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Abstract

Two-Way bilingual immersion programs, which bring together language majority and language minority children with the goals of bilingualism and biliteracy for all, are becoming increasingly popular in the United States. And while research shows high academic achievement for both language majority and language minority speakers, as measured by standardized testing (Thomas & Collier, 2002), several studies highlight the problematic tensions that arise around issues of equity, power, and the role and status of Spanish (e.g. Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Fitts, 2006; Valdés, 1997). I add to this literature by examining both the larger social processes that bring different groups of people together in the same urban space - such as gentrification and immigration - and how families and children differently experience the program. Through this ethnographic, discourse analytic study, I shed light on the social dynamics that influenced the creation of this program, including a funding crisis in the district along with a movement by middle class mostly white parents to "opt-in" to the public school system. I show how the efforts of one group to support and promote this program were driven by a desire for equity but also enmeshed in a system that reproduced class and race privilege. I demonstrate the stark differences in the realities of parents who composed the group of "English-speakers" and those who were the parents of the "Spanish-speakers." Yet, in the classroom, I illustrate how children showed a wider range of proficiencies than their labels allowed. I argue that, through everyday interactions children socialized each other into both languages, and into a range of ways of communicating that went beyond linguistic codes. Finally, through the concept of raciolinguistic socialization, I show how race and class impacted children's trajectories, which were consequential to not only their identities, but also decisions to stay or leave the program itself. Children and families from vastly different class, cultural, racial, and linguistic backgrounds are differently subject (or not) to processes of racialization and marginalization, which have consequences for their schooling experiences and eventual outcomes. As such, both these processes, and these programs, merit more scholarly attention.

Degree Type
Dissertation

Degree Name
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

Graduate Group
Education

First Advisor
Nelson Flores

Second Advisor
Betsy Rymes

Keywords
Bilingual Education, Ethnography, Gentrification, Immigration, Two-Way Immersion, Urban Schools

Subject Categories
Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education | Education | Linguistics

This dissertation is available at ScholarlyCommons: https://repository.upenn.edu/edissertations/2213
LANGUAGE AND THE GENTRIFYING CITY: AN ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY OF A TWO-WAY IMMERSION PROGRAM IN AN URBAN PUBLIC SCHOOL

Sofía E. Chaparro Rodarte

A DISSERTATION

in

Education

Presented to the Faculties of the University of Pennsylvania

in

Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

2017

Supervisor of Dissertation  Co-Supervisor of Dissertation

_________________________  __________________________

Nelson Flores,  Betsy R. Rymes,
Assistant Professor of Education  Professor of Education

Graduate Group Chairperson

_________________________

J. Mathew Hartley, Professor of Education

Dissertation Committee:

Betsy R. Rymes, Professor of Education

Nelson Flores, Assistant Professor of Education

Nancy H. Hornberger, Professor of Education

Stanton E. F. Wortham, Professor of Education and Dean of the Lynch School of

Education, Boston College
LANGUAGE AND THE GENTRIFYING CITY: AN ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY OF A TWO-WAY IMMERSION PROGRAM IN AN URBAN PUBLIC SCHOOL

COPYRIGHT

2017

Sofía E. Chaparro Rodarte
DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to the children, parents, teachers and individuals who opened their lives and shared their experiences with me

Le dedico este trabajo a los niños, padres, maestras, y personas que me abrieron las puertas y compartieron sus vidas conmigo.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Getting to this point has been an effort of many who have guided, supported, and encouraged me along the way. I could not have asked for better co-chairs and advisors, Betsy and Nelson. Thank you for your caring guidance, your generosity, and for opening doors and opportunities to present my work with others. Betsy, thank you for your optimism and excitement for my work - I always left our meetings energized and felt validated in the ideas I proposed. Nelson, thank you for your careful attention to detail, your critical questions that always pushed my work forward, and for las porras que siempre me echas in social media and IRL (in real life). Nancy and Stanton, thanks for being not only part of my committee but also, and importantly, part of my formation as a scholar from day 1 when I began graduate school. I feel honored to have had the opportunity to count such great scholars as my mentors.

I have benefited from the friendship, mentorship, and camaraderie from the amazing people that have come before me: Holly, Sarah, Roseann, Mariam, Cécile, Catrice, Krystal, and Haley. Holly, thank you for taking me under your wing when I was a confused former teacher trying to figure out what grad school was all about. Camra peeps, thank you for the amazing adventure the first year of not only figuring out grad school, but also trying to figure out filming/visuality/scholarship/ethnography all at the same time: Leya, Matt, Arjun, Gabriel, Veena, Amit, and especially John - who made it all happen and who I want to be like when I grow up. My comrades in arms - Miranda, Coleman, Jojo, Frances (Bebé), Aldo, Mark, Andrea, Siwon, Yeting, Kristina, Jenn, Katherine, David, and Gareth - it has been a pleasure to learn along with you. Thank you for the many times you listened to my work, gave me thoughtful feedback, and helped me get to this point. Coleman, I would not have survived the last couple of weeks without the knowledge that you were just as miserable as me in the library. Or without our lunches and exchanging our chapters and our cover letters. Tubabu, I ni sogoma?
This would not have been possible without the love and support from my family and friends. Mami, Papi, Marini, y Natalie - que les puedo decir? Son mi mundo y mi razón de ser, junto con mis adorados sobrinos Lucas, Emma Lucía, y pronto Luciana. Papás Chaparro, esto fue posible por ustedes y gracias a su visión de cómo educarnos de manera bilingüe desde que estábamos chiquitas. I love you and hope I've made you proud. Talar, Amanda, and Nina, grad school has been so incredibly fun with the adventures we've had together, and I would not have survived without you and our incredible friendship. Talar, thank you for your editing magic and all you did for me in this last week. I don't think anyone (other than my committee) will have read my dissertation as closely as you did, all so you could provide me with feedback and get me ready for my presentation. YOU are an angel. Angelo, thanks for keeping me fit and sane on our runs with Zaza, and always making me laugh like a good husband. Nina, your excitement for life is contagious and I have the most fun when you're around - we'll have to live a bi-state lifestyle, my HSLF. Ida, mai waife, we did it! I couldn't have asked for a better summer writing and travel partner - and I look forward to many more writing retreating to come!

A mi equipo de natación, 1 y 2, les debo mi salud y mi increíble condición física ;). Mi Coush, gracias por los entrenamientos y sus enseñanzas. Mi Estimado, ¿donde estaría sin usted? Pues creo que en el mismo lugar, peeeeero sin las risas, las conversaciones, las vivencias, el mezcal, y sin su amistad y su gran persona. Majo, si no hubieras sido tan buena alumna, yo nunca hubiera sido la Blackship ;). Gracias por tus porras y tu amistad. ¡Y sigues tú! Caro, Mariela, Y Jorge - estas últimas semanas fueron claves y nadar con ustedes me mantuvo sana de mente y cuerpo. Caro, ¿con quien hubiera estudiado tantos fines? Ahora sigue pagarlos con puras celebraciones.

Hay personas que aún al no ser parte de este proyecto, siempre han sido grandes mentoras y ejemplos a seguir. Guadalupe, tú eres una de ellas. Por tu sugerencia y apoyo es que llegué a
Penn, y por tu ejemplo es como supe que ser profesora sería posible. Espero sepas cuánto te admiro y cuánto agradecelo por tu apoyo. Tía Elea, ¿con quien más hubiera podido compartir estas experiencias sin sentirme como la “rara” académica? Poca gente entiende estos mundos en los que vivimos, y compartirlos contigo ha sido un honor y placer.

A mis queridas "Ms. O" y "Ms. A", sin ustedes este trabajo no sería posible. Gracias por su trabajo y todo lo que hacen. "Ms. O", sobretodo, gracias por abrirme las puertas de tu salón de clase, siendo el primer año tan difícil. Gracias por tu confianza y tu amistad. Esto es para ustedes y por su labor como maestras.
ABSTRACT

LANGUAGE AND THE GENTRIFYING CITY: AN ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY OF A TWO-WAY IMMERSION PROGRAM IN AN URBAN PUBLIC SCHOOL

Sofía Chaparro Rodarte
Nelson Flores
Betsy Rymes

Two-Way bilingual immersion programs, which bring together language majority and language minority children with the goals of bilingualism and biliteracy for all, are becoming increasingly popular in the United States. And while research shows high academic achievement for both language majority and language minority speakers, as measured by standardized testing (Thomas & Collier, 2002), several studies highlight the problematic tensions that arise around issues of equity, power, and the role and status of Spanish (e.g. Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Fitts, 2006; Valdés, 1997). I add to this literature by examining both the larger social processes that bring different groups of people together in the same urban space - such as gentrification and immigration - and how families and children differently experience the program. Through this ethnographic, discourse analytic study, I shed light on the social dynamics that influenced the creation of this program, including a funding crisis in the district along with a movement by middle class mostly white parents to "opt-in" to the public school system. I show how the efforts of one group to support and promote this program were driven by a desire for equity but also enmeshed in a system that reproduced class and race privilege. I demonstrate the stark differences in the realities of parents who composed the group of "English-
speakers" and those who were the parents of the "Spanish-speakers." Yet, in the classroom, I illustrate how children showed a wider range of proficiencies than their labels allowed. I argue that, through everyday interactions children socialized each other into both languages, and into a range of ways of communicating that went beyond linguistic codes. Finally, through the concept of raciolinguistic socialization, I show how race and class impacted children’s trajectories, which were consequential to not only their identities, but also decisions to stay or leave the program itself. Children and families from vastly different class, cultural, racial, and linguistic backgrounds are differently subject (or not) to processes of racialization and marginalization, which have consequences for their schooling experiences and eventual outcomes. As such, both these processes, and these programs, merit more scholarly attention.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

As I walked in to the newly painted light blue classroom, Ms. O\textsuperscript{1} was in the midst of conducting a parent interview with a Mexican mother. Ms. O, who is Venezuelan, called María over to the table to conduct an assessment, as her mother eagerly looked on. After explaining what they were going to do, Ms. O began: “Pon el bolígrafo sobre la nube.” [Place the pen on top of the cloud]. María stared at Ms. O with big eyes and a shy smile, but did not move. Her mother interjected: “Casi no entiende el español” [she hardly understands Spanish]. Ms. O then repeated the command in English, several times, until María did as she was told. I was surprised by the mother’s comment, (since María is part of a Spanish-speaking Mexican family), and I wondered whether it was the case that María did not actually understand Spanish or if her lack of response to the command was due to an unfamiliarity with the term ‘bolígrafo’ for pen, as opposed to the term ‘pluma’, which can be more familiar to some Spanish speakers.

In our conversation later in the afternoon, Ms. O described one of her previous interviews with Santiago and his mom, Jane, who is white American and whose husband is Costa Rican. Jane told Ms. O to please push Santiago to speak more Spanish, since he refuses to at home. Santiago quickly objected: “But mom, I’m not a Spanish boy!” Ms. O wondered whether Santiago, whose family will bring him from a wealthier area outside the catchment of the school, associated speaking Spanish only with Mexican immigrants.

Santiago and María are kindergarten classmates this school year in a brand new

\textsuperscript{1} The names of all individuals and organizations throughout this dissertation are pseudonyms.
bilingual Spanish-English two-way immersion program, located within a public school in a large urban school district. María’s family emigrated from Mexico several years ago, and settled into this area of the city, where a large part of the growing Mexican population resides. Santiago, on the other hand, lives outside the school’s neighboring area, in a more affluent part of town. Santiago’s mother, Jane, learned about the two-way immersion program through social media networks, and after attending a parent meeting and touring the school, decided to enroll Santiago. The individuals responsible for advertising the program in these social media networks are members of a neighborhood civic association in this gentrifying part of town, who are supportive of the program and who were aggressively publicizing it in order to ensure sufficient enrollment in its first year. Several families are counting on this program to exist for when their young children become school-aged, and have decided to invest time and resources into ensuring its success.

The institution that is bringing together these groups of people is a Two-Way Immersion (TWI) program within an urban public school - one I call George Washington School - that offers both Spanish and English speakers the opportunity of a dual language education. Two-way immersion programs, which by definition bring together language majority and language minority children with the express goals of bilingualism and biliteracy, are becoming increasingly popular in the U.S. (Collier & Thomas, 2004). And while the research literature points to the many benefits of this model, including higher academic achievement in both languages of instruction for both groups of students (Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Thomas & Collier, 2002), studies have highlighted the problematic tensions that arise around issues of equity, power, and the role and status of
Spanish (Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Fitts, 2006; McCollum, 1999; Palmer, 2009; Scanlan & Palmer, 2009). These studies – perhaps inspired by Valdés’ (1997) ‘Cautionary note’ on who benefits from these programs – have documented the pressures that arise from the asymmetrical power relations between English as a dominant language and Spanish as a minority language, and how those consequently affect students, their language practices, and their investment in each language (Cervantes-Soon, 2014; DePalma, 2010; McCollum, 1999; Potowski, 2004). Some of these studies also noted the problematic use of simplified Spanish in service of English speakers (Delgado-Larocco, 1998; McCollum, 1999; Valdés, 1997).

While two-way programs have been the object of considerable scholarly attention, one of the least explored phenomena in the literature are the processes that create fertile grounds for these programs to exist in the first place. In other words, there are larger social, economic, and ideological processes that contribute to the rise in number and demand for this type of program, and that have made this particular TWI program possible. In this case, two of these processes are immigration and gentrification. This is exactly the problematic that I explored through this dissertation study: how socio-political processes – in particular, gentrification and immigration, and the ideological discourses that go along with them – come to bear on the creation and development of two-way programs.

Part and parcel of what these larger social processes do, in creating spaces for TWI programs, is bringing together students, like María and Santiago, that have very different historical, cultural, and personal ties to Spanish, and who come from families
whose cultural, linguistic, economic, and migratory trajectories are enormously different. Moreover, the stakes for each child, and each family, are different: they are as different for English-speaking and bilingual children who belong to middle and upper middle class families as they are for newly arrived children coming from working class Latino households, and for Italian-American and African-American children whose families are long-time residents in the community. Thus, it is essential to explore the motivations of different families to support this program and enroll their children in it, and the ways in which students and families experience the program. And while parents and adult-members of families might have different motivations for their children to participate in this TWI bilingual program, the ways in which children experience it themselves is a different matter.

**Research Questions**

In this dissertation, I investigate the following questions:

1) How have large-scale social processes, such as gentrification and immigration, influenced and facilitated the creation of this two-way immersion program?

2) What are the experiences of children and families in the first year of the program? How do language, class and race impact these experiences?

3) Throughout the course of the program, how do the children interact with each other, particularly those with whom they do not yet share a common linguistic repertoire?
In the second chapter of this dissertation I review the bodies of literature that have informed my work, and that I hope to contribute to with this study. The literature on bilingual education generally, and two-way immersion specifically, frames the impetus for doing a study that considers both larger social processes along with interactional everyday realities in the classroom. Additionally, I turn to the small yet growing literature on gentrification and education within the sociology of education, along with studies on immigration and education, to inform and situate my analysis of the effects of these dynamics on public schools in cities and metropolitan areas. In this chapter I also lay out the theoretical framework that guides my inquiry. I situate my study within the linguistic anthropology of education. First, language as part of individuals' communicative repertoires undergirds my analysis, as well as a view of language learning as language socialization. In other words, as opposed to examining language development in a more traditional sense, wherein I would pay attention to the acquisition of forms of language, I focus on how language learning is happening in concert with other features of interaction, interactions which I consider part of a process of peer language socialization. A concept that is key is that of trajectories of socialization (Wortham, 2005), that in tandem with the concept of raciolinguistic ideologies (Flores & Rosa, 2015), frame my argument for the concept of raciolinguistic socialization. Finally, I bring together these lens on an analysis that takes into account the political economy and socio-historicity of the emergence of this two-way immersion bilingual program in the United States, placing it in context with
the realities and pressures of an underfunded public school system and market-based reform strategies.

Chapter 3 describes the research setting for this study as well as my research methods. It was important to situate this study in its actual location - the city of Philadelphia. This was in order to be able to discuss this study within the context of the city's history and the context of current processes of re-development and gentrification, as well as the recent efforts of middle class parents to improve the city's public schools. Methodologically, this is an ethnographic, discourse analytic study. In other words, within the frame of an ethnographic study, I pay attention to language use and language-in-use as empirical phenomena whose study can elucidate everyday experiences of participants. I describe the data collection methods and process of analysis that both of these undertakings require, spending much time discussing my positionality and relationships within the field. As an ethnographic study, these were key to the kinds of information I had access to, and in and of themselves revealed gendered, classed, and racialized dynamics.

In Chapter 4, I tell the story of how the two-way immersion program at George Washington School came to be. I describe the conditions that came together for this program to become a desirable and feasible option. First, I describe the funding crisis and market-based reform efforts that created a competitive environment where district schools faced significant pressure to perform in the midst of the imminent possibility of being closed. Concomitant to this, and a process that gained traction as a result, middle class parents who had opted to "stay in the city" began demanding better options for schooling, by forming local groups with the aim of supporting their neighborhood
schools. These groups formed in parts of the city that are gentrifying, and as such, the schools that have benefited from their efforts are located in neighborhoods that have a growing number of new residents, that tend to be white, middle class, and highly educated. Through the analysis of the efforts one such group, the Neighborhood Civic Association's Education Committee, I analyze how the group's efforts to support George Washington and its new TWI bilingual program were driven by a genuine desire for equity in schooling opportunities and to improve conditions for all children, yet ironically, also reproduced the dynamics of race and class privilege. In other words, their initiatives and activities, which took hard work, time, and energy, were mostly geared at attracting more parents – middle class and mostly white – to invest in the school by enrolling their children in it and joining the group's efforts to improve the school.

Chapter 5 tells the story of parents' parallel lives. The diversity in the neighborhood that attracted many of the white middle class parents did not mean that such diversity led to meaningful everyday intercultural connections – in fact, the different cultural and linguistic groups that have a presence in the surrounding neighborhood seemed to lead lives in which they were in the same physical place, but hardly occupying the same spaces. This shone through in my interviews with parents, particularly as they elucidated their starkly different everyday realities and their trajectories of migration. Also, I talk about the diversity within the groups of parents of children that were labeled "English-speakers" and "Spanish-speakers," underscoring how the differences in parents' needs and concerns influenced the school and placed different demands on the teacher.

In Chapter 6, I turn my attention to the experiences of the children, presenting snapshots of everyday interactions which I analyze through the participant frameworks
and interactional roles that children take up. Through this framework, I illustrate the importance of spatial arrangements of children, who, by virtue of their physical positioning, become participants in interactions that occur in both languages (and through a variety of other means of communicating). I argue that these are moments of peer communicative socialization, where children model and apprentice each other into different ways of speaking, which include not only English and Spanish, but also, other ways of interacting and of participating in literacy events. With these analyses, I hope to contribute to the way researchers frame interactions in bilingual classrooms, so that we understand them through a broader lens that allows us to consider all that transpires through children's talk, which goes beyond simply a choice of code.

In Chapter 7, I examine how race and class impacted students' experiences within this bilingual program. First, I describe how this kind of bilingual program regiments who "English speakers" and "Spanish speakers" are; categories that adhere not so much to actual language competencies, but to racial and ethnic backgrounds. In other words, in TWI programs, English is enregistered as belonging mostly to the white children, and Spanish is enregistered as belonging to the Latino children, precluding those that are already bilingual, or that are bi-racial, to occupy both categories simultaneously. Given this raciolinguistic ideology, I examine how being socialized into such a space affects children's trajectories in different ways. I call this process raciolinguistic socialization, and illustrate it through the cases of Santiago, Zoe, Monica and Larissa. Through field notes, parent interviews, and classroom interactions over time, I analyze students' trajectories of raciolinguistic socialization in the classroom, stressing how the intersection of race, class, and language impact children’s trajectories in distinct ways.
Finally, I conclude in Chapter 8 with a discussion of the implications of this study as well as its methodological and theoretical contributions. I end with a series of portraits and questions for what the future years of this program might look like, as well as how the trajectories and lives of these children might unfold in the coming years.

**Significance**

Two-Way Immersion programs in the United States are growing in number and popularity. At the same time, more urban spaces are being gentrified and middle class parents are demanding better schooling options for their children growing up in the city. Given the presence of Spanish-speaking immigrants and immigrant families in large metropolitan areas, many are turning to TWI programs as viable, attractive options. And while these programs have proven successful in several measures, including standardized testing in both languages and for both language minority and language majority students, many difficult issues arise in the challenging, muddy endeavors of implementing such programs. Issues of equity, power, diversity, class, race, and resources must be addressed. This study illustrates how these issues arise and are lived through in one such program – thus contributing to the growing literature on TWI programs and enriching the body of work that serves to guide practitioners and administrators interested in this model.

The intellectual merit of this study lies in the examination of the wider social processes around these programs – to look at this moment in time, and how processes at different scales (Lemke, 2000; Wortham, 2012) have come together to create fertile spaces for TWI programs. Immigration and gentrification are broad concepts that have
received scholarly attention in various disciplines, yet rarely have they been considered concomitantly with bilingual education scholarship. Furthermore, a much of the research on TWI programs that informs this study is quantitative, making an ethnographic, discursive perspective desirable. Additionally, a linguistic anthropological perspective allows me to focus on everyday interactions – of both adults and children – and examine these in relation to and as part and parcel with the larger social processes I describe above. Finally, understanding children’s interactions through a communicative repertoire perspective allows us to see how children learn a wide range of ways to communicate from each other, which brings about a fresh perspective that helps us think beyond coded languages to ways of speaking.
Chapter 2: Literature Review and Conceptual Framework

My dissertation has been informed by scholarship on bilingual education generally, and two-way immersion research specifically. Within this field, I consider both the quantitative research conducted on TWI programs as well as the qualitative studies that have identified some of the most pressing challenges. Additionally, in order to understand the larger social context around the creation of the TWI program that is the focus of this study, I draw on scholarship concerning immigration and gentrification in relation to urban schooling. After reviewing the major bodies of literature that inform this study, I explain the principal theoretical concepts that frame my work.

Literature Review

Bilingual Education Research and Two Way Immersion

The study of bilingual education has been historically approached from various angles. From the 1950’s to the 1980’s, three major tendencies dominated research and practice in the field of bilingual education: a focus on models and types of bilingual education, research on achievement and outcomes, and an emphasis on language competence and balanced bilingualism (Martin-Jones, 2007). In particular, emphasis on models of bilingual education engendered a number of typologies for the categorization of bilingual education programs, which resulted in some inconsistency and confusion in the naming of programs. Hornberger (1991) sought to clarify this by extensively reviewing the literature, comparing typologies, and proposing a new framework. Under this framework, Hornberger (1991) distinguished between program models and types,
models being based on a program’s goals towards language, culture and society, and types encompassing the characteristics through which programs are implemented, such as program structure and characteristics in student and teacher populations. Three bilingual educational models result from this framework: a transitional model, with the goals of language shift, cultural assimilation, and social incorporation; a maintenance model, with the goals of language maintenance, strengthened cultural identity, and civil rights affirmation; and the enrichment model, with the goals of language development, cultural pluralism, and social autonomy. Hornberger advocated enrichment bilingual education models as the most promising, and it is under this model that two-way immersion is found.

Similar to the various typologies that exist to distinguish among bilingual educational approaches, there were also several terms that were used early on to refer to two-way immersion programs – these included two-way immersion, two way bilingual education, language immersion, Spanish immersion, and dual language education (Lindholm, 1987; Hornberger, 1991). The most commonly used terms are two-way Immersion or dual language education, which some scholars use interchangeably (e.g. Lindholm-Leary, 2001). Others, myself included, use the term dual-language education to refer to programs that use two languages to educate, but whose students may be a homogenous group of majority, minority, or bilingual speakers, and reserve the term two-way immersion to refer to programs that teach in both the majority and minority language and have both majority and minority language speakers (and thus both groups are being ‘immersed’ in their second language). These programs are often defined by having three goals: 1) bilingualism and biliteracy for all students, 2) high academic achievement, and

The earliest two-way immersion program on record was begun in Dade County, Florida, where many Cuban refugees, mostly from middle and upper class backgrounds, who were fleeing from the Castro regime had settled (Bikle, Hakuta, & Billings, 2004). Thinking their stay in the United States to be temporary, they sought to educate their children in Spanish as well as English. Meanwhile, English-speaking middle class families enrolled their students as well, reflecting an increased desire for foreign language instruction (Baker, 2006). It was during this same time that the experiment of Canadian immersion programs was born in St. Lambert’s, where a group of parents, with the help of researcher Wallace Lambert, collaborated to create a French-immersion kindergarten for English speaking children in Quebec. The success of the Canadian immersion model became well-known and influential for the development of similar immersion programs in the United States (Baker, 2006; Bikle, Hakuta, & Billings, 2004), and since then, two-way immersion programs have been steadily increasing in number. The Center for Applied Linguistics’ online directory lists 453 as of March 2015 (http://www.cal.org/twi/directory/index.html); whereas in 1992 there were 124 listed, and in 1999 there were 261 (Lindholm-Leary, 2001).

Under Hornberger’s (1991) framework, both the Canadian immersion and two-way immersion programs in the US fall under the enrichment model, given their similar goals. They might fall under different types, given the different characteristics in student and teacher population. Yet another way of thinking about TWI is through the continua
of biliteracy, another framework conceptualized by Hornberger for situating research, policy and practice of bilingual education (Hornberger & Skilton-Sylvester, 2000; Hornberger, 1989). The continua consists of nested scales that represent the media, contexts, development and content of biliteracy, and suggests that the more a learning environment allows learners to draw from every point of the continua, the more successful learning can be. Analyzing TWI programs from a language policy perspective, and within the heuristic of the continua of biliteracy, Jeon (2003) argued that because TWI programs value both the more powerful and less powerful ends of the continua, TWI programs in theory can be vehicles to achieve the goal of cultural and linguistic pluralism. Thus, ideally, TWI programs are based on ideologies of linguistic pluralism and are also “anticipated to promote secure majority and minority students in a collaborative power relationship between them” (Jeon, 2003, p.140). However, even though dual language models might presuppose a commitment to language pluralism inherent in their goals and structure, programmatic, social, and linguistic practices must still be closely examined, for, as several scholars have elucidated, these are not unproblematic even within TWI programs. Freeman (1998, 2000) found that although the teachers within a dual language middle school program in Philadelphia were committed to challenging the dominant power relations as demonstrated in their teaching and language practices, there were challenging ideologies within the teaching staff and amongst the student population that defied their efforts. Furthermore, programmatic decisions undermined this pluralistic language ideology: only the Communications Team was dual language, which created a forced choice for those students entering the middle
school with little English proficiency, thus creating a prevailing association amongst the students that the Communications Team was the “hick” team (p. 217).

