desired. This takes into account G1.5 students’ memberships in multiple communities of practice, including their access to and histories of participation in Local ones. It also hints at one of the pivotal roles that G1.5 students played in the ESLL program at Tradewinds: that they brought with them into the ESLL classroom the knowledge and practices from these Local CoP; indeed, they are what provided G1.5 students the means to index their difference from ESLL newcomers and/or non-G1.5 ESLL students, to disrupt the “official” meanings of ESLL to begin with.

While in Chapter 9 I paid particular attention to G1.5 student CoP practices, in this chapter, my focus will be on teachers’, particularly the first-year ESLL teachers’ “accommodations” that attended and facilitated them. As mentioned in the previous chapter, these accommodations, which I gloss as “defensive teaching” (see below), are

---

1 I use the term “accommodations” here in much the same way that Tradewinds ESLL teachers used the term: an additional instructional provision aimed at facilitating ESLL student learning (cf. its use in standardized testing sessions, as described in Chapter 6).
evidence of teacher participation in the G1.5 cultural productions of ESLL. Thus, the findings in this chapter not only underscore the power that students can wield in the classroom (Giroux, 1983a, 1983b; Lantolf & Pavlenko, 2001; McKay & Wong, 1996; McLaren, 1999; Norton, 2000; Norton Peirce, 1995a; Pavlenko, 2002; Shor, 1992, 1996; Siegal, 1996; Sizer, 2004; Willis, 1977), but also provide additional support for many of the asserted, but less frequently documented claims about the bidirectionality of (language) socialization processes (Bayley & Schecter, 2003; Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991; Kramsch, 2002; Ochs, 1986; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a; Zuengler & Cole, in press).

To begin, I provide a short overview about a construct that will be useful for the discussion in this chapter, one that works as a sort of corollary to the student performance strike, and that is “defensive teaching” (McNeil, 1986, 2000). Following this, I provide critical discourse analyses of a number of interactions in which I argue four common defensive teaching accommodations were deployed. I continue by examining an interactional sequence that was referenced in Chapter 9, that is, during the presentation phase of the Pop-Up Holiday Project in the ELA 2W class. This is a sequence in which G1.5 ESLL students wind up FOBeing a newcomer classmate in front of the entire class, and ultimately are joined by their teacher in their efforts. I conclude with a discussion about G1.5 resistance, teacher accommodations of G1.5 cultural productions of ESLL, and the cultural and social reproduction of ESLL.
Defensive teaching in the ESLL classes

In Chapter 9, I considered student resistance in terms of the “performance strike,” examining in particular several practices that G1.5 students engaged in, in this endeavor: “‘It’s at home’: Not bringing books to class”; “‘Neva du am’: Not doing classwork”; “‘Bell’s gonna ring!’: Starting late and finishing early”; “‘I can’t speak English, man!’: Resisting and reproducing FOBeing”; “‘A little bit more time’: Bargaining”; and “‘Minimum effort’: Worksheet Syndrome.”

As alluded to in Chapter 9, a notion that is closely related to the performance strike that will be useful in the discussion below, particularly in regard to the first-year teachers’ classes, is what McNeil (1986) calls “defensive teaching” (also see McNeil, 2000; Shor, 1992, 1996).2 Defensive teaching is a phenomenon whereby teachers “simplify content and reduce demands on students in return for classroom order and minimal student compliance on assignments” (McNeil, 1986, p. 158). McNeil (1986) sees defensive teaching as an essentially tacit agreement between students and teachers in which minimal instructional demands are made in an effort to “create as little student resistance as possible” (p. 158). Viewed as reciprocally informing phenomena, then, the student performance strike and defensive teaching together contribute to what Sizer (1984/2004) has called “a conspiracy of the least,” whereby teachers and students together collaboratively disengage from (L2) teaching and learning.

Although much of my discussion in Chapter 9 regarding student performance strike practices necessarily included discussion of a number of teachers’ defensive

---

2 For a brief review of literature concerning first-year teachers, see Chapter 9.
teaching accommodations, and allusions to several more, below, I consider in some detail four of the most common:

"'Working behind or ahead': Study hall";

"'Let's see how much of it we can get done today': Floating deadlines";

"'Filler': Alternative assignments,”; and

"'It's really so easy': Test preparation."

'Working behind or ahead': Study hall

As indicated throughout Chapter 9, one of the primary defensive teaching accommodations to student performance strike practices engaged in by the first-year ESLL teachers in particular was a non-instructional activity I have called “study hall.” This essentially involved providing students with additional class time to complete what had been assigned for completion in previous classes and/or what had been originally given as homework. It was deployed in classes for a range of reasons, from students not doing their work, most obviously, to not bringing materials, to not having prepared required materials necessary for a particular activity to commence. Officially, then, the rationale for this activity was that students needed more time to complete whatever classwork had been assigned, the underlying, commonsense grounds for this need stemming from their status as ESLL students, that is, that the work was too difficult and students’ L2 proficiencies and literacy abilities too low for it to be completed on time.

---

3 Mr. Day referred to study hall activities as periods in which students could “work behind or ahead” (e.g., ELA42XmdS14: 1725), i.e., could catch up on work not completed, or work ahead on that which had not yet been assigned.
However, it was clear that there was much more to this accommodation than low L2 proficiency. Students who were clearly capable of handling the degree of L2 difficulty in the ESLL assignments and activities – and had done many of them with little problem at earlier points in the school year – nonetheless increasingly disengaged from completing classwork, even as they were given more time to do less of it. In this respect, then, involved in this accommodation was an “exchange” similar to what McNeil (1986; 2000) has described, with teachers in this instance providing additional means to do less work in exchange for students doing something, however minimal, related to the official ESLL classroom curriculum. As I describe farther below, an inevitable consequence of students doing less work was that their grades over the course of the school year plummeted. This was clearly the case with the G1.5 students, and all four of the ESLL teachers I observed on numerous occasions expressed frustration and dismay about this. “Study hall” was one way to counter this: by giving students class time to complete work, teachers removed a range of “reasons” students might have for not having done the work, for not having brought it to class, and so forth. Individual and group seatwork, that was on the face of it “student-centered,” was also a way to minimize the sorts of teacher-student confrontations that inevitably sprang up when students would opt not to participate in a classroom activity in which they had been actively recruited, e.g., in teacher-fronted activities or those that involved teacher participation in some way, regardless of whether homework or some sort of other (student) preparation had been required (see Chapter 9).

“Study hall” became so engrained in the official classroom curriculum, not just in the first-year ESLL teachers’ classes, but in Mr. Bradley’s, too, that, in further evidence
of the teachers' accommodations of and participation in the G1.5 cultural production of ESLL, teachers actually began planning lessons around it. This is indicated in Extract 10.1, an interaction taken from one of Mr. Day’s classes about one third of the way through the last quarter of the school year. Students had been assigned one of the readings from *Sadako and the thousand paper cranes* (Coerr, 1977) which was due this class session. The interaction takes place about five minutes after the bell has rung, as students are beginning to settle down. Although many in the class are still talking noisily amongst themselves, Mr. Day checks to see how many students have completed their work today.

(10.1) *A little bit of extra chance*  [ELA42XmdS13: 127-141]⁴

1  Mr. Day: How many of you finished your work for today?  
    Ioane: Not me!
3  Mr. Day: [Not Ioane.  
    ?Ss: [(inaudible, overlapping talk)]
5  Mr. Day: Okay, that’s good. That’s good. (inaudible) is good.  
    Jennie: [Uh:::]
7  Mr. Day: [Shhh. ((Many Ss continue talking in b.g.; Mr. Day talks over them))] 
    Today, I’m gonna give you guys a little bit of extra chance to finish your work. How many of you read the pages you were supposed to read in the book?
9  
11 Laidplayer: No, not me!
   Mr. Day: No?
13 Laidplayer: I don’t know where I put my book.
   Mr. Day: Okay, we’ll get you one, we’ll find it. Shh! Today we’re gonna be doing bookwork and grammar.

This short exchange is emblematic of many others repeated in slightly different terms in each of the ESLL teachers’ classes, especially the first-year teachers’, with increasingly

---

⁴ Jennie carried the mini-disc recorder for this class session.
regularity as the school year wore on. Of note is that the question in line 1 has been uttered at all, as if there is an expectation that students have not finished their work for today. This is, as I have argued in Chapter 9, a reasonable expectation for Mr. Day to have, one-third of the way through the fourth quarter of the year, in a class in which so many G1.5 students participate in a central G1.5 CoP activity, “not doing work.” Indeed, in line 2, Ioane confirms this is the case (“Not me!”), although it remains unclear how many other students it applies to, as so many of them remain unoriented to the teacher talk and instead continue chatting amongst themselves. Mr. Day confirms “Not Ioane.,” and then continues in line 5 with a positive evaluation of this apparent circumstance, repeated twice, possibly three times: “Okay, that’s good. That’s good. (inaudible) is good.” This suggests that Mr. Day had indeed anticipated at least one student not having completed her work. It is not clear what Jennie’s utterance of “Uh:::.” is in reference to on the recording, and I have nothing in my fieldnotes about it, though it could conceivably be a comment on Mr. Day’s preceding turn.

In lines 7-9, Mr. Day tries to quiet the class, but then simply talks over them instead, informing them that “Today, I’m gonna give you guys a little bit of extra chance to finish your work.” On the surface of it, then, it appears that Mr. Day has opted to give the class “a little bit of extra chance” to complete the bookwork from the children’s novel based only on the input of Ioane, but again, at this point in the school year, having been socialized into this particular aspect of the G1.5 cultural production of ESLL, Mr. Day is no doubt aware that many others in the class have not completed it either. Still in lines 9-10 he checks once again to ask how many students read the assigned pages for today.
In line 11, Laidplayer indicates that he too has not done the required work. Both his reply and Ioane’s in line 2 are notable here in that there is no “account” following them, which as Ford (2001; 2004) has demonstrated, is the “recurrent and normative” pattern following “disagreeing actions” such as this. I would argue that this is the case because these students don’t need one: Mr. Day has long ago accepted that such a response is to be expected, evident throughout this interaction, indeed that it has occurred at all. In line 13, Laidplayer makes reference to another G1.5 student performance strike practice, “not bringing materials,” following by Mr. Day who assures him he’ll find him a spare copy of the book, more evidence that Mr. Day has anticipated such an occurrence and planned accordingly. Finally, Mr. Day announces to the class what will transpire this class period: bookwork – which following a reading assignment meant vocabulary – and grammar, that is, the two mainstays of Worksheet Syndrome. In essence, the interaction in Extract 10.1 encapsulates several aspects of G1.5 ESL student cultural productions of ESLL in the form of performance strike practices and defensive teaching accommodations: starting late, not bringing materials, not doing work, Worksheet Syndrome, floating deadlines, and study hall.

Defensive teaching accommodations such as study hall meant that increasing class time was spent on previously assigned work, primarily bookwork activities related to the children’s novels, with a corresponding decrease in time spent on other activities (see Chapter 10). Gearing instruction for the rising number of students who participated in performance strikes in the ESLL classes meant that the curricular and instructional pacing of these classes subtly yet inexorably slowed down over the school year for all involved, to the point that (with the exception of Ms. Ariel’s class) little beyond the
bookwork assignments for the children's novels came to be done in them. This was significant because, as discussed in Chapter 7, these books were below grade level, sometimes by as much as six or seven years for some students; were of a singular genre, which many students recognized as "children's books" and which bore little relevance to other genres encountered in non-ESLL classes; and had largely mechanical activities deriving from them that involved rote memorization of vocabulary, short answers to comprehension questions, and written summaries, with little attempt at reformulating or synthesizing the information that was to be summarized. As the "official" curriculum thereby grew increasingly restricted, a breach in the formal schooling enterprise developed, in which an alternative and unofficial "curriculum" that was constituted by and constitutive of the G1.5 cultural production of ESLL, could prosper (cf. Gutierrez et al., 1995; also see Chapter 9, Extract 9.16).

Much of Chapter 9 described the outlines of this G1.5 classroom "curriculum," looking in particular at the details of them in socializing interactions, from not doing work to bargaining to Worksheet Syndrome. Also discussed was what I have argued was the G1.5 student appropriation of FOBeing practices that were embedded in the structural and official cultural productions of ESLL, as well as the linguicist discourses and ideologies that informed them. These practices constituted much of the unofficial G1.5 "curriculum," a curriculum that not only had substantial effects on classroom processes, for G1.5 and non-G1.5 ESLL students alike, but provided this latter group with access to community practices beyond the immediate boundaries of the ESLL program. Study hall played a central role in this by providing a space in which such access could occur, primarily in student-student interactions that usually only tangentially concerned the
“official” formal ESLL curriculum (cf. Extract 9.16). In this respect, study hall was a crucial component not only for the production of the G1.5 CoP, but also its reproduction, specifically in its induction of new community members.

‘Let’s see how much of it we can get done today’: Floating deadlines

As indicated throughout Chapter 9, another primary defensive teaching practice in the ESLL classrooms was the floating deadline, one which was implicated in other accommodations to G1.5 cultural productions of ESLL, including study hall, Worksheet Syndrome, and alternative assignments. As its label suggests, the floating deadline was deployed when students had not brought materials and/or had not done the classwork necessary for the “official” classroom business to be completed for a given day. Because all of the ESLL teachers had flexible time deadlines for bookwork, quizzes, and other assignments, ostensibly to provide additional time for lower L2 proficient students to complete the work, it rather easily and usefully came to be exploited in G1.5 student classroom performance strikes, to the extent that in the first-year ESLL teachers’ classes in particular, the majority of classroom assignment deadlines were either negotiated explicitly for extra time or simply extended with no discussion at all. As the end of each quarter approached in all of these classes, Ms. Cheney, Mr. Day, and Ms. Ariel would inevitably be reminding students to get work that might ordinarily be considered “late” turned in before the quarter’s end. Mr. Bradley, too, used the floating deadline regularly in his classes, as suggested in the brief data extract from his ESLL C class that follows. In it, only one of the 15 students in the class had completed their homework assignment:

---

5 Mr. Day uttered this during a bookwork study hall session (ELA32Xmd3: 228).
“write about five symbols of America that reflect this great nation of ours.” Mr. Bradley’s lack of reaction to the poor completion rate, as well as his automatic extension of the deadline to the next class session, speaks to the frequency of students not doing their work, in addition to the implicit expectation that this would be the case.

(10.2) *Anybody*? [ELC21Vfn: 59]

1 Mr. Bradley: Homework? Anybody? Nobody. ((one student raises her hand)).
   One person. Okay. The rest of you have until Wednesday. But I want it done then.

For their part, many G1.5 students relied on the relative lack of firm due dates for assignments, and in an indication of the reciprocal nature of performance strike practices on defensive teaching accommodations, and vice versa, would use them as an (additional) “reason” for not doing work. This is indicated in Extract 10.3, in a formal interview between Ioane and me, in which I was asking her to elaborate on why she rarely did classwork in Mr. Day’s ELA 2X class.

(10.3) *Budge* [SINT15: 142-159]

1 Mr. Talmy: Let me ask you: you were just saying, you think the work is really easy in ESL but you don’t do it.
3 Ioane: Yup.
5 Ioane: ((laughing)) Ai dono. I don’t know.
7 Mr. Talmy: ‘Cause it’s too easy?
9 Ioane: A:, no. Kaz laik ai tink – ai alweiz tink “o, nah, dis wrk izi, so –” alweiz get da nex dei fo du am, kaz im, hi nomo DU DEIT yae!? Uh, no. Because like, I think – I always think “oh, no, this work is easy, so–” there’s always the next day to do it, because for him, he never has DUE DATES, right!? 
Ioane makes clear that how Mr. Day’s floating deadlines factors into her own rationale for not turning in the work in his class. Interestingly, she contradicts my assertion that she does not do the work because it is too easy, as she herself had stated moments prior to this interaction: “An da wrk! Ha, is nat chalenjing, is laik – das wai ai don du am.” (And the work! Hah, it’s not challenging, it’s like – that’s why I don’t do it.) (SINT15: 58; also see Chapter 8). Instead, she elaborates that it is because deadlines are so unfixed, in addition to the work being so easy, that she doesn’t do it, the
implication being that she just puts it off, and then perhaps forgets about it, or waits until it is too late, or waits until there is simply too much to catch up on at the end of the quarter, to turn it all in. Whatever the reason, however, it seems clear in Joane’s talk (cf. lines 11-14 and lines 16-19) that floating deadlines are implicative of the relative value Mr. Day attaches to the work for which deadlines get extended, that is, that it is not important enough to turn in at a certain point in time, that it does not bear much relation to future work on which it might be based, that it is, in short, busy work or “filler,” to use Mr. Bradley’s term (ELC11Vfn: 126). What remains unspoken, however, is the role that students like Joane play in the defensive teaching accommodation of floating deadlines, that by not turning in assigned work even though it is “izi” – even as it gets easier and easier over the course of the quarter, the semester, and the school year – that they contribute to this accommodation, provide the premise for it, resulting in official ESLL curriculum and instruction that is precisely what she and so many other G1.5 students claim to hate about ESLL: that it is just too easy, and because it is, they “don ivin baj baut” it. This reveals not only the cyclical, mutually reinforcing dynamic between performance strike practices such as not doing work and defensive teaching accommodations such as floating deadlines that attended them, but also how both teachers and students came to collaboratively disengage in official teaching and learning.

“Filler”: Alternative assignments

As suggested in Extract 9.3 in Chapter 9, if students did not bring their books with them to class, or didn’t read them, other related assignments (i.e., the book work) couldn’t proceed. “Study hall,” as described above, was a common response to this
student practice, in which students would be given class time to complete grammar exercises or homework. A variation on this response, most often used by Ms. Cheney and Ms. Ariel, involved the assignment of alternative, mostly unplanned activities, instead of the book work or other activities that had been assigned as homework. In the event that not enough students had brought materials or done homework, Ms. Cheney, for instance, would often reach into a cabinet for a stack of anthologies of short stories or an assortment of dog-eared English survival skills textbooks for class use instead. Ms. Ariel tended toward small-scale “projects” which might extend over two or three additional class sessions, grammar exercises from one of several different ESL conversation books on shelves in her classroom, or perhaps a “freewriting” journal assignment followed by some sort of discussion. Because these were spontaneous, off-the-cuff assignments, they normally entailed little instruction, required minimal cognitive effort to complete (i.e., were “easy,” with the exception of some of the short stories that were distributed for reading), and usually bore little relation or relevance to other assignments in the ESLL classes; that is, they displayed the hallmarks of busy-work assignments. These sorts of accommodations were frequent enough that Mr. Bradley even had a specific term to refer to them: “filler” (see Chapter 7).

This particular manifestation of defensive teaching, here in response to students not bringing materials to class is illustrated in Extract 10.4, a segment from Ms. Ariel’s ELA 2W class which took place a few weeks before Winter Vacation. As in Extract 10.1 (but in contrast to Extract 9.3), this interaction comes toward the beginning of class. On the whiteboard at the front of the class is the following information, the “lesson plan” for the day:
1) Vocab test

2) Reading/summaries and final book tests

3) Extra credit and make Xmas cards - due today (ELA32Wfn: 1764-1766).

Below this information is a series of bulleted instructions detailing #3, the “extra credit” Christmas card-drawing assignment for a school-wide Christmas card drive that had been announced in the morning bulletin.

The vocabulary quiz consisted of 15 words drawn from one of two books that the students in this class were reading this quarter, *Dogsong* (Paulsen, 1985) or *Island of the blue dolphins* (O'Dell, 1960). Following distribution of the quiz, Ms. Ariel had given the following instructions: “If you finish ahead of time before other people, you can just come put it here {i.e., the quiz on her desk} and then go onto your reading” (ELA32Wmd6: 1825).6 The “Reading/summaries” work (#2 on the board) that students were to go on to after finishing the quiz had been assigned as homework in the previous class session (ELA32Wmd5: 1675) (see “not doing work” in Chapter 9) with several reminders from Ms. Ariel that with the approach of Winter Vacation, students needed to get their book work finished and turned in soon.

This interaction occurs as the class is in the process of transitioning from the vocabulary quiz to the bookwork assignments. Some students were turning in their quizzes, while others continued to work on them. CKY (CampKillYourself), a Vietnamese G1.5 9th grader who had lived in the US for 9 years, has just turned in his

---

6 All the ESLL teachers had flexible time deadlines for quizzes and other assignments, ostensibly to provide additional time for lower L2 proficient students to complete the work. See the discussion above on “floating deadlines” for consideration of how this came to be usefully exploited in student performance strikes.
quiz and is sitting at his desk, but contrary to Ms. Ariel’s earlier instructions, and those that are written on the board, he is not doing the book work.

(10.4) Just do this [ELA32Wmd6: 1888-1899]

1   Ms. Ariel:  (Where’s) your book?
    CKY: (3) It’s at home.
3   Ms. Ariel:  ((sounding irritated)) At home. (2) Okay. Um:: (5) ((looks at the whiteboard)) Well.
5   Eddie:  ((nodding at the whiteboard)) Mis, kaen wi du dat?= Miss, can we do that?
    Ms. Ariel: = Yeah, you can. ((to the class)) If — if you don’t have your book, you can just do this. ((points to the instructions for the Christmas card activity written on the whiteboard)) This is due today, though. It’s for (. . .) the card drive?
9   Eddie:  Yae, jas gada laik, laik [(inaudible)
      Yeah, we just gotta like, like
    Ms. Ariel:  [‘Cause tomorrow they’re gonna deliver them. (I have to.) All the — the rules are right here. ((points to the whiteboard again)) They don’t want you to use your last name.
13  Eddie:  [Yae, jas put yo nem, yae?
      Yeah, just put your name, yeah?
15  *:  [[inaudible Chuukese
    Ms. Ariel:  (5) ((to the class)) Bring your books next time! If you have them at home, bring them to class next time. Please.
17  Dannica:  Which book?
19  Ms. Ariel:  ((sounding irritated)) If you’re saying which book, then it probably doesn’t even matter. (. . .) The books you’ve been reading.

This interaction begins with the teacher asking a student a question about where the student’s assigned children’s book is (cf. Chapter 9, Extract 9.3). As students who took up the “not bringing materials to class” practice often did when confronted about this circumstance, CKY here responds that it’s “at home.” In line 3, Ms. Ariel restates CKY’s utterance “At home.” with audible irritation. After pausing briefly, she holds her turn with an extended hesitation marker “Um::” and then pauses in silence for five
additional seconds, as she looks from CKY to the whiteboard. Her actions here indicate an attempt to conceive of an alternative for the main classroom activities that she had already planned for this session, that is, the reading summaries and preparation for the end-of-book exam. In fact, two other G1.5 students, Eddie and Raven, indicated earlier in the class period (before the vocabulary quiz) that they had not brought their books either. At that time Ms. Ariel stated that she had spare copies for them; her pause here may indicate that she is now rethinking her earlier “remedy” for this particular problem, that is, that there may not be enough spare books. She then utters “Well.”, which as Schiffrin (1987) has noted, can mark some form of dispreference regarding “an answer that is clearly outside of the questioner’s expectations” (Schiffrin, 1987, p. 108). Ms. Ariel is evidently annoyed that CKY, and likely Eddie and Raven, have not brought their books for the book work and now seems unsure what alternative activity she can provide in its stead.

Eddie, who at the time had also turned in his quiz and was watching Ms. Ariel, then asks her if “we” (presumably he and CKY, and possibly Raven) can do “that,” gesturing toward the board in evident reference to the “extra credit” assignment that is written there. Ms. Ariel’s latched reply in line 6, “=Yeah, you can.”, suggests that she may have been contemplating precisely this possibility (cf. Cameron, 1999). She then raises her voice to address the class about this, modifying the instructions she gave earlier that students should go on to their reading book work once the quiz was complete: “If—if you don’t have your book, you can just do this.”, while pointing at the instructions for the Christmas card drawing activity.
What is of interest here is that there is no check to see if anyone else has left their books “at home,” and if so, how many. For that matter, neither is there any check here or at any point in the class period about whether anyone actually needs class time to do the book work (specifically the summaries), which, as mentioned above, had already been assigned as homework the previous class. Rather, Ms. Ariel’s statement here presupposes the possibility that more students have not brought their books, as if this is a common occurrence, a point supported by her not prefacing her modified instructions in lines 6-9 with any reference to or repetition of the original ones (which were uttered approximately 15 minutes earlier). It also presupposes the possibility that students have not already done the summary homework. Thus, that she has put “reading/summaries” on the classroom agenda at all signals an orientation on her part to the probability that students would not have already completed this homework, since she has scheduled class time for them to do it. Her statement in line 8, “This is due today, though.” also implies this, particularly use of “though,” which contrasts her explicit deadline (“today”) with an implied one she projects for the students, that is, not today: a later time, if indeed, ever. She follows this with a short explanation about the reason behind the assignment, that “It’s for (.) the card drive?” with a rising intonation, as if to justify either it or why the cards are due today. This is clarified in line 11, when she explains that the assignment is due today “Cause tomorrow they’re gonna deliver them.” By providing this rationale, Ms. Ariel further highlights the relative importance for those students who opt to draw Christmas cards of getting them completed and turned in today.

In line 16, Ms. Ariel finally addresses the issue of students not bringing their books to class when she says to the class, with an exclamatory intonation, “Bring your
books next time!” She then iterates an amended and therefore softened form of this injunction, “If you have them at home, bring them to class next time.” Following this comes “Please.” Coming as it does after the falling intonational contour of the previous sentence, it is accentuated, and uttered in such a way that it mitigates the imperatives before it while also conveying a stance of muted frustration. This frustration surfaces in line 19, when in response to Dannica’s question, “Which book?”, Ms. Ariel replies, “If you’re saying which book, then it probably doesn’t even matter.” The emphasis on “probably” and the addition of “even” combined with her ironic tone and quick delivery articulate an obvious stance of irritation. After a slight pause, she then, however, provides Dannica with her answer, “The books you’ve been reading.”

As it turned out, a majority of students (perhaps unsurprisingly) indicated that they had not brought their books to class. For these students, then, the remainder of this class was spent drawing, socializing, and playing cards as classical music played softly in the background, with the last 15 minutes of class spent correcting the vocabulary quiz that had been taken at the beginning of class (in fact, several quizzes were still out 60 minutes after it had been assigned). Thus, instead of the reading assignments, and instead of preparation for the most significant test of the quarter (the end-of-book exam), the testing of 15 vocabulary words and an “extra credit” drawing assignment became the main instructional activities for the day for a majority of the class members. Indeed, in the remainder of this particular class, and in the two remaining classes of that week, no other mention was made of the reading/summaries or the exam review; in fact, in the remaining two classes that week there was no work scheduled that involved the books at
all, with one class spent on an adverbs game, and the other on an exercise that involved writing a paragraph on “My best Christmas memory.”

The experiences of the first year ESLL teachers are instructive, but I should note that Mr. Bradley, too, encountered this practice (and others as described below), and in certain respects, e.g., reducing instructional demands on students and changing or canceling assignments, responded in similar ways. In certain other respects, however, she responded in a notably different fashion, as described in Chapter 9, and although this particular response resulted in more students bringing their books and other materials to her classes, the practice of not bringing materials nevertheless reached the point where more drastic action was necessary for each of the ESLL teachers I observed. Ms. Cheney, for example, who at the end of one quarter was missing over 60 books from her ESLL classes, began a policy of checking out books only to those students who had turned in ones from the previous quarter, which meant that a large number of her students were not allowed to take books home, and thus, had to do reading assignments in class. Both Ms. Ariel and Mr. Day also wound up anticipating and incorporating this practice into their lessons (cf. Extract 10.1 above), with Ms. Ariel gradually reducing the amount of book work in her class, in favor of “projects” instead. 7 As I mentioned in Chapter 9, Mr. Bradley, Ms. Ariel, and Mr. Day eventually went so far as to refuse to check out books at all, meaning that all reading work, which had previously been assigned as homework, came to be done in class, with Ms. Ariel and Mr. Day for the better parts of three quarters not assigning any homework besides vocabulary study for quizzes, too.

7 Students in Ms. Ariel’s class wound up being assigned to read three books rather than the usual four over the course of the school year (one per quarter) as in the other ESLL classes, with students assigned one book in the last two quarters of the year rather than two. In addition, and in notable contrast to all the other ESLL classes, Ms. Ariel did not have the usual “end-of-book exam” for the final assigned book.
since students simply wouldn’t do it. These forms of defensive teaching are clearly indicative of teachers’ various accommodations of G1.5 ESLL students’ cultural productions of ESLL.

Students not doing their work had a number of obvious implications both for their classes and for them; in terms of personal consequences, perhaps the most obvious was the decline in their course grades, which also had an important impact on classroom instructional practice. I describe both facets of this next.

‘It’s really so easy’: Test preparation

If there was one aspect of G1.5 community performance strike practices that appeared to trouble the ESLL teachers beyond the immediate effects they had on the official curriculum and classroom life, it was the consequences they hand on G1.5 ESLL students’ grades, which suffered a remarkable drop-off as the school year wore on. This is another of the more obvious (as well as superficial) gauges indicating that performance strikes can operate as a form of “self-sabotage” for their practitioners (Shor, 1992).

To give some indication of G1.5 ESLL student grade drop-off, I provide in Table 10.1 and Figure 10.1 quarterly grades of 55 students for whom I have these data, 25 of whom are students I have grouped as G1.5, and 30 of whom are students I consider to be “non-G1.5.” Obviously, it is a mistake to draw too many conclusions from students’ academic grades. However, grades do provide some indicators of school performance,

---

8 “It’s really so easy!” was a protest uttered by Ms. Ariel following a simplified vocabulary quiz on which a majority students had not done well (ELA41Wmd9: 940).
9 I am aware of the dangers of circularity in argument here. My determination of who was and was not G1.5 is, of course, a determination I made based on substantial ethnographic knowledge of these students, and includes most of the students discussed in Chapters 8 and 9 (as well as others), and using the criteria elucidated in Chapter 2. I should note that these determinations were made before I had compared these students’ grades. I should also note that I do not have grades data for all student participants in this study.
and are of interest at least because the level of difficulty of the ESLL classes across the board got easier over the course of the year, rather than more difficult, with the number of assignments and the requirements for them reduced, additional class time provided to complete classwork and homework, deadlines repeatedly extended, preparation for tests increased, and so forth (see below; Chapter 9).

As indicated in Table 10.1 and Figure 10.1, both the G1.5 and non-G1.5 groups completed the first quarter of school year with roughly similar grades in their ESLL classes, and although the G1.5 group was slightly below the non-G1.5 group, this difference is not statistically significant (t= .679, df=53, n.s.). For the remainder of the year, however, it is noticeable that the mean ESLL grade of the non-G1.5 group remained comparatively stable with only minor fluctuations (ranging from 2.27 to 2.37), whereas the mean ESLL grade for the G1.5 group, declined precipitously, particularly in the second and third quarter, though it recovered slightly in the fourth quarter. Differences between the groups were significant both for the third quarter (t=2.355, df=53, p < .025) and fourth quarter (t=2.358, df=53, p < .025).

Table 10.1. Comparison of G1.5 and non-G1.5 groups’ quarterly grades over one academic year (4.0 scale; Year 2 of study)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr 2 Quarter 1 – Fall</td>
<td>G1.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.092</td>
<td>.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-G1.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.213</td>
<td>.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 2 Quarter 2 – Fall</td>
<td>G1.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.201</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-G1.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.299</td>
<td>.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 2 Quarter 3 – Spring</td>
<td>G1.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.225</td>
<td>.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-G1.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.461</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 2 Quarter 4 – Spring</td>
<td>G1.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.194</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-G1.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.426</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A comparison of means within a repeated-measures analysis of variance showed a statistically significant interaction between group membership (G1.5 or non-G1.5) and quarter ($F(3,51) = 2.939, p < .05$). This means that both generation 1.5 status and which quarter was graded influenced ESLL grades for these students. Repeated-measures t-tests used as post-hoc tests indicated that for the G1.5 group, performance was significantly lower in Quarter 3 ($t = 2.688, p < .05$) and Quarter 4 ($t = 2.521, p < .05$) than in Quarter
1. No other differences between quarters were statistically significant. For the non-G1.5 group, no differences between quarters were statistically significant.\footnote{My thanks to Carsten Roever for his assistance with the statistics.}

Defensive teaching accommodations were thus not only deployed to ensure student compliance in exchange for reduced demands and expectations, but also to ensure that students wouldn’t fail classes en masse. Indeed, most of the defensive teaching accommodations, from extending deadlines, to reducing demands, offering alternative assignments, study hall, and Worksheet Syndrome, can be seen as being motivated at least in part by teachers’ desire that students receive better grades on (official) ESLL classroom assignments. This is no more apparent than in another of the primary defensive teaching accommodations, which I call “test preparation.”

Preparing for quizzes and tests was one of the most common, recurrent features of ESLL classroom instruction. Much of the preparation was concentrated around the vocabulary quizzes from the children’s books, from the word reviews and practice exercises to the extra time provided students to study before quizzes were to be administered. Test preparation was also common in the two or three weeks leading up to the quarterly end-of-book exams, at least in Mr. Bradley’s and Mr. Day’s classes, as Ms. Ms. Ariel abandoned these tests for the final two quarters of the school year,\footnote{Although Ms. Ariel did not have end-of-book exams for either the 3rd or 4th quarter (second semester) in her ELA 2W class, she did have a final exam, which due to an illness at the end of the semester, became “optional” (see Appendices I.8-I.10). After first hearing there would be final exam in the class, Raven exclaimed, “Final exam!? On what?” (ELA42Wfn: 4610). Review of the exam clearly indicates the influence and orientation of Worksheet Syndrome, and the “Essay Question” (Appendix I.10) offers another example of FOBeing in the structural and official cultural productions of ESLL.} and Ms. Cheney never used them at all (despite her use of the children’s books). Although activities that are designed to prepare and enable students to pass tests in themselves are not uncommon features of many if not all public high school classrooms, the increasing
frequency and repetition of them in the Tradewinds ESLL program, as students increasingly withdrew their participation in official classroom instruction, became notably pronounced.

This is indicated in the interaction in Extract 10.5, which came at the end of Mr. Day’s first quarter teaching the ELA 2X class. To provide a measure of background context here, Mr. Day’s first quarter of teaching this class was plagued by problems brought on by the onset of a widespread G1.5 student performance strike. Indeed, only five classes into the new school year, virtually all of the G1.5 students had failed the first vocabulary quiz he had given for the novel being read that quarter, *Call it courage* (Sperry, 1940). After consulting with Mr. Anderson, and obviously perplexed, he told me, “few people did well [on the test] in this class. So I think I’m gonna have to slow it down. Maybe I’ll have them draw pictures from the story and color them to help them understand” (ELA31Xfn: 158). Shortly afterward, he began implementing study hall activities and extending deadlines, with the clearly stated reason being that students needed these accommodations and others due to low L2 proficiency.

The interaction represented in Extract 10.5 thus occurs as Mr. Day was struggling in various ways to accommodate the G1.5 cultural production of ESLL, specifically to ensure that students would be able to pass the final end-of-book exam for *Call it courage*. As the interaction commences, he is standing at the front of the class, having just passed out a “practice test” for the end-of-book exam (cf. Appendix J.4).
1 Mr. Day: Now, this is a practice test. Practice. Nina already started. Shh! What I’d like you guys to do – shh! How many times have I gone over these answers with you?

3 Ioane: Four.
5 Mr. Day: Four, right?
7 Sky Blue: Yep.

7 Mr. Day: You did it once beforehand, then I told you the answers, we went over it again yesterday in class and you wrote it down. (inaudible) Four times. Alright. Last – fifth time. Write down – close your notes – I want to see how many of these questions you can answer correctly off the top of your head. This is the exact copy of the test. If you guys can answer this right now, off the top of your head (2) you’ll get an A.

13 Laidplayer: Whoa!
15 ?MS: Exact thing?
17 Laidplayer: ((sounding surprised)) Exact thing? EXACT thing?
19 Sky Blue: Exact thing.
19 Mr. Day: The exact thing.
21 Sky Blue: On the test?
21 Mr. Day: You’ll get an A on the test.

23 Sky Blue: ((sarcastic)) I’ll try my best.
23 Mr. Day: CJ, stop drawing, here. ((points to CJ’s test)) Everybody try.

25 Sky Blue: Try my best! Try my best, try my best! TRY MY BEST!
27 Mr. Day: See if you can do it! {some further instructions omitted} When you guys are done with this, you can check it yourself, see if the answers are correct. Just remember, I gave you all the answers.

As Mr. Day notes in line 11, and to the students’ (and my) considerable surprise at the time, this “practice” test was in fact the actual final exam that they would be taking the next class session. In lines 2-3, Mr. Day elicits the number of times they have already gone over the answers for this test. After Ioane’s answer of “Four.” in line 4, Mr. Day repeats, “Four, right?” The repetition and the added confirmation check are affective intensifiers that index a stance of strong, almost emphatic expectation: he has already gone over the answers for the test four times, in four prior class sessions, as he
enumerates in lines 7-9, as if to suggest that because he has spent so much time on test preparation, the students have no reasonable excuse to fail. He then continues, in further support of this expectation, that they will now go over the answers a fifth time, and not only that, that they will do so using an exact copy of the test. If they can answer the questions here "off the top of your head," then they will "get an A." Mr. Day’s stance here implies that he realizes that there may something else besides an ostensible lack of L2 proficiency responsible for students diminishing grades, which is revealed in line 22 with "Everybody try." and again in line 24 with "Try hard!" It appears that Mr. Day is imputing low student motivation, rather than low L2 proficiency as the putative reason that grades have been so poor in this class.

The students’ surprise at being handed the exact copy of the test is echoed variously in lines 14-25, even though the “exact” questions on the test had already been given on the four previous occasions that the answers had been reviewed. Also echoed here is at least one G1.5 student’s (Sky Blue’s) scorn, given his increasingly acerbic, high-pitched and high-volume “Try my best!” As I indicated in Chapter 9, Sky Blue was the one G1.5 student who was most overtly critical of Mr. Day’s instruction in the ESLL class, and here, he clearly plays on the implication that low student motivation might be the reason behind G1.5 students’ low classroom performance. In lines 26-28, Mr. Day appears to return to the rationale that students need the extra test preparation due to some

---

12 Because they were the same questions given every quarter as well, they would be known to students after the first quarter’s exam anyway (although this particular exam is for the first quarter). This underscores the point that the quarterly final end-of-book exam in fact only required rote memorization of answers already given in test preparation sessions such as this one (and those four prior). Thus, the students’ surprise (as well as my own) was no doubt a result of being handed the actual test itself, even though the content of it was already known.
sort of lack of ability when he says “See if you can do it!” He concludes with another pointed reminder, “Just remember, I gave you all the answers.”

As it turned out, despite five class periods spent going over each of the eight questions on this end-of-book exam, test preparation which included the distribution of the actual exam as a “study guide” prior to its administration, nearly all of the G1.5 students in the class wound up with Ds or Fs on it. Mr. Day was understandably very disappointed with these results. In an interview sometime later, he suggested the reason for performance such as this may not only have been due to low L2 proficiency or low motivation, but “stress, ‘cause they have a hard time with English.” He then continued, be it stress, low motivation, or low L2 proficiency, “for whatever reason, I don’t think they’re concentrating the effort. You know, it could be from the point of, maybe, you know, it needs to be easier.” (TINT9: 342-344).