A significant feature of the framework of the continua of biliteracy is the recognition that certain ends of the continua are traditionally more powerful in society than others, and within the contexts of biliteracy, these would be the monolingual, literate, macro contexts – as opposed to the bilingual, oral, and micro contexts (Hornberger & Skilton-Sylvester, 2000). In her own work of distinguishing amongst different approaches to bilingual education, (García, 2009) extends this idea of a monolingual – bilingual continuum by using the lens of heteroglossic versus monoglossic language ideologies. By *monoglossic* García refers to an assumption that “legitimate linguistic practices are only those enacted by monolinguals” (p. 115), and accordingly, a monoglossic view of bilingualism values and evaluates each language according to monolingual standards. In contrast, a *heteroglossic* view of language considers the “multiple co-existing norms which characterize bilingual speech” (p. 117), and does not equate a bilingual as two monolinguals in one, a view that has also been advanced by Grosjean (2001) and widely endorsed by many scholars. Another dimension through which García differentiates bilingual programs is whether they are additive, subtractive, or dynamic. This refers to the learning and overall goals of the programs in terms of language – whether the program seeks to transition the learners from one language to English (subtractive), whether it seeks to add on an additional language (additive), or whether it recognizes the dynamic, fluid nature of language practices in which teaching in and through both languages enriches the communicative repertoires of the learners (2009). According to García (2012), some additive bilingual educational models that
separate languages in one or more ways in order to develop each according to a monolingual standard are operating under monoglossic ideologies that can be detrimental to minority language speakers. This is so in part because linguistic minorities may speak non-standard varieties of a standard language, and thus programs that are meant to ‘empower’ bilinguals can have the unintended effect of belittling the language practices and language varieties that students come to school with (García, 2012). Under García’s dimensions of bilingual education, TWI programs, given their strict separation of languages, are structured according to monoglossic language ideologies.

Bilingual educational programs, whether classified according to their overall goals, their underlying linguistic ideologies, or their positioning along continua, have particular histories and are implemented in specific sociohistorical and demographic contexts. As Freeman’s (2000) research shows, the particularities of context and the sociocultural make up of communities and their histories must be closely examined especially within dual language programs. Although there is an increasing literature that engages anthropological approaches to the study of language (e.g. Heller, 2007), a good portion of literature in the field of bilingual education, and especially that which has been the most influential to practice, has drawn from concepts in the field of second language acquisition and sociolinguistics. And while ideologies are used abstractly to classify models and approaches to bilingual education, these are not used as a conceptual lens to investigate everyday linguistic practices. Thus, I hope to make a contribution to the field by taking a linguistic anthropological lens to the study of languaging in a TWI program, and of circulating discourses on language and bilingualism. Before I detail the conceptual
and methodological framework guiding my inquiry, I will summarize the additional literatures from which this study draws and to which it will contribute.

*Two-Way Immersion Education Research*

There is great optimism associated with Two-Way Immersion programs in the United States. This positive outlook seems warranted based on the research available on these programs, which consists of program evaluation and effectiveness studies that analyze quantitative achievement data based on test scores (e.g. Thomas & Collier, 2002), case study analyses of a particular programs (e.g. de Jong, 2002; Senesac, 2002), and implementation guides for practitioners (e.g. Calderón & Minaya-Rowe, 2003; Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000; Howard, Sugarman, Christian, Lindholm-Leary, & Rogers, 2007). In general, reviewers of TWI literature agree that both small and large scale studies, as well as cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses, have shown that students in TWI programs are successful in measures of reading, math, and language development in both languages of instruction (Bikle et al., 2004; Howard et al., 2003; Lindholm-Leary & Howard, 2008; Lindholm-Leary, 2012).

Using data from several studies, Lindholm-Leary (2012) reports that students who had attended dual language programs (a label which she uses interchangeably with TWI programs), by their secondary schooling, were just as likely or more likely to pass high school exit exams, were less likely to drop out of high school, were just as likely or more likely to be enrolled in higher level math classes, and finally, ELLs who had participated in DLE were more likely to close the achievement gap with native English speaking peers enrolled in English only programs by the end of high school. An important point that
Bickle et al (2004) point out, though, is that within TWI programs, language minority students never outperform their language majority peers in standardized testing. That is, while language minority students score as well or better than their language minority peers in other programs, and in some studies have been shown to approach language majority peers in other programs, they never, as a group, outperform the language majority peers in their program. The exception to this is in language and reading tests in the minority language; Spanish speaking students do outperform English speaking students in Spanish language measures (Lindholm-Leary & Howard, 2008). However, these tests tend not to carry the same weight in terms of meeting yearly progress measures set by district and state accountability measures. This leads Lindholm-Leary & Howard (2008) to point out a first language advantage in testing; that is, that language majority English speakers do better in English tests, while students who were considered native Spanish speakers at the outset of the program do better in Spanish language and reading tests, and that overall, Spanish speakers tend to show more ‘balanced bilingualism’ – or equal command of both languages.

Thomas and Collier (1997, 2002) have conducted the most comprehensive evaluation of educational programs for language minority students to date. Using records from about 700,000 students from five school districts across the United States, the authors conducted both cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses. In their 1997 report, Thomas and Collier report three key predictors of success for language minority students: 1) "cognitively complex on-grade-level academic instruction through students' first language for as long as possible" (p.15) with similar instruction through the second language (English) for part of the day, 2) "the use of current approaches to teaching the
academic curriculum through two languages” (p.16), and 3) a "transformed sociocultural context for language minority students' schooling" (p.16) - in other words, creating additive bilingual contexts in which students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds are valued and developed. For both the 1997 and 2002 report, TWI was the program with the best long-term results, where student achievement was above grade level for both language majority and language minority children in all measures. In fact, the data in support of TWI programs led the authors to publish another follow up report in which they describe TWI programs as “astoundingly” effective, provide data to demonstrate how more than any other program they have evaluated, TWI programs close the achievement gap for all students participating in the program, and state that, in fact, it is “the only program for English learners that fully closes the gap” (Collier & Thomas, 2004, p.1). The authors assert that their research report is more like a “wake up call” to scholars and practitioners, stating that,

[A]fter almost two decades of program evaluation research that we have conducted in 23 large and small school districts from 15 different states, representing all regions of the U.S. in urban, suburban, and rural contexts, we continue to be astonished at the power of this school reform model (p. 1).

While many researchers and reviewers share this optimistic and confident stance, other scholars have chosen to illustrate some of the incredible challenges inherent in these programs. Valdés (1997) early on voiced her concerns in her incisive ‘Cautionary Note’. Contextualizing her discussion within the larger literature of school failure of minoritized and economically disadvantaged students, and in particular Mexican-origin students, she highlights three main areas of concern with Two Way Immersion programs: the effect of the presence of majority language speakers on the quality of instruction in
the minority language, the issue of intergroup relations, and the wider issues of language, power and inequality. The difficulties she raises have rarely been addressed in the literature; nonetheless, some scholars have taken up her concerns by examining issues of equity and power within TWI programs.

Drawing on Bourdieu’s theories of capital and linguistic markets, some researchers have highlighted the higher social and symbolic capital associated with the majority language and majority language speakers. This often results in higher value being placed on the learning and speaking of English by students, something that McCollum (1999) discussed in her ethnographic case study of one TWI program. She contends that students, even Mexican American bilinguals, preferred English over Spanish in formal and informal interactions. Her analysis led her to conclude that this was due to three main factors: the devaluing of students’ Spanish vernacular by the Spanish teacher, the valuing of English as the language of power institutionally and structurally (in school announcements, state tests, etc.), and the valuing of English as a way to become "cool" or "popular" because it meant speaking English during Spanish time (oppositional behavior) and knowing more kids by virtue of being able to communicate with them. Thus, McCollum’s critique of the TWI program that she studied, which was a program created by decision of the central district office, was that while it explicitly valued Spanish in the curriculum, it was nonetheless reproducing social inequality through the “hidden curriculum” that valued the cultural capital of the dominant class.
Also drawing on Bourdieu’s theories of symbolic capital and domination, Palmer (2009) examines classroom discourse in one TWI classroom in order to examine power dynamics between the middle class majority language speakers and the minority language students. Palmer describes how Ms. Melanie, a bilingual white American teacher committed to social justice and to providing an equitable learning environment, was able to manage her middle class outspoken students during whole group discussion, ensuring equitable turn-taking. However, this was a constant struggle and unfortunately, not something that occurred during English time with Ms. Emma, the English teacher who struggled to keep her white, language majority students from dominating conversations.

Similarly, Fitts (2006) studied communicative interactions within one 5th grade TWI classroom in an established school program in Colorado to examine the ways in which students discursively distanced themselves or identified with people, groups, and ways of speaking. By looking at language ideologies and language practices at this site, she found that there was a strong ‘ideology of equality’ that permeated spoken and written discourse throughout the school – where often the idea that languages and speakers are equal was paramount. Yet, this ideology also worked to silence important challenges and differences that did not fit under an ‘equality’ frame – for example, discussions of diversity that downplayed differences while emphasizing similarities amongst groups of students at the school were welcomed, while explicit discussion of differences was avoided. This is an important point, since children at this school came from a wide range of socioeconomic, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds.
In her study, Fitts (2006) also illustrates how the practice of constantly identifying students according to their ‘native’ languages created a “fetishization of the ‘native speaker’” (p.354), which led to the need for ‘authentication’ on the part of Latino students. In other words, ethnolinguistic identification and competence in the language are separate issues that can be conflated in the case of Latino students, where some may be more comfortable speaking English yet still identify strongly with Latino culture. Fitts discusses how identity and language proficiency are intimately tied and important to unpack for Latino students, and are a much more sensitive issue than for non-heritage speakers of Spanish. In her conclusion, Fitts (2006) encourages others to examine "who gets to be bilingual and in what sorts of situations children embrace or turn away from speaking in certain languages or registers" (p. 356).

Clearly, the issues experienced by Latino students learning English and Spanish are quite distinct from those of language majority children learning a second language (Spanish). As Valdés pointed out, "For minority children, the acquisition of English is expected. For mainstream children, the acquisition of a non-English language is enthusiastically applauded" (p. 417). The distinct expectations and societal standings of language majority and language minority students already make for an ‘uneven playing field’. Not only that, but the distinct relationship towards Spanish and its ties to students’ ethnolinguistic identities as Latinos is complex and affects students’ use of Spanish and classroom experiences. Potowski (2004), for example, highlights this issue in her study of students’ use of and investment in Spanish in a TWI program. Unsurprisingly, she found that students preferred to use English for socializing, so that there was a diglossia in the classroom, where Spanish was used for academic purposes and to address the teacher and
English for social talk. Through ethnographic observations and linguistic analysis, Potowski even found that students “sometimes preferred to remain silent rather than speak Spanish with each other” (p.89).

Issues of equity within TWI also extend to other dimensions. Scanlan and Palmer (2009) examined the role of race and ability in the admission, recruitment, and retention policies and practices at two TWI schools – one public and one parochial. They found that while at the public school African American students were underrepresented in the TWI program as compared to the mainstream program (while whites were overrepresented), at the private school students with special needs were simply not admitted – an exclusion the school could make due to their status as a private parochial school. Thus, the authors illustrate the way in which TWI programs, which often strive for and are founded on lofty goals of equity and social justice, are paradoxically promising linguistic and cultural inclusion and diversity, while also being exclusionary in other dimensions, such as race, ethnicity, class and disability.

In fact, in a separate article Palmer (2009) highlights many of the existing tensions relating to equity at her focal school, which had a TWI strand. The school, which was located in a working class African American and Latino neighborhood in Northern California, had a diverse student population where African American students represented 30% of the students, yet only composed 5% of the TWI classes. Conversely, White children, who were bused from more affluent parts of the city, represented 28% of the total school population but 45% of the TWI students. Palmer found that there was a deficit discourse surrounding African American students, often considered both behavior
problems and not suited for the TWI program. This perspective created resentment among the mainstream teachers who perceived the TWI classes to be more manageable. Other teachers were also concerned about the Latino families that were left out of the TWI program - because of the way TWI is designed and implemented, half of the spots in TWI classrooms went to language majority speakers (mostly middle class white children). This meant that the program served half of the Latino families that the transitional bilingual program used to serve. Palmer points out the discomforting fact that only with the presence of majority language families can other students take part in this program: "it is only possible for these marginalized communities to reap the benefits of the program because of the converging interests of the white middle-class community" (2010, p.95).

Although these studies have shed light on the complex and difficult issues that arise in two-way programs, they have focused their attention on single classroom or school dynamics without greater attention to processes and relationships outside of the focal institution. The sole focus on local dynamics provides a narrow lens for examining a complex issue that goes beyond the walls of individual classrooms and schools. Indeed, as Valdés (1997) points out, educational researchers, policymakers, and practitioners often seek to find solutions to complex societal problems in micro-level classroom policies and programs that focus on one issue (language), out of a plethora of historical and sociopolitical conditions that perpetuate societal inequalities and the continued minoritization, racialization, and discrimination of non-mainstream students and families. Overlooking the very processes that bring middle class language majority families into the same urban space as Spanish speaking immigrants and Latinos misses important
implications for the study of TWI programs. I now turn to a broad review of two such processes, gentrification and immigration, as they relate to urban schooling.

*Immigration, Gentrification, and Two-Way Immersion*

The literature on TWI programs I have reviewed above often mentions the differential social status of the language majority families with those of the language minority families – where the language majority students tend to be white, and middle to upper middle class, and language minority students tend to be working class Latino immigrants or children of immigrants. While this generalization does not hold for all TWI programs in the country, it applies to a good number, and holds true for this site as well. Rarely, however, do critical ethnographies of TWI programs analyze the larger social processes that bring these two demographic groups together in the same urban space. In this case, immigration and gentrification are two social phenomena that have created a situation in which a TWI is both viable and desirable. More precisely stated, Spanish speaking immigrant and Latino families make a TWI program viable, while English dominant middle class families might find such a program desirable – and as is the case in this program, might take pro-active steps for this to become an option for their children. In this section, I review some of the literature that touches upon the ways that scholars have examined how these two phenomena – separately - affect urban schooling, and how in this moment of market-based urban revitalization and school reform, these two processes come together to create a ‘fertile ground’ for TWI programs to flourish.

Immigration to the United States has nearly doubled between 1990 and 2007, going from 19.8 million immigrants to 38.1 million (Fortuny & Chaudry, 2009). In 2003,
just under 12% of the total population, or about 33.5 million people, were foreign-born, and out of this number more than half (53.3 %) immigrated from Latin America. These figures, however, underestimate the number of immigrants and children of immigrants coming in to US schools: in 2007, children of immigrants represented one in five children under the age of 18 in the United States. Between 1990 and 2007, the number of children of immigrants grew by 8.1 million, which accounts for 77% of the growth in the US children population during that time. This means that children of immigrants are the fastest growing segment of the population of the United States (Fortuny & Chaudry, 2009). Given that large numbers of immigrant families live in large metropolitan areas (Larsen, 2004), it can be assumed that it is mostly urban public schools that receive these young immigrants and children of immigrants whose families reside in large cities.²

Urban schools have historically served disadvantaged, low-income students and families, and have been plagued with financial strains due to diminishing tax bases (Rong & Brown, 2002). Furthermore, immigrants that reside in urban areas are more likely to be poor and less educated than immigrants who reside in suburban areas, further intensifying the problems that arise from serving low income populations, whether native or foreign born (Rong & Preissle, 1998, as cited in Rong & Brown, 2002). Large numbers of immigrants and children of immigrants enter US schools with limited English proficiency; schools must be prepared with knowledgeable teachers and resources to educate multilingual students. Thus, immigration poses particular challenges to urban

² Although recent trends indicate that immigrants are choosing states such as NC, NV, GA, for residence, more than two-fifths, or 44.4 %, of the foreign-born population in the US lives in a central city in a metropolitan area (Larsen, 2004).
public schools, although some researchers claim that not enough research has been done on this matter (Ellen, O’Regan, & Conger, 2009).

It is this intensity, as well as the place of origin of immigrants – mostly Latin America and Asia, as opposed to Europe in previous decades - that makes some scholars term this the “new” immigration (Suarez-Orozco, 2001). Suarez-Orozco (2001) attributes this new wave of immigration to the processes of globalization – which links economic, demographic, social and cultural changes in this moment. One of the characteristics that sets this time period apart, or why globalization today is distinct from change in other eras, is “the regime of global capitalism,” where “the production of goods and services is completely internationalized” (2001, p. 348). Others, indeed, might refer to this economic process as neoliberalism. Whichever term one may use to define the forces that are contributing to the large numbers of immigrants from Latin America in particular, it is important to point out that it has been changing urban communities in large cities since the 1990’s. Philadelphia is no exception, with vibrant Mexican and Asian communities settling near the historically Italian sector of town – the area that is the focus of this study.

Yet, concomitant with these changes of the urban landscape is another social process: gentrification. Gentrification has long been a concern of urban sociologists, yet, it is not until recently that gentrification scholars are paying attention to young families with children and their role in urban schooling (Billingham & Kimelberg, 2013). Middle and upper middle class parental groups are playing an increasingly influential role in certain urban public schools through investment of time and resources, marketing, and
social-networks – yet the results of this involvement is mixed (Cucchiara & Horvat, 2009; Cucchiara, 2013; Posey, 2012). Comparing two qualitative case studies of public elementary schools, Cucchiara and Horvat (2009) investigated the reasons why and to what effects middle-class parents enroll their children in urban schools. While it was true for both cases that middle class parents brought in resources which benefited all the students, when parents took on a more individualistic approach to parental involvement, as was the case in one of the schools, their participation had the effect of marginalizing lower-income families and reifying class hierarchies. In contrast, when parents took on a more collective orientation to involvement, as was the case in the second school, there was a greater benefit to all children and families in the school, without necessarily marginalizing others. While there are major differences in the socio-historical periods in which white middle class involvement began in each of the case studies, as well as variability amongst parents at both schools in their emphasis of individual versus collective interests, the authors conclude that the overarching ethos of involvement at each school mattered greatly and made a difference in its effects.

In contrast to Cucchiara and Horvat’s findings, Posey (2012) found that, regardless of the parental approaches to school involvement, white middle class parental involvement in one public school increased marginalization and inequality. Posey studied a parent group composed of middle and upper middle class families in a large California city that was heavily invested in supporting their local, predominantly African American low income school. Posey found that parents were 'key actors' in local school and neighborhood change and were often driving that change. However, parents’ efforts to attain a critical mass of like-minded families in the school, in terms of values, class and
race, ultimately threatened the diversity of the school: six to seven years after the parent
group had formed, the economic and racial demographics of the school had significantly
changed - mainly, a decline in the African American population and increase in the White
student population. Posey states that "parents with a collective orientation and desire for
diversity may play a role in processes of exclusion based upon the broader policy context
within which the parents are operating" (p.6), and thus suggests a "potential paradox" in
which parents may "ultimately serve as catalysts of gentrification and greater exclusion in
urban public schooling" (p.6). This greater exclusion in public schooling is also
something Cucchiara (2013) highlighted in her study of a public elementary school in
Philadelphia. Cucchiara focused on the marketing efforts of a group of parents to attract
more middle and upper middle class parents to Grant, which had the effect of
marginalizing African American and working class families. This was evident
particularly in the ways in which ‘neighborhood’ parents were constructed as the desired
and most desirable customers, while ‘transfer’ students and families were discursively
constructed as a problem for the school. Because this particular school had a reputation
for being a good school, many families sought to transfer their children to Grant from
other catchment areas – these families were mostly Black and working class. The heavy
focus on marketing to middle and upper middle class neighborhood parents sent a clear
message of exclusion to those who were not middle class nor from the neighborhood –
something which they expressed clearly in their interviews.

Indeed, it was the difficult school selection process that the parents in Cucchiara’s
study were hoping to influence with their marketing efforts to middle class families. This
is precisely the process that Roberts and Lakes (2014) studied for middle class parents in
Atlanta, GA, in an area that had undergone significant gentrification. The authors conducted 30 open-ended interviews with parent-gentrifiers, identified through snowball sampling, and identified four different "roles" parents played in school selection that varied in terms of what the authors considered to be more or less agentive, use of social networking and social space, and ideas towards education. The authors found that "social networks became information sources for the arriviste who framed educational decision-making in market terms" (14), and not only that, but often the information obtained through networking heavily influenced the process of school selection.

Social networks were also an important factor in the school selection process in Butler and Robson's (2003) study of the relationship between gentrification and education in London. The authors conducted interviews in different areas of the city and found that parents in gentrifying areas deploy different strategies for their children's education which depend not only on economic and ideological factors, but also on 'circuits' of education in the specific areas in which they reside. They draw on work by Stephen Ball that demonstrated that "middle-class 'cosmopolitans'...as opposed to working-class 'locals', [sic] are the most active 'choosers' of their children's schools in the education marketplace" (Butler & Robson 2003, p.10). The authors found that in certain neighborhoods, the primary school served as the center of the community that enabled middle class parents to create and access social networks that were seen as key in the future transition to secondary education. However, this was not the case for all of the London areas that were studied; in another area the authors found that one reason for demographic instability and movement outside the borough was due to the fact that middle class parents found no secondary school in the area acceptable, and furthermore,
had not "been successful in establishing hegemony over any particular primary school and there is none that forms the focus for the community" (18), as it did for several of the other areas. The authors state that "education helped to structure the normative order in each area and so mold the nature of the gentrification process” (p.16), arguing that education is another driving and forceful influence in what and how urban spaces become gentrified.

The education-gentrification link in Boston has been the object of study for authors Billingham and Kimelberg (2013), who draw on in-depth interviews with middle-class parents to show how these parents have played a significant role in shaping the urban landscape through their involvement in their children’s public schools. The authors found that for many of the parents, elementary schooling options did not initially play a role in choosing a place to live, and in fact, many reported they might leave the city once their children became school-aged. However, the majority of the participants decided to stay in the city and enroll their children in Boston Public Schools, which the authors explain as an "unexpected shift in plans [that] was motivated, in most cases, by the realization that there were other middle-class parents 'like them' who were embracing a select number of schools around the city" (p. 95). They found that a great majority of parents were highly involved, from PTA membership to contributing time, effort and resources to school fundraising activities. In their sample, parents were mostly committed to their own local schools, as opposed to the district as a whole, which many had mixed feelings towards. The authors explain that this was due to the fact that the majority of parents sent their children to schools close to their homes, serving as "a neighborhood anchor" (99), similar to some of the elementary schools in Butler and Robson’s study that
had become the center of the neighborhood. Moreover, similar to the parents in Butler and Robson’s study, none of the Boston parents expressed that they would make the same investments towards their children's future high schools – to be clear, this investment went beyond "stereotypical images of organizing bake sales" (p.96) and instead included activities with much more substantial impact, such as grant writing, participating in personnel hiring, curriculum development, and recruiting of families, exploiting their own skills and social networks to do this.

On the question of why parents chose to stay in the city and send their children to public schools, the authors surmise that "an especially strong ideological commitment to public schooling or urban revitalization" is too simplistic an explanation. Instead, they suggest that "[r]ather than reflecting a broad ideological commitment to public schools, the relationship they [the parents] had crafted with BPS was predicated on the exercise of control in a small neighborhood institution". This is a similar point to that made by Roberts and Lakes, who at the outset of their article, state that “[E]ducational institutions are an example of social space modified to reflect the interests of the participants and are part of place-making activities and attachment of gentrifying parents" (2014, p.1-2).

Given the key role that individuals from the Neighborhood Civic Association have played in the inception and development of the TWI program at Washington Elementary, the focal school for the present study, and its rising popularity through publicity in various social networks, this literature is key in understanding both the process of gentrification and its effects on public schools. Thus, I draw from this growing literature to help me understand how TWI programs are influenced by middle class parents. Furthermore, I will consider the ways in which processes of gentrification and
immigration collude in the same space and time to create both a demand, and a supply, for two-way immersion programs to flourish. Given the emergence of this new TWI program, at the crux of two social processes that involve different groups of people, analyzing the ways in which the actual program comes about, the attitudes and motivations of program planners and stakeholders towards language and its speakers, becomes paramount.

**Conceptual framework**

*Linguistic Anthropology of Education*

My research is grounded in linguistic anthropological theory and methods that approach language and its use as meaningful social action – action that not only refers to, but also creates, re-creates and transforms social relations and ways of being in the world (Duranti, 2009; Wortham, 2003, 2008). I apply these ideas to understand educational phenomena - in this case, the creation and implementation of a Two Way Immersion (TWI) program along with the experiences of a group of focus families in its first year. While I focus on discursive behavior, it is important to note the ways in which this is not separate from the social, economic, cultural conditions of people’s lived experiences. In other words, I make sense of these particular social phenomena through discursive means.