As indicated at various points in both Chapter 8 and Chapter 9, Mr. Day’s explanations for low student performance here are similar to those made by the other ESLL teachers. Underlying all of these explanations was a notable lack of acknowledgement that students’ academic performance may have been the result of low investment in or resistance to materials, curriculum, and instruction that for them lacked the cultural, linguistic, and symbolic capital they needed or desired. Instead, what was implicated was putative deficiencies in the students themselves. This provided the rationale for defensive teaching accommodations such as test preparation, which led to an increasingly restricted ESLL official curriculum and a program that became increasingly easier and academically inconsequential as the school year progressed.
Whatever Mr. Day’s and the other ESLL teachers’ “explanations” for G1.5 students’ performance, the accommodations they made to it are emblematic of their accommodation to G1.5 performance strike practices. In this sense, then, defensive teaching is evidence of teacher uptake of and participation in the G1.5 cultural productions of ESLL (cf. Bullough, 1989; Shor, 1992; Sizer, 2004). Just as G1.5 students provided a broad context within and against which other students could participate in G1.5 community practices, their withdrawal from participation in official curriculum and classroom life prompted a series of related, mutually recursive compensatory adjustments on the part of teachers that both enabled students’ performance strike practices and facilitated the steady instructional slow-down in the ESLL classes, manifest in easier assignments, reduced demands, relaxed deadlines, and lowered expectations. As I argued in Chapter 9, this is a dynamic which turns on its head the commonsense relations of teacher/expert/oldtimer and student/novice/newcomer, as well as the ostensible roles of “socializer” and “socializee” (cf. Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; He, 2003; Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991; Lave, 1991; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). As more and more students took up participation in these practices, as the performance strikes became broader and more sustained, teachers took an active role in the G1.5 cultural productions of ESLL as they responded to and “accommodated” their performance strike practices.

Although I have maintained that teachers most often did not participate in the same practices as G1.5 students did in their accommodation of G1.5 cultural productions of ESLL, on a few occasions they did. This happened most often in Mr. Bradley’s classes, in his explicit invocation of linguist discourses and ideologies about ESLL that were in circulation at Tradewinds (see Chapter 9, Extracts 9.12-9.15). In the following
section, I examine a series of interactions in which another teacher, Ms. Ariel, also came
to participate explicitly in G1.5 community practices, specifically in terms of the
FOBeing of a non-G1.5 student, in far less contentious terms than Mr. Bradley’s, terms
which, I shall argue, further signal her accommodation of the G1.5 cultural productions
of ESLL through her participation in G1.5 community practices.

**Forever FOB: The respecification of ESLL**¹³

In Chapter 9, I examined a short extract (Extract 9.17) in which Mack Daddy, a
G1.5 Chuukese student participated in a G1.5 CoP instantiation of FOBeing, which I
have argued is a cluster of associated practices appropriated from (and that in some cases
parody) the structural and “official” cultural productions of ESLL at Tradewinds High
School. In that instance, he resorted to a mock language variety I call Mock ESL in
response to a non-G1.5 lower-L2-proficient student’s struggle with oral L2 English,
uttering in a caricatured, stylized way, “I don speak no Inglich.” In that instance, he was
(briefly) rebuked by his teacher, Mr. Day, an expected, if mild response from teachers
and no doubt one reason why FOBeing through Mock ESL was not a common
interactional event, at least in public (e.g., whole-class) forums where teachers were
present.

In the next series of interactions, however, I examine several G1.5 students
engage in (appropriated) FOBeing practices, not just through Mock ESL, but in
denotative and interactional terms as well, with their teacher co-present – indeed, with
their teacher as co-participant – during a whole-class activity. Thus, the following

¹³ A portion of this section appears in slightly different form and with slightly different analysis in Talmy
(2004a).
discussion is of particular interest not just in terms of the FOBeing practices employed, but also in how students appropriated the teacher’s role in FOBeing, fundamentally rearticulated it, and then were joined by her as the FOBeing continued for an extended period of time in front of the entire class, indeed, during a classroom presentation participation structure.

The interaction represented in Extracts 10.6-10.9 took place in Ms. Ariel’s class, during the presentation phase of the Pop-Up Holiday Project (see Chapter 9, Extract 9.8). This project involved students choosing a holiday “from their own country or culture” and then preparing a short summary about it for an oral presentation. This summary was to be accompanied by a “pop-up” scene, a kind of diorama that students were to create that signified the holiday somehow, e.g., a depiction of a setting with a jack-o-lantern to represent Halloween. As I argued in Chapter 9, the project was an attempt by Ms. Ariel to cultivate student pride in “their” cultures, yet was based on a rather narrowly conceptualized multiculturalism and a nationalist language ideology in which country, culture, language, nationality, and identity were conflated. In these terms, then, the Pop-Up Holiday Project was one manifestation of the structural production of ESLL, instantiated in an official cultural production. Put another way, it was an example of the structural and official cultural productions of FOBeing.

My analysis in Chapter 9 involved not only a discussion concerning the structural and official cultural productions of ESLL in terms of FOBeing, but also the resistance of two G1.5 students, China and Raven, to being positioned as FOB. As I argued, China and Raven performed an alternative (G1.5 or non-FOB) subject position through their resistance to Ms. Ariel’s FOBeing practice. I argued that their resistance held the
possibility for a rejection of the linguicist discourses and ideologies that constitute FOB, the practice of FOBeing, and the mainstream/ESLL hierarchy they were part of; unfortunately, as I describe in below, it ultimately was one that worked to reinscribe it as well.

Reinscribing FOB

In this section, I examine four excerpts from one oral presentation of the Pop-Up Project. Here, I argue that China and Nat, a 9th grade boy from the Marshall Islands who had lived in Hawai'i for over 8 years (see Chapter 9, Extract 9.20), (further) resist being positioned as FOB in terms specified by the Pop-Up Holiday Project, by positioning a classmate as one instead, thereby differentiating themselves from him and defining themselves relationally (Barth, 1969; Barker & Galasiński, 2001) as non-FOB. The means by which they accomplish this differ dramatically from those employed by Ms. Ariel in Chapter 9 (Extract 9.8): here they index their differences from Isaac*, who is presenting on New Year’s in Chuuk, by teasing and humiliation, which is to say, FOBeing, making fun of his lower L2 English ability and his Chuukese heritage. Still, the effect is the same: the reinscription (and redefinition) not only of the FOB subject position and the practice of FOBeing, but the linguicist mainstream/ESLL hierarchy they are constitutive of and are constituted by.
At the time of his presentation, Isaac was a 17 year-old sophomore\(^{14}\) who had come to Hawai‘i from Chuuk just weeks before. He was soft-spoken and reserved, and was the only Chuukese boy in the class. His L2 English proficiency allowed him to participate orally in most activities in Ms. Ariel’s class, but he had distinct difficulty with academic L2 English reading and writing. He regularly wore baggy black jeans that were too big for him and that were rolled up at the cuffs, an oversized t-shirt, and Keds sneakers; his wavy black hair, cut short at the sides, was long on top, pomaded, and pulled into a tight pony-tail. He was as different from Raven’s surfer image as he was from China’s NBA chic and Nat’s cultivated hip-hop style.

Isaac’s Pop-Up presentation occurred about two weeks after the Pop-Up project had been assigned. A handful of students had already given their presentations, but most of the class hadn’t completed the project yet, though it had been due the class session prior. Ms. Ariel was annoyed about this as well as by the fact that presentations had thus far averaged less than one minute each, despite more than two weeks of class time spent on preparation. In terms of the number of students with incomplete work, and the brevity of those presentations which had been complete, it can be argued that Ms. Ariel was again contending with the effects of a G1.5 student performance strike (see Chapter 9 for Raven’s and China’s Pop-Up Holiday “summaries”).

\(^{14}\) Isaac was one of many Micronesian students who were not in “age appropriate” grade levels, i.e., were considerably older than their peers (see Heine, 2002; Talmy, 2005 for more on contemporary circumstances of Micronesian students in Hawai‘i public schools; for discussion of formal schooling in Micronesia, see Hezel, 2002; Spencer, 1992; Thomas, 1984). The disparity between Isaac’s age and grade resulted in his unexpected “release” from Tradewinds shortly after these data were collected: he had just turned 18 but was nowhere close to earning the credits needed to graduate. Over the period of this study, an alarming number of ESLL students, Micronesian and otherwise, were similarly “released.”
The first in the series of data extracts that I present occurs just before Isaac gives his presentation. He is standing at the front of the class with only his written report: he has not completed the Pop-Up artwork.

(10.6) *It's a country again?* [ELA32Wmd5: 1572-1581]

1. Ms. Ariel: Okay. Let us know where you’re reporting from.
   Isaac: Huh?
3. Ms. Ariel: Where your holiday is from.
   China: Hwat, its a kantri [agen.]
   *What, it's a country again?*
5. Isaac: [Chuuk.]
   Ms. Ariel: Country.
   Ms. Ariel: ((to the class, nodding)) Micronesia (.) Chuuk.
   ((Isaac laughs, Chuukese girls and others laugh; China joins in exaggerated, loud))

The frame for the interaction here is “keyed” (Goffman, 1974) by Ms. Ariel with reference to a far-off place, distance, the imagery evoked by the phrase “where you are reporting from.” The implication is that wherever it is, it isn’t “here.” Following Ms. Ariel’s clarification in line 3, but before Isaac has a chance to reply, China interjects with a sarcastic challenge about “it” being a country. Though it appears odd that China knows what “it” is (Chuuk), and that he’s contesting it being a country, even though no reference has been made to either, he is referring to an unresolved dispute from an earlier presentation when two Chuukese girls made this assertion. China had questioned this, the girls had reemphasized it, and with the class looking on, both parties had yielded to Ms. Ariel to arbitrate. Though she had been unsure, Ms. Ariel had sided with the girls,
and to China’s disbelief, Chuuk’s status as a country remained unchanged.\textsuperscript{15} Thus, China’s question here works as another challenge to the idea (that Ms. Ariel has endorsed) that Chuuk is a country. More to the point, it is a challenge to Ms. Ariel herself: the form of the sentence is an exclamatory question (“Hwat, its a kantri agen.”) with a strong emphasis on the first syllable of “kantri”, and is spoken in a loud, deliberate, syllable-timed manner with a falling intonational contour, hallmarks of Pidgin (see Sakoda & Siegel, 2003, pp. 29-30). The switch to Pidgin further emphasizes the exclamatory nature of the question, and thus China’s doubt, and, as a variety that tends to be used in more informal communication, it works to compress power asymmetries between the institutional roles of student and teacher. It also works as a challenge to Ms. Ariel in terms of China’s ongoing negotiation of who is and is not FOB: Pidgin is “Local” language (see Chapter 2); it is hardly something a FOB would, or more precisely, could speak. Thus, the switch to Pidgin also signals in-group membership with other Pidgin speakers in the class: G1.5 students such as Nat and Raven who have been living in Hawai‘i for years, who may identify more as Local than “foreign,” and who resist being cast as FOB. China here not only questions whether Chuuk is a country, but Ms. Ariel’s authority, her knowledge, and her power in the classroom: her position, really, to position others, especially him, as Others.

The confusion about Chuuk serves as an ironic counterpoint to the one nation/one language ideology that this assignment and the linguist hierarchy it perpetuates

\textsuperscript{15} Chuuk is a state (of the country called the Federated States of Micronesia). A similar issue had arisen with a prior assignment called the Flag Project: there had been considerable confusion among the Chuukese students about which flag represented “their country,” and they had difficulty finding representations of it in the atlases and other reference materials Ms. Ariel had brought in for research (in contrast to the other students in the class).
promote. However, in the context of this class and this assignment, the questionable statuses of Chuuk and of Micronesia leaves the people they are identified/conflated with on an unequal footing with class members who “represent” places that are more well known, at least at Tradewinds (China, Taiwan, Korea, the Philippines, etc.). In other words, in the context of this class, where a nationalist language ideology is as salient as it is, that there is some question about the status of Chuuk and of Micronesia makes them somehow less: less well known; less worthy, perhaps, of being known. Therefore, those students who are identified as Chuukese or Micronesian may be considered somehow less as people. Indeed, a racist “status order” similar to the one that Bickel (2002) reports on was evident at Tradewinds, with “[s]tudents from East Asia often look[ing] down upon Micronesians” (p. 2). This racism was manifest in a host of distressing comments about Micronesians’ intelligence, hygiene, behavior in class, activities outside it, and motivations for being in the US (see Talmy, 2005). It is also evident in the interactions that follow.

In response to China’s question, Ms. Ariel is firm, with her one-word averral that Chuuk is indeed “Country.” Isaac agrees, then confuses matters by stating “Micronesia. Uh, Chuuk.” Ms. Ariel accepts this as a confirmation and repeats it for the class. Mona, a Chuukese girl, then imitates Ms. Ariel, and Isaac and the other Chuukese girls laugh. China joins in, but in a mocking, exaggerated manner, again suggesting a double-edged challenge, one to Ms. Ariel, the other to the Chuukese.

The interaction continues after the laughter subsides. As Isaac begins his presentation, Nat begins his attempt at rearticulating the attributes of an FOB subjectivity, and thus respecifying what “ESLL” is to signify.
From Isaac’s initial mispronunciation of “celebrate” in line 14 up until line 20, students’ laughter (in lines 15 and 20) is rather muted. However, it becomes more pronounced once Nat revoices “senprade” in line 22 and again in line 26, in an evident instance of FOBeing through Mock ESL (cf. Chapter 9, Extracts 9.9, 9.17, 9.20). The mispronunciation of “senprade” is not just being pointed out for ridicule, here, of course, but as an index of low L2 proficiency, and therefore, of certain status as FOB, Isaac as well. Here, Nat distinguishes himself (and other G1.5 CoP members in the class) from Isaac by positioning him not only as “limited English proficient,” but as someone who is also hopelessly naïve: Isaac does not correct himself despite Nat’s pointed repetitions of his mistake, and thus appears unaware he has even made a mistake. More to the point,
however, Isaac is unaware he is being FOBed. Indeed, even before Nat’s uptake of Isaac’s mispronunciation in line 22, he has interjected (in line 17) with a mocking, yet rather unfunny “You go out all night eat dinner?” It is only after Isaac repeats “senprade” twice more (lines 19, 21) that Nat utilizes it as a (much easier, more overt) point for ridicule. Isaac’s lack of familiarity with the practice of FOBeing non-G1.5 and lower L2 English proficient students, so common in ESLL classrooms at Tradewinds, marks him as the newcomer he is as much as his English, clothing, and hairstyle do. Nat’s redefinition of the FOB subject position has taken shape: it is someone who comes from somewhere so exotic that it may not even be a country, someone whose English is undeniably “limited,” someone who is unfamiliar with the cultures, styles, and practices of the US and its schools, someone who is, indeed, “fresh off the boat.” And it is just what Nat, China, and the other members of the G1.5 CoP in Ms. Ariel’s class, quite likely those who laughed in 25 and 27, are not. These students are stating in stark terms what the school, the ESLL program, and the curriculum never did: that there are – that they are – different kinds of ESLL students.

It is important to point out that there is identity work going on in this exchange beyond that concerning FOB. Nat is Marshallese and Isaac is Chuukese: both are “Micronesian” in the sense that they come from the region called Micronesia. More specifically, they are “Micronesian” as this identity is locally defined at Tradewinds: an amorphous group of mostly poor, irreconcilably alien Pacific Islanders. In these terms, Nat’s public display can be seen as an effort to distinguish himself from Isaac as a non-FOB, and as a non-Chuukese: a “different kind” of Micronesian. In effect, Nat is (re)producing another social hierarchy, this a specifically Micronesian one, with the
Marshallese on top and the Chuukese on the bottom. It is a hierarchy that Bickel (2002) also reports on (also see Hezel, 2003, 2004), and which I saw enacted in the Tradewinds ESLL classes on numerous occasions.

In Extract 10.8, Ms. Ariel again prompts Isaac to continue with his presentation.

Nat is joined by China in teasing Isaac, as Ms. Ariel continues to ask Isaac questions.

(10.8) *Yeah, that’s all* [ELA32Wmd5: 1598-1610]

Ms. Ariel: What do they do?
29 Isaac: ((reading)) “They make noise (. ) [and walk −”
31 Nat: [((loud, exaggerated laugh))]

Isaac: ((laugh; continues reading)) “around. Dance. And they get gift. They get gift from somebody else.”

33 Nat ((continues to laugh loudly))
35 Eddie: Shut up, Nat.
37 Isaac: Yes. You have to dance. People dance around and kiss anybody, they dance.

39 China: Do they have to?
41 Nat: What if I dance with your grandma?

43 Eddie: You’re rude.

Nat’s laughter in line 30, just after Isaac says “they make noise,” points out an apparent peculiarity of the phrase, and the loud and exaggerated quality of the laughter as well as its duration into line 33, again indicates that Isaac is being FOBed. Eddie assumes a role he frequently took in the class – its moral arbiter – and indicates to Nat that the FOBeing has gone far enough. But no doubt because Ms. Ariel continues to question Isaac without validating Eddie’s directive – or addressing Nat herself – it goes disregarded, and Isaac remains in the front of the room, a target for added derision.
China's question in line 39 ("Do they have to?") is an apparent attempt to get in on the action, but his question is immediately upstaged by Nat's rather eye-opening insult in line 40 about dancing with Isaac's grandmother. China responds with a hearty, appreciative laugh and Isaac, perhaps at last realizing that the interruptions he has endured have been mean-spirited, signals "the end." Eddie's fitting coda to this segment, "You're rude.,” calls attention to Ms. Ariel's silence regarding the character and quality of Nat's and China's contributions up to now.

Indeed, Ms. Ariel's silence here is indicative of a subtle yet profound shift in both her and the G1.5 students' participation to this point in the interaction. Five of the first 11 turns of the interaction have been Ms. Ariel's as she has prompted Isaac to begin his presentation, dealt with China's question about the status of Chuuk as a "country,” and finally signaled "we're ready" for the presentation start in line 12. From line 13, when Isaac starts to read, she has had two more turns, a request for Isaac to speak louder (line 16), and then a clarification (line 18) that is overlapped with Nat's initial foray into FOBeing in line 17 ("You go out all night eat dinner?"). The overlap in lines 17 and 18 is pivotal; whereas Ms. Ariel has contributed nearly than half of the turns to this point in the interaction (seven of 16 turns, excluding the laughter in line 10), after it, until line 43, she has just three of 23 turns (including student laughter) (I will discuss these three turns shortly). In the interaction up until the overlap in lines 17 and 18, Isaac has had five turns, and G1.5 students (China and Nat) have had two turns (line 4 and line 17), which with one turn of unidentified student laughter that appears aligned with the teasing, totals three turns. After the overlap in lines 17-18, Isaac has had seven turns, and G1.5 students (including Nat's laughter in line 33, and excluding Eddie's two turns of scolding, which
are not aligned with G1.5 community practices) have had eight turns (Nat, six turns, China, two turns). There are also three turns of unidentified student laughter (lines 20, 25, 27), which because it is aligned with Nat’s FOBeing, can also be specified as G1.5, for a total of 11 G1.5 turns.17

Table 10.2. Distribution of turns in Extracts 10.6, 10.7, 10.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Distribution of turns up to and inclusive of overlap in lines 17-18, i.e., lines 1-18 (N=16)</th>
<th>Distribution of turns after overlap in lines 17-18, i.e., lines 19-43 (N=23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Ariel</td>
<td>7/16 = 44%</td>
<td>3/23 = 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1.5 students</td>
<td>3/16 = 19%</td>
<td>11/23 = 48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>5/16 = 31%</td>
<td>7/23 = 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1/16 = 6%</td>
<td>2/23 = 9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As summarized in Table 10.2, there is a rather remarkable reversal in terms of Ms. Ariel’s and G1.5 student’s participation before and after the overlap in lines 17-18 in the interaction represented in Extracts 10.6-10.8. Before that point, Ms. Ariel contributed nearly half of the turns to the interaction, with Isaac contributing about a third, and G1.5 students slightly more than half that. After the overlap in lines 17-18, Isaac again contributes about a third of the turns, but now in a notable inversion, Ms. Ariel

17 Of course, there are many dangers to counting turns in this manner since a transcript is simply a representation of an interaction (Ochs, 1999) rather than the interaction itself. The potential for problems is exacerbated in that this is a multiparty classroom interaction in which any number of up to 30 people may be contributing at one time: cf., e.g., the laughter (however, see Duff, 2002). But used as a heuristic, it does give a strong indication of a shift in participation to this point in the interaction.
contributes about half that, with G1.5 students dominating the interaction with close to 50 percent of the turns.

Ms. Ariel’s participation prior to the overlap in lines 17-18 is consistent with the assumption of a situational identity (Zimmerman, 1998; see Chapter 9) of “teacher,” particularly at the beginning of a student classroom presentation: she helps Isaac introduce his topic, contends with a question, and signals him to begin. What is inconsistent, however, is her silence after the overlap in lines 17-18, as Isaac has to contend with a series of interruptive contributions from G1.5 students that hardly seem indicative of acceptable (student) audience participation in an officially sanctioned classroom-presentation participation structure (cf. Fairclough, 1989, pp. 134-136), not only in terms of the quantity of G1.5 students’ turns, certainly, but also their content. In what may be characterized as an “avoidance strategy,” Ms. Ariel remains silent throughout Nat’s Mock ESL voicings of “senprade” and the laughter that attends them (lines 19-27); indeed, she prompts Isaac to continue immediately afterward, in line 28, with “What do they do?” She says nothing about Nat’s exaggerated laughter in lines 30-33, and provides no uptake to Eddie’s directive of “Shut up, Nat.” after it. In fact, immediately following Eddie’s turn, Ms. Ariel again prompts Isaac to continue with “You can get gifts?” in line 35. After Isaac’s response in lines 36-37, Ms. Ariel prompts Isaac once more with “They dance on the beach with anyone they want to?” This is followed by China’s turn in line 39, “Do they have to?” followed by Nat’s “What if I dance with your grandma?” and China’s loud laugh afterward. Even after Isaac ends his talk with “Yeah, that’s all.” and Eddie rebukes Nat with “You’re rude.”, Ms. Ariel continues to remain silent on both Nat’s and China’s contributions.
The shift in interaction noted above is, I would like to argue, indicative of the appropriation by G1.5 students of Ms. Ariel’s “role-given right [as a teacher] to speak at any time and to any person . . . [to] fill any silence or interrupt any speaker . . . [to] speak to a student anywhere in the room and in any volume or tone of voice” (Cazden, 2001, p. 82). Through this appropriation, they have also assumed her power to position others as Others – that is to perpetrate FOBeing – and produce their G1.5 CoP identities and the G1.5 cultural production of ESLL. What’s more, Ms. Ariel has not only yielded to G1.5 students’ attempts to this point in the interaction, she has participated in them through her silence, her refusal to intercede on Isaac’s behalf, indeed, in the questions that she has continued to pose to him in lines 28, 35, 38; these serve to keep him front and center, the target of G1.5 students’ ongoing respecification of FOB. Ms. Ariel’s participation in the interaction above is thus not only indexical of an alignment with G1.5 students’ CoP, is not only an example of a teacher accommodating the G1.5 cultural production of ESLL, it is an example of a teacher actually engaging in G1.5 community practices, in this instance, in these G1.5 students’ instantiation of FOBeing. Unfortunately for Isaac, Ms. Ariel’s participation in G1.5 FOBeing endures for the remainder of the presentation, in fact, it intensifies, even as an increasing number of G1.5 students join in the FOBeing, as they do in the final extract.

(10.9) *Do they burn themselves?* [ELA32Wmd5: 1611-1641]

| 45 | Raven: | What about the fire? [Remember you told me about the fire? | (inaudible) |
| 45 | Isaac: | Yeah, yeah. |
| 47 | Ms. Ariel: | Listen, you guys. |
| 47 | Isaac: | (. ) They make fire around them and (. ) they dance (. .) around the fire. |
| 49 | China: | So, do they burn themselves? ((laugh)) |
Ms. Ariel: I asked him if anyone ever got burnt, and he said no.

51 China: That’s a lie!

?MSs: [[inaudible]]

53 Ms. Ariel: [They make a ring of fire and they dance around.
Raven: Oh, oh, a ring? So they don’t dance inside the fire?

55 Isaac: No.

?Ss: [[(laugh)]]

57 Ms. Ariel: Inside or outside?
Isaac: Outside.

59 Ms. Ariel: Okay. ((soft laugh)) So –
China: Do you dance inside?

61 Nat: I did! ( . . ) I died once.
China: [((loud, exaggerated laugh))]

63 ?Ss: [((laugh))]
Isaac: Yeah.

65 Ms. Ariel: How long does it last?
Isaac: Huh?
((lines 67-70, in which Ms. Ariel’s question is clarified, are omitted))

71 Ms. Ariel: Is it, is it one day, is it= 
Isaac: =No. One week.

73 Ms. Ariel: One week!
?FS: Oh.

75 Ms. Ariel: Oh, so, big party.
China: So, so nomo jab oa samting?
So, people don’t work or what?

77 ?Ss: [((laugh))]
618: So lai!

That’s a lie!

In this final extract, Raven now joins Nat and China, as does 618, a Chinese girl who had lived in the US for four years (and whose L2 proficiency made her a target for this sort of teasing herself; cf. Chapter 9, Extract 9.20). China’s silly question in line 49 about whether the Chuukese who dance around fires during New Year’s get burned, is ratified as a legitimate question by Ms. Ariel. The form of Ms. Ariel’s answer in line 50 is interesting as she addresses China directly about Isaac, referring to him as if he is not there. The use of pronouns in this turn and in line 53 (see below) suggest that Isaac has been figuratively transported from Ms. Ariel’s classroom to Chuuk, while she and China
Each of these points further indicate Ms. Ariel’s (re)alignment with the G1.5 CoP as well as her co-participation in their FOBeing of Isaac, which indeed becomes clarified as the interaction continues.

In line 53, after not addressing China’s mocking “that’s a lie!”, Ms. Ariel again positions Isaac in a way that is consistent with the G1.5 students’ developing respecification of FOB, when she addresses China and the rest of the class once more, perhaps in an effort to help by speaking for him, as if Isaac is not there (“They make a ring of fire and they dance around.”). Raven responds with his own bid to join the FOBeing with his absurd clarification (“Oh, oh, a ring? So they don’t dance inside the fire?”). After Isaac’s negative reply, Ms. Ariel again appears to ratify the preceding question as legitimate when she asks in line 57, “inside or outside?” Ms. Ariel’s silence on the FOBeing and her continued querying to this point in the interaction, now come into sharp focus with the ratification of questions that have been clearly intended to mock Isaac. Indeed, any ambiguity about this point is eliminated in line 59, after Isaac says “outside,” when Ms. Ariel affirms his answer and then, just as a G1.5 student might do, laughs. Ms. Ariel has interactionally and denotatively aligned herself with Nat and China, accommodated, indeed, participated in their respecification of FOB through FOBeing, and uniquely contributed to the G1.5 cultural production of ESLL; this clears the way for other students to take part.

The humiliation continues when China directly asks Isaac about the fire, “Do you dance inside?” Isaac is not allowed the chance to reply, as Nat interjects with his joke that he did and died once in the process. China’s question, which is similar to Raven’s in
line 54, evokes racist imagery of mysterious, fire-walking "savages." Once again, the
switch from the third to the second person indicates that "you" (Isaac) is actually "them"
(Others). China and Nat have worked together to construct a similar set of dichotomous
hierarchies as Ms. Ariel did when giving the instructions for this assignment (see Chapter
9, Extract 9.8; also see Figure 9.1): their Local me/us in-group includes Raven, 618, and
the students who have been laughing; this in-group has also been positioned by Ms. Ariel
as aligned with hers. It excludes Isaac, the other Chuukese students, and those who have
not understood what’s been said; they are members of a rearticulated you/them out-group:
the “real” FOBs. In this interaction, China and Nat have usurped Ms. Ariel’s position as
“positioner” and claimed it for themselves. They have appropriated her frame and recast
it, posed their own kinds of exoticizing questions, redefined the FOB subject position,
and cast Isaac as its icon. In the process, they have (per)formed their G1.5 identities and
cultural productions of ESLL. The differences between these newly (re)defined identities
become further articulated as the rest of the interaction plays out. It culminates with
another rejoinder from China, again in Pidgin, about Chuukese not having jobs, a
constituent feature in the discourses about Micronesians at Tradewinds (see Talmy,
2005), since New Year’s is celebrated for a week there. The switch to Pidgin here is
another indexical display of difference from the “real ESLL” students and another signal
of in-group membership with other Pidgin speakers in the class such as 618, who indeed
follows China, also in Pidgin, with an evaluation of Isaac’s answer as a lie.18

18 It is worthwhile pointing out that 618’s “So lai!” is a voicing similar to China’s utterance in line 51. Also
of note is a comparison between 618’s actions in this extract where she participates in FOBing, and those
in Extract 9.20 (in Chapter 9), where she is the target of this practice. This highlights the relational fluidity
inherent in the set of interactional and discursive practices I have argued are constitutive of the identity
category of “G1.5” (see Chapter 2).
Following the interaction represented in Extracts 10.6-10.9, the questions and teasing continued rather painfully for nearly a minute more, before Ms. Ariel concluded the presentation with a surprisingly abrupt “Okay, I think we should all go there [to Chuuk] for New Year’s. Thanks Isaac.” This presentation lasted more than three times as long as the other students’, yet of the time that Isaac was in front of the room, he only actually read two sentences from his paper. The rest of the time was spent contending with interruptions as Nat and China did their identity work with the help of Ms. Ariel, Raven, and other students.

The other Other: The respecification of ESLL and the reproduction of linguicism

As I argued in Chapter 9, G1.5 students efforts to reject being Othered, to rearticulate the FOB subject position, and then relationally define themselves as distinct from it are important forms of resistance. It is resistance in which subjectivity is appropriated in the face of a stigmatizing, institutionally imposed social identity category, the reductive, orderly equation of language = country = culture = people is challenged, and the warm superficiality of a trivializing multiculturalism is subverted. It is resistance that highlights agency and the possibility, or rather, the inevitability of (these adolescents’) multiple, complex, and frequently incongruous cultural and linguistic affiliations, of ambiguity and hybridity in identity. Yet it is also resistance that ultimately reproduces the very linguicism constituting the FOB subjectivity that was resisted in the first place. China, Raven, and Nat’s redefinition of FOB, at Isaac’s expense, signals not a repudiation of the linguicist hierarchies in Ms. Ariel’s class, but their perceived place within them. Societal attitudes about immigrants, bi- and multilingualism, and
assimilationism that have become manifested in educational policies, in turn have become manifested in curricula and instruction, which in turn have become instantiated in everyday interaction between teachers and students, and finally, among students themselves. As linguicism is produced at the micro level, it becomes reproduced at the macro; in a perpetual, recursive cycle, this in turn shapes and enables the conditions for its micro level production. This is no more evident than in the G1.5 students’ appropriation of “official” FOBeing practices as manifest in exotifying curriculum and instruction, and their uniquely personal respecification of them in the everyday classroom worlds of the Tradewinds ESLL program.

Through G1.5 students’ identity work, through their cultural production of ESLL, the social category of “ESLL” at Tradewinds is elaborated and differentiated. Although the institutional category of ESLL as manifest in the structural and official cultural productions of ESLL evidently conceives of these students as a monolithic group of recently-arrived, cultural and linguistic Others – as FOBs (see Chapter 7) – these students are stating in dramatic terms, as I stated earlier, that there are – that they are – different kinds of ESLL students. They have done this through their indexical performances of difference, which in relational terms, necessarily required an “other Other,” that is, a “real ESLL” student: in this instance, Isaac.

Ms. Ariel’s participation in the G1.5 CoP FOBeing of Isaac above is indicative of the extent to which G1.5 students’ cultural productions of ESLL could penetrate “official” cultural productions of ESLL. As I have maintained throughout this chapter and Chapter 9, defensive teaching accommodations such as “alternative assignments,” “study hall,” “test preparation,” and “floating deadlines” were made in response to G1.5
students' cultural productions of ESLL, as manifest specifically in a host of performance strike practices such as not "bringing materials," "not doing work," "starting late/finishing early," "Worksheet Syndrome," and so forth. Ms. Ariel not only accommodated the G1.5 cultural productions of ESLL through a range of defensive teaching responses, but also, as indicated in the interaction represented in Extracts 10.6-10.9, through alignment with and participation in G1.5 ESLL student community practices, in this instance, engaging in a G1.5 instantiation of FOBeing. This underscores the influence that the G1.5 CoP could wield, to the extent that at times it was unclear which CoP, the "official" one or the G1.5 one, was dominant in a given ESLL classroom (cf. Lave, 1991, p. 79). G1.5 students therefore provided a broad context within and against which other G1.5 students, non-G1.5 students, and their teachers could participate in the G1.5 community practices and cultural productions of ESLL. Thus, the effects of these cultural productions of ESLL on classroom instruction were felt by all the students, G1.5 and non-G1.5 alike, with many in the latter group coming to gradually participate in them as well, simultaneously disengaging in official classroom activities. The performance strike thereby became a mass refusal to perform well, on the parts of both students and teachers, a collective disengagement in official teaching and learning, such that the ESLL program became precisely what it was that G1.5 ESLL students claimed to be resisting: an easy, dumbed-down, academically inconsequential program that had little relevance in terms of students' L2 learning needs or goals and/or formal school preparation (cf. Shor, 1992).

In these terms, then, teachers' manifold accommodations of G1.5 community practices, not just in terms of defensive teaching practices but in a whole range of
responses to G1.5 cultural productions of ESLL, demonstrate the complex socialization processes that were daily negotiated in the ESLL classrooms I observed, here by newcomers in institutionally-sanctioned roles of power, authority, and expertise (first-year ESLL teachers), and oldtimers who were cast in hierarchically subordinate positions of novices or learners (G1.5 ESLL students). Indeed, the teachers’ defensive teaching responses to G1.5 community practices — to the extent that they not only accommodated them, but even participated in them — fundamentally complicate the normative assumption that socialization processes necessarily and inevitably proceed along lines of a priori categories of hierarchical or institutional status or age, that it is schools and teachers who are agents of socialization and students simply who are passive recipients of it, unthinkingly internalizing the social, cultural, linguistic, and communicative norms of a pre-determined social category which they then, just as unthinkingly, inhabit. When G1.5 ESLL performance strikes and other associated practices, and instructors’ responses in the form of defensive teaching, are seen as the complex social phenomena that they are, as dense sets of situated, mutually-recursive practices, they amply demonstrate the bidirectionality of socializing processes, as illustrated in the chapter above (cf. Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; He, 2003; Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991; Lave, 1991; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998).

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have considered a range of teaching accommodations deployed by Tradewinds ESLL instructors in the face of G1.5 CoP cultural productions of ESLL, which I have glossed as “defensive teaching,” that is, a tacit agreement between teachers
and students in which minimal instructional demands are made in exchange for student classroom compliance (McNeil, 1986). I have examined four of these accommodations in detail, “‘Working behind or ahead’: Study hall”; “‘Let’s see how much of it we can get done today’: Floating deadlines”; “‘Filler’: Alternative assignments,”; and “‘It’s really so easy’: Test preparation,” arguing that when viewed in tandem with G1.5 performance strike practices, they contribute to what Sizer (1984/2004) has called “a conspiracy of the least,” whereby teachers and students together collaboratively disengage from (L2) teaching and learning. I have also examined one extended classroom interaction in which a teacher’s accommodation of G1.5 cultural productions of ESL went so far as to actually involve her participation in a rearticulated G1.5 form of FOBeing. I have concluded with brief consideration of the consequences for all of this on the reproduction of linguicism.
CHAPTER 11. IMPLICATIONS, CONTRIBUTIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND QUESTIONS

At: Thank god there's no ESL in college.
Mr. Talmy: There's ESL in college, At.
At: No way. No way!
China: If I have to take ESL in college, I'm gonna kill myself.

At and China, 10th grade G1.5 ESLL students
(ELB52Wfn: 285-289)

Wat? Get ESL in calij? Ho, jas falo yu araun! . . . So iz ESL calij diploma les dan regir calij diploma?
What? There's ESL in college? Damn, it just follows you around! . . . . So is an ESL college diploma less than a regular college diploma?

Brahdah, 9th grade G1.5 ESLL student
(ELA21Xfn: 63 & 489)

Introduction

In this chapter, I will briefly recapitulate findings from Chapters 7-10, concerning the structural productions of ESLL at Tradewinds High School, teachers' and students' representational practices concerning the ESLL program, generation 1.5 (G1.5) ESLL students' resistance and cultural productions of ESLL, and finally, teachers' defensive teaching accommodations. Following this, I consider some of the main implications of this research for applied linguistics scholarship concerning cultural production; language socialization; identity, agency, and resistance; and generation 1.5 (G1.5) ESLL students. I then conclude with an appeal that applied linguistics would do well to redouble its
efforts at connecting to the K-12 ESL area of the field, rather than attempt to move in directions farther away from it.

Summary of Chapters 7-10

In this study, I have examined how ESLL was structurally produced in terms of program organization and policy, intra-institutional relationships, and curriculum. In terms of program organization and policy, and institutional relationships, ESLL was structurally produced by the program's unique place and marked status in the Tradewinds curriculum as a "required elective"; by J-section classes as the lowest ability-group track, metaphorically located "beneath" their A-, B-, and C-track mainstream counterparts; by the absence of communication between ESLL and the rest of the school; by the fact that J-section and ESLL dangler teachers' subject-area affiliations overrode those of the ESLL program; and by the program's lack of integration with the rest of the school. These structural productions were augmented by the administrative policy of assigning ESLL danglers (and some J-sections) to (junior) faculty who often had little background in L2 learning or teaching. In these terms, the structural productions of ESLL at Tradewinds signified an isolated, subordinate, low-prestige program: an afterthought or late-arriving add-on to pre-existing institutional arrangements.

In terms of curriculum, ESLL was structurally produced in ways that were consistent with the program's institutional standing: marginal, marked, and unintegrated with the school. This was most clearly evident in the choice of children's novels as the centerpiece of the ESLL curriculum, as these books, and many of the activities that derived from them, were well below high school grade-levels and too often had tangential
relevance to (mainstream) high school academics and/or L2 learning. Aside from this, and in stark contrast to other required (i.e., core) courses, the fact that the curriculum was not codified in some form suggested that it did not need to be, a point underscored by the absence of ESLL standards. The lack of a written, codified ESLL curriculum and the absence of ESLL standards thus resulted in considerable variability in terms of what was made available for learning across sections.

Of particular consequence to students was how ESLL students were positioned through the curriculum. Students were variously constructed as a more or less undifferentiated group of recently-arrived, cultural and linguistic Others, or FOBs, a structural manifestation of “FOBeing.” They were also variously positioned as children, with the below grade-level children’s book implying that ESLL students could not meet the linguistic demands of on-grade-level material, and by extension, the substantive and conceptual demands of it as well. In addition, the centrality of children’s novels in the ESLL curriculum signaled an apparent supposition that students wouldn’t have read such books in earlier grades, perhaps wouldn’t mind or wouldn’t understand what the intended audience for these books was, and wouldn’t have connections to the wider school population, who most likely would. The use of activities, materials, and projects that many G1.5 students maintained they had completed in earlier grades, sometimes repeatedly (e.g., family trees, the Fairy Tale Project, lessons on holidays, etc.), further signaled that ESLL students were conceived as recent arrivals, as did the implicit assumption that students both knew about and identified with the cultures, customs, and languages of “their” countries, and would be amenable to efforts to incorporate them into ESLL curricula. As well, vocabulary and grammar instruction (both in terms of what was
and was not taught) appeared based on the supposition that ESLL students had had the
benefit of continuous formal schooling in their L1s, had already acquired such basic skills
as how to use a dictionary, and were generally print-literate in and had a metalinguistic
understanding of their L1s. And finally, ESLL placement policies and curricula signaled
that ESLL students were essentially the same, with negligible differences in L1 and L2
proficiencies, educational backgrounds, or needs, a conception also advanced beyond
local levels (e.g., with No Child Left Behind [NCLB]). These, I have argued, were the
structural productions of ESLL within and against which teachers and students’ cultural
productions of ESLL would necessarily be situated.