One of the concerns of early linguistic anthropologists that focused on education was the connection between instances of language use and larger social processes (Wortham, 2003). Scholars such as Philips (1970/2009), Heath, (1983), and Michaels (1981) documented particular interactional norms and contexts within particular groups.
of people that differed from the “mainstream” (often white, middle class) norm, and thus attributed educational inequalities to this “mismatch” in communicative norms. For example, Michaels (1981) illustrated the ways in which African American children in classrooms narrated events according to a framework that was unfamiliar to their white teachers, yet was the norm in their communities. This led teachers to mark these students as deficient from early on in their educational trajectories, which had lasting consequences. Similarly, Heath (1983) described the socialization patterns and interactional norms in three small communities in the Piedmont Carolinas, and argued that the mainstream middle class white community’s communicative norms were those that were valued in school. This had the effect of setting up these children for success, while black and white working class children were at a disadvantage given the different ways they were socialized to approach text and talk in their communities. These examples of what has become widely known as the “mismatch theory”, illustrate how these theorists “connected culturally embedded speech patterns to larger social processes,” and “instead of ignoring particular contexts and treating instances as mechanical replications of larger patterns, they began to describe the interplay between larger social processes and the particular contexts in which they are enacted and sometimes transformed” (Wortham, 2003, p.4). In a similar fashion, in this dissertation I look at particular instances of language use and connect those to the larger contexts in which they occur, as well as to larger societal processes of which they are part of, which they come to constitute, and which they transform.

More recent work within linguistic anthropology focuses on central concepts such as indexicality, which refers to the ways in which signs come to be associated with
meanings in patterned ways, so that they come to “point” at that meaning for a particular set of people (a sign’s social domain) (Agha, 2007). This concept first elaborated by Peirce (1932) has become central and influential in linguistic anthropology and has been used productively by scholars to investigate cultural and social life (e.g. Agha, 2007; Silverstein, 1998). Thus, as Wortham states, “[t]he central issue in contemporary linguistic anthropology is: how do linguistic signs come to have meaning in cultural and interactional context?” (2003, p.9). A key point here is that context is indeterminate – that which becomes relevant to interpreting any interaction is presupposed in the unfolding interaction itself. This is precisely the reason why close analysis of interaction and knowledge of context and meaning for participants as studied through ethnographic and discourse analytic methods are best suited for understanding social life.

Wortham (2008) and Wortham and Reyes (2011) argue that research within the linguistic anthropology of education attends to not only language form, but also its use, along with the ideologies and social relations it indexes in particular contexts or domains. In other words, work within the field attends to Silverstein’s “total linguistic fact”: language form, language use, language ideologies, and social domains (Silverstein 1989; Wortham 2008). Because linguistic anthropological research attends to all of these, it has provided different ways to understand social practices in relation to language use that are critical in bilingual education spaces. For example, code-switching has been extensively studied as a bilingual languaging practice. Linguists have a long history of exploring the systematicity and the grammatical rules of code-switching (e.g. Muysken, 2000; Myers-Scotton, 1997; Poplack, 1980), and in part this research has served to counter deficit notions of it. From a linguistic anthropological lens, one can understand the practice of
code-switching to one that deals with the indexical quality of language and social *models of personhood*. Languaging, or using language in particular ways, allows individuals to perform certain identities. This is so because over time, ways of speaking become emblematic of certain types of people. Agha (2007) has labeled this process *enregisterment*. Thus, certain ways of speaking have been enregistered as emblematic for certain kinds of people – and the people who make this indexical link form the social domain for this enregistered form. Zentella (1997) illustrated this clearly in her study of second generation Puerto Rican youth in New York. For this group of youngsters, intra-sentential code-switching became an enregistered and emblematic way of speaking, and thus become their “badge of identity” as Zentella described. In other words, alternating intra-sententially between English and Spanish was a choice speakers made, not because of lack or incomplete knowledge in one or another language, as Zentella (1997) and Poplack (1980) elegantly showed, but in order to claim and perform a particular Puerto Rican identity.

*Raciolinguisitc Ideologies*

Language ideologies in particular have been an important part of linguistic anthropological research in education, especially because, as Wortham and Reyes state, “educational processes establish associations between ‘educated’ and ‘uneducated,’ ‘sophisticated’ and ‘unsophisticated,’ ‘official’ and ‘vernacular’ language use and, accordingly, types of students.” (p.184, Wortham & Reyes, 2011). Language ideologies are said to be the “mediating link between social structures and forms of talk” (p.55, Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994). They are also multiple and vary across meaningful divisions within societies, and speakers differ in their levels of awareness of these beliefs,
so that some may be explicitly stated while others may serve as unconscious beliefs that undergird social practices (Kroskrity, 2000).

Recently, Flores and Rosa (2015) have proposed the concept of *raciolinguistic ideologies* to highlight the racialization of speaking subjects that affect evaluations of their language use. Because language ideologies refer to the kinds of links that are made between ways of speaking (and other co-occurring signs) and types of people - how “people” are already perceived, and more specifically, racialized, has consequences for how their languaging is evaluated - which is highly consequential in educational contexts. A significant intervention of this approach is that it decenters actual linguistic forms and practices and instead focuses on the *white listening subject* - insisting that racialized bodies will be construed as linguistically deviant by the white gaze regardless of the linguistic forms produced. In other words, the focus is on the "racialized ideologies of the listening subject" as opposed to the "empirical linguistic practices of [racialized] speaking subjects" (p.152, Flores & Rosa, 2015). In order to understand the raciolinguistic ideologies within the spaces I studied, it was important to take into account how race, and class, were important mediating factors in how children’s language practices within this TWI program were evaluated and perceived by teachers and other students. Furthermore, in line with a view of language learning as language socialization, which I elaborate below, I propose the concept of *raciolinguistic socialization*, to refer to the ways children are socialized into spaces with existing raciolinguistic ideologies, that, through routine, everyday interaction, become part of the socialization process itself. This concept brings to the fore the way that, in classroom and educational spaces, and through everyday interaction, children are socialized in ways that reinforce perceptions of language use and
ability that are intimately tied to racialization. In Chapter 8, I will show how one white, middle class student, Zoe, is socialized in the classroom not only as a good and competent student, but also, as an emerging successful bilingual student, in ways that allow her to see herself as such (as a bilingual). In contrast, I will show how another student, Larissa, who is Mexican and working class, becomes part of socializing interactions in which she is positioned as needing help and whose emerging bilingualism is not recognized.

**Communicative Repertoires**

Key to this analysis is a view of language as part of a person's *communicative repertoire*, which Rymes (2010) defines as “the collection of ways individuals use language and literacy and other means of communication (gestures, dress, posture, or accessories) to function effectively in the multiple communities in which they participate” (p. 528). Rymes builds on Gumperz’ concept of *verbal repertoire* (2009/1968), which meant to expand the concept of language to encompass the different varieties spoken within a community. While the notion of verbal repertoire applies to a speech community, a communicative repertoire is individually oriented, and well suited to understand the communicative practices of individuals in increasingly transient, globalized, and interconnected worlds. A repertoire is thus like “an accumulation of archaeological layers” (p.10, Rymes, 2014), indicative of the places and experiences of an individual throughout a lifetime. The concept of communicative repertoire is one way to take seriously Makoni and Pennycook’s (2007) call to consider bound, named languages as socially and historically constructed, and to consider bilinguals’ language
practices as heteroglossic, as García insists (2009). Part of the move to expand our
notions of what “counts” as language, particularly in educational spaces, is in order to
understand all the resourceful and creative ways young people all over the world have
developed to communicate, which too often schools and institutions not only fail to
acknowledge, but when they do, sanction as ‘non-academic’ or ‘illiterate’ forms of talk
and expression that are not ‘appropriate for school’.

Thus, understanding language as part of an individual’s communicative
repertoire has implications for analysis. This is most evident in Chapter 6, where a focus
on communicative repertoires, as opposed to linguistic codes, re-calibrates the focus of
bilingual classroom discourse analysis to not simply choice of code in interaction, but to
the interaction itself, of which a particular code is one of the multiple ways an
interlocutor can communicate. Given the diversity of the children who enrolled in the
TWI program that is the focus of this dissertation, there was accordingly a diversity of
repertoires that children brought with them to the classroom. Some of the students’
repertoires overlapped, in that they shared a linguistic code and/or manner of speaking
before entering kindergarten. Yet what all the students had in common is that they were
learning and expanding their repertoires to include not only what we normally refer to as
English and Spanish, but also other ways of communicating through gestures, talk, and
importantly, writing. In other words, just like children were learning an additional
language, they were also learning to read and write - another way to communicate -
which became part of their repertoires as well. In this process, they were also socialized
into the values and ideas that are associated with each of these entities - be they English,
Spanish, or other ways of speaking. In other words, as students’ repertoires’ expanded, so too the ‘metadiscursive regimes’ that went with them (Makoni & Pennycook, 2007).

Language Socialization

Each student’s repertoire is a result of their own language socialization; a process which continues as children enter school. This is particularly true for bilingual TWI programs, where the goal is for all children to acquire a second or additional language. In this dissertation, I am interested in the language development of students as a process of language socialization. Thus, I am not so much interested in tracking the acquisition of particular linguistic forms, structures, or fluency; but more so in how, in the process of acquiring the forms of a language, children are also socialized into particular ideas, values, and dispositions associated with what they understand ‘English’ and ‘Spanish’ to be. And children are not only acquiring the forms and structures associated with one standard variety of a language, but they are also exposed to and experimenting with other forms of communication and of self-expression, which include a range of Englishes and Spanishes.

Language socialization has traditionally been the study of the ways in which children are socialized into becoming competent members of their cultures through language and in turn how the learning of language is inextricable from socialization into a particular culture (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1986). In one of their original formulations, the authors define this process in the following way:
"The process of acquiring language is deeply affected by the process of becoming a competent member of society, [and] the process of becoming a competent member of society is realized to a large extent through language, through acquiring knowledge of its functions, its social distribution and interpretations in and across socially defined situations" (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984/2001, pg. 264).

In this setting, the children in the classroom are learning to be competent members of their classroom community, which involves learning in Spanish, although both English and Spanish (and many other ways to communicate) are used constantly. They are also learning how to “do school” and are learning how to acquire the forms of communication required of them. In this case, as students expand their repertoires, they do so not only through the formal teaching that occurs in the classroom - but through the informal interactions they have with each other, which becomes part of the process of socialization. In other words, children socialize each other into different ways of speaking - which, as I will illustrate in Chapter 6, includes not only English and Spanish, but also different ways of speaking and different ways of participating in literacy events.

Within the framework of language socialization, it is important to attend to everyday interactions over time, across a variety of settings, following a small group of social actors. Indeed, one of the contributions of this approach has been to illustrate the importance of the routine, everyday activities (Garret & Baquedano-López, 2002). Furthermore, in addition to understanding language learning as language socialization, I also followed particular students' trajectories of socialization (Wortham, 2005). As Wortham (2005) highlights, academic socialization is an intertextual process that is
accomplished across linked events over time, drawing from resources at different
timescales. Thus, in order to account for this process, one must be able to study discourse
across speech events (Wortham and Reyes, 2015). In order to do this, I audio recorded
classroom interactions of a select group of focus students, complementing the audio with
video recording, observations, and field notes, as well as multiple informal conversations
and interviews with teachers and parents. As I illustrate in Chapter 8, processes of
language socialization are not neutral, and in the bilingual classroom, they are deeply
embedded in ideological notions of language and literacy, and intertwined with
evaluations of competence and linguistic ability, which race and class come to affect
deeply as well.

Participant Frameworks

In addition to understanding language as part of students’ communicative
repertoire, and learning as a process of socialization, I analyze children’s’ everyday
interactions using participant frameworks as the unit of analysis. Goffman’s (1981)
theories of interaction - particularly looking at participation frameworks - are useful lens
through which to interpret young children’s creative use of language. The participant
frameworks of an interaction refer to the audience format and the nature of the
relationship between speaker and hearer – whether the hearer is a ratified or unratified,
and acknowledged or unacknowledged. Goffman's analysis of the structured nature of
interaction allows the analyst to interpret the ways in which interlocutors take up stances
throughout an interaction vis-a-vis their interlocutors and/or the content of their
interaction, through changes in footing. These subtle changes are perceived through
analyzing the production format and participant frameworks of an interaction. The
production format refers to the possible roles a speaker can take on during an utterance – that of an actor, principal, or animator – depending on whether the utterance conveyed was that which the utterer is responsible for, or is simply reporting, or voicing. It is through analyzing these fleeting moments in interaction that we come to understand an interlocutor’s footing, as Goffman explains: "A change in footing implies a change in the alignment we take up to ourselves and the others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance" (1981, p. 128). Thus, understanding the ways in which speakers not only take up different production roles – such as actor, animator, and principal – but how they change the participant frameworks, by addressing the hearers, both ratified and unratted, is useful in examining kindergarten students’ interactions, which are fluid, messy, and go from two to four to many interlocutors in a manner of seconds.

*Metacommentary*

Finally, a key element of investigating language and other social phenomenon from a linguistic anthropological point of view is taking into account the reflexive nature of language use – that is, the capacity of language not only to refer to things in the world, but also to refer to itself (Lucy, 1993). Others have called this the ‘metapragmatic’ (Silverstein, 1993) or ‘metadiscursive’ (Urban, 2001) properties of language-in-use. Educational institutions, and particularly programs with a specific aim of bilingual schooling, are sites ripe with metapragmatic discourse - explicit comments on language - through which many linguistic ideologies and ideologies of language learning intersect. Rymes (2014) proposes the concept of *everyday metacommentary*, or “comments on communication” (p.1), as one that encompasses both explicit metapragmatic discourse as
well as implicit communicative behavior that accomplishes a metapragmatic function. Rymes explains how everyday metacommentary, “signal[s] an understanding of what a sign means…by pointing to that sign’s situated communicative value” (p.11). Analyzing metacommentary allowed me as a researcher to examine the relevant aspects of language and communication that participants themselves found meaningful, and it was a way to anchor analysis of classroom interaction.

In sum, informed by the theoretical concepts and traditions outlined above, I examined how one TWI bilingual program came about in the midst of other larger social processes that gave rise to and facilitated its creation, how it brought diverse groups of people and children together, and how this diversity was evident and flourished in everyday interactional dynamics in the classroom. I examined how processes of socialization in the classroom were evident in peer-to-peer everyday interactions; and how trajectories of socialization were deeply affected by already existing race and class dynamics that predisposed understandings of children’s language use and ability. While focusing on discourse and interaction, I also considered the material conditions and systematic challenges that were part of the reality of people’s lives and of the situation of the school and the school district.
Chapter 3: Research Methods and Setting

“At best, an ethnography can only be partial.”

-Agar, 1980, The Professional Stranger, Ch. 3, Who are you to do this?

In the fall of 2013, I became involved with a group of people interested in starting a bilingual two-way immersion program at George Washington School\(^3\). My involvement was facilitated through Dr. Nelson Flores, who had already become part of the planning team. My role in this process was to create a video for the TWI program that would make Dr. Hite, the superintendent for the School District of Philadelphia, “immediately buy in to the program,” according to my notes of what Mr. Davis, the principal, had said in that first meeting. The video was to also serve as PR for the school, the TWI program, and the surrounding community. I was extremely excited at the prospect of working with this school; not only to make the video, but at the possibility of this school becoming my dissertation site.

I had been inside this school two years before, as a volunteer with Enlaces- an after-school tutoring and homework help program for Latino students, mostly coming from Mexican families. My time volunteering only lasted a semester, when I realized the work load of graduate school was too much to sustain a regular volunteer commitment at this after-school program. I was also discouraged by the fact that Enlaces, at that time, was not necessarily open to people who wanted to do research with their students and parents. Yet, I was intrigued by this growing Mexican immigrant population, and also

\(^3\) This name, as all names of people, places and organizations, are pseudonyms - unless otherwise indicated.
realized the lack of bilingual personnel available to address this populations’ needs. The opportunity to go back to this school, and work with this community, was exciting not only because of my earlier interest during volunteering, but also, and more importantly, because of my past work as a teacher in a two-way immersion school in Boston, MA. I quickly realized that the questions that brought me to graduate school, the ones I wrote about in my personal statement, were those that I could ask in this same setting. This was an area that was changing. There were increasing numbers of Spanish-speaking immigrant families, mostly from Mexico and increasingly from Central America. But also, it was an area undergoing the changes associated with gentrification, in that there was a growing population of new residents, who were mostly white, middle class, and highly educated. How this latter group of people were beginning to organize to support public schools, and how in particular there was strong interest for the bilingual program, reminded me of a very similar process which my school in Boston had gone through before I had become a teacher there.

When I began my teaching career as a 2nd grade dual language teacher in a Boston Public School, it was a school and a community undergoing a transformation: the neighborhood was being gentrified, and for the first time, the school had a steady enrollment of white children of middle class and affluent backgrounds. In the two-way immersion program, the mostly white English-speaking children came from privileged backgrounds, and the Spanish-speaking children came from immigrant, low-income Latino households. While I strongly believed in the significance of having my Spanish-speaking students be considered the language experts and role models in my Spanish language classroom, I was often uncomfortable with the social inequalities between my
students’ families and how these could permeate the classroom. There were instances that solidified my commitment to these programs, such as the time when Pierce, a blond haired English-speaking boy from an affluent household, came to ask me a question, and Lalo, an outspoken bilingual Dominican boy from a low-income family, answered right away. Satisfied with the answer, Pierce went back to his table to continue his work. This was powerful to me: first, when else would the lives of these two children intersect? And second, where else would a boy like Pierce go to a boy like Lalo for the answer to a question? But there were other moments that were frustrating, such as when Pierce, and many of his white classmates, were able to go to an ‘Accelerated Learning’ program for academically advanced children to work on project based learning, while Lalo and most of his Latino classmates were not - a program, which was created as a result of the lobbying efforts of the white affluent parents, and had nebulous criteria for what it meant to be ‘academically advanced’.

While the Philadelphia and Boston context have important differences, embarking on this research project has allowed me to delve deeply into the questions that originally motivated me to attend graduate school. As a researcher, I have been able to examine the larger social processes surrounding the creation of two-way programs in this particular urban school, along with the repercussions at the classroom level. For the past three years, I worked closely with the principal and the teachers of this new two-way immersion program, taking different roles as consultant, mentor, assistant, and researcher. I chose to do an ethnography because it allowed me to explore the questions I was interested in, in their full complexity. In the section below, I begin with a description of the school and the surrounding neighborhood in which this study took place. I then
spend some time exploring my positionality, and discussing the implications of how others viewed me for the work presented here, which, as the quote above indicates, is at best partial. I also introduce some of the main characters of this story and talk about my relationships to them. I conclude by describing my methods of data collection and process of analysis.

**Research Setting: George Washington School and its surrounding area**

S: ...can you tell me a little more how it's changed, the area, over the years and..?

K: Sure, you mean specially this area right around [Washington]?

S: Yeah, yeah.

K: It's improved I mean there... Yeah, when I was a kid it wasn't great. *George Washington did not have a great reputation*... honest, and the area was working-class and becoming run-down working class... Right now, and now because of, sort of, the [name of main street] growth and the push out from there it's um... a lot more friendly, a lot more family... Right now, and now because of, sort of, the [name of main street] growth and the push out from there it's um... a lot more friendly, a lot more family-but one thing I think it's fascinating it's definitely become more diverse... I mean when I was a kid it was very much the remnants of the old Italian families, the remnants of the old Irish families and then you just started to have Asian families moving in. Now, this area is um... there are a lot of Asian families but they're of... you know, several striving Latino communities and there was none of that when I was a kid. That just... I mean, if you think, you know, you can kind of identify a community through its food. For example, there was... I can't think of a single Latin, Mexican or anything type restaurant when I was a kid and now it's just... *this community has grown and become so multicultural which is really cool.*

Washington School is located in a diverse part of the city that is undergoing change. As K, a TWI parent who grew up in this part of the city describes above, this area was historically where many Italian immigrants settled in the mid-twentieth century, making this zone home to the second largest Italian community in the United States.
(Singer, Vitiello, Katz, & Park, 2008). Before then, however, the area had already been home to different groups of immigrants, including Irish immigrants in the 1800’s, as well as Russian Jews, Slovaks, Greeks, Italians, and a small Lebanese community. In the last half of the 20th century however, refugees from Cambodia and Vietnam have settled in the neighborhood, as well as a growing number of Mexican immigrants (Singer et al., 2008). Yet, in the past decade or so, these same areas are now popular among (mostly white) young professionals. News stories and observations, both my own and those of my participants, indicate a growth in new and re-modeled properties in the area.

As K also mentions above, many of these ethnic immigrant communities are easily identifiable because of its food. This part of Philadelphia still has several Italian bakeries and deli’s, along with the corridor not so far from the neighborhood known as the Italian Market. Yet along with these older establishments, there are pockets of Vietnamese and Thai restaurants, and an increasing number of Mexican corner stores, bakeries, a tortillería, and several restaurants. At the same time, there are hip new restaurants, expensive coffee shops, and locally owned businesses (that sell pretty expensive things) along one of the main commercial streets in this part of town, which has also seen a resurgence and re-development.

The school itself is located in a residential area. The school building is an imposing, four-story, grey stoned structure, surrounded by black iron gates. There is a tiny plot of grass in front of the school, and bright blue entrance doors that contrast with the grey walls. The back of the school is a vast concrete space. Half of it is used as a playground, and the other half, as a faculty and staff parking lot. Next to this school is an
even larger, more imposing, concrete art-deco building, that used to be a public high school, whose closing and selling as a cost-saving measure by the School District of Philadelphia was quite controversial. The short blocks that surround the school are lined with small, two-story homes. One block away, there is a building that used to be a large and thriving Catholic school in the area. The building is well kept, with green spaces and several Catholic statues surrounding it. The block adjacent to this school has several large, newly-built, modern single family homes.

George Washington School is a public K-8 school. In school year 2013-2014, there were 564 students enrolled - in subsequent years, that number has steadily increased, so that for the 2016-2017 school year, there are more than 700. Of the students enrolled in the year 2013-2014, 42% were officially labeled English Language Learners. There is great diversity at Washington, with many different languages spoken by families, including Mandarin, Nepali, Indonesian, Vietnamese and Spanish, and many more cultural backgrounds. In terms of ethnicity, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) website provides the following breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Ethnic Breakdown of George Washington School*
The majority of the student population (89.9%) is considered economically disadvantaged.

As K mentions, the school did not have a good reputation - I found that parents, both English and Spanish speaking, along with some of the school staff, would tell me this. Several people mentioned frequent fights and conflicts with the recently closed high school students across the streets. Not only that, for many years the school was a revolving door for school leaders. Before Mr. Davis came along, several people reported to me that there was a different principal each year. In contrast, there are staff members who have been at the school for many years. Ms. Grainger, now the Assistant Principal, has been at the school for over 20 years, as well as the ESL teacher (they are good friends), and several others.

Washington School begun a TWI program in 2014 with one kindergarten cohort of 24 students. Each subsequent year, there will be one classroom added to the program until it becomes a K-8th program. At the moment, there is a district-approved five-year plan to expand the program. Based on strong interest in the TWI program from middle class, mostly white, families moving to the area, it is likely that the student demographics will change during this time period.
Participants, Roles & Positionality

Ethnography is an ontological, embodied enterprise (Rosaldo, 1989; Warren & Hackney, 2000). In this kind of research, we are our most important research tool, and both who we are and how people perceive us shape the kind of information that is gathered, analyzed, and inscribed in the final write up. Aside from my ethnicity and bilingualism, my gender, class and educational level, in particular, were important factors in how others saw me, whom I had access to, and who felt comfortable with me. My identity as a Penn researcher and as a former two-way immersion teacher were also very important in gaining access, building rapport, and earning credibility in this setting. I developed different relationships with different participants, and my roles and responsibilities varied in each setting. In turn, in each setting, different people perceived me in different ways. As I describe these relationships, I also introduce some of the main participants in my study.

In the classroom: Maestra Sofía

During centers one morning in March of 2015, I was working with a group of students at the ABC Center, or Centro ABC. As the children worked, chatting away in a mix of English and Spanish words and phrases, Lilly, a jovial girl from an English speaking household, asked me: “Can I get some agua, porfavor?” Before I could reply, Michaela, a sassy child also from an English-speaking Italian American household, responded to her: “you gotta ask the real teacher” (2015.03.03_A04_CentroABC). I couldn’t help but laugh at Michaela’s comments - both at the truth of what she said and at
how perceptive children are, even at their young age. Indeed, in the classroom, the children knew I wasn’t their “real teacher,” but nonetheless would call me “Maestra Sofia” and would greet me excitedly whenever I was there. In the classroom, I was a teacher aide/researcher. I listened (and recorded/took notes) during whole group lessons, and in general supported centers and small group or individual work. Children got used to me placing down my phone or a recorder at their tables, eventually wanting to be the focus of my recordings. By the end of the year they all vied for my attention and that of my recorders. Some children would also ask for my help often - they wanted assistance in reading and/or writing, or at times in resolving conflicts within a group. I would accompany the class to the restroom and would usually take the group of girls or the group of boys, and I volunteered on several occasions to do a read aloud or to be responsible for the group when Ms. O had to administer reading assessments. I would also volunteer to add drawings and visuals to Ms. O's anchor charts, and at times would help her prepare materials for her lessons. On a few occasions I led small group guided reading lessons, the first of which was to model one way to approach this teaching method for Ms. O.

Ms. O - Kindergarten TWI teacher

Before becoming a Kindergarten teacher, Ms. O was a chef and owned her own restaurant. She describes her motivation for switching careers and going into teaching as wanting to do something more meaningful. Part of this, was because in school, she had her own challenges. During our interview, she shared how she hated school in part
because she was dyslexic and had problems with attention - but that at the same time, she
loves children, and felt like she could transfer her skills into the classroom. That
transition proved to be to a very difficult, and often, Ms. O gives me undue credit for
helping her survive her first year at Washington. She claims I was there to help her figure
out what to do when she was lost, in terms of planning, of setting up centers, of
organizing a routine, of figuring out how to address parents’ concerns. While I do feel I
was helpful, I often did not feel useful enough. Nonetheless, I believe that me being
there, simply to listen to Ms. O, especially during the hardest and most challenging times,
was comforting. And in particular, it was crucial that I understood from personal
experience what she was going through, and would often offer advice by sharing what I
did in similar situations when I was a teacher. I believe having me there as a witness to
the crazy responsibilities, demands and expectations during her first year was validating.
It didn’t take long for Ms. O and I to become good friends, which we continue to be. It
also happened that we were neighbors, so at times I would visit her at home, or would
accompany her on walks with her dog. I share a connection to Venezuela, her home
country, since my brother-in-law is also Venezuelan. We both come from highly educated
homes and share the experiences of having had a somewhat similar level of class
privilege while growing up. I have met her family and friends, and even stayed with her
while traveling through Spain in the summer.
Ms. A - 1st Grade TWI teacher

With Ms. A, I have also developed a caring, friendly relationship. Because Ms. A is a seasoned teacher, she needed less pedagogical support from me, but similarly appreciated my presence in the classroom. Ms. A taught in Chile, her home country, for about 8 years before moving to the United States. While she was very strong in her classroom management and pedagogy, she felt more insecure about her mastery of English and during her time at Washington, was preparing to re-take the state licensing exams to become a certified teacher. Because she was new to the district school system, having come from a charter school, she was also getting used to the policies, standards, and requirements of how the district works. The beginning of the school year was a struggle because of this, along with a lack of curricular materials in Spanish, and because of the shuffling that occurred in the student population of the TWI program, which I address in Chapter 5. In her classroom, I was able to focus on data collection and observation during instructional times, and during prep and lunch time, would spend time with Ms. A providing support, answering her questions when I could, and chatting with her about her experience and the everyday goings on in the school and in the classroom.

In the school: Researcher/Random graduate student

In the school, I developed friendly relationships with several other teachers and staff; however, there were a large number of teachers I did not know, even by name (nor did they know me). I spent the majority of my time on the 1st floor and in the TWI classrooms, and because the building is so large, there were parts of the school (and people within it) that I wasn’t very familiar with. While there were some tensions with
other kindergarten and 1st grade teachers during the time I was there - mostly as a result of the attention and change that the TWI program was creating in the school - everyone overall was polite to me, and I to them. I tried to greet everyone at the office when I arrived (although not everyone greeted me back - my constant complaint about the culture of the school). I was also friendly with several of the specialist teachers, and would greet the cafeteria ladies when I would accompany the children to lunch. Not everyone knew exactly what my role in the school was - they probably assumed I was a student teacher with the TWI program. When I came back the second year, I joked that maybe some people thought I had flunked my student teaching year and had to do it again. The individuals that I worked most closely with, the TWI teachers, some of the office staff, as well as Mr. Davis and Ms. Granger, the teacher leader who later became the Assistant Principal, knew that I was a graduate student getting my PhD at Penn.

Because my involvement was so focused on the TWI program, and because other teachers constantly saw me with the TWI teachers and students, my perspective of the school is very much through the TWI program’s eyes. In other words, I learned about school tensions through Ms. A and Ms. O, and through the conversations they had with other teachers they were friends with. On a few occasions, I attended grade-group meetings or a school-wide professional development. I was friendly with the Spanish Bilingual Counseling Assistant (BCA)4, Ms. Juliet, and the people who were in the office.

---

4 There were seven BCAs who worked part-time at Washington who spoke the following languages: Vietnamese, Burmese, Indonesian, Nepali, Mandarin, Spanish and Their main responsibilities were to interpret for families and provide counseling services in their specified language.
This was usually the secretary - who left and was replaced in the second year - and Ms. Grainger, and occasionally Mr. Davis.

Mr. Anthony Davis - Principal

Before becoming a principal, Mr. Davis was an ESL teacher - which is part of the reason he was quickly onboard with a TWI initiative. He understands the benefits of bilingualism and is familiar with the research. Mr. Davis, a tall, white man, is well-liked in the school and very much appreciated by the parents. He, on various occasions and by different people, was described as a visionary, as ambitious, as a collaborator, as really caring for the children and families in the school. Throughout his relatively short time there, he has made a lot of things happen: a new TWI bilingual program, increased enrollment, a grant for a music program along with the donation of a classroom full of pianos, a focus on STEM, new technology, and the list goes on. While many of those achievements have come from his strategic collaborations with others, it is his vision for the school that drives these efforts towards improvement.

My interactions with Mr. Davis were sporadic during my time at Washington. Sometimes I would seek him out if I hadn’t seen him in a while, just to check-in and chat. He would often excitedly share some new development or a grant he had gotten or a new program he was able to secure. If it was a bad day, which many times it was, he would share with me some of this thoughts and concerns, lament his inability to do something, or simply vent to me about some district policy. My conversations with Mr. Davis throughout the two years I was at Washington were just as valuable, or even more so,
than my interview with him. I was able to better understand his perspective and get a sense for his vision and his leadership style.

Ms. Grainger - Teacher Leader

My relationship to Ms. Grainger was constantly evolving - but that may just be the nature of her relationships with people. She was an institution in the school - she had been there for a long period of time. She was a teacher leader and the PFT representative. It was quickly evident that nothing happened in the school that didn’t go through her approval. She had been part of this school community, and part of the larger neighborhood for a long time. She knew students and families, and sometimes even taught children of students of hers. She is from the area, part of an Italian American family. The first time Ms. Grainger greeted me with a friendly, “Hi, honey!” I felt it was a fieldwork triumph; I had earned her approval. Yet, this wasn’t necessarily consistent. While there were times when I felt we had a good relationship, when we chatted about school things, or joked about something, or when I hung out with her and several teachers during happy hour after school, there were other times when she did not acknowledge my existence. I was very disappointed when after several times of asking to schedule an interview, we somehow never got around to it. This dissertation is thus lacking from her interview, as well as that of Ms. Travis, the ESL coordinating teacher and also a long-time teacher in the building, with whom I also tried to get together on multiple occasions that didn't end up working out.
In the NCA’s Ed Committee: Penn graduate student/researcher

In the NCA’s Ed Committee, I was a Penn researcher involved with the TWI program. At first, and out of all the other spaces I was in, I was most nervous about being part of the Ed Committee. First, I knew that whatever I ended up writing would be of interest for many of the members of the committee, who would most likely have access to my work. Second, and as I will describe in detail in Chapter 4, several of the members of the NCA’s Ed Committee were familiar with the work of Maia Cucchiara, who wrote about the problematic way in which public schools in center city were being marketed to white middle class parents as a strategy for keeping the "professional class" in the city, to continue its re-development and re-investment. One member even described it as an “exposé” of all the problematic things that went on with the Center City Development District. This made me feel that members might not only have had a heightened awareness of being observed, but also, made me wonder about the repercussions of being more critical, when you know your participants might also be your audience.

Nevertheless, with time and as I got to know the members of the committee, and as they got to know me, there was a more comfortable relationship. I had coffee with Alice, the NCA Ed Committee chair at the time, to explain my project to her, and I also explained my project at the first two meetings I attended, when I introduced myself. I also volunteered to help during events and when I could, and as the only bilingual (and Latina) in the group, I usually offered my translation services. Eventually, after about a year of being involved, I volunteered to take the lead role in planning one of the events, along with another member of the group. I felt it was important for me to do this, to give
back by helping out in a more significant way, before I had to stop my involvement and begin writing.

For the parents: Maestra Sofía

One of the most surprising findings during fieldwork was that the majority of Mexican and Latino parents didn’t know I was Mexican until I explicitly told them during our interviews. While they had interacted with me and knew I was bilingual, they didn’t perceive me as a fellow *paisana*. Furthermore, I was usually accorded the respect conferred to teachers, along with the respectful distance that class and educational differences dictate in Mexico and other Latin American countries. With few exceptions, all of the parents spoke to me in the formal “usted” register. I believe that because parents associated me with the school, and as one of the teachers, attempting to gain access to their home lives proved very tricky, and for the most part, unsuccessful. It seemed culturally inappropriate to “invite myself” over to their homes, and the invitations didn’t come as easily as I assumed they would. It was by accident that I was able to form a close relationship with one of the Mexican families, and this was because it was mediated by their teenage daughter. In the first Back to School night of the program, I met Laura, who was there because her daughter, Belén, was entering the bilingual kindergarten. Elisabeth, her oldest daughter and a high school freshman at the time, was also there. Elisabeth, Laura and I spoke at length that night. For school, Elisabeth had to do a project where she interviewed someone about their profession, and since she was considering being a teacher, she asked if she could interview me. I agreed, excited that so early on I was
beginning to get to know one of the families of the program. We set a date and time, and I went to Belén’s house for the interview. This set a precedent for a friendly and close relationship - seeing me in her home made Belén very excited, and she and her little brother quickly invited me back, specifically to watch Frozen. With that invitation, I went back, and many times after that, continued receiving invitations from Laura and her husband Salvador.

That fluke didn’t repeat itself with any of the other families, which was a bit disappointing. I attempted to contact several Latina mothers after I had interviewed them, to ask if I could stop by and visit, but sometimes my texts or notes home went unanswered. I think some families didn’t feel comfortable having me over, perhaps didn’t have the time, or felt ashamed/embarrassed to host me. Some mothers ended up hosting me at home for the interview (one by accident, because she had forgotten and left dinner cooking on the stove, so we went back to her house together), while others felt more comfortable doing it at school. The mothers whom I interviewed at school were those who probably didn’t feel comfortable having me over. Of the Spanish-speaking Latino focus students, I visited four of their homes, most of them on multiple occasions. Of the English-speaking focus students, I visited the home of one child, Zoe, on multiple occasions as well, also having developed a good relationship with her parents (whom I interviewed three times). The only other home I visited on two occasions was that of Kelsy, an African American child from a working class family, who was being raised by her grandmother.
The way I interacted with middle class parents was different - it was on a more “level” playing field. In general, they were comfortable and happy to talk to me to help me for my project. They understood my role as a researcher, and not really a teacher, more so than the Latino working class parents. In fact, for middle class, mostly white parents, my role as a Penn researcher and support person in the classroom added a bit of caché to the program, and it usually made parents feel better and excited that I was there. It apparently was also a ‘selling’ point for some parents who were considering Washington as an option, according to my interview with Rebecca - one of the members of the planning group for the TWI, a ‘pre-parent’ who is credited with having the idea to do a two-way immersion in the first place.

As I mentioned at the outset of this section, aside from me being Mexican and bilingual, I felt that my class and gender were important factors in how my fieldwork relationships developed. As Rosaldo states, “The ethnographer, as a positioned subject, grasps certain human phenomena better than others. He or she occupies a position or structural location and observes with a particular angle of vision.” (P. 19, 1989 [1993]). Not only that, my point of view within the school was also from the location of a person involved with the TWI program, so my perception of school dynamics were through what the TWI teachers reported to me and from what I observed during my time there. My perception of the experiences of parents were informed by the parents whom I had the closest relationship to and the most access. My perception of the dynamics among new residents, who were mostly white and middle class, were informed by the people I most talked to, the members of the Ed committee, and those who had “friended” me on social media, who would express their point of view on these sites through what they posted or
what they shared. And finally, for the children, the most important main characters in this story, I was a teacher-like figure. They knew I was bilingual, although sometimes they would ask me if I knew English (sometimes I pretended I didn’t, but they knew better).

As time went by, and especially in 1st grade, more and more of the Latino students would have conversations with me where we talked about where we, or for the students, where their parents were from. “Mis papas son de México! Como la Maestra Sofía” or “Mis papas son de El Salvador”. I think about these children every day, and have missed them during the writing phase of this project. In the next couple of chapters, several of the children will feature prominently.

**Ethnography & Discourse Analysis**

The point of ethnography, as Becker (1996) states, is “not to prove, beyond doubt, the existence of particular relationships so much as to describe a system of relationships, to show how things hang together in a web of mutual influence” (p. 56). Furthermore, ethnography is an attempt to understand these relationships from participants' perspectives. In order to understand this system of relationships in the way the program was begun, and the experiences of those within it in the first couple of years, I needed to “be there” in multiple places: both inside and outside the school. I was able to spend much time in the school, and had varying levels of success at spending time with families and children outside the school. In that sense, my original design was too ambitious: I did not get to do as many home visits as I originally hoped for. My insistence on doing both was a commitment to understanding these relationships and how they play out in multiple
spaces, yet my access and ease at building these relationships were also indicative of class, cultural, and gendered social relations as they played out in different contexts and with different groups of people.

Analyzing discourse was a major component of this study. As described in the previous chapter, I situate this analysis within the linguistic anthropology of education, and as such, I analyze social and educational phenomena through language, and analyze language as social action. In particular, I understand discourse as language-in-use whose analysis lies in its relationship to its context (Blommaert, 2005). There is a vast range of layers that can become 'context' to a stretch of discourse. That which becomes relevant to interpreting any interaction is presupposed in the unfolding interaction itself, which is precisely the reason why close analysis of interaction is crucial. At the same time, such analysis must be embedded within an ethnographic understanding that allows for an analysis of the participants' own interpretation.

Intertextuality, the idea that texts are connected to, and refer to other texts, is a key concept. Connected to this are the terms contextualization and entextualization which refer to how texts travels and gets re-purposed in new configurations. Specifically, contextualization refers to the idea that ‘text’ is always surrounded by an indeterminate context (co-text) that emerges within the discourse itself (Agha, 2007; Bauman & Briggs, 1990). In other words, contextualization is the process by which people, in the course of interaction, signal through tacit and overt ways how their utterances are to be interpreted. In turn, entextualization refers to the process of extracting a text from its original context and repurposing it within a different utterance/context, along with metadiscursive framing.
of the text (Silverstein & Urban, 1996). Understanding how texts were connected to others, and how they were repurposed in interaction, was key to examining the "Spanish boy" story, the vignette presented in the introduction and elaborated in Chapter 7. This was also key in understanding the trajectories of socialization (Wortham, 2005) of children in the classroom over time.

Specifically, I approached the task of analysis of classroom interaction in two ways. One, by looking at the interactions of focal students over time, to understand their trajectories of socialization in the classroom (presented in Chapter 7); and two, by analyzing the spatial and temporal configuration of conversations according to the participant frameworks of such events (presented in Chapter 6). The analysis of conversations, texts, meetings, and interviews took a different form. Interviews, in particular, yielded important insights not only in their content, but in the way they unfolded with each participant. The interview is a specific type of speech event that not every person or every cultural group is familiar with (Briggs, 1986). As such, the information it yields is important data, not necessarily in a positivist sense, but as data that illustrates the ways interlocutors are understanding and interpreting the communicative event at hand, and that reveal differential access to specific kinds of communicative resources, access that is unequally distributed in society (Blommaert, 2005). Furthermore, how participants in the course of the interview embedded reported speech of others revealed not only their own positionality towards these stances but also the kinds of discourses they encountered in their everyday lives. This is most evident in Chapter 5, as I present the different lived realities of the parents in this TWI program. In what follows I describe my methods of data collection and analysis in more detail.
Data Collection

Ethnographic Participant Observation

As an ethnographic study, participant observation was the main source of data collection. I spent the majority of my time at the school, both in the TWI classrooms as well as in the building, and attended school-related events and activities. I visited the classroom regularly during two school years: 2014-2015 and 2015-2016, following the first cohort of TWI students from kindergarten to first grade - although the main data collection period was from September 2014 - June 2015, and September 2015 - December 2015. During these two years I also attended the monthly meetings of the Neighborhood Civic Association’s Education Committee, and at various times of the year volunteered to table at weekend festivals. I also attended Mexican cultural events held in that part of the city.

For the meetings and events outside of the classroom, I took careful notes during the event or immediately after, recording what happened, the conversations and exchanges amongst participants, and my thoughts and impressions. When appropriate, I took pictures and/or recorded video data. I paid careful attention to recurring themes and attempted to write down verbatim phrases from participants that seemed particularly important. As soon as possible, I would type up and extend my jottings for these events. I also collected documents from the events, whether those were flyers passed out at a weekend carnival or a meeting agenda. If it was an event for which there was press coverage, I made sure to find and save the article that was published documenting the event.
My participation and data collection in the classrooms, both Kindergarten and First grade, were slightly different than my participation at events as described above. I usually spent more time in the classroom (from 2 - 5 hours), and took on a more active role as an assistant to the teacher, especially for the kindergarten year. I kept my notebook close at all times to be sure to jot down interesting observations, events and conversations among the children. During whole-group instruction, I would usually sit behind all the children facing the teacher. Playing a less active, more observational role, I could record the activities and interactions I observed. Once I obtained parental permissions from all of the children’s parents, I was able to begin audio and video recording in the classroom. This occurred mid-way through the first year. I began recording whole group activities and then placing several small recorders at the children’s tables to capture small group and table work. At times, I would sit down at the table and observe/participate in the activity at hand, thus recording my own involvement in the interaction. At other times, I would simply leave the recorder on the table, instructing the students not to touch it (which of course, they did). I would jot down the main activities and participants for the recordings, and made sure to log these in my general data log. While most of the time I attempted to listen to the recordings of the day and document the general content of the interactions, other days the most I could do was to catalogue the interaction and mark it for future transcription.

Early on, I focused my observations on whole-group, teacher to student dynamics as well as interactions at tables that involved my original list of eight focal students. I had selected a group of focal students in order to focus the observations and later analysis I would do in depth. I attempted to get equal numbers of girls and boys, as well as a
balanced number of children who represented the 'Spanish-speakers' and 'English-speakers'. I also wanted a group that represented the diversity of this first cohort in terms of language, race, and class. Yet, as time went on, I began adding students to my list, so that in the end, I had about 12 students whom I included as the focus of my observations. Some of this was due to the fact that, because children sat at tables of four or more students, I would normally record and observe the focal students’ tablemates as well. Another reason was that children did interesting things all the time, and as an eager researcher, I wanted to keep track of those interesting developments.

When I observed, I was particularly interested in how students interacted with each other, especially when they interacted with peers who came from a distinct language background than their own. I was also interested in how students talked about English and Spanish, paying attention to their metacommentary. My ears perked up when I heard them talk explicitly about this, and I would often quickly turn on a recording device nearby if I wasn’t capturing that conversation already. While my recordings and observations were focused mostly on the TWI classroom, I also observed their art class frequently, and on several occasions also accompanied the students to dance, computer and PE class. I usually spent some time at the beginning of lunch time with students, helping them get their food, open ketchup packets, or simply observing their interactions and seating arrangements. It was usually too loud for me to record in the cafeteria, so after a couple of futile attempts, I stopped. I observed recess time on several occasions as well, jotting down field notes and recording some of their conversations. Most of the time, I opted to spend lunch time with the teachers, as I found our conversations extremely valuable - especially the first year with Ms. O. During lunch time Ms. O would
talk to me about her challenges and frustrations for that day or week. I would provide a listening ear, and suggest strategies or lend advice on some of the things she shared. This helped me understand her experience as a teacher and on many occasions to hear about classroom moments which were significant to her, which may have occurred on a day when I was not present, or which we would reminisce about together.

My participation in the school community was key to developing research relationships based on mutual trust and reciprocity. It was very important to me to be a contributing member of this school community, to contribute as an assistant teacher, as a translator, as an extra set of hands in the classroom and the school when needed. Sometimes, this became confusing as a researcher, and presented ethical questions for my work. For example, there were times when I wasn’t sure at which point to intervene, or how directly to give Ms. O suggestions or advice; as a novice teacher, she was overwhelmed with many aspects that her job required of her, and that she demanded of herself. I limited myself to only offering advice when she asked for it, or giving her feedback when she asked for it specifically. I also was torn about how directly to address some of the school tensions I was observing with Mr. Davis - there were times of the year where I barely saw him or talked to him, and I wondered whether I should be in more regular communication about some of my impressions or suggestions for building a stronger program. It was not my place to mentor Ms. O nor to provide suggestions for improvement for Mr. Davis. Yet, it was difficult to witness things that I felt I had the knowledge and experience to help address in different ways, and I wanted to feel useful in that regard.
It was also important to me that members of the school and parental community knew who I was, understand my experience as a bilingual individual, a former TWI teacher, my passion for bilingual education, and the goals of my study. Of course, that wasn’t always the case - I will elaborate on how others perceived me in the next section. The opportunities for interaction that consistent involvement in various activities provided were crucial both for data collection and for the aforementioned reasons of cultivating relationships in the field.

Audio and Video Recording

I collected many hours of audio and video recordings of multiple classroom and school-related activities. The majority of these recordings are focused on the second half of kindergarten and from September to December of 1st grade. Recording was mainly focused on whole group activities or small group work that included the focal children of the study. These recordings have provided rich semiotic data on communicative interactions. However, because of the amount of audio and video data I collected, I focused on the kindergarten audio data, leaving the video and audio data of 1st grade for later analysis. I also took a generous number of pictures throughout the year, and these included both classroom routine activities as well as special events such as fieldtrips, celebrations, and school-wide and community events. I took pictures and video on multiple devices, including my phone, audio recorders, a DSLR camera, and a GoPro camera.
Interviews

I conducted 27 formal interviews with parents, community members, the teachers and principal. I conducted an additional 13 interviews with parents of children in the second cohort that, while not at the core of the analysis presented here, have allowed me to develop a stronger sense of how the program is developing. I interviewed the civic association’s education committee chair, Alice, as well as the association’s board president, Mr. Cottone, to learn more about the history of the association and the extent of their involvement in the TWI program. I also interviewed the individuals that were part of the development of the TWI program from the beginning, three of whom eventually became TWI parents. I formally interviewed the principal, Mr. Davis, as well as the kindergarten teacher, Ms. O - and also had countless of conversations with them throughout fieldwork, which I recorded in my field notes. While I did not formally interview Ms. A -not wanting to overwhelm her with another demand on her time, as she was adjusting to the school, the school district, and to being the mother of a toddler - we did have many conversations over her lunch or prep time where I was able to ask her questions and get at some of the aspects of her experience which interested me, which I recorded in my field notes.

Originally, I had planned on conducting in depth interviews with focal children’s parents during the first school year (2014-2015), and to follow up with interviews in the second school year, but I ended up conducting only one interview per focal child’s parents, with the exception of one set of parents, whom I interviewed three times. During fieldwork, access to parents, and planning for interviews, turned out to be more elusive than I thought. The majority of parents whom I interviewed were mothers or female
caretakers (two of my interviewees were grandmothers and the main caretakers of the focal children). Only in two instances did my interviewees include both mother and father, and they were the two families with whom I was able to form the closest relationship. Asking for and scheduling interviews with English-speaking middle class parents was much more straightforward than with the majority of the Latino immigrant parents. How I scheduled those interviews and communicated with the participants, where the interviews took place, the length of the interviews and the focus of what we talked about were illustrative of different everyday life activities and experiences. For the most part, I scheduled interviews by email with all of the middle class white parents, while I usually scheduled interviews informally in person or over text with the Latino mothers, as well as with the working class grandmothers of two of the children. With some exceptions, I usually met with middle class parents in public spaces or in their homes. I met with immigrant parents at school or at their homes. Middle class parents were comfortable during the interview, and were glad to contribute to my research. Some of the immigrant and working class parents were uncomfortable or nervous during the interview. I made efforts to minimize this by sharing my story at the beginning of the interview. As I explained my project I talked about how I became interested in this program, my experience as a TWI teacher, and my experience growing up bilingually along the border. I emphasized that I was recording so I could pay attention to our conversation without the need to take copious notes, and that only I would listen to the recording. When I noticed that a parent was still nervous, quiet, or uncomfortable, I would attempt to turn the interview into a conversation, by sharing some of my thoughts
or experiences. I later realized that by doing so I spoke longer than I should have, and it left me wanting to know more about that particular interviewee.

Throughout the course of fieldwork, I held multiple conversations with many individuals involved in the program that I recorded in my fieldnotes. Informal conversations I had with Ms. O, Ms. A, Mr. Davis, other teachers and staff at the school, parents and caregivers of students, and members of the civic association who attended meetings, were incredibly important for my project - they often corroborated what was said by others or reiterated what they had told me during interviews or in other settings. At other times, they provided unexpected information to follow up on. Overall, both formal interviews and informal conversations were important and useful ways to understand the patterns and relationships within the program, the school, and the larger community.

Document and Artifact Collection

During the time I was involved with Washington School and the development of the TWI program, I collected the following documents:

- TWI program proposal; TWI information session Power points; & other TWI-related documents;
- News media circulated through listserv, twitter, and Facebook relating to the TWI program, the school, and the community;
- School-home communications, both school wide and TWI program specific;
• News media documenting changes to the neighborhood surrounding the school, as well as articles on the Mexican and Latino Immigrant community in the city.

Many of these documents were particularly useful for my first question, in trying to understand how gentrification and immigration in South Philadelphia was co-occurring and interrelated with the development of this TWI program.

Additionally, I collected classroom artefacts that were helpful in understanding how students were developing their language proficiencies and their ideas of language and speakers. I took pictures of student work and teacher generated anchor charts, as well as pictures of the classroom and of particular documents that were relevant to the day’s activities. Many of these artefacts were helpful in contextualizing some of the interactions and responses children had during interactions around the particular text.

Data Analysis

Taken together, I collected a large amount of data, which I broke down in the following table. The totals are approximations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Notes</td>
<td>180*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictures</td>
<td>900+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>~20hrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Audio Recordings (classroom)  | ~70hrs
---|---
Media Articles  | ~60
Other documents (meeting agendas, notes, flyers, etc.)  | ~60

* This is an approximate number: I typed up 170 field note documents on Word, however, I kept some fieldnotes in my notebooks and uploaded pictures of these notes to analyze on Dedoose. Therefore, this is a conservative approximation.

**13 additional interviews conducted with parents from the second cohort were not directly included in this analysis

| Table 2: Data Collected |

In order to keep the data organized, I created a log of data collected in an Excel spreadsheet, organized by data type, date collected, brief descriptions, and identifying keywords. This was especially important for audios and videos. I would mark recordings that I knew I would want to analyze carefully - these included interactions among focal students that were characterized by interesting metacommentary, or interactions where I noticed children using their repertoires creatively or in new ways, by using their second language, for example. I approached the task of data analysis by addressing my research questions in reverse order, so that I focused on classroom interactional data first, followed by the analysis of parent interviews, and finally with the analysis of NCA Ed Committee meetings and interviews with those involved in starting the TWI program.