What I have glossed as the “official” cultural productions of ESLL, that is to say,
how structural productions of ESLL were instantiated in practice, were made manifest in
the full range of official ESLL instructional practices, from the assignment of,
instructions about, and other forms of implementation for activities that concerned the
children’s book reading assignments, comprehension questions, summaries, and
vocabulary work, to the various worksheets, holiday units, grammar components,
artwork, projects, and other “supplementary” ESLL work that was assigned; to the (lack
of) enforcement of classroom language (e.g., English-only) policies and other classroom
rules; to seating charts and grouping arrangements; to the defensive teaching
accommodations that were variously made and incorporated into pedagogical practice in
every ESLL class that I observed. What was remarkable was the relative consistency
between the structural and official cultural productions of ESLL, particularly given the
flexibility and variability of the ESLL curriculum; however, given that three of the four
teachers that I observed were all in their first years teaching ESLL at Tradewinds, and
that the fourth, Mr. Bradley, was one of the architects of the curriculum, this consistency is more understandable. Regardless, it led to eight different ESLL classes that I observed that were in many ways remarkably similar despite different teachers and different student populations. Thus, as the official cultural productions of ESLL were notably consistent with the structural productions of ESLL, students were positioned similarly in actual classroom practice, in terms I have called “official” FOBeing.

However, it is important to move beyond these structural and official cultural productions of ESLL to see students’ creative responses to them, because although many students will produce practices and identities that are consonant with dominant definitions of particular schooled identities (e.g., “ESLL student”), many others will not, coming to relationally define themselves against what they perceive those identities to be. In this regard, I have examined in detail a number of central social practices in G1.5 students’ oppositional cultural productions of ESLL. Indeed, as I have argued, the “joint enterprise” that many G1.5 students were “mutually engaged” in, and around which a community of practice formed – and the “shared repertoire” of cultural forms that simultaneously derived from and reproduced it – was the subversion of the official ESLL curriculum and the official conceptions of ESLL that went along with it. Implicated in these efforts were G1.5 students’ prior (negative) experiences in ESLL classes, as well as their memberships and histories of participation in multiple communities of practice beyond the ESLL program, where ESLL was stigmatized and where linguist discourses about immigrants, bi- and multilingualism were in circulation. I argued that these students’ efforts at undermining local formal or “official” meanings of ESLL, and resisting socializing interactions that (officially) positioned them as “ESLL,” worked to
significantly transform both local cultural notions of “ESLL” as well as ESLL classroom environments and learning opportunities.

The G1.5 ESLL student cultural productions of ESLL centrally concerned difference, and in this regard, these students can be seen as attempting to differentiate the ESLL population at Tradewinds in ways that the classes, the program, the school, and educational policies such as NCLB never did. These cultural productions thus overwhelmingly complicate the neat and orderly structural and official cultural productions of ESLL at Tradewinds – and the ESLL policy formulations of the Hawai‘i and US Departments of Education – which are informed by and rely on linguicism, simplistic and essentialistic conceptions of one nation/one language, “limited English proficiency,” indeed, of “ESLL.” In this respect, as well as in a number of others, G1.5 students’ cultural productions of ESLL held the potential for subverting the linguicist and assimilationist ideologies and beliefs that informed the structural and official cultural productions of ESLL, and the exotifying and demeaning practices that constituted them. Their efforts to reject official FOBeing practices and positionings and to relationally define themselves as distinct from this exoticized, recently arrived Other held this radical potential. Unfortunately, these students wound up reproducing the very linguicism they had ostensibly been resisting as their oppositional cultural productions of ESLL were in fact predicated on it. This was most clearly apparent in G1.5 students’ appropriation of FOBeing practices, and their corresponding respecification of FOB to signify not them, but the “real” ESLL students, the “real” FOBs, that the ESLL program should be serving.

And yet despite G1.5 students’ efforts to differentiate themselves, despite their oppositional cultural productions of ESLL, their discourse and indexical displays of
difference from ESLL, their appropriation of FOBeing practices – or perhaps more precisely, because of them – a majority of these students would remain in ESLL, would remain as “ESLL students.”1 This was true, certainly, in the eyes of the institution, as these students continued to be classified as “ESLL.” However, and more to the point, they were ESLL students in terms of the consequences this classification would continue to have on them as language learners, as students, as people, with their course choices, who they would and would not study with, the friends they would and would not (be able to) socialize with, the forms of formal and informal knowledge that would be made available for learning, the sorts of investments they might make, the trajectories of their educational careers, all correspondingly circumscribed in ways that nearly all of the G1.5 students who participated in this study indicated they did not want them to be, most paradoxically, in the indexical displays of difference themselves. In one sense, then, the power of the institution to name and classify students is indeed consonant with its power “to do things to them” (Cameron, 2001, p. 16; cf. Lave, 1991; McDermott, 1993; Mehan, 1993), but in another, this is only part, although perhaps a substantial part, of the story. That is to say, these students’ oppositional cultural productions of ESLL worked to keep them in ESLL as they didn’t bring their books, didn’t do their homework, didn’t do their classwork, wouldn’t accommodate the official cultural productions of ESLL except to the barest minimum possible, and in the process saw their grades spiral to depths that would ensure they remained in the program. In this regard, we do indeed see both the

1 This claim is made based on a limited number (N=35) of G1.5 students for whom I have these data, and only from the second year of the study going into the third year: 80%=retained in ESL; 9%=exited from ESL; 11%="released"sent to alternative education. One of the three G1.5 students who exited ESLL in fact managed to “pass” the LAS because he cheated: he obtained a copy of the test just before it was administered. The four G1.5 students who were released were all at least 16 years old.
constraining and the enabling aspects of structure, its “rules” as well as its “resources” (Giddens, 1979). We also see the potential for social and cultural reproduction in that by remaining in an ESLL program that so clearly does not meet the unique learning needs of a substantial proportion of its students, that these students are in an important sense participating in their ongoing academic under-preparation (cf. Kadooka, 2001).

**Implications and contributions**

I turn now to address certain implications and contributions that this study has to cultural studies, communities of practice, L2 studies, and for generation 1.5 ESL students as population that demands the attention of L2 researchers.

*Cultural studies, cultural production, and communities of practice*

This study contributes to cultural studies by examining a nexus of discrimination frequently unexamined in the area, and that is linguicism. As discussed in Chapter 3, much cultural studies scholarship has been concerned with a wide array of important topics involving representation, identity, hegemony, hybridity, among much else, that has primarily concerned issues of class, gender, and race and ethnicity (cf. e.g., Barker & Galasiński, 2001; Billig, 1997; Giroux, 1996; Grossberg, Nelson, & Treichler, 1992; S. Hall, 1996a, 1998; Levinson & Holland, 1996). This study examines how linguicism not only works as a frequently unexamined form of discrimination, indeed, one that remains to a considerable degree socially acceptable, but also how it can function as a proxy for racism and classism, in particular. This is evident to varying degrees throughout the study, from the historical perspectives on language politics and language education in Hawai‘i in Chapter 6, to my reading of the structural productions of ESLL, especially in
terms of curriculum, to FOBeing practices in classroom instruction, to G1.5 appropriations of FOBeing, for example, in terms of Mock ESL.

Additionally, this study contributes to cultural studies by including a microanalytic perspective, particularly with regard to issues concerning identity, hegemony, and discrimination, deepening analyses, shoring up claims, and invigorating conclusions in ways not often undertaken in cultural studies research. As Barker & Galasiński (2001) note,

cultural studies has been lopsided in its concentration on ‘dead’ texts and its general failure to analyse the utterances of living speaking subjects. Even where, as in ethnographic . . . studies, cultural studies has explored the speech of living persons it has rarely brought the tools of linguistic analysis to bear (p. 21).

That research in cultural studies hasn’t often examined micro-level interactional phenomena from a rigorous discourse analytic perspective is a criticism that Billig (1997; 1999a, 1999b), among others, has also pointed out and is an observation that has been similarly made of post-structuralism more generally (Wetherell, 1998).

At the conclusion of their introduction to their 1991 monograph, Lave & Wenger note that:

Hegemony over resources for learning and alienation from full participation are inherent in the shaping of the legitimacy and peripherality of participation in its historical realizations. It would be useful to understand better how these relations generate characteristically interstitial communities of practices and truncate possibilities for identities of mastery (1991, p. 42).
This study thus also contributes to research in communities of practice in its focus on an “interstitial” community of practice like the G1.5 CoP, which developed in part as a result from “alienation from full participation” in mainstream communities, classrooms, and discourses, due to their lingering placements in ESLL, where these students’ L2 and academic learning needs were simply not being met. However, as also noted, these students in effect participated in their own alienation from full participation in these mainstream communities and practices due precisely to their signified desire to join the mainstream (or their claims of having already joined it), as evident in their cultural productions of ESLL. In so doing, they also worked to marginalize non-G1.5 ESLL students in the ESLL classroom, denying them from full participation in official ESLL classroom and L2 practices also. This study thus illuminates not only how interstitial CoP come to be generated, but also how members of that CoP can themselves claim “hegemony over resources for learning” and work to deny participation in other CoP that indeed the interstitial CoP mediates. As well, this study subverts the notion that is implied that an interstitial CoP cannot develop its own hybrid cultural forms and identities of mastery, as the G1.5 CoP did.

In this regard, this study contributes to what Wenger (1998) and O’Connor (2001; 2003) have argued is a central need for research on situated learning in communities of practice, and that is for studies that move beyond “exemplary” contexts (cf. Lave & Wenger, 1991) to consider communities of practice and situated learning in settings characterized by heterogeneity, power asymmetries, and conflict (also see Watson-Gegeo & Nielsen, 2003). Indeed, this study met this particular need in that it concerned language minority adolescents in a compulsory educational context, who were required to
study in a program that was marked and low prestige, and which did not meet their unique learning goals or requirements.

*L2 studies*

This study contributes to L2 studies in a number of ways. To begin, it offers contributions to L2 qualitative research; while the number and quality of qualitative L2 studies has risen considerably in recent years, there continues to be a comparative lack of in-depth (critical) ethnographic studies in the field. As Edge & Richards (1998), Markee (1994), and others (e.g. Canagarajah, 1999; Lantolf, 1996; Norton Peirce, 1995a, 1995b; Pennycook, 1990, 2001; Rampton, 1995, 1997a, 1997b) have observed, the “dominant paradigm” in L2 studies has for some time been nomothetic science; experimental, quantitative methodology is associated with nomothetic epistemology. Markee (1994), for one, claims that hermeneutic studies, that is, those employing a qualitative methodology, have been severely undermined by the nomothetic “orthodoxy.” He goes on to argue that because of its dominance, researchers may be “subtly discouraged from committing themselves to nonexperimental research” (pp. 90-91).

This study also contributes to L2 studies by concerning an area of inquiry that has long been under-represented in the L2 research literature: K-12 ESL, particularly at the secondary level. As Faltis (1999, p. 1) has argued, “Bilingual and ...(ESL) education at the secondary level is one of the most unexamined and overlooked areas of education in the United States.” With several important exceptions (e.g., Cole & Zuengler, 2003; Duff, 2002; Faltis & Wolfe, 1999; Gutierrez et al., 1995; Harklau, 1994a, 1994b, 1994c, 2000, 2003; Talmy, 2004a), it is also one of the most unexamined and overlooked in L2
studies. Indeed, it offers a contribution to K-12 ESL in particular due to its focus on an emergent population, G1.5 ESL students, that has yet received little attention in L2 studies, but which presents unique challenges to schools, ESL programs, and ESL educators (Harklau, Losey et al., 1999; Talmy, 2001a, 2001b).

Beyond the immediate setting and population that are its main foci, this study contributes to the developing poststructuralist research literature in L2 studies. This literature is broadly concerned with multiply situating L2 learners in social, historical, cultural, and political contexts, accounting for identity and agency and the ways that race and ethnicity, gender, and class mediate L2 learning and use, and what role these play in reproducing and transforming social relations. As Pavlenko (2002), notes, central to poststructuralism in L2 studies is

the view of language as symbolic capital and the site of identity construction . . .
the view of language acquisition as language socialization . . . and the view of L2
users as agents whose multiple identities are dynamic and fluid . . . . [These]
theor[ies] allow . . . us to examine how linguistic, social, cultural, gender, and ethnic identities of L2 users, on the one hand, structure access to linguistic resources and interactional opportunities and, on the other, are constituted and reconstituted in the process of L2 learning and use.

This study has variously demonstrated the ways that the symbolic capital that was offered by the ESL program at Tradewinds in terms of the forms of (L2) knowledge and types of practices that were made available for learning was implicated in G1.5 students' low investments (Norton, 2000, 2001; Norton Peirce, 1995a) in the program, as manifest most evidently through their performance strikes. Identity was also centrally implicated
in G1.5 students’ indexical displays of difference from newcomer ESLL students, low-L2-proficient ESLL students – the FOBs and the rocks – as well as those ESLL students who accommodated the structural and official cultural productions of ESLL. It was most plainly manifest in G1.5 students’ FOBeing practices, in which G1.5 students in many different ways worked to position non-G1.5 students as FOBs, thereby rejecting the (FOB) subject position articulated in the structural and official cultural productions of ESLL and respecifying its boundaries. This study has also demonstrated how such practices as performance strikes and G1.5 students appropriations of FOBeing indeed worked to structure access to linguistic resources and interactional opportunities: for G1.5 students, in terms of disallowing them access to those mainstream resources and opportunities they claimed to want to have access to, yet which their actions simultaneously prevented; and for non-G1.5 students, who were the frequent relational targets upon which G1.5 students could build their linguicist mainstream/ESLL identity hierarchies in ESLL classrooms. This study has also demonstrated the ways that this all worked on the one hand to provide G1.5 students with a hard-won “space” of their own, within the institution that mandated their placements in a program that conflicted with and seemed so fundamentally at odds with who they wanted to be. This was a space in which they could be different from, perhaps even briefly free of, the official cultural productions of the ESLL student, a space where the inevitable tensions and contradictions in their social identities were not smoothed over by a network of hegemonic discursive practices that positioned and represented them as Other people, from Other places, with automatic affiliations to “their countries and cultures,” and a uniform set of pre-specified L2 learning needs that children’s novels, decontextualized vocabulary and grammar
exercises, and artwork would apparently address. Yet, on the other hand, this study has also showed how the construction of this “space” was predicated on and worked to reproduce the very linguicism constituting the structural and official cultural productions of ESL that G1.5 students had ostensibly resisted.

As maintained throughout the preceding chapters, this study contributes to contemporary work on language socialization by taking into account the contingency and bidirectionality of socialization processes. As I have argued, the G1.5 CoP cultural productions of ESL provided a context within and against which other students – and teachers – could participate in G1.5 community practices. Indeed, the results of G1.5 student practices on curriculum and instruction, that is, the inexorable slowing down of the ESL classes, the easier assignments, the reduced demands, the lowered expectations can be seen as indicative of the influence of G1.5 socializing processes for non-G1.5 ESLL classmates as well as teachers. As I have argued, this is a dynamic which turns on its head the commonsense relations of teacher/expert/oldtimer and student/novice/newcomer, as well as the putative roles of “socializer” and “socializee” (cf. Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; He, 2003; Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991; Lave, 1991; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). In the ESLL classroom world, the oldtimers were the G1.5 students; the newcomers were the non-G1.5 students, and in the first-year ESLL teachers’ classes, the teachers themselves. As more and more students took up participation in G1.5 CoP practices, as the performance strikes became broader and more sustained, it became unclear which CoP, the “official” one or the G1.5 one, was “dominant” in a given ESLL classroom (cf. Lave, 1991, p. 79). That is to say, the G1.5 cultural productions of ESLL threw into question what precisely were the “target”
community, cultures, and social practices that ESLL students were ostensibly being socialized into (cf. Duff, 2002, 2003). What's more, the broad circulation of these cultural productions in ESLL classrooms served as socializing resources through and to use language, not just for students, but for teachers as well, thoroughly complicating, as just asserted, normative assumptions that socialization proceeds inevitably and linearly along lines of a priori categories of hierarchical or institutional status or age (cf. Duff, 2002, 2003; He, 2003; Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991; see Chapter 3). Contingency and bidirectionality in socialization processes—indeed, what community practices and norms those processes ostensibly derived from—were thus centrally implicated in the G1.5 cultural productions of ESLL.

This is also not to suggest that the G1.5CoP cultural productions of ESLL simply replaced the official cultural productions of ESLL, either. Indeed, the G1.5, particularly as a relational CoP, involved highly contested practices, ones which were inevitably tied to the structural and cultural productions of ESLL (cf. R. Williams, 1977). In this regard, as I argued above, there was always already bidirectionality in socializing processes: there may have been a slowing down in the ESLL curriculum, but there was still an ESLL curriculum; G1.5 students may have appropriated FOBeing practices embedded in structural and official cultural productions of ESLL, but they thereby reproduced them; classwork may not have been completed or turned in, but as a consequence, students received poor grades, earned the label of low-achieving, and “failed” (cf. Lave, 1991; McDermott, 1993; O'Connor, 2001, 2003).

Finally, this study contributes to L2 studies in terms that the contributors to Coupland, Sarangi, and Candlin (2001) all variously argue for, and that is in its explicit
attempt to connect L2 sociolinguistic research to social theory, or perhaps more precisely, to locate itself within social theory rather than linguistic theory. This has been most evidently accomplished in terms of my efforts at incorporating language socialization within a combined communities of practice and cultural production framework, all three highly compatible in terms of the social-linguistic continuum specified by sociolinguistics, but with notably different emphases, with language socialization most clearly situated toward linguistics, and communities of practice, and especially, cultural production, situated toward social theory. This has, I believe, been a productive theoretical incorporation, one that plays on the strengths of each of these theories, while simultaneously working to ameliorate the others’ weaknesses. Such a productive association has been advanced by Coupland (2001) who has observed in terms that particularly resonate with this study, that Giddens’ (e.g., 1979, 1984) theory of structuration implies an analytic focus on local practices, of which talk is probably the most salient and the most accessible. Giddens does not himself undertake the observation and analysis of ‘institutional discourse,’ and the theoretical account of structuration is to that extent incomplete without sociolinguistics. Furthermore, sociolinguistics is able, drawing on its own analytic resources, to develop much more differentiated and hence, arguably, better social theoretic accounts of structure and agency, through its analysis of local practices of talk (Coupland, 2001, p. 16)

I believe this study amply demonstrates precisely Coupland’s point.
Generation 1.5 ESL students

The still developing L2 research literature on G1.5 students appears to have slowed recently (but see Ferris, Kennedy, & Senna, 2004; Talmy, 2004a; Thonus, 2003; also see Danico, 2004, for an important exception in Asian American Studies), although by all indications this is a population that continues to increase both in K-12 schools, community colleges, and four-year universities (cf. Fleischman & Hopstock, 1993; Hopstock & Bucaro, 1993; Kindler, 2002). The comparative drop-off in L2 research may be due to the generally marginal position of what I take to be the underrepresented research area of K-12 ESL in the field of L2 studies as a whole. Therefore, this study offers important contributions to this particular research area if only in terms of revisiting it. Beyond this, however, this is the first study about G1.5 ESLL students that I am aware of that examines in microanalytic detail what has been centrally represented about them, that is, that they dislike ESL, resent their placements in ESL, resist instruction in ESL classrooms, and have the L2 oral/aural proficiencies to make their resistance, resentment, and dislike patently known, with potentially powerful consequences for ESLL classroom instruction. In this respect, then, this study also transforms how to conceptualize this population, moving away from a more deficit-oriented definition, that is, in terms of the "problems" so many of these students have been represented to have with L2 print literacy practices, and more toward what they are "good at," which is to say L2 oral interaction. This is not to dismiss by any means the need for research that addresses these students' L2 writing needs, of course. Indeed, it seems that the rapidly increasing work in New Literacy Studies (see, e.g., Cope & Kalantzis, 2000; Hull & Schultz, 2002; Street, 2003) offers tremendous potential for just this student population (see below).
This study has provided an illuminating glimpse into not only why G1.5 ESL students apparently resent and reject their ESL placements, but also how they perform this resistance to ESL in classrooms. What’s more, due to the unique placement policy of Tradewinds, it has provided an understanding of how linguist hierarchies based on putative L2 proficiency levels can come to be constructed in classrooms, hierarchies which, I have argued, are the instantiations of linguist discourses and ideologies circulating in the high school and wider societal contexts. In this respect, it has concerned the relational identity work that is so centrally implicated in G1.5 students’ desire “not to be ESL.”