Data-analysis, for all stages, involved open coding, reflective memo writing, and data triangulation (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). With the help of qualitative research software Dedoose, I coded all fieldnotes, first focusing on
those that had to do with classroom observations and student interaction, transcribing the corresponding audios. My coding scheme for classroom interactional data was descriptive: I sought to get a sense of the kinds of classroom interactions I observed and captured in the audio. I coded for the participants in the interaction, whether it was whole-group or small group/table work, and a general descriptor for the interaction. I coded for all instances of metacommentary. As certain kinds of metacommentary become more evident, I created sub-codes for these, which included comments on language proficiency, on language shift/loss, on pronunciation, on language abilities and on language development. I also created codes to categorize different kinds of interactions, for example, storytelling, repetitions, and interactions with/about/around books.

During the coding and transcription process, I selected a key interaction to analyze in depth. This interaction had sparked my curiosity ever since I observed and recorded it because of the way one white middle class child began to change her normal way of speaking to one that seemed to emulate that of her African-American and Dominican classmates. During the analysis process, I experimented with several ways to represent the transcription, eventually developing one that allowed me to represent the dialogue alongside the text the children were reading (Example 3 in Chapter 6). This analysis led to the key insights presented in Chapter 6, and motivated a second round of coding to analyze interactions for shifting participant frameworks, with another round of experimenting with transcription representations that included spatial positioning.

As part of the aforementioned analysis, and to understand the experiences of my focal students in more depth, I toggled between classroom interactions, field notes, and
parent interviews. I selected to analyze the cases of four children because of the contrasting ways in which race and class impacted their trajectories of socialization. Based on this, I developed the analysis of raciolinguistic socialization presented in Chapter 7. Furthermore, through this analysis, some of the significant themes of parent's experiences started to emerge.

Throughout the data analysis process, I recorded insights, questions, observations, and developing ideas in research memos. This was an iterative process that allowed for more focused coding as I continued analyzing interviews, field notes, and documents - providing for important triangulation between sources of data. The research memos were key in the process of coming to the analyses and interpretations presented in this study. Finally, the process of writing itself became one of the most important analytical tools. It is through the printed words on these pages that I have attempted to present a thoughtful, analytically productive, and human account of the way one bilingual two-way immersion program was created, the motivations of all those involved in such a feat, and the experiences of those whom it brought together.
Chapter 4: Creating a TWI Program amid Neoliberal School Reforms, the “Opt in” Movement, and Changing Demographics in Philadelphia

S: ...Tell me how the idea for the two-way immersion program first came up.

Mr. D: Sure. Um, I, one of the first things I did was reach out to all the communities. [...] And, you know, the idea of bilingual education was a trend in every language-cultural-I mean, you name it [any] community that we talked to, that when I asked a simple question, what do you want in a school, safety came up, of course, you know, good teachers, and bilingual education came up again and again, and that got me excited 'cause, I mean, that's my background, working with ESL and bilingual programs even though I'm not bilingual, so it just got me moving very quickly [...] 

S: ...any other reason why you would want a two-way immersion program in South Philadelphia?

Mr. D: Yeah. I may have 'cause bilingual is the way to go. I mean it's, it's so underrepresented in schools and even top schools don't begin, you know, another language, second language 'til middle school, so it's clearly something that I know our kids need to compete and it's also something that I know is not available readily, so it does provide our school with a huge point of pride to say, you know, we offer this and it's a competitive market out there. We gotta have programs that people want. People want that.

-Interview with Mr. Davis, Principal, George Washington School

Rebecca: I was telling [him, Mr. Davis, the principal, about the] people who wouldn't join our group or weren't interested because they didn't think Washington was at all an option [...] And he was like, well, what would make them come? And I was like, using Washington's - the strengths of all the kids who speak different languages making it, like, a two-way immersion type [...] and I was so surprised that he was immediately like, yeah, let's do it.

-Interview with Rebecca, "pre-parent" and TWI advocate

The excerpts above come from interviews I had with Mr. Anthony Davis, the principal of George Washington School, and with Rebecca, one of the main pioneers of the two-way immersion program, regarding how this TWI program began. Rebecca, a white middle
class highly educated woman who is bilingual in Spanish and English, became one of the main proponents of the two-way immersion program at George Washington School. In our interview, she described her first meeting with Mr. Davis, which occurred shortly after he was hired as the principal. This conversation, along with many other conversations over a year, was how the idea for the TWI program was born and developed, until in 2014 it became a reality. As Mr. Davis notes, he met with members of the different communities that make up GW School, a highly diverse school that enrolls children from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds, mostly immigrant and refugee populations from Asia as well as Mexico and Central America. He also met with the small but growing number of white, middle and upper middle class new residents to this area, who were beginning to explore schooling options for the future - residents like Rebecca. During my interview with Rebecca, a native of New York City and new resident of South Philadelphia, she described to me how once her first son was born, she began worrying about schooling options for the future. Given the state of public education in the city, and the difficulty at getting a slot in a good charter school, Rebecca realized she needed another option that did not force her to move to the suburbs - which is when she started focusing her attention on Washington School. For his part, Mr. Davis understood the schooling situation as a “competitive market” in which, not only do his students have to compete (for high school and beyond), but also a market in which he has to compete with other schools, such as charters, and offer something that “people want”.

These quotes, the assumptions behind them and realities that they point to, are the focus of this chapter. A major factor in how the program came about, and the main stakeholders that were involved in getting it started, are part of a movement among new
middle class residents in city neighborhoods, such as Rebecca, that are “opting in” to public schools (over charters, private schools, or moving to the suburbs). As city neighborhoods in Philadelphia change and gentrify, a key dimension to this change has been that young middle class parents, instead of fleeing to the suburbs once their children are school age, are opting to send their children to their neighborhood public school. This, in a context of a public school system facing incredible challenges, including lack of resources and an aggressive market-based reform threatening to close under-performing and under-enrolled schools. In this chapter, I first lay out the context of the School District of Philadelphia - the funding crisis along with the neoliberal reform that created a competitive environment where schools must compete to survive. As a response to this crisis as well as to the limited choices professional parents felt they had in terms of schooling, middle class and upper middle class residents began creating groups to support their neighborhood public school, often naming themselves “Friends of ____ School”. I discuss the activities of the one organization I became involved with, which was and continues to be a community partner to George Washington School, and its key role in bringing media and parent attention to the TWI program during its first year. The group of parents and ‘pre-parents’ heavily involved in this organization were not only driven by their own interest in having a good neighborhood school for their own children, but also by a desire for a more equitable educational system that was accessible to all. Yet, the activities in which they focused operated under the assumption that one way to improve a school was to recruit more middle and upper middle class parents into it. This created tension - both for the individuals themselves and for the school – between, on the one
hand, a desire for and a maintenance of diversity, and, on the other hand, pressure to cater to the needs, demands, and desires of a middle and upper middle class population.

**Public School Closings, the Doomsday budget, and the “Friends of” Movement**

The School District of Philadelphia has been under a state takeover since 2001, governed by a state- and mayoral-appointed School Reform Commission (SRC), that in 2012 and 2013, made the very controversial decision to close nearly 30 schools in order to address the projected 1.35 billion deficit on the budget (Jack & Sludden, 2013). In 2012, the SRC employed the Boston Consulting Group to develop strategies to “stabilize the district finances and to ensure that all students have better access to safe, high-quality educational options that ready them for college and careers,” as was described by then acting Superintendent and Chief Recovery Officer Thomas E. Knudsen on the cover letter to the BCG report (Boston Consulting Group, 2012). One of the key restructuring strategies for the district, as evident throughout the BCG report and the district Action Plans that followed, is a move towards a portfolio-based management system - that is, towards a system where a district manages a variety of high-quality schooling options, including charters and semi-autonomous operators along with district schools. Thus, the reform strategy for the district is one that envisions a district that provides a variety of so-called “high quality seats” and creates pressure for low performing schools to change or be restructured/taken over by a different operator. Many have argued that reform efforts such as these, which increase competition, accountability and choice, similar to those
found in an economic market, are products of the neoliberal moment (Lipman & Hursh, 2007).

The funding woes in Philadelphia were due to a variety of factors, including the loss of federal stimulus dollars as well as a considerable reduction in state funding. However, charter school expansion and policies have played an important and controversial secondary role, placing a considerable financial strain on the district (Jack & Sludden, 2013). According to the BCG report, for each student who enrolls in a charter school, the district incurs an additional $7,000 (2012, p. 7). This additional cost is due to the fact that the money that goes to charters per seat still leaves the district with the same facilities and maintenance costs for the buildings that continue operating the district’s traditional public schools. Because of this, charter school advocates and public school advocates have been pitted against each other for lack of adequate funding for all schools in the district, given the widely circulated figure of the extra costs of charters, that take away valuable money from district schools. Many activists and advocates have also turned their attention to lobbying for more equitable school funding, given that Pennsylvania continues to be one of the states with the most inequitable state funding given its lack of a clear funding formula (Education Law Center, 2013; Pew Charitable Trust, 2015).

The BCG report, published in August of 2012, was followed by the implementation in 2013 of the so-called “Doomsday budget” along with the closure of 24 district schools. The doomsday budget eliminated after-school services and programs such as music and art as well as the reduction of personnel such as school counselors and nurses (Shamlin,
2013). These closures and cuts were met with much resistance from activist and advocacy groups. One such coalition that was formed around this time was Philadelphia Coalition Advocating for Public Schools, or PCAPS, which organized town halls, parent meetings and protests, and advanced a vision for community schools (Gym, 2013). Around the same time, other groups of people began getting together with the goal of supporting their local neighborhood school. Many of these groups named themselves “Friends of [name of neighborhood school]”. The year after the doomsday budget was passed, “Friends of” groups started gaining more traction - springing up in several areas of the city - exclusively in areas of the city undergoing re-development and gentrification. In fact, in at least one of the ‘Friends of’ groups website, the link between the district’s funding crisis and the forming of the group is made directly:

The [name of organization], a 501c3 nonprofit organization, was formed in 2013 in response to the continued resource crisis facing our city’s public schools, and in particular, our neighborhood school. We are made up of future and current parents of [name of school] students and other interested community members and public school supporters. We are open to all who care about public education and want to positively impact [name of school]’s present and future!

These organizations began to form in response to not only the funding crisis but also, and more importantly, to fulfill a need for a good quality school option for professional parents who did not wish to leave their urban environment for the suburbs in search of better schooling for their children. Thus, more than being responsible for their creation, the crisis in the district precipitated these groups’ formation. These ‘Friends’ groups were composed in their majority, of parents interested in potentially sending their children to their neighborhood school - who were often referred to as ‘pre-parents’- and
who were in large part mostly white and college educated. The anxiety over schooling options for the children of professional parents that I interviewed was very evident: choosing a school in the city of Philadelphia was very stressful, given the budget crisis and the condition of public schools; the limited number of seats at charters that are at the mercy of the lottery system; and the exorbitant prices of private education that many professional parents couldn't afford. This, along with a strong desire to “stay in the city”, prompted some parents to begin forming groups of like-minded individuals to see what they could do to support their neighborhood public school. By 2016, an article in the Philadelphia Notebook called this what many within it felt it was: a movement - the “Friends of” movement (Carlson, 2016). By then, the ‘Friends of” groups had organized their second annual summit. The larger organization Friends of Neighborhood Education (FONE) was a result of the first annual summit in 2015, which I attended. FONE is logistically housed under the Philadelphia Crosstown Coalition (PCC), officially created in 2014 as a non-profit composed of representatives from neighborhood civic associations.

Indeed, many “Friends” groups formed as spin offs, or with some connection to, the local civic associations already in existence. Although the history of the city’s numerous civic associations vary, the civic association for the area where GW elementary is located is the product of the city’s changing demographic make-up. South Philadelphia, historically a receiving site for many Irish and Italian Catholic immigrants, was traditionally organized by their churches, which were the de facto political and social organizations of the city, according to my informants. Yet, as Catholic residents began moving out of the city, or began aging and passing away, the newer generation of
residents were no longer affiliated to the parishes in the same way. Mr. Cottone, the head of the Neighborhood Civic Association, explains it in the following way:

Before there were civic associations, Philadelphia was all a neighborhood of Catholic parishes. You would say, where do you live, and they would say, St. Monica's or Epiphany or St. Nicholas. No one ever said, you know, no one ever said I live in Newbold or Lomo. They do now, but no one ever said that when I was a child 40 years ago. They said I lived in Stella Maris parish, so as the parishes diminished and the civic associations came along, we tried, we at least, tried to use the markings of the old parish parameters to get an idea of what our boundaries should look like. (INT, 2016.04.25).

Alice, the education committee chair and a resident of this area for about 10 years, also described it in similar terms:

…[Y]ou know, this neighborhood, all of the social and kind of political stuff used to be done more through the parishes, through your ward leader, that kind of thing, and as that sort of fell away and people began to move into the neighborhood who weren't Catholic, who didn't join a parish, that system kind of dissolved a bit, and what, what happened starting in the past maybe 10 to 15 years is that civic associations started to form a lot along the lines of the old parishes. (INT, 2015.12.15)

An interesting aspect of the civic associations is the fact that many “new residents” were the ones forming them, as opposed to the older residents who had been there for a long time, some even for generations. Yet, despite the trends among the majority of the civics, one of the unique aspects of this particular Neighborhood Civic Association, as Mr. Cottone explains, is that it has both new residents and long-term residents in its membership.

But they, like [names of other civic associations], are primarily new neighbors where NCA, we're very fortunate that we've always had a board that had a mix of old and new neighbors which is good, I think. You get a, you get a better sense of a neighborhood when there's a multiplicity of voices like that and you have, you know, experience and innovation both working together. (INT, 2016.04.25)
This combination is due in large part because Mr. Cottone himself, as a long-term resident, became part of the group that originally formed the civic, and has since been the representative of, and a strong voice for, the long-term residents in the area. Other associations, he noted, have had very contentious relationships to the long-term residents. Given the parts of the city he names as “more contentious”, those conflicts are probably due to racial differences. Another unique aspect of this area of the city is that the long-term residents are for the most part Italian American, and thus share a racial background with new residents (even though at one point these same immigrants were racialized along with other immigrant groups, through the generations they have 'become white' (Roediger, 2006)). It is this Neighborhood Civic Association that Rebecca first went to in order to begin learning about her local public school. She began emailing several people she knew regarding this, and after going back and forth discussing this issue through email, they eventually decided to meet about it. Because one of the members of this group was Alice, a board member at the Neighborhood Civic Association, they decided to form the Education Committee as part of the NCA, with Alice chairing.

At this point, they also approached Washington School to figure out how they could be supportive of the school. At that time, and for a number of years prior, the school was undergoing constant changes in leadership. The initial contact they had at the school, a teacher who was beginning to collaborate with the group, retired - and the newly hired principal didn't seem to be open to the group's efforts. A year later, once the principal retired, a search committee was put together to hire a new school leader. The group was able to get a representative on that committee in order to have a say in who became the new principal. Mr. Davis was hired, and his relationship to the NCA's Ed Committee took
on a very different form. The summer before his first year as principal, Mr. Davis met with Alice, and then separately, with Rebecca - and it was in this meeting where the idea for the TWI first came up.

**The birth of the TWI program at GW**

Given Mr. Davis’ entrepreneurial and collaborative spirit, as well as his background in ESL education and excitement for bilingualism, he did not hesitate in making the creation of a TWI a priority in his first year. Mr. Davis’ saw this program as a way for his school to not only survive in a competitive environment, but to stand out among other schools, to support his largest immigrant community, and to attract a key demographic: the growing number of white middle class and upper middle class residents of the neighborhood. As he mentions in the opening excerpt for this section, something like the bilingual program is “what people want” and it is what will give his students a competitive edge. After it was clear that many of the white middle class potential parents were strongly interested in a bilingual program, it became important for him to also recruit several of the Spanish-speaking mothers into the project of the TWI. Rebecca reached out to Lizeth, a Spanish-speaking Mexican woman and mother of a GW student whom she had befriended at an earlier event, and someone with whom she maintained a friendly relationship. Lizeth and María, another Mexican parent, became involved in the planning committee for the TWI, and became the representatives for the ‘Latina moms,’ as several of my interviewees referred to them. All of the parents and community members involved were tasked with collecting letters of support for the program.
Rebecca was able to get some of her friends and neighbors to write letters, even when many of them decided not to attend GW and moved to the suburbs - they were still supportive of Rebecca’s energy and initiative. Lizeth and María, on their part, collected signatures from the Spanish-speaking parents to show support from the ‘Mexican community’ for this bilingual program.

For his part, Mr. Davis moved quickly and strategically - he reached out to the director of the Office of Multilingual Curriculum and Programs (OMCP) for the School District of Philadelphia, who at the time already had a plan to transform five of the district’s transitional bilingual programs into dual language, Spanish-English programs. The director became very supportive of Mr. Davis’ proposal and wrote a letter of support, and included GW as part of the initiative to expand the dual-language programs offered by the district. This meant that the OMCP would provide part of the financial support needed for the bilingual program, including paying the salaries of the bilingual teachers, and a commitment to supporting the program for the next five years. The director also connected Mr. Davis to Dr. Nelson Flores, who had already been working with the OMCP office to provide support for bilingual teachers and for the ambitious bilingual restructuring plans. Dr. Flores provided the needed research and expertise on bilingual education programs for the proposal. Along with Dr. Flores, who represented the University of Pennsylvania as a community partner, Mr. Davis also had the support of Enlaces, an after school bilingual literacy program working with Spanish-speaking families at Washington, which had grown out of the larger health organization with the same name, which serves the Spanish-speaking population in South Philadelphia.
By the fall of Mr. Davis’ first year as principal, he had already assembled the planning team for the TWI program, which included three white middle class/upper middle class ‘pre-parents’ and community members (Rebecca, Kimberly, and another woman), two current Mexican parents (Maria and Lizeth), Dr. Flores, the director of the OCMP office, and the assistant director of Enlaces. Mr. Davis’ ambitious vision for the TWI proposal also included a video, through which he wanted to convey to district leadership how much the ‘community’ wanted this program. I became part of the initiative at this point, tasked with making the video - which I gladly took up as a first step in gaining access to what became the focus of this dissertation. In the spring of that year, Mr. Davis’ proposal was approved by the district, and he quickly began working to recruit the first cohort of students and hiring a highly qualified teacher. Dr. Flores and I collaborated with Mr. Davis to plan and lead informational sessions for parents in English and Spanish. The NCA’s Ed committee publicized these events among their networks, which is how Mary and Jane, two white middle class mothers, found out about the program in the first place.

The Ed committee, “pre-parents” and the TWI program

By the time I became involved with the committee, it had been in place for about two years, and it was actively supporting Washington School. And while it included several community members that simply wanted to become more involved in education issues, the majority of its members were “pre-parents”: individuals who either had young children or were planning on it, and who were also planning on sending their children to GW elementary (or who were at least considering it). A commitment to supporting public
education, in the face of the lack of (public) funding and support in the state, was also shared amongst its members. Furthermore, a commitment to equity and diversity were also often expressed at the meetings, along with laments at the lack of the latter: the group was made up of mostly white middle class professional individuals, something which was often recognized by Alice. By the time I began attending the monthly meetings, it seemed that there was a constant stream of newcomers (like me). At the second meeting I attended, one of the ‘original’ members of the group decided to summarize the mission and history of the group in a handout that was passed out during the October meeting. I have pasted some of the text from that handout below (leaving out identifying details):

*We are a group of parents and community members from the [Neighborhood Civic Association] focused on providing support to [George Washington School, located at [...] and to [...] Catholic Regional School, located at [...]*. 

**Since March 2012 we have: (at GW School)**

- Created a list of educational resources for the community (2012)
- Held a happy hour school supply drive at [...] (2012)
- Participated in the New Principal Selection Committee (2013)
- Held a happy hour for GW teachers and community members to mingle at [neighborhood bar]
- In collaboration with several parents from the school, we facilitated the creation of a School Advisory Committee (2013); we now serve on the committee.
- Held online and “gift registry” school supply drives (2013/2014 School Year)
- Conducted an art supply donation day
- Applied for and received a grant to work with [name of company] an internationally recognized design firm, to create a master plan for GW’s school yard during the fall of 2014. Implementation of this plan will be forthcoming.
- Held a fundraising event at [local restaurant] to raise the administrative fee for the grant (2014)
In the two years that they had been officially a committee, the group had managed to do various supply drives and provide donations to the school, as well as apply for and receive a grant to fund the plans for a re-design of the schoolyard - a large achievement in and of itself. Importantly, the group was also able to leverage a say in important decisions that affected the school: a voice in the principal selection committee, and a voice in the newly formed School Advisory Council. The group of six women who were responsible for these, the women who were the “original” members of the group, were all ‘pre-parents’ except for two: one woman who eventually left the group to attend seminary school, and Alice, who by then had already placed her son in a local charter school - a bilingual school with a long waiting list of agonizing parents. In fact, the reason Alice was the chair of the committee was due to the civic association’s rules - each committee needs to be chaired by a board member, and thus, Alice became chair. Her position as not a ‘pre-parent,’ but solely a community member interested in supporting GW, gave her a unique perspective (more on that later). At first, the fact that she was “already taken care of” (INT, 2015.12.15), in the sense that she already had a good school option for her son which happened to be a bilingual charter school, made her uneasy about leading the efforts to advocate for a TWI program at the school. So, initially, two “pre-parents” led the effort to support Mr. Davis in getting the program started - outside of the “official” group. Yet, the group was looped back in to the project given the relationship that Alice developed immediately with Mr. Davis’ upon his hire. (In fact, Alice had been part of the committee which hired him).

In the same handout quoted above, a subsequent section outlined the “current work” of the committee, which listed five major projects at GW: a teacher/staff appreciation
breakfast, developing a “Marketing/PR/Social Media strategy for Committee”, discussing fundraising and a supply drive, the library project, and the schoolyard project. There was one current project for the Catholic school, which involved providing support for the athletic program. It was understood among the group that everyone’s “hearts” were set on supporting GW based on a belief on the right to a good public education in the city, and that the support of the neighborhood Catholic school was a gesture towards appeasing the Civic Association’s chair and long-time resident, who felt that both schools within the catchment area should be supported. This tension is illustrative of the more general tension between long-time residents and the priorities of the new residents. New residents were not interested in the local Catholic schools, nor were they active members of the local churches. New residents were part of the generation of young parents “staying in the city”, and investing in neighborhood public schools.

What was evident at the October meeting, and the many that followed throughout the year, was the impressive know-how and knowledge in the room in terms of marketing strategies, fundraising, and grant-writing. Many of the women (since the committee was made up mostly by women) had professional experience in precisely these areas, and lent their expertise to helping the group. The conversation in the October and November 2014 meetings, which focused on the marketing strategy, made it clear that in order to attract more grants and more funders, the group needed to look more professional, it needed to stand out, it needed a logo, and a larger ‘social media’ presence. While first brainstorming this in October, the woman in charge of the Marketing/PR/Social Media, outlined it as a “two-pronged approach”: one to focus on the Education Committee for the NCA, and one
to focus specifically on GW elementary. Under the latter approach, several bullet points were listed - which are reproduced below:

- **Open houses- when is it? How is the word getting out? What is NCA’s role, how can/should we help?**
- **Think about creative ways to engage young parents.**
- **How are we conveying the story? How much of it do we want to go out?**
  - STEM School
  - Dual Immersion
  - Give suggestions to update school website as a vehicle for telling its story.
- **Partnerships—what can we get going with local businesses (this may belong in the Education committee line?)**

The first three points, about hosting Open Houses and “getting the word out,” about “creative ways to engage young parents,” and about conveying a “story” about the school all have to do with attracting middle class parents into this particular public school. In other words, the assumption was that there were young parents that needed to be “engaged” with a particular “story” about this school, in order to be convinced that this may be a good choice for their family. Throughout the course of the school year, the committee’s meetings and activities continued to focus on the marketing strategy and the “branding” - as well as some more definition on its overall mission. The library and schoolyard were ongoing projects throughout the year. Several other projects were undertaken between 2014 and 2015: Open houses and a happy hour for prospective parents were organized (mostly geared towards the TWI program), a “Little Friends” group of ‘pre-parents’ and their young children/toddlers, and a supply drive and paper ‘happy hour,’ which I volunteered to organize myself. I have summarized these major
projects and activities in the chart below. I have also summarized the goal for each of these activities as well as the audience for the efforts or in some cases the beneficiaries of these projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Project</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Activities Involved</th>
<th>Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Project</td>
<td>To get the school’s library up and running again</td>
<td>To raise money/get donors for online system; attend online system training; recruit volunteers to organize and scan books; recruit, train and coordinate volunteers to maintain library</td>
<td>Multiple audiences - Benefits the whole school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground Project</td>
<td>To raise $1,000,000 to build the playground</td>
<td>Grant writing; ambitious fundraising</td>
<td>Benefits school and surrounding community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Friends</td>
<td>To get parents with children of similar ages to begin to know each other; to form cohorts; to get parents into the school so that it becomes an “option” and public school seems less “scary”; to “change the narrative”</td>
<td>Obtain permission from the school to use an available room to meet; to create flyer and advertise in social media/list servs/flyering; translate flyer to other languages; responsible during playgroups</td>
<td>Although efforts were made to recruit parents of other backgrounds through translating flyers; the audience was mostly middle and upper middle class parents, mostly white, mostly “new residents”, ‘for those who have choice’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Houses</td>
<td>To get interested parents to tour the school and get information; meet principal and see teachers and classrooms in action; to get parents into the school so that it becomes an “option” and public school seems less “scary”; to “change the narrative”</td>
<td>Advertise through social media/listservs; Point person (Mary) to attend each one to serve as current parent; principal in charge of tour</td>
<td>Mostly aimed at middle and upper middle class parents, mostly white, mostly “new residents”, ‘for those who have choice’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming a “Friends of GW” group/Increasing social media presence/re-branding</td>
<td>To transition from an education committee to a “Friends of” group in order to support GW exclusively, and in order to brand itself as such. To get on “people’s radar”; to be able to attract more funders/get more grants.</td>
<td>Brainstorming mission/vision/tag line for the group; recruiting designer to create logo pro-bono; creating and maintaining online presence (i.e. Facebook, Instagram accounts)</td>
<td>Mostly aimed at middle and upper middle class parents, mostly white, mostly “new residents”, ‘for those who have choice’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabling at neighborhood events</td>
<td>Have a presence in the neighborhood, get the “word out” about the group and about GW</td>
<td>Coordinating volunteers to be at the table; creating and printing flyers; volunteering hours on weekend</td>
<td>Spreading the word about GW and the Education Committee to attendees of events (mostly white)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realtor Tour</td>
<td>To show realtors the school and have them become familiar with it so they may more knowledgeably talk about it to prospective clients looking for housing in the catchment; to “change the narrative” about public schools in the city</td>
<td>Working with a group of representatives from several schools/“friends of” groups to plan a one-day event; coordinate with each school; obtain corporate sponsors; obtain school bus for transportation; coordinate all day-of logistics; advertise; print and pass out flyers with information for each school</td>
<td>Realtors; and indirectly, young parents/couples/individuals moving to South Philadelphia, “new residents” - who are mostly middle and upper middle class, mostly white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanksgiving Supply Drive</td>
<td>To obtain donations of supplies for school/teachers and to get the word out about GW teachers to the “community”</td>
<td>Enlist teachers to provide lists of resources/supplies they need (visiting the school during the day, during teacher/grade level meetings); managing the “wish lists” on amazon; advertising the supply drive on FB; interviewing teachers, getting their picture; maintaining drive during the month of Thanksgiving</td>
<td>The “community” - those who would pay attention to the drive on social media; to benefit teachers and students at the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Happy Hour</td>
<td>To obtain paper donations for the school; event to socialize with</td>
<td>Plan the event; get a space, coordinate the date, create a flyer/translate flyer; publicize on social media networks;</td>
<td>To benefit the whole school (paper reams divided among all teachers); the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the third column of this chart, I have listed all the activities involved in reaching the major project’s goal to highlight how much work, time and effort were involved in each of these projects. Many of the parents involved in this group also had full time jobs, and so the time commitment for leading some of these efforts was considerable. Some women were not working full time and so could volunteer more of their time to these projects- yet it was clear that sustaining the group’s activities required a considerable personal commitment. While the most dedicated were those that were parents or ‘pre-parents’, who had the most stake in investing in the school, it was evident that an attention to equity was also a shared belief - that parents were investing not just for their own children, but for the benefit of all the children attending the school, and for a commitment to public schools in general, which in Philadelphia were so starved of resources.