Finally, this study has provided some understanding of ways that L2 educators might (and might not) approach pedagogy for G1.5 students. As just mentioned, work in New Literacy Studies offers much potential in addressing the L2 literacy needs of G1.5 ESL students. New Literacy Studies conceives of literacy as social practice, and in this regard, of multiliteracies, modes and modalities of representation “much broader than language alone” (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000, p. 7). This not only posits a plurality of situated literacies, of which “schooled literacy” is just one (if often privileged) form, but that literacy is “rooted in conceptions of knowledge, identity, and being” (Street, 2003, pp. 1-2). New Literacy Studies findings show considerable promise for students such as the G1.5 ESLL students at Tradewinds, many of whom have not received the kinds of L1 and L2 literacy instruction they need to succeed in school, in that students’ everyday out-of-school literacies – e.g., those involving music, photographic, video, computer, oral, and alternative print-literacy forms – are brought into the classroom and used as “a
bridge” to “extend the range of the literacies with which [students] are conversant” (Hull & Schultz, 2002, p. 36).

Beyond this, it is apparent that G1.5 students would also benefit from a radical rethinking of the assumptions that educators bring with them into the ESL classroom about their students’ backgrounds, interests, language expertise, and affiliations. It is quite clear that it is time to move beyond modernist conceptions of ESL students and see them for who they are and for who they want to be, rather than what we think they ought to be. G1.5 ESL students, in particular, tend to have singular configurations of L1 and L2 language and literacy proficiencies, significantly different life and educational experiences, and far more hybrid interests and affiliations than many of teachers may realize. In this regard, it may be well worthwhile to incorporate findings from studies such as this into pre- and in-service teacher education and professional development seminars so that these students’ educational needs may be more gainfully met.

Limitations

There are a number of limitations to this study. Primary among them is that this study concerns one school at one point in time in one place; the extent to which these findings are “generalizable” to other schools, times, and places thus, is questionable. However, “generalizability” is a term and a concept from an alternative research paradigm. Lincoln & Guba (1985) have argued strongly against the wholesale importation of terms regarding the external validity of research from experimental research into hermeneutic research, preferring instead for the notion of “transferability,” that is the extent to which findings from one study can be “transferred” to another. Stake (2000) opts for what he calls “naturalistic generalization” in the “epistemology of the
particular” (cf. Ramanathan & Atkinson, 1999). This is where a highly contextualised analysis “provides opportunity for vicarious experience, [so that] readers extend their memories of happenings. . . . feeding into the most fundamental processes of awareness and understanding” (Stake, 2000, p. 442). It is these understandings that lead to general insights that can be abstracted across contexts.

Another limitation to this study is the comparative lack of attention to non-G1.5 students. Although I have substantial data on non-G1.5 students, I have not included much of their perspectives in this dissertation beyond my immediate arguments concerning G1.5 students. This was, I should add, a conscious decision on my part, and there are a number reasons for it. First, this study was conceived first and foremost as concerning student resistance to ESL, and in this regard, a student population of G1.5 ESL students. Much of the data concerning non-G1.5 students, while interesting in and of themselves, frequently bore little relation to the central questions guiding this inquiry. Second, the unexpected lack of focal students, as described in Chapter 5, left me with a dilemma in terms of organizing and representing my findings. I opted for an organizational framework that therefore focused on the G1.5 CoP as it spanned several classes; for this reason, the language, culture, and practices of the G1.5 CoP, rather than those of particular classes or even of the ESLL program at Tradewinds were the focus of the study. In this respect, I drew on such scholars as Willis (1977), whose study concerns the culture of the “lads,” not Hammertown Comprehensive, their school; Bucholtz (1999), whose study concerns the social practices of a community of nerd girls; Lave & Wenger (1991) whose work centrally considers five CoP; and Wenger (1998) and his extended depiction of insurance claims processors.
An additional limitation of this study is its restriction to the ESLL classes. Although I have substantial data from the J-section and mainstream Health classes, it was clear early on that the story that was most germane to my research questions was occurring in the ESLL classes.

As well, the exclusive focus on *classroom* cultures and interaction has meant an overwhelmingly partial representation of participants’ lives, perhaps no more so than with the G1.5 students, whose connections to and affiliations with mainstream and Local communities outside of the ESLL program are, I have argued, so central to their performances inside it. This is, unfortunately, a severe limitation I opted early on to accept, given the tremendous difficulties and manifold obstacles posed by institutional review boards and schools to conduct ethnographic research with minor populations in schools, particularly language minority children (cf. Lagemann, 2002).

I have also unfortunately incorporated little of the hours of L1 data I collected, marked, indexed, and for much of the data, paid to have translated and transcribed, simply because I do not have the L2 capabilities myself in the languages to undertake suitable analyses of these data. These languages include Cantonese, Mandarin, and Korean, which were translated, and Tagalog, Ilokano, Visayan, Samoan, Tongan, Chuukese, Marshallese, and Pohnpeian, which were not. This is a tremendous shame, on the one hand, since these data have much to offer; on the other hand, this is more my own personal limitation – or at least an indication that I should have studied more languages besides Japanese and Spanish – than a limitation of the study.

This study also is lacking in fundamental ways in terms of analyses of race and gender in particular between teachers and G1.5 students. As I indicated in Chapter 5,
however, the educational communities in Hawai‘i are so small that in an additional effort to protect the confidentiality of teacher participants, I opted to alter for some of their ascriptive characteristics such as their sex and race, which therefore precludes any possible subsequent analysis. As I mentioned, this is a regrettable, but “necessary ambiguity.”

Conclusions and questions: Toward the (re)prioritization of K-12 ESL research

As the population of ESL students in US K-12 public schools continues to increase as dramatically as it has, a resoundingly clear signal is being sent to L2 researchers, teachers, teacher educators, and student teachers; to MA-TESOL programs and departments of applied linguistics; to departments and colleges of education: there must be a reevaluation of priorities. Despite difficulties with access, institutional review boards, and so forth, there is a compelling need, as there has been for years, for “usable knowledge” (Lagemann, 2002) that is directly relevant to K-12 educators and students, that contends with the difficult circumstances, multiple pressures, and myriad challenges faced by them daily in real classrooms, with real consequences, across the country. There is a compelling need for such a revaluation of priorities, still.

There is a compelling need to strengthen the connections between university research programs and public schools, to work in creative and constructive ways, in dialogue, in such a manner as Allwright & Bailey (1991, p. 198) have suggested (also see Crookes, 1997a). In such a cooperative linkage, teachers and researchers could collaboratively formulate research agendas of mutual interest and benefit, and schools’ and universities could pool their considerable human, intellectual, and financial resources and together attempt to make what it is that both do relevant to each other, certainly, but
in more immediate terms, to make it relevant for the children, who are currently not getting the educations they not only deserve, but could well have access to if L2 research programs only included them. There is a compelling need for connections and collaborations such as these, still.

There is a compelling need to promote in graduate applied linguistics departments and programs more K-12 L2 research. There is simply too little of it being conducted for L2 studies as a field to be satisfied that its moral and ethical obligations to the communities and to the constituencies that it serves are being met. There is a compelling need for this, still, as well.

The question is no longer only about why these needs are so compelling: we now must be concerned with why they continue to be so compelling.

Why the continuing marginality of K-12 ESL in L2 studies?
Why the continuing lack of cooperative linkages between university departments of applied linguistics, colleges of education, and public schools?
Why the continuing lack of K-12 ESL research?

Why?
## APPENDIX A. TRADEWINDS CLASSES OBSERVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course name</th>
<th>Section code</th>
<th>Duration of observation</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Total hours¹ Rec</th>
<th>Total hours¹ Obs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESLL A</td>
<td>ELA 1X</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Ms. Cheney</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESLL A</td>
<td>ELA 2W</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Ms. Ariel</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESLL A</td>
<td>ELA 2X</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Mr. Day</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESLL B</td>
<td>ELB 1U</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Ms. Cheney</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESLL B</td>
<td>ELB 2Y</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>Mr. Bradley</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESLL B</td>
<td>ELB 3W</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>Mr. Bradley</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESLL B</td>
<td>ELB 3X</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>Mr. Bradley</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESLL C</td>
<td>ELC 1V</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>Mr. Bradley</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts J</td>
<td>LAJ 2Z</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>Mr. Grant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences J</td>
<td>LSJ 1V</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>Ms. Frank</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences J</td>
<td>LSJ 2U</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Ms. Frank</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies J</td>
<td>SSJ 1W</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Ms. Enders</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>HLM 2Vf</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>Mr. Iris</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>HLM 2Vs</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>Mr. Iris</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>HLM 2Y</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>Ms. Hughes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ "Total hours rec" = Total hours of classroom recordings (including student-carried recordings; see Chapter 5); “Total hours obs” = Total hours of classroom observation (including all classroom and student-carried recordings).
APPENDIX B. ESLL STUDENT PARTICIPANTS

Students classified as ESLL, by L1, grade, classes observed, length of participation in research, and length of residence in the US/Hawai‘i, arranged alphabetically (all student names are pseudonyms).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Observed classes</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>LOR @ study start</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>610 (Star)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chuukese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0 yr (#)</td>
<td>2 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ada</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0 yr</td>
<td>2 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiya</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Visayan, Tagalog, English</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allexy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chuukese</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0 yr (#)</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chuukese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr</td>
<td>1 mo (4 yr Guam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chuukese</td>
<td>9?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2 mo (lived in Guam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr (#) (&amp;)</td>
<td>8 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chuukese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bai Yang*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr (&amp;)</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barehand</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0 yr (&amp;)</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5 yr (#) (&amp;)</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benz</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5 yr (#) (&amp;)</td>
<td>2 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bing Yi*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitty*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chuukese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr</td>
<td>2 mos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahdah</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ilokano, English</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5 yr (&amp;)</td>
<td>Born in Hawai‘i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5 yr</td>
<td>Born US; to HK as baby; ret’d 1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CKY (CampKill Yourself)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5 yr (&amp;)</td>
<td>9 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carboli</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cantonese?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr</td>
<td>2 yr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Students in the second and third years of the study were given the chance to select their own pseudonyms. Those who opted not to do so, and whose pseudonyms I chose, are marked by an asterisk (*). I also chose the pseudonyms of many of the students from the first year of the study, particularly those who did not participate in the second or third years.

2 The L1 information is self-reported data.

3 “Grade” denotes student grade-level from the beginning of the first year students participated in the study.

4 “Observed classes” refers to the number of classes students were in that I observed.

5 “Participation” refers to the amount of time students participated in this research. Number symbols (#) indicate that a student carried a recorder in class. Ampersands (&) indicate that a student was formally interviewed.

6 “LOR @ study start” notes students’ length of residence in Hawai‘i as marked from beginning of first year students began participation in this study. This is self-reported data. For a discussion of length of residence, see Chapter 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student name¹</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>L1²</th>
<th>Grade³</th>
<th>Observed classes⁴</th>
<th>Participation⁵</th>
<th>LOR @ study start⁶</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5 yr (#) (&amp;)</td>
<td>4.5 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cici</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mandarin, Cantonese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0 yr (#) (&amp;)</td>
<td>4 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ilokano</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0 yr (#) (&amp;)</td>
<td>7 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coco</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5 yr</td>
<td>4 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr (#) (&amp;)</td>
<td>5 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corine</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Ilokano</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0 yr (#)</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr</td>
<td>2 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dannica</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Samoan, English</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr (#) (&amp;)</td>
<td>2 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dart</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tagalog, English</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr</td>
<td>9 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5 yr (#)</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Ilokano</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0 yr</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddie*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ilokano</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr (#)</td>
<td>4 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0 yr</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Samoan, English</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr (&amp;)</td>
<td>7 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Palauan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr (#) (&amp;)</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyyes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chuukese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr (#) &amp;</td>
<td>1 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan Buo*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5 yr</td>
<td>1 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanny</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-Koput</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chuukese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5 yr (&amp;)</td>
<td>2 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr (&amp;)</td>
<td>3 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho Yin*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0yr</td>
<td>Entered mid-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-Ness</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chuukese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5 yr (#) (&amp;)</td>
<td>Entered mid-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ioane</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>English, Tongan, Tahitian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0 yr (#) &amp;</td>
<td>Born in Hawai‘i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Farsi</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr</td>
<td>6 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chuukese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5 yr</td>
<td>1 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwannafuckalot (IwannaFAL)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr (#) (&amp;)</td>
<td>9 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jade</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chuukese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr</td>
<td>1 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenifer</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Ilokano</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr</td>
<td>6 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr (#) &amp;</td>
<td>Born US; to Korea as baby; retn’d 2 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Laotian/English</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr</td>
<td>10 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5 yr</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Marshallese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr</td>
<td>2 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jin Wai*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5 yr</td>
<td>2.5 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jing Yang*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ilokano ?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr</td>
<td>Entered mid-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JohnnyBoy</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Pohnpeian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr</td>
<td>4 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonelle</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>9?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr (&amp;)</td>
<td>Entered mid-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ilokano, Tagalog</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0 yr</td>
<td>Entered mid-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyleen</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chuukese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0 yr (#) (&amp;)</td>
<td>2 mo (6 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student name</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Observed classes</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>LOR @ study start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judo</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0 yr (#) &amp;</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun Luo*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr &amp;</td>
<td>2 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jung*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0 yr #</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chuukese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr &amp;</td>
<td>? (5+ yr Guam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Samoan, English</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5 yr &amp;</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5 yr &amp;</td>
<td>2 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemo*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chuukese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr &amp;</td>
<td>1 mo (lived in Guam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenlyn</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cebuano</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5 yr (#) &amp;</td>
<td>6 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitty</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr &amp;</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KKKMin</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr &amp;</td>
<td>5 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwan*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0 yr (#) &amp;</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laidplayer</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>English, Palauan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr (#) &amp;</td>
<td>1 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li Jun*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5 yr &amp;</td>
<td>4 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin Mei*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0 yr &amp;</td>
<td>4 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr &amp;</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luffy</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5 yr &amp;</td>
<td>2 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chuukese</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr &amp;</td>
<td>2 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDogg</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr (#) &amp;</td>
<td>2 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mack Daddy</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chuukese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr (#) &amp;</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majestic</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Visayan, Tagalog, English</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5 yr</td>
<td>1.5 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Tagalog, English</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr (#) &amp;</td>
<td>4 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlene*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chuukese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr &amp;</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marnie*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr &amp;</td>
<td>1 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chamorro</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr &amp;</td>
<td>1.5 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Marshallese</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr &amp;</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mei Lan*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0 yr (#) &amp;</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr (#) &amp;</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miz</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cebuano</td>
<td>9?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr &amp;</td>
<td>1 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mochenia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chuukese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr (#) &amp;</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mona*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chuukese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr &amp;</td>
<td>3 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Marshallese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr &amp;</td>
<td>8 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nell*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chuukese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr &amp;</td>
<td>1 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chuukese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr &amp;</td>
<td>4 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chuukese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr &amp;</td>
<td>1 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peach Girl</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5 yr &amp;</td>
<td>3 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr &amp;</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qian Ming*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5 yr &amp;</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raul*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0 yr &amp;</td>
<td>Entered mid-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raven</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr (#) &amp;</td>
<td>8 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regine</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Ilokano</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5 yr (#) &amp;</td>
<td>9 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romeo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Carolinian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0 yr &amp;</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Ilokano</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr &amp;</td>
<td>1.5 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr &amp;</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sai Wai*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr &amp;</td>
<td>2 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0 yr &amp;</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saraphy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>9?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr (#) &amp;</td>
<td>Entered mid-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student name</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Observed classes</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>LOR @ study start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorty</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Samoan, Tongan, English</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr</td>
<td>Born in Hawai‘i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sky Blue</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sou Li*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5 yr</td>
<td>3 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5 yr (#)</td>
<td>2 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teng Teng</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0 yr</td>
<td>6 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiare</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5 yr (#)</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Palauan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr</td>
<td>1 yr (3 yr Saipan; 4 yr Guam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To-chan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tommy</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr</td>
<td>2 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5 yr (#)</td>
<td>2 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinh</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr</td>
<td>4 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanz</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Tagalog?</td>
<td>10?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0 yr</td>
<td>Entered mid-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr</td>
<td>3.5 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicky</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Marshallese</td>
<td>9?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr</td>
<td>2.5 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei Yang*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 yr</td>
<td>2.5 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr (#&amp;)</td>
<td>6 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winner</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5 yr</td>
<td>4.5 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiao Bao*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0 yr</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiao Qiang*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr</td>
<td>6 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 yr</td>
<td>13 yr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C. KEY TO DATA REFERENCES

Data from observation field notes, classroom recordings, interviews, and documents are labeled throughout the dissertation as follows:

1. Field notes and classroom recordings:

   **COURSE_SEMESTER_SECTION_SOURCE: LINE#s**

   - ELA = ESL A
   - ELB = ESL B
   - ELC = ESL C
   - LSJ = Life Sciences J
   - SSJ = Social Studies J
   - LAJ = Language Arts J
   - HLM = Health
   - MSCLU = Miscellaneous-Lunch
   - MSCNE = Miscellaneous-Negotiating Entry
   - MSCPD = Miscellaneous-Prof Development
   - MSCTE = Miscellaneous-Testing
   - MSCXC = Miscellaneous-Extra-curricular Activities

   **U-Z** (Section code)

   - _fn_line#s = Field notes + line #s
   - _md #_line#s = Mini-disc number + transcript line #s
   - _mdS#_line#s = Mini-disc number (student carried) + transcript line #s

1.a Example (classroom recording): **LSJ42UmdS11: 12-17**

   LSJ_42_U_mdS11_12-17

   Life Sciences J 4th semester, 2nd quarter Section code Student MD #11 Transcript lines 12-17

1.b Example (field notes): **ELB41Yfn: 23-40**

   ELB_41_Y_fn_23-40

   ESLB 4th semester, 1st quarter Section code Field notes Field note line #s
2. Interviews:

INTERVIEW TYPE_INTERVIEW NUMBER:_LINE#

SINT = Student interview
TINT = Teacher interview

2. Example: SINT17: 112-124

SINT_17_112-124

Student interview Interview #17 Transcript lines 112-124

3. Documents:

COURSE_SEMESTER_SECTION_doc:_LETTER

ELA = ESL A
ELB = ESL B
ELC = ESL C
LSJ = Life Sciences J
SSJ = Social Studies J
LAJ = Language Arts J
HLM = Health
MSCLU = Miscellaneous-Lunch
MSCNE = Miscellaneous-Negotiating Entry
MSCPD = Miscellaneous-Prof Development
MSCTE = Miscellaneous-Testing
MSCXC = Miscellaneous-Extra-curricular Activities

3. Example: HLM31Vdoc: B
4. Student classwork and homework:

COURSE SEMESTER SECTION STUDENT NAME: LETTER

- ELA = ESL A
- ELB = ESL B
- ELC = ESL C
- LSJ = Life Sciences J
- SSJ = Social Studies J
- LAJ = Language Arts J
- HLM = Health

4. Example: ELA41WRAVEN: I

ELA_41_W_Raven_I

ESLL A 4th semester of study, 1st quarter Section code Student name Document I
APPENDIX D. TEACHER INTERVIEW PROTOCOL TEMPLATE

ESLL TEACHERS

Biodata

- Could you describe your:
  - educational background?
  - teaching experience?
  - experience working with ESL students?
  - experiences (if any) learning an L2?

- How did you come into teaching?

Teaching

- What do you enjoy/dislike about teaching?

- Are there some kinds of students you prefer to teach? Who? Why?

- What are your responsibilities as a teacher at Tradewinds? Which of these are the most/least important, in your view? Which do you spend the most/least time on? Which do you wish you could spend more/less time on? Why?

- What are some of the challenges you face teaching at Tradewinds?

ESLL as a program

- What do you think is the purpose of ESLL? (Probe: is it in service of academics or is it academic in and of itself?) What do you think is the role of ESLL in relation to the rest of the school? What does this mean/what effects does this have in terms of curriculum and instruction in your ESLL classes?

- How would you characterize the communication between teachers teaching the ESLL classes?