Many of the initiatives of the committee were about “changing the narrative” about Philadelphia public schools, which already had a “bad rep”. Thus, for the Open Houses,
the Little Friends, and the Realtor Tour, part of the idea was simply getting people inside
the building so they could judge for themselves about the quality of the school, and not
simply be swayed by the media and what they heard from others. Yet the continued
assumption underlying this approach, and ultimately the audience for these initiatives,
were those who had educational ‘options,’ those who could actually make a choice -
between a public, a charter, or perhaps an independent school or the ability to re-locate to
a different district. In one of the meetings where the Open House monthly initiative was
being discussed, several interesting points came up. First, the fact that many other
schools, both a popular neighborhood school as well as a charter, had open houses very
frequently, was a sign that GW should have them as well - and Mr. Davis, present at the
meeting, reiterated energetically that they would do whatever it takes to be competitive.
During the discussion, Alice mentioned her excitement for being a tour guide, and then
said that "people have this view that Philly Public Schools are crappy," followed by "not
enough people in the city have been in the schools". She then added that public schools
are not that scary, and it's not like kids are fighting all the time. Jokingly, a pre-parent and
former health teacher in the school said, "just don’t go to the 3rd floor". The 3rd floor of
the school was the middle school, where frequent fights would erupt between the middle
school students (but which were becoming less frequent during the year that Mr. Davis
was principal). After joking and chatting a bit more seriously about the initiatives in the
school, and Mr. Davis chiming in about the character education program he was very
proud of, Alice added that the stance of the group, as "community members choosing to
get involved," is that the school is doing great things, and that "people shouldn’t judge
without taking a look first". (FN2014.10.15). Many shared this view - but also acknowledged that as a Philadelphia public school, it still had its challenges.

As the discussion of the Open House continued, one of the women in the group mentioned that there were about 10 homes being sold within the catchment each month, and that targeting the new residents would be a good idea to spread the word about the school. Many seemed enthusiastic about this idea. Eventually, the idea of a Realtor Tour began to take shape - this would become an initiative of multiple schools and was modeled after successful tours and walk-thrus that had been arranged by other “friends of” groups in a different section of the city. The idea behind this was simple: if realtors themselves tour the schools, and see all the great things happening, then they will be more likely to talk about the school to prospective buyers.

**The Realtor Tour: Changing the Narrative**

Mary, frustrated by the lack of progress on other initiatives in the group, decided to take on the Realtor Tour project in 2015, not only by being the GW representative for the group of schools, but also becoming the main organizer for the day. She secured enough corporate sponsorship so that the event was funded in full, and in fact, had some extra funds that were divided among the schools. She organized the day so that a group of realtors, reporters/the media, and other community residents would attend a day which included breakfast and a walking tour of five schools. There was a folder with a one-page hand out with information for each of the schools as well as ads and flyers from some of the corporate sponsors (who were for the most part locally owned businesses). I helped
Mary and the group of organizers to stuff folders and go through the logistics of the event a week before, and also participated in the event itself, which has held in February of 2016. One of the documents that explained the events of the day to the participating school leaders stated the following:

As you know, realtors help shape our communities, and we’re excited to give them firsthand understanding of why our schools are more vibrant — and more attractive to prospective families — than the media portrays them. They’re the first connection to new residents, and we’re excited that they will be able to share our stories as part of their dialog. Thank you for opening your doors to be a part of this effort.

Being part of the school tours was very informative - especially because of how principals and teachers represented their schools. At the school where the tour kicked off, after having breakfast courtesy of Whole Foods, the principal, Ms. Johnson, welcomed us to her school. Part of her welcoming speech included an oft-heard narrative: how a few years back, ‘nobody’ wanted to send their kids to this school’, that it had a really negative image, that ‘people sent their kids to Catholic schools or other places’. However, because of all the changes and transformation the school (and the neighborhood) has undergone - including a visual transformation - now, ‘people’ wanted to send their kids here. Before her blurb to the whole group, she was chatting with a couple of people in the room, when she mentioned the phrase ‘parent power’. I jotted the following in my fieldnotes for that day:

Before everyone came in, [Ms. Johnson, the principal] came and greeted us and said a couple of interesting things about 'parent power,' in relation to how important the event was, and how it was so important to get "good parents.” She said, ‘we need good parents', and 'I have a school totally supported by the community, I am supported by the community, I have parents that have a voice, powerful parents…I am able to get things here that not other, not all schools have...'. (FN 2016.02.02_RealtorTour)
After she finished her welcome blurb, Mary, as the lead organizer for the day, chimed in. She introduced herself as one of the organizers for the event and the mother of a public school child. She then repeated the message I heard her say on multiple occasions: how Philadelphia Public schools are NOT the 'dark scary places' that the media sets them out to be, that when she first went to Zoe’s school, she saw artwork on the walls, and that it looked just like a school should look like. We then set off on the tour of the school, visiting a kindergarten class, the vegetable garden, and an impressive music room. We then hopped on the big yellow school bus that was rented for the event, and went to four other schools. Each school’s tour was led either by the principal or by a teacher, and in each we spent time in different rooms, with the tour guide highlighting different aspects of their school.

GW was the last school on our tour. We were welcomed by some of the school’s middle school student leaders, as well as the school’s mascot. We were led into the auditorium, a large room with dark panel wood walls and wood folding theatre chairs. We heard a string performance by several African American and Cambodian upper elementary students, led by the music teacher. After the performance, Mr. Davis introduced himself as well as one of the ESL teachers, who went over the ESL services offered at the school and described the classroom we would observe momentarily. After a tour that included the ESL 2nd grade classroom and the bilingual two-way immersion kindergarten, we walked into the auditorium again. Immediately, Mr. Davis was asked whether he accepts students out of the catchment for the bilingual program. He replied: “We want people that are committed from K all the way through 8th, to achieve full bilingualism and biliteracy,” adding that he wanted to keep it at the “grassroots” level, on
a “family by family basis.” Mr. Davis had shared this with me on other occasions, and on that day, he explained that he’d like to keep it this way in order to avoid having the program “blow up” where if he gets 500 people signing up, he’ll have to go through the student placement office in the district, which he wanted to avoid at all costs. He continued elaborating on the strengths and recent improvements of the school, including the fact that he had parents that ‘when needed can put up a stink at the district to get what we need’, and the proof of that was that this year he received the biggest increase in Title I funding of any other school - thanks in large part to advocacy efforts that included Mary. He then talked about student enrollment, and how this year he had more than 700 students. In the end he talked about facilities, making a joke that as real estate people they would understand how much it would cost to maintain a building such as the one we were in. He mentioned he the entire outside walls of the building were being cleaned, that they had installed a new roof, and that they were in the process of getting the boilers replaced.

Throughout the day, I chatted with several of the realtors and others taking the tour. I realized that many of individuals that were present, including the realtors themselves, were also part of this ‘movement’ of young professionals opting to stay in the city and considering sending their children to a public school. I chatted with one woman, a realtor with short hair and red-rimmed glasses, who had recently sold a house to an incoming TWI family right in front of the school, and who was talking with another man next to her about considering public school for her own children as well. Another woman commented on how ‘this parent movement is really picking up,’ adding that she was more familiar with what was happening in her part of the city.
After the event, there was an article that was published about it in a local independent online paper, where Mary was quoted extensively. She described how she personally had been struck by the number of realtors who said that it was the first time they entered a Philadelphia public school, and how they were excited about being able to confidently encourage their clients to visit their local neighborhood public school. Furthermore, she stated how this event was one of the ways in which she, along with other parents and public school advocates, can "really change the conversation" and give people information that is accurate about the schools. In addition to the article, the parent organizers and their respective “Friends of” groups shared photos, videos and blurbs of the event on Facebook, reporting the Realtor Tour a success and further spreading the good news about public schools in the city.

While there was a commitment to equity among the members of the NCA’s Ed Committee, and in its overall purpose, there was also some tension in the theory of change implicit in the activities they took on. Some parents, like Mary, were very clear in their goal: to change the narrative. Indeed, many schools seemed to have a questionable reputation, not just among the middle class crowd - some immigrant parents that I interviewed also mentioned negative reputations for the schools. Yet, the audience for many of the Ed Committee efforts, intentionally or not, were middle class and upper middle class parents and their networks. Furthermore, as I highlighted in Ms. Johnson's and Mr. Davis' comments during the Realtor Tour, having a strong parent voice, “good parents”, or “parents who will put up a stink,” was something these principals felt was instrumental in helping achieve their goals. It is not a coincidence that the first school we visited is in a gentrifying area. In her assessment, then, for Ms. Johnson, “good parents,”
those with “power”, were the middle and upper middle class parents (mostly white) who could raise funds and demand certain things from the district, either through enough advocacy, pressure, or from the right connections to the right people. To a certain extent, Mr. Davis also shared that view. Thus, there was an implicit understanding that one way to contribute to the ‘improvement’ and ‘support’ of the school was to ‘change the narrative’ in order to attract more middle class and upper middle class parents. In fact, the TWI program was seen as the key to helping GW become an ‘option’ for many middle class families, and in part, that was thanks to the activities of the NCA Ed Committee, and Mary in particular, that made the TWI program gain so much recognition in its first year. Thus, during this time, the NCA’s Ed committee and the TWI became almost crucial to each other in realizing their respective goals. The NCA’s Ed Committee was responsible for publicizing the program among networks of parents, who were mostly white, mostly middle and upper middle class, and who would make up the “English-speaking” part of the cohort, and the TWI program became the draw for many of these aforementioned parents to consider GW as a potential schooling option. In fact, for several of them, it became the only reason why they would consider this public school.

The TWI Program: The Double-edged sword of Putting GW on the "map"

Alice: [...] You know, it's like a double-edged sword. You know, the immersion program has allowed the Friends of [George Washington] group to attract people and attract families. It's allowed [Washington] to hit the ground running in a much more quick way than many other neighborhood schools.

S: Yeah.

Alice: I mean it's, it's true. Without that program, given its background and given the fact that it was [Anthony’s] first year, whatever, [Washington] wouldn't
**be on the map, right?** We would sti—we would be in our, we might just now be starting to get a little bit of interest. Maybe [Name of mother] and all those other moms would have put their kids in [Washington] based on what we were doing based on [Anthony] being there. Maybe they would have put them [their children] in a regular kindergarten class (1.0). Maybe.

*S: Maybe.

Alice: But probably not, right?

In this excerpt, Alice points towards the impact of the TWI on the school and on the newly formed Friends of GW group, and describes it as “putting GW on the map”. It was a symbiotic relationship: the TWI program had attracted families because the NCA Ed Committee spread the word about it throughout the right channels. Like Mr. Davis’ predicted, it quickly sparked interest among other middle class and upper middle class professional parents. This was attested by the well-attended open houses that Mary organized starting in the fall, which occurred every first Thursday of the month, and the many emails Mary began receiving from interested parents asking about the TWI and at GW more generally. These open houses were advertised on several popular parent listservs - email lists for parents living in certain parts of the city. In my interview with Rebecca, she remarks how a woman, an NPR reporter, had heard about the school:

Rebecca: Um, so, I, um, yeah, there's, like, an NPR reporter, on, like, one of my listservs, like, Mom Listservs for [my daughter’s] age, and she e-mailed me the other day, and, like, oh, I'm trying to remem—“re-locating from the art museum area to South Philly and I want to know more about this two-way immersion program because I think I'm going to try to find a rental in that area so my kid can go there.”

*S: Oh.

Rebecca: Right? Versus [names three popular Center City schools].
For Rebecca, this meant that word had been spreading around about the program, and that at least for this woman she refers to (the NPR reporter), the school was a draw into that area of the city, as opposed to the “big three” center city schools that were already popular among middle and upper middle class mostly white parents in the city (Cucchiara, 2013). Not only that, Rebecca was very frank about how the program was not only attracting more middle class folks like her, but that it was the only reason why some parents would even consider GW, including herself:

Rebecca: [...]’cause I knew that, like, the only way that I could get even my husband or, you know, (1.0) even myself to feel comfortable going to Washington was this program.

S: Really?

Rebecca: Yeah, and I know that (1.0) that's the same reason why, like, there are other people going there, is it's the program, it's not the scho:ol and (1.0) there are people who literally have not been to the suburbs because of this program. Like it's, this program, (p) I'm telling you, you should somehow look into this about (p) who or ask to interview people if they would have left or not if this program didn't exist because I bet it's going, it's going to be driving up the property values.

During my interview with Rebecca she talked about how her husband was never very convinced about Washington, even with the bilingual program. For Rebecca, as she makes clear, it was only because of the bilingual program that she would consider Washington an option. In the end, Rebecca got a spot at a very well regarded charter school - so after advocating for the program and being so instrumental in its development, Rebecca chose to enroll her child at a charter school. Given Rebecca’s admission above, it seems that Alice was correct in her assertion that middle and upper
middle class families would probably only consider Washington if they got a spot in the bilingual immersion program.

Another important idea Rebecca expresses at the end of the excerpt above is the belief that a “good” school, one that becomes an “option” for middle and upper middle class professional parents, will drive up property values. Indeed, in the city of Philadelphia, the perception of school quality has been a major factor in increasing property values, as the case of Penn Alexander school showed (Steif, 2013; 2014), and this was precisely part of the motivation for organizing a Realtor Tour. The connection between a good school and a good neighborhood is made explicit in multiple places - in the media, and in how people think and talk about neighborhoods and schools. In the article which covered the Realtor Tour event, the reporter stated that, “For homebuyers (and the realtors selling to them), an improving school is a win-win: Even if they don’t send their children there, good schools help raise property values and make neighborhoods more livable”. Similarly, in an op-ed article written by Jeff Hornstein, a major public figure in the FONE organization, he argues precisely this point, which his title conveys clearly: How solid neighborhoods and strong public schools are built together. He states:

Quality neighborhood schools make quality neighborhoods - and vice versa. [...] To put it bluntly, a successful neighborhood school greatly increases property values, and thereby greatly increases wealth for homeowners at the same time as it increases the City’s tax base. Increasing property values in turn leads to increased commercial activity, and to increased sales, wage, and business tax revenues - a truly virtuous cycle, the positive side of gentrification (p.1, Hornstein, 2015).
Some of the ideas expressed here resonate with the efforts of the “Friends of” groups and many ‘pre-parents’. While there are many assumptions in his article that are worth questioning, and while not everyone agreed with all of Mr. Hornstein expressed views, the logic behind some of the activities of the NCA Ed Committee and the “Friends of” groups was about getting more middle class parents into public schools as one strategy for improvement. In his article, Hornstein cites research that shows how socioeconomically integrated schools are better for all children, and this is something I heard at least one other leader within the “Friends of” movement state on multiple occasions. And yet, just like there is a tension between the ‘improvements’ that gentrification brings, so too was there a tension in attracting more middle class families as a strategy for improvement to public schools - whether indirectly through ‘changing the narrative’ or directly through events catered to this audience. Mr. Davis touches upon this tension within the logic of gentrification as improvement when I ask him about his relationship to the NCA:

S: […] and you mentioned already, sort of, that one of the community partners that you work with is the NCA and Alice, and so what has been that relationship?

Mr. D: It's great. I mean, I find it, I like that it's very informal, and, I mean, Alice was the first person that contacted me after I got the job, literally, so there's trust there, there's respect, there's a unified vision that, you know, we want to be the best, and we want to be a great school for the community. You know, we want people's hous—you know, I guess their housing prices to go up. I mean, after all, isn't that what people want?

S: Yeah.

Mr. D: Although that has implications that trouble me, you know, in terms of our immigrant population, but, you know, they've been wonderful.

S: Yeah, like the potential for prices to go too much or too high.
Mr. D: Yeah, and then, it prices out our immigrant families, you know, so it's, it's tough, and I do know colleagues that like it that way, that their neighborhoods become more and more gentrified and then they have a certain kind of kid, and I'm not thinking that way, not at all. I mean, I think, I think what I love about the area is you have all of that, you know, you have all the diversity and I think that's, that's the best, the best.

Mr. Davis describes his relationship to Alice and the NCA as great because they share the same vision for a “great school for the community”, and automatically, he makes the connection between a good school and rising property values. Yet, almost in the same line, Mr. Davis hedges when he says, “we want people’s hous-you know, I guess their housing prices to go up” and immediately follows that with how that is concerning because of his immigrant families, and how they might get priced out. And although some principals might find a “certain kind of kid” more desirable, Mr. Davis states that he loves the diversity of the area (and his school). The “certain kind of kid” Mr. Davis is referring to is most likely white and middle or upper middle class, with highly educated parents. Both Alice and Mr. Davis bring up this tension that was widely felt and talked about - the relationship between equity, diversity, and gentrification, which often, seemed like an inverse one: the more a neighborhood is gentrified, the less diverse it becomes, the more questions around equity that arise. Notice that absent from the groups of people Mr. Davis mentions are non-immigrant families who might also get priced out, for example, working class White or Black long-term residents of the area. These groups don’t seem to factor in to the groups of people Mr. Davis mentions - and in general, in the ways in which I heard many of my informants describe the area.
Like Alice and Mr. Davis, others recognized the dilemma. What Alice refers to as the “double-edged sword" of the immersion program getting GW on the "map", meant that one, the immersion program was getting on the "map" for those people who already have the privilege of 'choice', and two, that might be to the detriment of the non-immersion classrooms. Many people expressed to me, and at several meetings it was acknowledged, that not everyone had the privilege of choice, and because of that, their group efforts were about improving the school for all children and families - and not just those in the TWI program. Yet there was still the underlying logic that if more middle class and upper middle class (mostly white) parents invested in the school (through the TWI program), they would have the ability to bring in more resources to the school, either directly through personal resources or through grant-writing and advocacy in the district (or a combination of these). Thus, the efforts at gaining recognition were still aimed at a mostly white, middle class public that had the option to opt-in, or opt-out, of public schools - and most likely, they would only be opting-in to GW if they were able to secure a spot in the TWI program. Like Alice expressed firmly at one of the NCA meetings, their efforts were not “about making this school for white upper middle class kids and families” since the school serves a diverse group of children (FN2015.1.28). This sentiment was shared among the members of the NCA Ed Committee/Friends of GW. Indeed, a major draw for many of these parents to stay in the city and send their children to public school was the experience of ‘diversity,’ and, for some individuals in the NCA and some parents and “pre-parents,” there was that creeping fear that if they did a bit too well - then, like it had happened at other schools, little by little the school would become a white middle class school. Mary was clear in expressing that the goal was not to
gentrify the school but to diversify it, and she realized that the design of the TWI program would at least ensure this kind of diversity within the bilingual program.

Because there were examples of what not to do, or perceptions of things gone poorly at other schools, where working class families, mostly Black, were displaced from neighborhoods and slowly from schools, these parents were aware of the complicated entanglements between gentrification, school improvement, and displacement. However, even in my interview with Mary - she stated that she didn't think GW would experience the same dynamics of it slowly becoming a white middle class school, first, because of the structure of the TWI program, and second, she states, because the “neighborhood I think will not allow that to happen” (INT2, 2015.06.26). By “that”, Mary is presumably referring to gentrification and displacement, yet it is unclear how the "neighborhood" would prevent that kind of change. Many parents I spoke with were aware of these dynamics, and tried to work to avoid that in their own schools and organizations - although it wasn’t always clear how. For GW and the NCA Ed Committee, one way was to try and involve others in their initiatives, to be more inclusive and more diverse in their make-up, although that did not always succeed (because even if you translate flyers about a happy hour, there are really only certain parents with the interest/knowledge/networks/resources to attend them).

Furthermore, across many interactions and interviews I had with the most involved individuals in this effort, it was evident that they all felt Mr. Davis truly had an interest in serving all the children in the school, that his ‘heart’ was in the right place and he wanted to implement the TWI bilingual program not simply as a way to remain competitive but
also for the benefit of the Spanish speaking families of his school, an impression which I shared as well. Kimberly, a pre-parent and active member of the TWI planning group, explained to me that she felt that it was particularly significant that early on in the planning efforts, Lizeth and María, the Latina moms, became involved - and that it showed his collaborative stance and his commitment to serving the ‘existing’ population:

K: Kimberly, S: Sofia

K: and [Anthony] being so (2.0)
S: proactive=

K: =yeah! (1.0) and for him I feel like that's what I really like about him and respect about him he: wants to help our existing population (1.0). He's (1.0) I know that there's been issues with other schools in the area kind of (.) catering to: a diff= like (1.0)

S: yeah like more middle [class families that move= moving into the area
K: [the= the upper c= the= up= the people] coming in (0.5) you know
S: yeah

K: kind of listening to them and kind of pushing out what (0.5) and (0.5) I really AM proud of our civic and the people that we work with /cuz/ I feel like that's= I don't know if the principal= because I feel like that's just definitely never something that's been (.5) even an option (1.0) you know and I feel like that's gonna make a difference of a really great program and a really great school

S: yeah

K: you know so I'm= I'm really hopeful (rising tone) about [everything

S: [yeah] (.) yeah I agree I really admire Andrew because I think it's true I think he always has his eye like his (1.0) you know he always understands everything he needs to look out for

K: yeah

S: you know
K: and= and that's like we met (0.5) ah with Rebecca /cuz/ Rebecca she spoke um: Spanish (.) we: kind of brought in the Latina moms and we had meetings with them and (.5) that's with Lizeth and Maria um (2.0) and he was great about that and I think (.5) before him they felt like they were being shut out and nobody was listening to them and they didn't have a voice in this school and they're such a (1.0) majority in the school

S: yeah (1.0) yeah

K: so when he came I really do feel like they appreciate him too. You know and= and I think that they= I mean we haven't met with him we were trying to hold meetings it's very difficult because of (1.0) the transition= but I think it got people talking and then they got involved with the you know like (1.0) had we not= had he= if he wasn't so receptive and if our civic wasn't so I don't think that that's [would have happened] that connection I don't think it would have been as (1.0) amiable I think that they would have thought we were (1.5) trying to do something you [know what I mean like with] I don't know

S: yeah [ya:h yeah]

K: [I just think it's important for everybody to be included in on board I mean that's [obvious right (laughter)]

In this exchange, Kimberly articulates the awareness of the pitfalls of white middle and upper middle class parents having a stronger voice at the expense of others, and the danger of principals catering too much to this demographic. Kimberly felt that everyone in the NCA Ed committee that had been involved in the efforts to support GW and the TWI were on the same page, in the sense that they wanted this effort to be collaborative and diverse, and they did not want it to be about, in some ways, just themselves or people like them, white and middle/upper middle class. And, that it was important and as she states, obvious, that Spanish speaking parents - the Latina moms - be involved in this effort.