- How would you characterize the communication between ESLL and content area departments that have J-sections or mainstream classes which ESLL students are required to take (e.g., math, PE, Health). Do you provide assistance to the teachers of these classes? Do teachers ask for assistance?

- What perceptions do you think J-section and mainstream teachers have of ESLL? (Probe for specific examples) Why?

- What perceptions do you think regular or mainstream students have of ESLL? (Probe for specific examples) Why?

- What perceptions do you think ESLL students have of ESLL? (Probe for specific examples) Why?
ESLL class

- What are the goals/objectives of your class? Who determined them? Do standards factor in, in any way?

- Could you describe your curriculum for me? What's the rationale for it? Who decided it? Do standards factor in, in any way?

- What would you like to keep the same about your curriculum the next time you teach this class? Is there anything you'd like to change?

- Are the materials you use (textbooks, dictionaries, etc.) designed for ESLL students?

- What types of ESL students would you say your class is geared toward in terms of curriculum and instruction? Newcomers/long-term learners? Low/high L2 proficiency?

- What do students have to do to be successful in your class?

- What do you enjoy about teaching this class?

- What are some of the challenges you face teaching this class? What are ways you deal with them?

- Do you have a language policy in the class?

- What is the rationale behind your seating chart?

ESLL students

- How would you characterize the diversity of ESLL students in your class?

- Have ESLL student populations become more or less diverse over the years? How so? Why do you think that is?

- What are some of the classroom behaviors you find challenging in your ESLL classes? (Probe for specific examples) How do you deal with them? Why do you think students do these things?

Having me in the classroom

- How is your participation in this project going?

- How would you characterize my role in your class?

- Is there anything you would like me to do more of? Less of?

- Do you have any questions for me?
APPENDIX E. STUDENT INTERVIEW PROTOCOL TEMPLATE

Biodata

• Where were you born?

• Did you go to school there? What was school like? [for those born in Hawai'i probe for previous schooling experiences]

• [for those not born in Hawai'i] Do you miss the country where you were born? Do you plan to return sometime later?

• Do you have any plans for the future (probe college plans, where, possible jobs)?

Hawai'i [for those not born in Hawai'i]

• How old were you when you moved to Hawai'i?

• Why did you move here?

• How did you feel about moving here before you came? How do you feel about it now?

• What was it like when you first got here? What was the first day of school like?

• Think of a student from your country who has been in Hawai'i for a longer/shorter period than you: how are you similar/different?

• If you had stayed in [country], how do you think you'd be different than you are now?

• [for long term Ss] Do you know anyone here from elementary or intermediate? Do you hang out?

Language

• What languages do you speak at home?

• What language do you speak with your friends? (Do you have any non-[Chinese] friends?)

• When did you begin learning English?

• Which language do you use most at school, your L1 or English? Why is that? What about today?

• How do you feel about your English? How about your L1? Can you write your L1?

• Which language do you feel more comfortable speaking? E.g., at home. In school. Which language do you think is stronger?

• Do you think it's important for you to learn English? Why?

• Do you think you study English too much/enough/not enough every week?
ESLL

- What do you think of ESLL? J classes? Why? What do you think is the purpose of these classes?
- What do you learn in ESLL? J-classes? What do you want to learn?
- How is ESLL different from J classes? Mainstream classes (probe for L2 use/learning opportunities, instruction, pacing, assignments, homework, issues with classmates/friends)?
- Do you think ESLL classes help you to be prepared for other classes, e.g., J classes or mainstream classes (probe for perspectives on the books, vocab, writing assignments, and class projects)?
- Which classes do you do most/least HW?
- How are you doing in your classes (use Ss’ course schedule)?
- What do you think mainstream Ss/Ts think of ESLL Ss? Why?
- In period ____, are there people who you prefer to work with? Who? Why? People you prefer not to work with? Who? Why?
- Have you ever heard of FOB? What is it? How do you know about it?
- Would you prefer to stay in or to leave the ESLL program? Why?
- If you had a message for ESL teachers, what would you say?

If in Health class

- How are you doing in Health?
- Do you like the class?
- What is/was the hardest thing about Health? (probe specific assignments, etc.)
- How do you feel about speaking in front of the class? Why?
- If you had a message for the teacher, what would you say?
- Do you have any questions for me?

Specific questions:
APPENDIX F. STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Student Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Grade:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birth Place:</td>
<td>Birth date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, Country</td>
<td>Age:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What language(s) do you speak at home?: ________________________________

When did you arrive in the US (Hawai‘i)?: ________________________________

School Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>TEACHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are your most difficult classes? Why are they difficult?

What are your easiest classes? Why are they easy?

What school activities (school sports teams, clubs, etc.) do you participate in?: ________________________________

Do you work?  Yes / No  If yes: What do you do?: ________________________________

Do you plan to go to college?  Yes / No

What future career(s) are you interested in? Why?

______________________________

______________________________
APPENDIX G. TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

. falling intonation
, continuing intonation
? question intonation
! exclamatory intonation
word word stress
word – abrupt sound stop
WORD Louder than surrounding talk
(.) micropause
( . .) pause of about .5 second.
(1) pause of ~1 second (pauses above 1 second counted to nearest whole number)
[word onset of overlapping talk
[word
[word= latched speech
=word
: sound stretch
(inaudible) inaudible utterance
(word) best guess at a questionable transcription
((word)) physical movements, characterizations of talk, laughter, coughing, etc.
word English gloss of Cantonese, Mandarin, Korean, or Pidgin (Hawai‘i Creole)

She said it was.
When I put it down, he laughed.
What time is it?
You’re kidding!
I said yes.
I was – wait, what did you say?
He’s coming TOMORROW.
I think it goes (.) there.
He just ( . .) started eating.
So (3) what do we do now?
A: And then [I wanted to say –
B: [Who’s that waving at us?
A: It was so funny.=
B: =It really was.
School was so bo::ring.
After that (inaudible) until lunch.
I’m going to go to (town).
You want to ((laugh)) do what?
E, yu laik go.
Hey, do you want to go?

---

7 The intonational contour for Y/N questions in Pidgin differs from standardized English (SE). Whereas in SE, intonation generally rises, ending on a high pitch, in Pidgin it falls and ends on a low pitch (Sakoda & Siegel, 2003, p. 30). Thus, when a Y/N question is asked in Pidgin, with the appropriate falling contour, my English gloss of it will maintain the question mark. Instances where there is some ambiguity will be discussed in a footnote.
| {word} | inserted information to clarify utterance | I told him {Sam} he was right. |
|        | extraneous utterance(s) omitted          | When I went home. . . it was raining. |
| ?M/FS(s) | Unknown male/female student(s) | 
APPENDIX H. CHILDREN'S BOOKS USED IN ESLL

H.I. Blume (1970)

JUDY BLUME

Are you there God?
It's me, Margaret.
Sadako and the Thousand Paper Cranes
ELEANOR COERR
Family Tree Lesson Plan

Part 1

- Today we are going to make a family Tree. A family tree is a diagram of your family members and how they are related to you.

- Use the blank family tree diagram on page 3. Write the names of your family members and their birth dates, if you know them, and tell how they are related to you.

- Look at the sample family tree on the next page to see how it should be done.

Part 2

Vocabulary Words: Find the meaning of these words and write them in a sentence.

1. family-
2. descendants-
3. relatives-
4. ancestors-
5. born-
6. country-
7. grandmother-
8. grandfather-
9. great grandmother-
10. great grandfather-
11. sister / brother-
RECEIVED AS FOLLOWS
I.2. Class syllabus for 
Spring semester

Class Syllabus
ESLL

The Wanderer by Sharon Creech
Reading: Bud, Not Buddy by Christopher Paul Curtis 25% of grade
Requirements:
- Two to three per class period.
- Five vocabulary words, define and use in a sentence
- Neatness

Vocabulary Tests 25% of grade
Words chosen from book. Test each Friday

Journaling 25% of grade
Free writing with prompts from blackboard. Use your best most imaginative writing.

Various projects and exercises will make up the rest of the course work. 25% of grade

Work sheets - on going
Questions to answer on The Wanderer & Bud, Not Buddy
1.3. Fairy Tale Project assignment sheet

Fairy Tales, Folk Tales and Legends
Book Writing
Class Project, ESL I

Project entails retelling/rewriting a folk tale, fairy tale or legend from your own culture, using your own words, in English in a book format. The books will be illustrated, that is, you will be required to provide original, quality artwork for each page of your story as is used in real children’s picture books. The story can be told simply with a few lines per page. Art supplies will be provided. Selected final projects will be submitted to various teachers and some of the office staff to be reviewed. Prizes will go out to the top three works.

I. Read various folk tales, fairy tales and legends, aloud as a class.

II. After ward the students are invited to browse through the books that will bring in to get ideas about how these stories are written and retold and also to inspire us to think about how we would like to illustrate our own stories.

III. You will sign up for the story you chose to do submitting the title of the story as well as the country it is from along with your name.

IV. First drafts of the stories will be worked on and proofread in class. Second and final drafts without mistakes will be typed.

V. While writing your story think about the lay out of each page: How many lines will their be on each page and can you create an illustration for it?

VI. Artwork is important and should be top quality and enhance the story. You can choose from any of the following to illustrate your book.
   1. Black and white pencil or pen drawings.
   2. Colored drawings w/ markers, crayons, colored pencils, or chalk.
   3. Paintings, watercolor.
   4. Multimedia collage w/ found objects, cut paper mixed w/computer images.
   5. Paper cut outs, pop-up books.

* All underlined words are vocabulary words and must be defined and understood. Quiz will follow.
BUD, NOT BUDDY
by Christopher Paul Curtis

Reading 1: Chapters 1-3
1. What were some of ten-year-old Bud Caldwell’s rules for living which helped him to understand the world? Relate these rules to his personal life.
2. Who were Bud’s parents? What had happened to them? In the first reading, what three places are mentioned about them?
3. Bud’s suitcase was of great importance. What were the contents of it? Do you have any special object that you treasure greatly?
4. What happened at the Ambrose house? How does Bud get his revenge?

Reading 2: Chapters 4-6
1. Bud faced hunger at least three different occasions. How did he resolve his hunger and who came to Bud’s rescue?
2. What adventure did Bud and Buga have in Hooverville (Flint)? What historical value (importance) did this event have in American history? Did the two boys split up?
3. Was Bud more like the dirt blowing in a storm? Explain. Did Bud know about his family roots?
4. What were the symbolic meaning of the five smooth stones from his mother (page 79)? What more do we know about Bud’s life regarding Herman E. Calloway?

Reading 3: Chapters 7-9
1. Leif Lewis, a stranger, picks up Bud along the country side of Flint. In your opinion, was Mr. Lewis a good or bad man? Explain.
2. What was the mood of America in Historical Terms? Include the labor unions, KKK, and White-Black racial tensions in your answers.
3. How does Herman Calloway react to Bud’s accusations? Do you think they are father-son? What makes Bud think that Herman Calloway is his father? Explain.

Reading 4: Chapters 10-12

Reading 5: Chapter 17 - afterword
Short Vowel Sounds: i

Write i in the blanks to make short i words. Read the sentences to a friend.

1. I h_ d the l_ d, I d _d.
2. I w__ ll f__ ll the h__ ll with flowers.
3. I w__ sh the f__ sh were still in the d__ sh.
4. The b__ g p__ g ate a f__ g.

Add the beginning letter to make the short i words from the sentences.

1. _ id  
   _ id
2. _ ill  
   _ ill
3. _ ish  
   _ ish
4. _ ig 
   _ ig

Write two silly sentences with short i words.

__________________________

__________________________
WHAT IS IT?

Sometimes the main idea of a paragraph is not clearly given. It is not said exactly in any of the sentences. From a careful reading of all the sentences, however, a conclusion can be drawn as to what the paragraph says. In other words, the reader supplies the main idea of the paragraph with his or her conclusion.

A. Read the following paragraph.

One day Susie took a box of chalk from the shelf. She went outside and began to draw large rectangles and triangles on the sidewalk. She put numbers in them. She put letters in a couple spaces. Susie and her neighbors were going to play hopscotch.

1. What kind of game is the writer talking about?

2. Circle the letter of the best choice for the main idea of the paragraph.
   a. Susie is getting ready to play hopscotch.
   b. Playing hopscotch
   c. The fun of a hopscotch game

B. Read the following paragraph. Decide what the main idea of the paragraph is. Write it on the line.

Mary went outside to play with her friends. Mary was selected to be IT. She counted to 10 and then looked around. Everyone was gone. Her friends were now hiding. After a few minutes she gave up. Up jumped Bill, down climbed Eddie, and out crawled Jack. The game was over.
### Week 7 – Brown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Language Arts</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | **A.** did Chad like the brown bear?  
     | **B.** the bear he did tricks.   |   |
| 2   | **A.** are all bears brown?      |   |
|     | **B.** han seen a white one!     |   |
| 3   | **A.** Sam brown lives next to me!|   |
|     | **B.** I and Sam can ride our bikes. | |
| 4   | **A.** mom and dad have four brown kittens. | |
|     | **B.** how many tan kittens are there? | |
| 5   | **A.** I colored my dog brown and white. | |
|     | **B.** han and sora liked it.     |   |

### Week 8 – Black

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Language Arts</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | **A.** has you seen my black boots?  
     | **B.** they isn't here.   |   |
| 2   | **A.** why do the sky look black at night?  
     | **B.** I'm said that he didn't know. | |
| 3   | **A.** do you like my black cat?      |   |
|     | **B.** black and I like her.          |   |
| 4   | **A.** three black dogs was in the show. |   |
|     | **B.** they didn't want to do any tricks. | |
| 5   | **A.** may I paint the sheep black?   |   |
|     | **B.** Anna and Ben didn't like them. |   |
Name: __________________________ Date: __________________________ Per. ____________

Final Test ESL

1. A noun is a ____________________________ or ____________________________.

2. A verb is an ____________________________

3. To describe or tell about something, we use ____________________________

4. To tell how someone runs, sings or dances we would use an ____________________________

5. A ____________________________ takes the place of a noun. Give three examples:
   1. ____________________________
   2. ____________________________
   3. ____________________________

   Fill in the blanks: ____________________________

   Singular | Plural
   ------------- | -------------
   Boy | People
   Leaf | Children
   Box | ____________________________
   Horse | ____________________________
   Knife | Sheep
   Shepherd |

   Antonyms (opposites): Fill in the blanks
   example: black white
   hot ____________________________ logical ____________________________
   behind ____________________________ bright ____________________________
   beginning ____________________________ talkative ____________________________
   like ____________________________ dull ____________________________
### Verb Tenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past example</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Were</td>
<td>Am</td>
<td>Will be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Run</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Eat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Will swim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Sleep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Had</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Brought</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Will sing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Made</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Bought</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Catch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Will bring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Played</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Call</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Will wait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Flew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Listened</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proofread and Correct
The number on the left indicates how many mistakes are in that line.

4) In an old house in paris, that was cover in vines, lived twelve little Girls in to

3) straight lines. In two straight line they broke there bread and brush their teeth

1) and went to bed. They smiled at the good and frown at the bad and sometimes

3) they was very sad. They leave the house at half past nine in to straight line, in

1) rain or shine. The smallest one were Madeline.

Essay Question: Write about one important thing you learned in ESL this year or write about why it is necessary to offer an ESL class to new students from another country.
NEGATIVE FORM; REVIEW: (a) With the verb to be, we form negatives in the present and past tenses by placing not after the verb. (Examples: He is not a good student. We were not busy yesterday.) (b) With auxiliary verbs such as can, must, may, will, should, etc., we form negatives by placing not directly after the auxiliary. (Examples: He can not speak English well. She will not leave until tomorrow.)

In the blanks at the right, write not after either the verb to be or the auxiliary verb; also include the main verb, where the sentence contains one. Practice changing these sentences to negative form.

1. John will study in our group. (will not study)
2. You must tell him about it.
3. She may return later.
4. He is very busy today.
5. They were here yesterday.
6. He is studying in our group.
7. She should spend more time on her English.
8. They will be back at five o'clock.
9. She can speak French well.
10. We are going to the movies tonight.
11. They are old friends.
12. She is a good cook.
13. He has gone to Chicago.
14. She will telephone to you tonight.
15. We were tired after the dance.
16. I am an American.
17. There is a book on the table.
18. There were many students absent from the lesson.
19. I can meet you later.
20. You must write your exercises in pencil.
21. You may smoke here.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Outline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- chapter #(#s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 6 picture descriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading 1-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>30pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readings 4-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>20pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Comic book(strip)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- six pictures minimum for each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- captions or dialog on each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>picture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- coloring and/or shading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- cover page or first page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sadako words 4

lap n- the area of a sitting person from the knee to the top of the thigh
moonlit adj- lit by the moon
pause v- brief stop or hesitation
longingly adv- persistent desire
thoughtful adj- showing consideration
barbershop n- place where people can get a shave or a haircut
amused v past tense- to cause laughter
throbbing adj- to pulsate or beat
crumpled v past tense- to crush together
patient n- a person who is getting medical treatment
poison n- something destructive, harmful, deadly
pale adj- without much color
appetite n- a persons desire to eat food
clammy adv- damp, cold and sticky
rustle v- gentle light sound
Book Test

Write the answers to the questions below in complete sentences. Use a separate sheet of paper.

1. What is the title of the book? What is the relation of the title to this book?

2. Describe the setting of the book. When and where does the story take place?

3. What are some of the problems in the story? How are the problems solved? If they are not solved, why not?

4. Who is the main character in the story? What kind of person is the main character?

5. How does the main character change from the beginning to the end of the story?

6. Briefly trace the plot (main events) of the story. (8 - 10 sentences)

7. What is the theme of the book? What is the big idea the author wants you to learn? (What does the author say about people?)

8. What were the qualities of the book that made it good, enjoyable, or interesting for you? What were the qualities of the book that made it dull, slow, or painful for you?
Holidays

Holidays are special days. Most holidays are days to remember important people and events. In the United States, there is a holiday in almost every month of the year.

Banks, offices, and schools do not open on some holidays. These days are national holidays. Most people do not work and students do not go to school on national holidays. Three national holidays in the United States are Independence Day, Presidents' Day, and Labor Day.

Some holidays are special religious days. Christmas and Easter are important religious holidays. Some holidays are festivals from other countries. Immigrants brought the celebration of Chinese New Year and Mardi Gras to the United States many years ago. Now many Americans enjoy these holidays every year.

A holiday is usually a time for a happy celebration. People have parties or picnics with friends on some holidays. On other holidays people stay at home and celebrate with their families.

Everybody likes a holiday. Don't you?

2 New Words

Choose one of the following words to complete each sentence. You can work with a classmate.

celebrate  religious  celebrations
immigrants  events  picnic

1. Christmas is an important ________ holiday.
2. We remember important ________ on some holidays.
3. Holidays are times for special ________.
4. Most people ________ Christmas with their families.
5. ________ brought Mardi Gras to the United States many years ago.
6. Some people like to have a ________ with their friends on a holiday.

3 More Word Work

A. Find the words. Some words go across. Some words go down.

RELICELBRANJO
PICNDCARPMBTS
FYDMV(EASTER)ZL
EPEOPLEPARTYU
SONIRELIGIOUS
TFESTBACELEBR
IMMIGRANTSNI
VPEOPANIPJNI
AEVENTHCIMOIG
LINGICELEBRYGT
NJOYEVEPICNIY
PNATIONALMREL

Celebrate
Easter
Enjoy
Event
Festival
Immigrants
National
Party
People
Picnic
Religious
What are the answers to these questions? Discuss your answers with another student.

1. How do people celebrate holidays?
2. What day is a national holiday in the United States?
3. Do schools open on national holidays?
4. What day is a religious holiday in the United States?
5. Do you like holidays? Why?
6. What day is a national holiday in your country?
7. What day is a religious holiday in your country?
8. Do you like picnics?
9. When do you like to have picnics?
10. When do people in your country have parties?