Indeed, there was a shared awareness not only within the NCA Ed Committee but through many of the “Friends of” groups and its members of the need to pay attention to
issues of equity and diversity. There was a desire to learn from past mistakes and to do things ‘right’, with equity in mind, and this was made particularly evident in an event organized by one of the local civic associations. I found myself in the unique situation of having my field work and the academic literature which I was reading come together: they had invited Professor Maia Cucchiara to give a talk on her book, *Marketing Cities Marketing Schools.*

The event was held one evening at a local community center connected to a neighborhood park. I arrived early and walked around while I waited for the event to start. The center was home to an afterschool program - in the hallway there were colorful stars displaying the names of different children in each one, as well as a community bulletin board with various colorful flyers and announcements. I noticed that on one of the boards there were beautiful re-design plans showcased, which were done by the same group who had done the re-design plans of the GW playground. The community center and park was next to an older building that had recently been remodeled into condo's, with a new City Fitness Gym on the first floor. As attendees started trickling in, I helped unfold and arrange the metal folding chairs. The meeting was attended by about twenty people. Everyone at the event, except three of us, were white, and it could be assumed that everyone was middle or upper middle class with a college education. The three of us who were not white were very much outsiders to this effort: there was a young Black man who was a student of one of the main organizers of the event (a professor of sociology); a South East Indian man who was a friend visiting one of the attendees; and myself, a Hispanic PhD student and researcher. One of the main organizers for the event stated that among the reasons this event was organized was, first of all, because they didn’t want to
repeat the mistakes of past efforts, and that this was particularly important because the interactions with the district had felt "a bit weird", so they wanted to understand if there was a legacy to this. When Dr. Cucchiara began her talk, she was enthusiastic about the fact that people were reading her book (outside the academy), and made the observation that this was a pretty “middle class” crowd, so that “we haven’t yet figured it out”. She went through a synopsis of her research and her experience studying “Grant” elementary, starting with the conundrum over which she was torn: while research shows that economically diverse schools do better than largely low-income schools, the implicit message becomes that a certain kind of person matters more. After her talk, a discussion followed. We decided to re-arrange our metal folding chairs into a large circle, and everyone introduced themselves and the reasons they were there. Aside from myself, there were three members of the NCA’s Ed Committee present-including Alice.

Individuals mentioned the situation and challenges at each of their schools. It was a very open and frank conversation - in some ways. My first impressions from the meeting were that the people who organized and attended the event were genuinely interested in being thoughtful about their efforts in ways that were sensitive to issues of equity - yet nonetheless, can’t help being part of the discourses and processes that may in the end create the same inequitable situations.

Maia Cucchiara’s book - as I illustrated above - as well as examples of schools such as Penn Alexander or the “big three” Center City schools, provided these groups with “lessons learned” on what not to do. Emphasizing equity for all children was a big one - not just for people’s own children. And in the NCA which I became involved in, many often emphasized that the goal was to diversify schools, not gentrify them. However, the
activities of the NCA’s Ed Committee still fit under the implicit (or sometimes, explicit) widely-shared (neoliberal) logic of school improvement in this city of resource-starved schools: recruit middle class and upper middle class parents to save them. And to a certain extent, in the School District of Philadelphia, that had borne out to be true: the more middle class and upper middle class parents a school had, the more it was able to raise funds and raise its profile within the district, which put pressure on the district officials to pay attention. This is why principals like Mr. Davis and Ms. Johnson valued “parent power” so much, and parents that could put up a “fight” in the district.

Parents, such as Mary, became critical in advocating for the school. Mary was involved in not only advocating in the district for GW, but also testifying at SRC hearings against approving charter schools, testifying at City Hall to advocate for increased city funding for schools, advocating for a city soda tax to be passed in order to fund pre-K in the city, and many more. Furthermore, Mary would use any opportunity she could to sing the school's praises - especially through her posts on Facebook, where she enthusiastically documented Zoe's bilingual development - making sure to always credit the bilingual program in Zoe's public school. In our interview, she talks about being able to help the school more strategically, yet how in part it is due to her being a white well-educated mother that she may have been able to be so effective.

…and so I spend a lot of time on the, on the phone, and you know, I use my blog to, to talk about GW and to talk about public schools and I, you know to the extent that I can, I can't do as much as I would like, if it was just my blog, I would probably write about education everyday um, but yeah, its, it has been, and honestly the program and the school I think it sells itself, but you do NEED-and this is, on so many levels, is kinda frustrating, you do need some-in order to bring more resources and more people back into our public schools you need someone who looks like me, to to to start, and then you get your critical mass, unfortunat-I
really I have tried not to, tried for this not to-I've wanted for that not to be totally true, but it's, you know, and the reason I want it so badly for Laura and Salvador and you guys to be at that council hearing was because I don't want it to be that way always. You know? So, I mean its probably generations before that’s you know, totally changed but…(INT2)

[...]

So anyway...its one of those things that's frustrating, but, I mean, if its if that's where we're at, then that's where we're at, and I think that that this program in particular speaks to my desire to change that. you know? because Philadelphia is not a white city particularly, its not a middle class city, particularly, but unfortunately, that's who the wheels turn, in the world.

As she’s reflecting on the role she has played, Mary painstakingly shares her perception that it is necessary to have a white, middle class person advocating for the school in order to get that “critical mass” of other white middle class parents and supporters who might have a greater impact in other school and city-wide advocacy efforts. She realizes the class and race connotations of privilege, and not only laments this fact, but actively tries to change it by reaching out to Latino parents to share some of the advocacy efforts and represent the school. To do this, she would call on me and Ms. O to invite Latino parents to also share their voice whenever she was attending an event representing GW as a parent. In one occasion, as she mentions, two Mexican parents, Laura and Salvador, were able to testify in City Hall advocating for a greater contribution from the city to the public school budget, a meeting for which I acted as a translator.

Mary often thought about the implications for equity and diversity that this line of reasoning would have on the school. She acknowledged her white privilege and her class privilege, and at the same time used it strategically to advocate for the school and other public education causes. This did not mean, however, that she was not uncomfortable
with the situation. Towards the end of our interview, she muses on these implications for equity, and her own position as a white middle class woman, and the experience of being the minority in the school.

M: [...] but its tricky, its hard, and I'm cognizant of it all the time, of, of being, knowing that, right now I am in the minority in the school, and I mean, you feel it when you walk in the door, and I pick Zoe up, you know? And I'm sure that everybody notices it, a little bit...its an interesting, THAT has been really interesting, sort of getting used to being, not just the minority in the language that I speak, and as far as the class goes and the parents goes, but also, being a minority just in the school in general, has been really interesting, and I think it should remain, essentially, that way. I don't, I would hate to walk in and have for it to be the flip of that. So, anyway, its complicated, its complicated - and I think about it a lot

S: really?

M: (laughs) yeah I do. I worry about it a lot, being really careful, not to turn this really wonderful thing for all the kids into something that, that that compromises the diversity of the school, cuz that's why you choose a neighborhood school, because it represents the neighborhood. [00:52:08.21] and and versus a charter or private school, you want it to be, WE want it to be representative, and to serve the entire community, so, we'll see.

S: thank you so much....its important to talk about them..they're complicated

M: [00:52:32.16] they are so complicated, we're gonna be talking about them until we're old and gray...probably around this very table-

S: and I think in some way that's why I'm drawn and so happy that this turned out to be my dissertation project, I saw all the complex issues...great but also need to talk about things...

[00:52:57.29]

M: and its HAAARD,

S: and its hard

M: its hard, its its uncomfortable, and, yeah, and even me-its uncomfortable for me to say, you know, someone who looks like me will bring in more people who look like ME cuz that's kind of what we're talking about but ahh you know, and its its interesting to be the person to look like me being uncomfortable about looking like me, you know, and I think that, there need to be more people that feel that, that understand that.
Interrupted by Mary's younger daughter, and with the need to pick up Zoe from school, our interview ended on this profound note. Here, Mary points to the problematic logic of the efforts that many were so passionately involved in -- and that in a very real sense she embodied. There was a varying degree to which individuals were comfortable talking about issues of class, race, and privilege. Some, like Alice, were not scared to call things out, very matter-of-factly. Others, like Kimberly, another pre-parent who has involved in the early planning efforts, hedged and stuttered their way around naming groups of people along these dimensions. Others, like Mary, seemed to be getting increasingly comfortable. Mary, for example, would point out the fact that when blanket statements were made about "people," it meant people who had the privilege of such choice. Thus, she herself acknowledged that both the efforts of her group, and her own efforts at "changing the narrative," were geared towards a specific segment of the population, one that had class and race privilege:

...because I think in Philadelphia more than many many many other cities there's a feeling that it's scary and dangerous to send your kid to public school so in order to find-and that's coming from people who have choice. Right? that's not coming from people who send their kids to public school.

This caveat that Mary makes, specifying that the discourse of schools as 'scary' places circulates among those who have the luxury of choice, was not always made explicit in conversations. It was an assumption that many middle and upper middle class parents made, because it reflected their reality.
Conclusion

As Alice mentions in her interview, the TWI immersion helped GW get on the “map” - not just for middle and upper middle class parents, but also, within the district and the city as a whole. The program was recognized in the Superintendent’s letter that accompanied Action Plan 3.0 (2015) as a successful example of the District’s bilingual efforts, and that same year the school was recognized by Mayor Nutter during one of his “innovative and effective” schools tour. In a highly publicized visit, Mayor Nutter and Superintendent Hite toured the school, making the obligatory stop at the TWI kindergarten classroom. The TWI program at GW was only one of several initiatives Mr. Davis boasted about, which helped him, in a short amount of time, get the recognition from the district and the Superintendent that he received. As a principal, he was open and collaborative with multiple community organizations, of which the NCA Ed Committee was just one. He strengthened the school’s STEM program and hired a STEM teacher; he acquired new technology for the school, including iPads and SMART boards for the younger grades; and he partnered with one of the city’s hospitals to provide support for students with mental and behavioral health needs - a connection that was facilitated by Rebecca. He had one of the largest after-school programs in the city, with four organizations providing after-school programming. He was also invested in ensuring that all of his different populations had a voice: he had seven Bilingual Counseling Assistants (BCA’s) who spent part time in the school and helped translate for families who spoke Mandarin, Vietnamese, Burmese, Nepali, Spanish, Khmer and Indonesian. Furthermore, he collaborated with the BCA’s to form language-based SACs - School Advisory Councils - so that each language based group could meet on its own and then have a
representative at the English SAC meetings. Mr. Davis had (and as of today continues to have) an ambitious vision for the school, and he thrived under the competitive pressure of the district. He had the entrepreneurial spirit that the district encouraged.

While there is no doubt that the improvement efforts that Mr. Davis has spearheaded are on their way to helping this school be considered a good quality school, the idea that a school was “good,” and for whom, is one that was produced by a combination of factors. In the city of Philadelphia, several public schools have become “high quality” public schools as attested by rising property values, waiting lists, and day-long lines of anxious parents on registration day. The schools that have become “good options” have also become schools with a rising population of white middle and upper middle class students, and a decreasing enrollment of students that are on the free and reduced price lunch program and that are African American, Asian, Latino or any other minoritized, non-white population. This change is intimately and directly tied to the change in the school’s surrounding neighborhood. That is, schools that are becoming “options” for middle class parents are those that are located in neighborhoods that have been gentrified and substantially re-developed enough so that a “critical mass” of other (mostly white) middle class parents take an interest in the school and enroll their children. This line of reasoning was what inspired many of the activities of the NCA’s Ed Committee and other “Friends of” groups - particularly the “Little friends” group, whose goal was to get cohorts of parents together for playdates, to host those playgroups in the schools, and to get the parents in schools, so that, when parents begin to get to know the school, to get to know the teachers, they dispel (for themselves) the myths that Philadelphia Public Schools are ‘scary’ places.
Throughout this chapter I’ve provided an analysis of the dynamics and greater processes that provided the fertile grounds for the TWI program to arise and grow successfully in such a short period of time. First, there were several processes occurring in the city simultaneously: young professionals choosing to stay in the city and not wanting to leave once they have children, and an increasingly worrisome fiscal crisis in the school district, depriving schools and students of essential resources, along with a neoliberal reform strategy that pushed a discourse of choice and "high-quality seats" as opposed to high quality schools. In turn, the growing demand for better educational options from young professional parents - in their majority white, highly educated and middle/upper middle class - spurred groups of people to come together to join “Friends of” groups. These young parents who were opting to stay in the city, did so out of a desire to live an urban lifestyle not only for the city amenities but for the diversity of people, experiences and cultures that the city provided. Sometimes this also meant an ideological commitment to equity and belief in the right to good public education - regardless of class, race or educational background. Thus, given the state of city schools, these new parents became perceived as agents of change: through aggressive and strategic fundraising for schools, connecting to organizations and other services and grant programs, fighting the district for greater funds/resources/teachers/rights in their own schools, etc. And because of this, these parents, in some cases, became symbolic of improving schools. Yet, the racial and class connotations of this argument also created unease. In the following chapter, I focus on the stark differences between parents in the 1st cohort of the TWI program, discussing how some of the parents that were perceived to bring about improvements also created challenging circumstances for the teacher,
placing demands on her time and energy - energy which she also needed to address many of the Latino immigrant parents' needs.
Chapter 5: Leading Parallel Lives: School, Parents and Communities

[...] particularly [our neighborhood] is just like a melting pot with so many different= although [...] we were saying that the cultures don't necessarily mix. [...] They all live, like, parallel lives...and I feel like [Washington] is a place is a place that could...change that.

- Rebecca, Interview, 2015.08.04

The lofty goal of bringing different groups of people together as a vision for the school, and specifically, the TWI program, is one that was shared by many others. Indeed, this is one of the main goals of TWI programs in general: building positive cross-cultural relationships (e.g. Lindholm-Leary, 2012). Furthermore, the majority of residents in this area, both long-term and newer residents, mentioned its cultural diversity as a benefit and a major factor in people's decisions to move here. Diversity is also a sought-after quality in what parents who "opt-in" to the Philadelphia Public Schools want in an educational experience for their children. Yet, as Rebecca notes, although different groups of people from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds live in the same place, it seems that their paths don't meaningfully intersect. In fact, because Rebecca is bilingual, she was one of the few participants in my study who reported having a friendly relationship with several of her Mexican and Spanish-speaking neighbors. During our interview she described how she frequented her corner bodega and had made friends with the Mexican family who runs it, exchanging hand-me downs of children's clothes and what not. She also is the one who befriended Lizeth during a community meeting, and the one who looped her in once the planning for the bilingual TWI program began. They had also gotten together for a few play dates, since their children are close in age, as well as
some language exchange conversations. When I interviewed Rebecca, though, it seemed they were both too busy and life had caught up with both of them. Yet, she mentioned that she had just gotten in touch with Lizeth to hire her to clean her home; she knew Lizeth was looking for work and wanted to help her out. In fact, she also referred her to several of her friends (I also got a referral text where Rebecca sang Lizeth's praises), and this is something Lizeth told me she was very grateful for.

The relationship between Rebecca and Lizeth shows some of the incredible differences between the parents, or in this case, the "pre-parents", of children in the TWI program. It also shows some of the possibilities. Although the class and educational differences between these women may seem problematic, and representative of the unequal social positions of those who represent the "English speakers" and those that represent the "Spanish speakers" in these kinds of TWI programs, it is also illustrative of some of the more optimistic possibilities. First, these women were both part of the planning group, and "parent founders" of the TWI program - on (somewhat) equal footing. Second, they maintained a friendly relationship, where one used her privilege to provide an employment opportunity for another (and hopefully opening up more doors). Third, this situation is something that would not happen in Lizeth's country of origin, Mexico. Although it may be cringe-worthy to think of the Mexican mother working to clean the house of the white American mother, in Mexico, these two women - the cleaning lady and the woman that hired her - would most likely not be friends, and would most definitely not send their children to the same school. Furthermore, if it was the case that Rebecca hired Lizeth as an assistant, or an administrator, or translator, it may not give us as much pause, which means this may have more to do with the value associated
with certain types of work and the status of certain jobs, such as cleaning and manual labor.

Nevertheless, the trajectories of these women are enormously different. Rebecca and her husband, both highly educated professionals, chose to buy a house and make this part of Philadelphia their home; while Lizeth, almost a decade ago, made the difficult decision to leave her home country, travel a dangerous journey across the desert, and come to a new country seeking a better life and better opportunities. The Mexican society Lizeth was fleeing is one that is incredibly classist, with little opportunities of upward mobility, and often with few economic or educational opportunities to make a difference (Esquivel Hernández, 2015; Portes & Hoffman, 2003). Neoliberal trade policies have widened the gap between rich and poor in Latin America, where in all countries, with few exceptions, wages stagnated or decreased for urban workers while wages increased for those in the top 10\textsuperscript{th} percentile (employers, high-level managers, etc.), making migration the "economic strategy of choice for an increasing number of Latin Americans" (p.73, Portes & Hoffman, 2003).

Thus, the significant differences between these two women are the focus of the present chapter, which aims to describe the different experiences of parents that were labeled "English-speakers" and those that were labeled "Spanish-speakers" in the TWI program. As I described in the introduction to this dissertation, and as this vignette shows, TWI programs bring together children and families from vastly different experiences and from different linguistic, cultural, racial and class backgrounds. Furthermore, the children and families that are part of this program have come together
as a result of larger social processes, which, as discussed in Chapter 4, include gentrification, the opt-in movement, and a market-based reform effort in the district. In addition, some of these families have also come together as a result of immigration - more specifically, the majority of Spanish-speaking families in this cohort are relatively recent immigrants to the United States who settled in this particular part of the city.

Based on interviews, my fieldwork observations and interactions, and news and social media sources, I outline the experiences, concerns, and discourses that were evident for these parents and families and how they point to very different realities, and show how those differences created particular challenges for the teacher and the school. First, I illustrate the teacher’s point of view in terms of the parents, their differences, and the challenge in managing them. Then I follow with a general discussion of the parents and children labeled "English-speakers" in the first cohort. In this section, I focus on the experiences of white middle class parents and the particular case of Jane, because it illustrates many of discourses that circulated among middle class white parents opting to send their children to public schools. In this section I also discuss the parent “outliers”: working class White and Black families that were part of the cohort, yet whose experiences are often overlooked in the dichotomized perception of two-way programs. I follow this with a comparison to the very different realities of the parents of the "Spanish-speakers". The Latino parents I interviewed described to me very different pressures and discourses than those of their counterparts, and thus our interviews looked quite different to that of the "English-speakers". Finally, I conclude this chapter with a summary and discussion of the different needs, demands and pressures these different populations placed on the school and the TWI program.
Ms. O's Perspective

One of the biggest challenges for Ms. O was not only managing different parent populations who have very distinct needs and demands, but also managing the corresponding needs and abilities of the children entering kindergarten in the same cohort. When I interviewed Ms. O after her first year of teaching in this TWI, she described the act of balancing the “two” parents - those that are very demanding, with those that are less involved:

Yo creo que los retos más grandes, uno de los retos más grandes es como balancear esos dos padres, ¿no? Como unos padres fueron super, you know, well-educated and involved and a little extreme, and the other parents that kind of, you have to sort of chase so that they do their work to help their child, etc. And so that they participate, then, in their children’s education, and then, that same thing is reflected in the classroom, because they have their challenges in the classroom, in the same classroom with the children, the children that are making progress because they have parents that are helping at home, because they have, lets say, the tools, right? With which to teach their children how to improve, learn to read, learn to write, learn to do math, and then there are parents that don’t do anything with their children and the children struggle]

Ms. O then makes the distinction between two groups of parents: those who help their children at home, and those who don't. She connects these types of parents to the results
in the classroom: children who make progress, and children who struggle. Part of the challenge is that these children learn side-by-side, in the same classroom. I have organized Ms. O's comments in table form, to illustrate the juxtaposition she makes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents that are well-educated, involved, a little extreme</th>
<th>Parents that you have to chase so they help their child/to participate in their child’s education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children that are making progress because parents are helping at home,</td>
<td>Children that have their challenges in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(because) Parents have the tools to help</td>
<td>Parents that don’t do anything with their children at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children struggle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4: Parent Juxtapositions 1*

In our interview, she continues talking about parents, and mentions the advice she received from Mary, in preparation for the second school year, when she was about to welcome the second cohort of students into the TWI kindergarten. She states:

Ms. O: [Mary] me dijo eso que pusiera boundaries, que aprendiera a poner boundaries, because now my, at least, like, half my year, half my—

S: Parents.

Ms. O: Are going to be parents, [inaudible] [003:00] like Jane, you know, un poquito como over the top and demasiado involved y que…me dijo también que debería añadir like a written letter, either, like, bimestral o mensual y que allí también como que to set up boundaries con, con esos padres o con todos los padres, porque en realidad los padres Latinos también—they used to show up in the middle of the class para que los ayudara a interpretar o fill out a form or have a meeting or hablar, o sea, es como the two opposites pero al final tienen, each tienen sus challenges, ¿no?

[Ms. O: [Mary] told me to have boundaries, to learn to set boundaries, because now my, at least, like half my—

S: Parents
Ms. O: Are going to be parents…like Jane, you know, a little bit over the top and too involved and that, she said I should also add a written letter, bimonthly or monthly and in that way set up boundaries, with those parents, or really with ALL parents, because in reality the Latino parents also—they used to show up in the middle of class so that I could help them interpret or fill out a form or have a meeting or talk, I mean, its like the two opposites but in the end, they each have their challenges, right?]

In this second excerpt, Ms. O adds to this juxtaposition - stating that parents that need boundaries are parents like Jane, the ones in the left column. Then, as she's reflecting on the different needs some of her Latino parents, she realizes boundaries would be helpful for them as well. So we could complete the chart in this way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents like Jane - a bit over the top</th>
<th>Latino parents that need an interpreter, help filling out a form, or need to talk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents that need boundaries</td>
<td>Parents that also need boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents that would appreciate/like/benefit from a written letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two opposites - but they each have their challenges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5: Parent Juxtapositions 2*

Ms. O’s dichotomy is one that places involved parents in the same category as white middle class parents like Jane, and Latino parents as the ones more likely to not be involved or not to have the tools to be involved in their child’s education, and who may need assistance in translating and/or filling out forms.

Its important to point out that in reality, these neat dichotomies were more complicated. First, the lack of available bilingual personnel in the school meant that Spanish speaking Latino parents who needed assistance did go to Ms. O for a variety of issues. The Spanish Bilingual Counseling Assistant, Ms. Juliet, was only in school three
days a week. Nobody in the front office was bilingual in Spanish. Thus, given the lack of support in the school overall, the responsibility to help Spanish-speaking parents fell on Ms. O. Secondly, and most importantly, Latino parents were very involved in their children’s education, and that was something Ms. O felt and acknowledged. For example, Ms. O always had more than enough parents to volunteer to chaperone on field trips, so much so that on occasion she had to limit their participation or turn some away. Even though the school did not require it, Ms. O's parents, mostly the Latina moms, would organize themselves so they could provide food to bring for all the children during these trips, which would include making sandwiches, making bags of fresh fruit, bags of chips, buying cases of small water bottles, etc. During social events organized for the TWI families, such as the potluck held in the fall and picnic in the spring, almost all the children in the classroom and their families participated. Ms. O always made an extra effort to make sure all the children and parents attended these events, even offering to make arrangements for those whose parents worked late and could not attend. When I asked about her expectations for parent involvement, she replied the following:

Los padres Hispanos, hay, dependiendo de su, de su educación y de su nivel, ¿me entiendes? O se involucran o no se involucran, pero el Latino en general me parece que es un, que están muy involucrados, pues, en, en su, en la vida de sus hijos y luego la otra parte, bueno, algunos, I think they had the challenge que tenían que trabajar mucho, que no podían, ¿me entiendes?

[The Hispanic parents, depending on their education and their level, you know what I mean, they either get involved or they don't get involved, but in general the Latino parent is very involved, in the life of their children and then on the other side, well, some, I think they had the challenge that they had to work a lot, that they couldn't [get involved]. you know what I mean?]
Thus, Ms. O knows that many Latino parents are involved in their children's lives, but some may not have the educational level, or the time, or the "tools" to help them *academically*. Yet, she knew she had a strong parent group she could count on, who were involved and present in the classroom. Ms. O “chased” some parents, which also included non-Latino parents, to support their children academically at home out of a deep commitment to seeing all her children succeed - especially her Latino children. There was a lot of pressure on Ms. O to demonstrate that children were learning according to certain benchmarks and she felt she did not have enough time to devote to children individually, thus, Ms. O really emphasized that parents help their children at home, especially those who were struggling. Ms. O noticed what a difference it made when parents did work with their children at home, especially when Ms. O mentioned specific concepts or skills the children needed to practice. Thus, she would often plead with parents - *to help her* help their children learn - that she couldn’t do it alone.

Having to manage these different parent populations was a responsibility that took up a lot of Ms. O's time and energy. These pressures were on top of the fact that she was the face of the brand new TWI program, which meant she had a constant stream of visitors, volunteers, and student teachers in her room at all times. Not only that, Kindergarten in a 90-10 TWI program is particularly challenging given that for many of the children it is a total immersion experience. There was also significant pressure to be accountable for student learning according to district benchmarks, an accountability system that also reflected on her as a teacher. That year, she was also finishing up her master’s degree, and was studying to take the teacher licensure exams. On top of all of this, Ms. O, had to manage the parents, and in particular, several demanding parents,
which as she mentions, were “a little extreme”. These parents mostly belonged to the "English-speakers" part of the cohort - which I turn to next.

The "English-speakers"

The very first cohort of the TWI program had six students that were considered "native English speakers." These students came from English speaking homes and non-Hispanic backgrounds. They were Zoe, Michaela, Kelsy, Lilly, Devon, and Tara. Of these six, Zoe, Michaela, Lilly and Tara were white, and Kelsy and Devon were African American. Zoe, Lilly and Tara come from middle class and upper middle class households, where one or both parents had finished college or beyond and worked in professional careers. Michaela came from a working-class English speaking Italian-American family who had lived in this part of the city for generations, and was being raised by her grandmother. Kelsy was also being raised by her grandmother and commuted from a different part of the city. Zoe, Michaela and Kelsy were three of my primary focal students, and Tara and Lilly were two of my secondary focal students. For all of them, I interviewed one or both of their parents or main caregivers: Kelsy's and Michaela's grandmothers, Lilly's mother, and Tara's and Zoe's parents.

When I conducted the interviews, I would usually start off by asking how they got "here": how they found out about the program, why they decided to enroll their children, and what other options they considered, if any. Lilly, Tara and Zoe's parents, along with the other middle class white parents I interviewed, described to me the different schooling options they considered. This often involved doing some research and even
some school visits, as well as talking to friends or acquaintances and getting information through Listservs, social media networks or local parent groups. Zoe's parents, Mary and John, described the options they were considering, which included both charter schools and their assigned public school, which they thought they would eventually go with, until they learned about the TWI program at Washington. Tara's parents received a flyer about the TWI program at Tara's daycare, and quickly got in touch with the principal to talk about the possibility of sending Tara there, given that she was a little young to begin Kindergarten (but her parents thought she was ready). The bilingual aspect of the program quickly became a plus for them and the main reason they considered Washington. Lilly's older brother already attended Washington, and Lilly's mother, Talia, thought it was a great opportunity for her daughter to become bilingual from an early age, and so that she could communicate with her new Latino friends' families and neighbors.