6 Writing

1. Write the name of your country.
   
   **Example:** My country is Brazil.

2. Write the name of a national holiday in your country.
   
   **Example:** Independence Day is a national holiday in Brazil.

3. Write the name of a religious holiday in your country.
   
   **Example:** Christmas is a religious holiday in Brazil.
Lesson: Paragraph Development

Agriculture, Aquaculture, and Lots of Aloha (Part 1)

Directions: The following sentences are to be organized into 3 paragraphs. Paragraph #1 includes 2 sentences. Paragraph #2 includes 3 sentences. Paragraph #3 includes 4 sentences.

A. The United States Pacific Command is centered in Hawaii.
B. Other service industries are a big part of Hawaii's economy, too.
C. Tourism is Hawaii's leading industry.
D. But there's much more to Hawaii's economy than tourists.
E. When you think of Hawaii, you probably think of beautiful islands where tourists wear necklaces of orchids, swim near sandy beaches, and eat exotic foods.
F. It is responsible for defending United States interests in an area that covers about fifty percent of Earth's surface.
G. They bring about $11 billion a year into the economy.
H. The second-largest source of Hawaii's income is federal defense.
I. If so, you're right.
J. You might think of sugar and pineapples, but would you think of soldiers?
K. Tourism and government activities are called service industries.
L. More than 6 million people a year come to enjoy the beauty of the islands.
M. They include businesses such as medicine, law, insurance, banking, and real estate.
N. They produce services instead of manufactured or agricultural products.
I HAVE A DREAM
by Martin Luther King, Jr.

I have a dream
That one day
This nation will rise up
And live out the true meaning of its creed
"We hold these truths to be self-evident,
That all men are created equal."

I have a dream
That one day on the red hills of Georgia
The sons of former slaves
And the sons of former slave-holders
Will be able to sit down together
At the table of human brotherhood.

I have a dream
That one day
Even the state of Mississippi
A state sullen with the heat of oppression
Will be transformed
Into a beacon of freedom and justice.

I have a dream
That my four little children
Will one day live in a nation
Where they will not be judged
By the color of their skin
But by the content of their character.

I have a dream
That one day
Every valley shall be exalted,
Every hill and mountain shall be made low,
The rough places will be made plain,
And the crooked places will be made straight,
And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed
And all flesh shall see it together.
This is our hope.
K.3. Patriotism is strong in their hearts for choral reading
www.things-to-say.com/tribute/troops.htm

Patriotism is strong in their hearts
The young and brave are leaving our fold
After the days of the horrific attack
They feel they must make their mark.

To wipe out demonic terrorists abroad
Who thought they'd bring us to our knees
They know not of the love we have
For our country and democracy

Cowards thought the Americans were
How little do they know
Wielding our people by their attack
Bonding us in body and soul

We pray for our troops men and women alike
Our thoughts and prayers go with them
Looking to the day peace comes to earth
And no more troops will we send.
The Day the World Cried
September 11, 2001

We watched in disbelief as the Trade Center fell
The sorrow we felt was so deep
For all to us that were lost
Most nations joined in our grief

United are we in our resolve
They can't bring us down to our knees
Many nations have joined us in cause
The terrorist will feel the big squeeze

The American people from all walks of life
Were brought together when disaster came
Our lives have been emotionally affected
Things will never be the same

People from different
Jobs came together to rescue the unknown heroes.
Okay. Okay. I know what you will say
I am too tired and weary at the end of the day
But suppose you were to look at it this way
If I don't work, how will I get payed?
Alright. Alright, but before you sigh,
Think of all that your paycheck can buy
Yes, I agree it may not be a lot
But it's better than staying home or have you forgot?
Think of all the experiences you can get
Think of all the nice, welcoming people you have met
You are very smart and intelligent, please don't forget,
so think of all the possibilities I haven't even mentioned yet.
Think about work as something you can do
To touch the lives of those who come in contact with you
You are there to make a difference in your office
Think like that and you'll feel better, I promise
Think of work as something that needs to be done
So you can make time for something more fun
I know it's hard so I won't pretend
But think of work as a means to an end
Find something about work that is even 'okay'
Then give it your best day after day
And when you feel like crying, in between each sob
Send up a prayer and thank God you have a job.
Times will come when you feel down and sad
Other times you'll make someone smile and you'll know it's not that bad
And when you are overwhelmed and can't take another minute
Just remember you have me. You are not alone in it.
K.6. Vocabulary quiz

Name

Vocabulary Test #2.

Part I. Spelling and Meanings: Use the back if necessary. (30 points)

1. _____________________________________________ 9. _____________________________________________
2. _____________________________________________ 10. _____________________________________________
3. _____________________________________________ 11. _____________________________________________
4. _____________________________________________ 12. _____________________________________________
5. _____________________________________________ 13. _____________________________________________
6. _____________________________________________ 14. _____________________________________________
7. _____________________________________________ 15. _____________________________________________

Part II. Sentence Completions: Choose the words from Part I to complete the sentences. (30 points)

1. The bored student caught a(n) ______________ outside of the window as his teacher was talking.
2. The magician mumbled a few words to ________________ a potion of transforming little children into rats and lizards.
3. I can not _________________ to go to the movies; so i stay home to watch TV.
4. The busy doctors had no time to sit down for dinner. He ________________(ad) a quick bite of an apple, peanut butter sandwich, and milk.
5. Those newly built cars is so _______________ that there is an extra fact for your legs.
6. Rich people enjoy the _______________(es) of life with good food and a beautiful house.
7. Do you smell that _______________ odor? Is it a dead dog or poisonous gas?
8. _______________, a bus strike will occur on Tuesday. It is still unsure.
9. John _______________(es) with everyone at the party by talking and dancing to all.
10. I am most _______________ bothered by roaches, flies, and bugs and get nervous.
11. ESL students have speaking _______________ since they can speak 2 languages.
12. Can't be so _______________ when you go shopping. Buy what you need.
13. I am _______________(d) that the 5 year-old is able to read the story book.
14. The evil witch _______________(d) the little children to do what she wanted.
15. The "A" alphabet _______________ the other alphabets of B __Z.
Vocab List #3

1. mention = to say or state.

2. hideous = very ugly; repulsive.

3. arrange = to put into a specific order.

4. agitated = irritated or annoyed.

5. sermon = a religious discourse esp. as part of a worship service.

6. wiggle = to move to and fro with a quick, jerky or shaking movement.

7. maneuver = to move through in order to reach an end.

8. chomp = to chew.

9. broom = an instrument with a long handle used for sweeping.

10. porch = a covered entrance usually with a separate roof.

11. symbol = something that stands for something else.

12. disgruntled = unhappy, upset.

13. shrug = to hunch (the shoulders) up to express the fact that you don’t care or are unsure.

14. refresh = to revive, restore, or rejuvenate.

15. knuckle = the rounded knob at a joint, esp. at a finger joint.
Name ________

pd. ________

Thanksgiving Quiz:

Directions: Listen to the story and circle the correct answer.

1. What year did the Pilgrims have their first Thanksgiving Feast? 1619, 1620, 1621, 1635

2. What food was probably NOT on the Pilgrims’ Thanksgiving menu? potatoes, corn, fish, dried fruit

3. The Horn of Plenty, or Cornucopia, which symbolizes abundance, originated in what country? Holland, Greece, America, Turkey

4. In 1673, a day of Thanksgiving was proclaimed to take place during what month? May, June, October, November

5. What president didn’t like the idea of having a national Thanksgiving Day? Washington, Nixon, Truman, Jefferson

6. Who is credited with leading the crusade to establish Thanksgiving Day? Parker, Lee, Hale, Ferguson

7. Which president first established the date of Thanksgiving as a national celebration? Jefferson, Adams, Lincoln, Wilson

8. Which president moved the date of Thanksgiving twice? Lincoln, T. Roosevelt, F.D. Roosevelt, Eisenhower

9. The reason Thanksgiving was moved up a week was—
   To fulfill a political promise, To ward off evil spirits, Due to public pressure, To lengthen the Christmas shopping season
Remembering...

Students in Karen Shoesmith’s sixth grade English class at T.W. Hunter Middle School wrote poems to express their feelings about the Sept. 11 attacks on America. A selection is reprinted here.

What Goes Through My Mind
What goes through my mind in this horrible time?
A time of despair, when the world needs care.
My life has been turned upside down,
And, my family and friends all wear a frown.
As the tears roll down our faces,
So many people lost without traces.
Our lives are changed forever more,
Our minds will soar and our hearts will fly,
Now, all these things will make me cry,
So, I say good-bye
Laura Kettheragen, 11

September 11 or 911
On that awful day,
What can I say?
New York was in rubble,
There is going to be trouble.
As the Trade Centers start to collapse,
The people can only hopelessly watch and gasp.
The Pentagon was next to be hit.
The U.S. is going to have a big fit.
They thought they had cut out our light,
I wonder if they’ll think that way when we win the fight?
Never has there been such sorrow,
But, maybe other countries will watch us and follow.
Brandon Reavis, 11

Strong!
We must be sad,
And not just mad
For all the lives
Of men and wives
That we are now missing,
That we will miss kissing...
But, as we try to pass
THE PUSHCART WAR
by Jean Merrill

Readings

Reading #1

1. What was the Pushcart War? Explain when, where, who, what, why? Explain the Mighty Mammoth, the Leaping Lema, the Large Object Theory of history and the Daffodil Massacre.

2. Has there been a "pushcart war" in your country? Explain when, where, who, what, why, how. How did it affect you and your family? As a good citizen, how would you have helped to improve the conditions for your country?

3. Describe New York's traffic conditions in the 1980's. Explain how many licensed pushcarts there were, who were "The Three", what was the secret meeting of The Three and who were Marvin Seeley, Buddy Wisser, Jean Merrill, Mazie Hammerman and Joey Kafflis?

Reading #2

1. At the meeting of all pushcart peddlers, what did they decide to do to stop the truckers from pushing them off the street? Explain what would you have done or suggested if you were a pushcart peddler.

2. Explain the Pea Shooters Campaign. Whose idea was it? What did the pushcart peddlers do? how successful were they? What happened to the truckers? Would you have participated? Why or why not?

3. What was the Outer Space Theory? What would have been your theory for all the 18,991 flattened tires? Explain. What happened to Frank the Florist? Would you have been as heroic? Why or why not?
APPLICATION FORM

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Name ___________________________ Social Security Number ___________________________

Date ____________________________

Last First Middle

Present Address

Street City State Zip

Permanent Address

Street City State Zip

Phone No. ___________________________ Date of Birth ___________________________ Age ___________________________

If referred to anyone in our employ, state name and department ___________________________

Referral ___________________________ By ___________________________

PHYSICAL RECORD

List any physical defects ___________________________

Have you any defects in hearing? ___________________________ In vision? ___________________________

In speech? ___________________________

Weight _______ Height _______

Health Record ___________________________ Excellent ___________________________ Number of days absent due to illness ___________________________

Satisfactory ___________________________ Poor ___________________________ During the last three years ___________________________

Nature of illness ___________________________

EMPLOYMENT DESIRED

Position ___________________________

Date you can start ___________________________

Salary desired ___________________________

Are you employed now? ___________________________

If so, may we inquire of your present employer ___________________________

Applied to this company before? ___________________________

Yes No ___________________________

EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade School</th>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Grade Completed</th>
<th>Degree or Diploma</th>
<th>Dates Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AVAILABILITY

I am available for work ___________________________

Full Time Part Time ___________________________

If part-time, indicate hours available: ___________________________

S M T W T F S
Who Gets What?

by Jan Gleiter
Who Gets What?

Mr. Lopez likes fish. So one day he went fishing. He went to the lake. He thought of the fish cooking. It made him hungry.

At last he got a fish. He started cooking it for dinner. But along came a bear. The bear liked fish too.

So the bear got the fish. And Mr. Lopez got away.
APPENDIX M. SELECTED STUDENT WORK

M.1. "Minimum effort = Minimum grade"

1. Stanley was arrested for stealing a famous shoe. He was a small boy. He lives in a terrible house. He has no keys. He doesn't like to go there because he didn't steal it.

2. The old lady cursed his family cause his grandmother was carrying on the old lady to the station. Stanley's little curse cause she had to go carry a green suitcase. It was no curse cursed, it, but only his family. And complete sentences would be much better.

3. You granddaddler didn't steal the pig. Mother gave it to him and many the girl and suppose to every father.

Reading #1

He has to have a nickname. ? Why?

Yes, cause you could make more friends and they could help you.

Is this respecting your work?

No, they are doing something the warden.

No, cause the point of digging is to find something for the warden.

She cares about the stuff? She is looking for and

She is very spellish. She doesn't care about the health or anything and now the house cause they enjoyed winning it.
Comprehension

A. Circle true or false after each sentence.

1. Memorial Day is in May.  
   True  False

2. Memorial Day is a happy holiday.  
   True  False

3. Americans visit soldiers and sailors on Memorial Day.  
   True  False

4. People put flowers on graves on Memorial Day.  
   True  False

5. Many cities have parades on the last Monday in May.  
   True  False

6. Americans give flags to soldiers on Memorial Day.  
   True  False

7. People do not like to have good weather on Memorial Day.  
   True  False

Now show your answers to another student. Are your answers the same or different? Why?

B. One word in each sentence is wrong. Find the word and cross it out. Then write the correct word.

1. The last Monday in June is Memorial Day.  
   June

2. Memorial Day is a holiday for Americans to forget their dead friends and relatives.  
   forget

3. Many people visit beaches and put flowers on the graves of their friends and relatives.  
   beaches

4. People decorate the graves of soldiers with American flags.  
   large

5. Many people like Memorial Day because they have a four-day weekend.  
   four

6. Most public parks and beaches open for the vacation season on Memorial Day.  
   opening
2 New Words

Choose one of the following words to complete each sentence. You can work with a classmate.

military   sunshine   dead
weekend   graves

1. Many families spend the _____ weekend _____ at the beach.
2. People put flags on the _____ graves _____ of American soldiers and sailors.
3. Americans remember their _____ dead _____ friends and relatives on Memorial Day.
4. There is always a ceremony in _____ military _____ cemeteries on Memorial Day.
5. People usually like to have good weather and _____ sunshine _____ at the beach.

3 More Word Work

A. Look at these words. Look for the opposites of these words in the story "Memorial Day." Circle the opposites. Then write the opposites here.

1. big    _____ small _____    4. first    _____
2. cool    _____ warm _____    5. forget    _____ remember _____
3. end    _____    6. sad    _____
6 Writing

A. Write five things that Americans do on Memorial Day.

Example: Many people go to patriotic programs.

1. __________________________
2. __________________________
3. __________________________
4. __________________________
5. __________________________

Now write what you are going to do on Memorial Day.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

B. Put the words in the right order.

1. The last Monday in May is Memorial Day.
   Day in the Monday Memorial is last May

2. __________________________
   holiday very it not happy a is

3. __________________________
   relatives their of decorate the graves people

4. __________________________
   flags of soldiers put the on people graves

5. __________________________
   cities many are in parades there

6. __________________________
   beaches go people and parks to
C. People remember their dead friends and relatives on Memorial Day. Read this story.

My Classmate Martha

I remember my high school classmate Martha very well. She was very smart and pretty. We studied in class together. After school was over, we played Ping-Pong, went swimming, and did our homework together. One day she was in a car accident and died. I was very surprised and sad. I'll never forget my classmate Martha. She was my best friend.

Now write a story about someone you remember.

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Think and Discuss

Think about these questions. Then discuss your ideas with the class.

A. Do you think that it is important for people to remember their dead relatives? Why or why not?

B. On what other holiday do Americans remember dead soldiers and sailors?

The first good luck sign was that fuzzy spider, a spider brings good luck. The other one is the speck of cloud in the blue sky.

Yes! Sometimes when a leaf fall on you that’s a good luck sign. There’s a sign that the lizard brings good luck or bad luck.

2. Because on that day of peace was the grandmothers of the Sadako’s death day. It’s the day to remember those who died in the atomic bomb.

3. The atomic bomb and the disease that spread after the bomb drop. No.
M.7. Journal entry for the prompt “Things I wish teachers knew about students from my country.”

Transcription:

Things I wish teachers knew about students from my country

The thing my teacher should know about student from my country that, they don’t speak English because in China, they don’t teach English cause people think that they don’t need it. The second thing the teacher should know is they’re come from China and once again they don’t speak English.

[this entry was found on the floor at the end of the class]
M.8. Journal entry for "If I had a million dollars"

If I had a million dollars... I would buy a car or a house. Or I would buy a store and work as a boss. I might save the million dollars and use little by little every time I need.
M.9. Journal entry

1. *thinker* - small mound

2. *provision* - strong, proving

3. *paddling* - moving along slowly

4. *erotic design - strange*

5. *logical - reasonable*

1. I use a *thinker* to think.

2. My *provision* is some money.

3. He is *paddling* over.

4. My *erotic design* is erotic.

5. He is *logical, reasonable*.

1. "The Wanderer"

1. They are sailing to England. It will take them three or four weeks.

2. I would teach them fishing so they don't get hungry and they will have the strength to sail. Sophie story teller. I would teach them fishing. Brian - navigation so they won't starve. Cody - slogging

3. She wants to do things that a boy also does. That a girl would never do. She also thinks that the sea is calling her. She wants to see her grandparents.

4. Brian is very organized and very picky. Cody makes jokes, grumbles a lot. Very hyper.

2. Grandpa Bomye - Ulysses

Uncle Dock - Jonah

Uncle Stew - Stewart

Uncle MO - Moses
M.13. Grammar exercise

Pg. 15 Grammar Work

1. described 11. carried 21. traveled 31. referred
2. forced 12. played 22. pleased 32. insulted
3. studied 13. guided 23. spelled 33. noticed
4. indicated 14. planned 24. faced 34. admitted
5. needed 15. hoped 25. worried 35. satisfied
6. learned 16. cried 26. depended 36. chased
7. practiced 17. seemed 27. decreased 37. talked
8. used 18. enjoyed 28. remained 38. learned
10. managed 20. helped 30. supposed 40. proved

Pg. 16 Grammar Work

3. counted, 2 23. picked, 1
4. rented, 2 24. looked, 1
5. needed, 2 25. lived, 1
6. showed, 2 26. liked, 1
7. seemed, 1 27. lasted, 2
8. worked, 1 28. closed, 2
9. washed, 1 29. changed, 1
10. wanted, 2 30. landed, 2
11. waited, 2 31. used, 1
12. walked, 1 32. mated, 1
13. stopped, 1 33. handed, 2
14. spelled, 1 34. crossed, 1
15. smoked, 1 35. pulled, 1
16. rented, 2 36. earned, 1
17. pointed, 2 37. painted, 2
18. asked, 1 38. boiled, 2
19. danced, 1 39. blinned, 1
20. talked, 1 40. touched, 1
21. learned, 1
22. parted, 2
2. He said that he had too much work.
3. John said that English was difficult.
4. Can you tell me where I find Mr. Smith?
5. Alice said she could not finish her homework.
6. She said that she did not feel well.
7. George told me all about his trip to New York.
8. He said that he liked New York very much.
9. You can believe William because he always tells the truth.
10. Larry said yesterday that he liked the new teacher very much.
11. He said that he understood every word she said.
12. He told William and me that he planned to continue in her class.
13. I told Mr. Smith that I did not know how.
14. He said that he could teach me easily.
15. It was John who told us it was a good restaurant.
16. He said he ate there every day.
17. I told them I did not want to go to the movies.
18. William said the book belonged to Smith.
19. I told him I thought it belonged to Hagen.
20. Who told you Mr. Reese was an engineer?
RECEIVED
AS
FOLLOWS
M.15. Grammar exercise.

1. I had to work late tonight.
2. I had to leave early.
3. We had to stay late for our next examination.
4. He had to work extra late on his report.
5. Did you have to stay a long time to see him?
6. We do not have to spend some time on his homework.
7. We did not have to return this.
8. I did not have to be in bed so early from a sleep.
9. They did not want to have breakfast in the room.
10. They did not have to walk to school in the rain.
11. You did not have to see him a few times.
12. You do not get to wear a big hat.
13. We did not feel the desire for his hall.
14. Did not have to go to the beach.
15. I do not have to run in this area.
16. We do not have to take an examination of English.
17. We do not have to pay the room.
18. We do not have to have for breakfast this work.
19. We do not have to spend a century on this book on the page.
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