Kelsy's grandmother, Carla, found out about the program through a relative of hers who volunteers at one of the afterschool programs, and who knew that Carla was looking for a school for Kelsy. Even though Carla lives in a different part of the city, she grew up in the surrounding area of the school, where she still spends much of her time with her relatives who live there. During our interview, although Carla at first mentioned she hadn't considered other options for Kelsy, it became clear that she had done extensive research and had gone to several Center City schools she had heard were good to see if she would be able to register Kelsy. She quickly realized those schools are at capacity with children from the catchment area. After learning about the bilingual program, Carla, like Tara's parents, also reached out to Mr. Davis to inquire about it. Because this was the first year, Mr. Davis didn't have many children and families from his catchment sign up,
especially not those that would make up the "English-speakers" portion of the group. So, he asked Carla to follow up later, once he was sure he had a spot. In keeping with Mr. Davis' desire to get families who were going to be truly committed to the program, he asked her if she was really willing to drive her granddaughter every day and stay committed to the program; to which she said yes, and enrolled.

In contrast, Michaela's grandmother, Ms. Anne Marie, was recruited by Mr. Davis during a meeting held to discuss another one of her grandchildren’s behavior (for whom Michaela's grandmother was also the main caretaker). At the end of the meeting, Mr. Davis thought to offer this option for Michaela, and Ms. Anne Marie agreed. Michaela was already going to attend Washington School, and the bilingual program seemed like a good opportunity. During our meeting, Mr. Davis describes how he mentioned the program to her and was surprised at her interest:

So during those meetings about her grandson, you know, I, I offered that. I said, 'hey, by the way, you know, is this something you'd be interested in?' And, you know, it-it, I consider her and her family interesting because they really represent a population within [this part of] Philadelphia, within our school that, you know, sometimes you would question would, would want something like this, but people do, people do, so I'm, I'm, in a way it's, you know, that cohort's really diverse, really diverse.

The population Michaela represents, as Mr. Davis describes it, is not one who Mr. Davis assumed would be interested in the program. Perhaps this is because they were a working class family. Thus, when Mr. Davis describes the first cohort as really diverse, he is most likely thinking about the class and race diversity that exists, specifically within this small group of "English-speakers". In other words, Michaela represents not only a child from a white working-class family, but one from an Italian American family that at one point
represented the majority of residents in this area. Kelsy and Devon are both African-American children from working class families. Thus, the small group of "English speakers" do come from different class and race backgrounds, something which many stakeholders - both parents and administrators - seem to value. Yet some of this diversity, particularly within the "English-speakers" group, may be compromised as the program gains more popularity within networks of parents that tend to be white, middle/upper middle class, and highly educated.

Within this rigid dichotomy of thinking about the children as "English-speakers" or "Spanish-speakers", there was one student who did not fit neatly into either category. He was English-dominant, in the sense that he was more comfortable expressing himself in English, but he came from a bilingual home, where both parents were bilingual. Santiago's mother, Jane, is white, middle class and highly educated. Santiago's father, Esteban, is also highly educated and from Costa Rica. Santiago was the only student in this cohort with mixed heritage, and whose case I will discuss in detail in Chapter 7. Santiago's mother, Jane, like her middle class counterparts, described learning about the program and considering several well-researched options for their son. Jane's case is especially illustrative of some of the more problematic tensions of recruiting and attracting middle class white parents to programs that are within urban, underfunded public schools that face incredible challenges.
Jane’s Case

As will be discussed in Chapter 7, Jane had been very hesitant to enroll Santiago in a public school. She found the building old, dark, and depressing, and the reputation of public schools in the city did not do much to help the image of a resource-starved school in a seemingly old and crumbling building. Yet, there were several important factors that convinced Jane to enroll Santiago. First, the fact that the bilingual program was a 90/10 model was a big draw for Jane and Esteban’s goal of having their son become bilingual and proud of his Latino identity, as will be discussed in Chapter 7. Second, and very importantly, the principal, Mr. Davis, was very open and accessible to them, and after meeting twice with Jane, he invited her to be part of the hiring committee for the new TWI Kindergarten teacher. The kind of influence Jane was invited to have in this important decision for the program set a precedent for how much of a voice Jane wanted to exercise as the school year began.

One of the first days of school, Jane expressed her dissatisfaction with the dismissal process, and volunteered to think of another system or to streamline the one Ms. O had in place. She expressed this in a long email she sent to Ms. O, who reading it the evening after a long day of teaching, became upset and anxious about the procedures she had in place. On another occasion, Ms. O reported that she saw Jane meeting with Mr. Davis, after which he came over with a printed copy of Ms. O’s “Donors Choose”
During that meeting, Jane had also asked to see and discuss the kindergarten curriculum. On top of that, during this time Jane had also been persistently asking Ms. O to provide her with a list of high frequency words in Spanish, and had also been insisting on coming to the classroom to read to the children. It was during one of these conversations, at the peak of Ms. O’s frustration, that she shared with me that she was passionate about bilingualism and that she was in it for her Latino children and for supporting her community, that she wasn’t there “para los hijos de los gringos” [for the children of the gringos], and that she thought Mr. Davis was catering too much to ‘them’ (FN2014.10.28). Ms. O passionately cared for all her students, yet the kind of pressure she was feeling, which was coming from parents like Jane, and the kind of attention Jane was receiving from the principal, made Ms. O feel frustrated that the attention was disproportionately on one (very small) population, and not on the needs of all the other children (and parents) in her classroom.

More often than not, some of Jane’s more serious concerns were not necessarily things that Ms. O could control or that had to do with her classroom in particular. For example, in my interview with Jane and Esteban, the first big issue that came up for Santiago, after “getting off to a good start”, as Jane reported, were the “lunch ladies”. The “lunch ladies” refers to the women who are responsible for administering the cafeteria.

---

5 Donor’s Choose is a popular website for teachers to create fundraising campaigns for their classroom. They create a page and a project which specifies the kinds of materials and supplies needed, with specific descriptions of the projects and a description of the children and the classroom. People then donate money to specific projects and if the goal amount is reached by a certain time, teachers (and students) receive the supplies selected.

6 Some of the wording, which Ms. O borrowed from a fellow teacher highlighted the ‘high needs’ of the children in the classroom, making it seem that they all came from low-income households.
and who by default, were also responsible for overseeing all of the children in the cafeteria during lunch time, often without any administrative support. Many of these women were African-American. The head woman in charge was Ms. Johnson, an African American woman who had a reputation for being strict and stern in her demeanor. The following is the interview excerpt where we discuss this:

J: an issue from the beginning …he complained about the lunch ladies
S: o:h right
J: and the very= and I= in his defense even though I think he over reacted in his defense the very first day of school I got yelled at by the lunch ladies
E: yeah
S: (laughter)
J: because the very first day we don't know what we're doing
E: yeah
J: and we sat in the first two rows and this lady comes over and she's like=
E: 'mo:ve all the wa:y to the [ba:ck']
J: [you] don't sit in the first two rows that's [for people that are eating]
E: [we don't know]
J: 'you sit in the back' I was like okay (laughter) but everyday he because he is a little anxious
S: [yeah]
E: [yeah]
J: he felt like they were yelling at him. [The principal] was like they just talk= they say they were just talking in a loud voice and so it's just like a cultural thing too like he's interpreting it as being yelled at
S: yeah
J: and they're interpreting it as this is like we're just being authoritative and like telling you kids to [not throw food]
E: [but he's just a sensitive little] prick my son [you know what my son]
J: [laughter]
E: it's just like 'aw you're mean to me'
S: [laughter]
J: [yeah] he said= he said that he's moody [but they are little]
E: [so I said] it's gonna be a time in life
S: [laughter]
J: he said he should man up he thought he should man up but I felt bad for him
S: [yeah]
J: [/cuz/] he was like feeling like he was being picked on by the lunch ladies or like singled out and then (.) I don't [know]
E: [but at] the same token when I grew up and was in kindergarten I never had that experience too I never had anybody screaming at me so: I don't know (laughter)
S: yeah
E: so: it's hard for me to [to relate]
J: [I did bring it up to (the principal)] and he said that it was an issue in the past and that those people were let go and that he felt that the people that remained had better attitudes.

Several things are important to point out. One, Jane talks about her own nervous interaction with the lunch ladies, and although she reports that it does not legitimize her son’s "over-reaction", she nonetheless describes her interactions with the lunch ladies as unwelcoming and anxiety-producing. Two, Esteban’s own ambivalence towards this issue shines through, as he is debating over wanting his son to “man up” but also wanting to relate and understand his son’s experience vis-a-vis his own. Third, Jane’s confidence and ability to go straight to the principal to talk about this issue is indicative of a middle-class entitlement and characteristic of the ways in which middle class parents deal with
institutions (Lareau, 2011; Reay, 2010; Wois, 2010). Finally, the characterization of this as a “cultural difference” stands as a euphemism for a very marked racial and classed difference of the kinds of expectations Jane held for interactions between adults and children at school. What is absent from this conversation is any kind of mention of Santiago’s own behavior during lunch time - which Ms. O constantly characterized as ‘awful’, or ‘sneaky’ - where he would instigate a play fight or other objectionable behaviors and then complain about the consequences (the lunch caretakers reprimanding him for it).

The lunch time seemed to produce anxiety for Santiago, which in turn made Jane anxious about the situation and quite vocal with the principal and the teacher about it. The principal, in turn, talked to the lunch caretakers about this issue, which seemed to have a ripple effect on their attitude towards Ms. O and the “new parents” - that is, the white middle class parents, which were at this point a very small minority, yet had already had an effect on their job and their relationship to their supervisor (the principal). Lunch time was very regimented: students were separated by gender, grade level, and classroom, they were required to line up to get their food, they had a certain amount of time to eat, and they had indicated time to go to the bathroom. They also had minimal time for recess (about 15 min), if the weather permitted it. This went directly against Santiago’s own past experience at a Montessori school and the kinds of values and environment that Jane, like many of her middle class peers, expected and desired from an educational institution. When during our interview I make the distinction with the experience at a Montessori school (having attended one myself for elementary school), Jane elaborates:
S: and if it was so different from [you know Montessori]

J: [at Montessori] it was like okay it was always sit with your frien= and it was no lunch time it was like whenever you wanted to eat and (.) it was all like whenever you wanted to have snack whenever you wanted to eat it it was more like a little family of what like twenty kids compared to like a whole cafeteria so it was like a little culture shock there

S: yeah

J: compare public and private

S: yeah

J: but that was his main thing like in the beginning of the year he never complained about the class

Here, Jane describes the contrast in approaches to lunch time as indicative of the differences between 'public' and 'private' school. Later on in the interview, I try to get at what part of their perception of public school is what was not a 'good match' for their son:

J: but if I want him at a school that focuses on play like that= play has to be like= play and movement have to be like the main thing /cuz/ otherwise he can't learn anything if he doesn't like it get out his wiggles

S: and is that sort of the main reason why you think like public school is just not a good match just because of= is it because of so like Santiago’s particular like need to be moving or is it like

J: yeah I mean the other day I drove by our um public school here in [name of neighborhood] it was snowing and the kids are outside…I was like what= honestly I've never given er the school here a= a chance like

[++]

J: so we've never really given them that school a chance and um like traditionally here like the middle class people have sent there kids to the ah catholic school which closed down two years ago …so now there's like a movement for like everyone to invest in the local public school …but traditionally it's only been the children that attend the h= that live in the housing project and our neighborhood had went to the [public school]

Throughout the interview, the kinds of values and ideas about what Jane desired in a schooling experience, particularly at the primary level, ideas like “play” “independent
learning” and “diversity”, are values, ideas, and attitudes that are part of a particular class based stance, or habitus (Bourdieu, 1977; Lareau, 2011), that was shared across middle class parents that I interviewed.

Part of this stance, for this particular group of middle class parents that were “staying in the city,” was a commitment to diversity and to the right to a good public education. This ideological component seemed to go along with this wave of "new" residents in the city, which is evident in the organizing to support public education that I described in the previous chapter. It is also evident in the way some parents described their decision to choose public school for their children as one that is aligned with their values and beliefs, which at the same time, meant there was a level of guilt for those who chose to ultimately take their children out of the program, such as Jane. In the excerpt below, as she continues talking about the movement of middle class people investing in public school, Jane recognizes the moral dimension of the decision to attend public school, by characterizing it as "the right thing to do":

J: but is sounds like people are really investing in it and giving it a chance and they're trying to recruit more people (. ) more middle class people from the neighborhood and have it be like everybody working together so I think that's a good goal

S: yeah

J: but because I feel like I was burned already once (laughter)

S: yeah

J: by like **trying to like do the right thing** /cuz/ I do think public education is the best thing like being in a more **diverse environment** but I just think I probably wouldn't try it again.
Throughout the interview, Jane describes that she would like an educational environment for her son that focuses on play and movement, which was in stark contrast to the highly disciplined and controlled environment that urban public schools with a majority minority population provide. The highly scrutinized focus on achievement as measured by standardized test scores has narrowed down the curriculum and shifted focus on the tested ‘academics’, with electives such as art, physical education, music, and others being cut down or eliminated, particularly due to the underfunding.

Class Advantages: School Readiness and the Privilege of Choice

As described above, Jane and Esteban made the decision to take Santiago out of the program. They felt his well-being was more important to them than what the bilingual program offered, and that they wanted him to like school and be excited by it - not be depressed and anxious about it. They discuss their decision in the following excerpt:

J: yeah like we didn= we want him to be learning but we also want him to be happy and so like at this age his mental health is more important than like learning to read and write and do math because he was doing like= he was doing like advance math when he was four he was already like counting by tens and fours and when he was four so I'm really not that worried that he'll I think he'll catch up whenever we want to put him in like a more academic (.) [direction]

S: [yeah]

E: yeah

S: and I bet you that also didn't help his behavior you know

J: oh yeah like he was coming home with like writing number ones like he was doing that when he was like two (laughter)

E: so like one two one to ten like
[...]

J: u:m but yeah I mean I know there were kids that probably couldn't write their name going into kindergarten and they needed that practice so it's hard when you have dif= all these different levels like

S: yeah [yeah]

J: I completely yeah I don't blame anyone for his [experiences] I just think it wasn't the right fit for him

Jane and Esteban realize that they want him to, above all, be happy, and that the academic learning will follow once they choose to focus on that. Furthermore, they come to the conclusion that the program was just not “the right fit” - and that no one is to blame for that. This kind of conclusion and decision - of taking Santiago out of the program and doing a combination of home schooling and an outdoor nature-focused program the rest of the year - is only available to them as middle class professional parents with *schooling options* to choose from. Having the ability to decide whether something is the “right fit” or not is only possible when there are actually various options from which to choose - and this is a privilege that not everyone has, particularly in terms of schooling. The prevalence of this kind of talk - of whether something is the “right fit” or not, was very prominent in my conversations with white middle class parents - and almost completely absent from my conversations with working class and immigrant parents. In Chapter 7 I will highlight how Mary and John also stated very clearly that they felt the immersion program was very right for Zoe, given her advanced language skills - and like them, several other parents expressed similar ideas - these ideas form part of the discourse of school choice - something I will take up again in the conclusion to this chapter.
Jane rightly points out the different levels of “school readiness” with which children come to school - one of the major challenges of this program. Jane states, “I know there were kids that probably couldn't write their name going into kindergarten and they needed that practice so it's hard when you have dif= all these different levels.” For Jane, this was part of the reason this program was not the “right fit” for him, and they would rather have him be happy than have him focused on ‘academics’ yet be miserable. What’s noteworthy here is Jane’s expectation that Santiago will eventually catch up, given his advanced skills, particularly in math. Throughout the interview it was clear that there was no doubt about Santiago’s literacy development and cognitive abilities. Indeed, Santiago’s parents’ considered his abilities beyond what was being asked of him in school - and this is something many of the white middle class parents expressed.

Santiago’s parents' belief in his cognitive abilities and academic development - or better stated, the lack of doubt in his ability, is telling of their social positioning and own educational background. As a professional who works in school settings, Jane knows she has the knowledge and skills to understand the kinds of behaviors and abilities required for school literacy, and by doing all the ‘right things’ at home (reading, exposure to print, etc), they know they are preparing Santiago for what is to come in more academic settings. As I will discuss in Chapter 7, Zoe also began kindergarten with high levels of schooled literacy that helped to quickly position her as an advanced student vis-a-vis her classmates (although neither did Zoe or her parents ever mention a lack of rigor as a problem). During an interview with another parent, Talia, she also expressed a similar idea as Jane, that even though the immersion experience was difficult for her daughter Lily, that in fact, it had been good because otherwise she might have been bored:
T: anyway - and, she's just um, she walks around muttering in Spanish half the time, she just yeah yeah, it’s been really nice to see that she really took to it like that. Despite her grumbling - she does complain sometimes that it's hard

S: yeah

T: so it’s not easy - the class. But I mean **I'd rather have my kids stretched than not**, so for me, that's okay. And I thought, in a regu-traditional kindergarten class she might have been a little bored, because of where her birthdate falls. She actually spent an extra year in pre-school, because she's a January kid, so she came after September, so I think she would have been rather bored if she hadn't had the second language to learn, cut even for the first month - **as hard as it was for her, learning a new language that month, her biggest complaint the first month was, why do I have to write my name again? I know how to write my name, like in the HW assignment, she's like I've been writing my name for a while and why do I have to keep doing this.** So, um, so I think it was very good for her. and I think it’s helped her learn other concepts too - in English, do you know what I mean? Like, she she understands all the things she should understand, you know? The things that I only understand in English she seems to understand in two languages - so, so that's good.

Talia describes the program as being “good for her” daughter, even when it was difficult at times, especially because it had increased Lilly’s own metalinguistic awareness of the elements of English. Talia, like Jane, reports that her daughter complained about work that seemed to easy - such as writing down her name. Part of Ms. O’s morning routine was having students write their name multiple times on lined paper. As the year went on the students transitioned to writing notebooks, where they were free to practice other kinds of writing. For some students, like Santiago and Lily and several others - who already knew how to write their name - this seemed like a tedious activity. Some students, like Zoe, would take it as an opportunity to write more: to write other children’s names, or to write notes, or simply to draw. This is one example of how the different levels of schooled literacy with which the children entered kindergarten posed a
challenge, especially for a first year teacher. Knowing how to differentiate activities is crucial, and its also a skill that comes with time and experience teaching.

These differences seemed even more pronounced the second year of the program, with the second cohort of kindergarteners in the TWI program. On the very first day of Kindergarten, as the children were going up one by one to put away their things and were waiting at their tables to be called up, I noticed that some of them began picking up on all the things in the classroom with which they already were familiar. Right away, a tall, lanky, blond boy, while reading the letters in the large ABCs lined up along the top of the white board, noticed something different. He said, “why are there two n’s?” Another girl, already bilingual because of her mother’s home policy of only speaking Spanish (her own second language) to her children, began singing an ABC song in Spanish while pointing to the letters in the ABCs on her name chart. A boy at another table began counting the numbers on his number chart in English. All of this happened within the first 30 minutes of being in the classroom. The first thing I jotted down in my field notes for that day was, “WOW – super different from last year – MC/super prepared,” where MC meant middle class. This reaction was due to the way many of the mostly white middle class children were responding to their new classroom environment. These children aforementioned were the “English-speakers” part of the cohort, who were white, and came from homes with highly educated parents. The second cohort of the TWI program was a sharp contrast to the first, because it had a much larger population of English-speaking, white and middle class children. In other words, it was the "ideal" proportion of "English-speakers" to "Spanish-speakers," as TWI theories dictate. Most likely, this new cohort is more representative of what is to come in the future for this TWI program.
Middle Class White Parents: Improvement Efforts and the Threat of Leaving

While these events and conflicts mentioned above are specific to Jane’s case, they are illustrative of one of the main challenges of (mostly white) middle class parents entering public schools: what they seek in an educational experience is often not what’s in offer at these schools. This incompatibility, along with an orientation to social justice and/or equality, led to parents’ desire to ‘change’ or ‘improve’ the school. Some of these efforts, for some, are not only welcomed but desired, even a 'survival' strategy for some school leaders as discussed in Chapter 4. At other times, some efforts on the part of middle class white parents seemed like an overstepping of boundaries, a show of disrespect and/or entitlement, and a selfish move to improve a particular child’s experience. At other times still, the well-meaning efforts to offer “help” simply taxed the school - and the teachers - in ways that overburdened their tough load already - as in Ms. O’s experience with Jane’s constant desire to help and improve what she deemed unsatisfactory.

There were also important differences in the ways some parents and pre-parents chose to exercise their power/privilege in order to help the school. Some parents, such as Jane, as well-intentioned as she was, became a constant source of stress for the teacher. However, others, like Mary, became a strategic partner to the school - both for the principal and the teacher - and an outspoken advocate for public schools and school funding during a contentious year in the district. While these differences were probably due to idiosyncrasies in personality and in approaches to people and to improvement
efforts, they also were significantly affected by their children’s own experiences in the program, and the parents’ way to deal with children’s emotions and reactions. In other words, Jane, and her son Santiago, were both anxious about multiple aspects of school - and their anxiety probably fed into each other’s. On the other hand, Zoe was overall very happy in school and in the classroom - thus Mary had much less to worry about. As previously mentioned, the gender component was a big factor in their experiences, as was the racialization of Santiago that I will discuss in Chapter 7. Finally, there were some white middle class parents who were a “mid-point” between these two extremes, who seemed to be not too involved, yet involved enough when there was a problem or something needed to be addressed at school.

In the beginning of her second year as the TWI’s kindergarten teacher, Ms. O quickly identified the couple of parents who were the new versions of “Jane”. One lobbied for snack time in the afternoons and was particularly focused on including ‘pretend play’ in the kindergarten classroom and curriculum. Another one kept having issues with her child being too anxious and not wanting to come to school, and reached out to Ms.O often, and vice versa, since the child also had behavior adjustment challenges in the classroom. While some of these challenges were part of the process of beginning kindergarten, and the adjustment that both children and parents have to go through, the way in which some of these mothers dealt with these seemed to be quite taxing to Ms. O. At other times, the desire to implement or change something in Ms. O’s routine, in the curriculum, or in the school in general seemed like an entitlement of middle class white parents, and part of the tension with this situation was the ‘threat’ that some of these parents could, at any point, decide to leave the program, like Jane had.
In fact, at the beginning of the second year of the program's existence, the number of children who had left or were considering that option was worrisome to both the teachers and particularly the principal. Santiago had left the program mid-year the previous school year; Devon, an English-speaking African-American child, was taken out of the TWI 1st grade and placed into the mainstream English class; and Mariana, one bilingual Latina student had gotten a spot at the sought out bilingual charter school and had left. Monica’s parents had just made the decision to leave the program as well, as I discussed in Chapter 7, and there were rumors that Michaela, a child from an English-speaking Italian American family, no longer wanted to be in the program. On the second week of school, I spoke with Mr. Davis who was worried about the children leaving the program, and how that did not reflect well on its success in the first year. He was worried that if Dr. Hite left the district, and if the director of the OCMP left as well, that whoever came next might just as well eliminate the program. Although Mr. Davis knew he had enough parents who would put up a “stink” in the district and lobby and fight for that not to happen, he still wanted to have the numbers to show this was a strong and successful program.

While the children who left as well as those who wanted to leave were not all white nor middle class, and while they all had different reasons for leaving or wanting to leave, the threat of leaving seemed to be most present with the white middle class families. There was a perception, among Ms. O and some of the other teachers and staff, that Mr. Davis made more of an effort to cater to the needs of the middle class mostly white parents in order to keep them happy so that they would not leave. Those involved with the program had already suffered the loss of one family, Santiago’s, which left very
mixed feelings. Not only did Ms. O have a sense of failure and loss (and to a certain extent, relief) when Santiago left, but also, Mary had felt the family’s departure deeply as well. Mary wanted to encourage Jane to be more involved as a bilingual parent who could connect the Spanish and English speaking parents within the school, so that Mary could focus her efforts in doing advocacy for the school and the district. Thus, for those families who had the privilege of choice, their ability to exercise that privilege was perceived as a lever to pressure the school to address whatever issue they were dissatisfied with. Furthermore, because these families had made, in most cases, a very conscious, well-researched, well-thought out choice in sending their child to this school, having it not work out could become particularly distressing and disappointing.

In the particular case of Santiago’s parents, because they were bilingual and bicultural, many of us (myself included), felt they could be the “bridge” that was sorely needed between the groups of parents. Whenever there were events for TWI families, there seemed to be a very obvious "divide" between the parents, one that some would characterize as a "language barrier". The differences between English speaking families and Spanish speaking families, however, went beyond language, as the next section will illustrate.

The "Spanish-speakers"

The first cohort of the TWI program had 16 children that were considered the "Spanish speakers" and who came from Hispanic households. Thus, the first generation of TWI students had an "imbalance" in the number of children that represented each
language background. In reality, the majority of these children were bilingual to varying
degrees. That is, living in the United States and being exposed to English media, older
siblings and relatives who spoke English, and to English-medium pre-school, the
majority of Latino students understood and spoke English to some degree. There were
about five or six children who started the year with less exposure to English and were
considered the more "Spanish dominant" of the group (which changed throughout the
year, as their English repertoire grew). The Latino families in this cohort came from
various Spanish speaking countries, including Nicaragua, Ecuador, Venezuela,
Dominican Republic, El Salvador, and Mexico. With few exceptions, all of these parents
had immigrated from their countries of origin, and their children had been born in the
Unites States. For the children who lived in households with a father or stepfather, the
majority of these men worked in restaurants. Others worked in construction. Mothers
either stayed at home to take care of the children and the household or had jobs as
cleaning personnel or also in food establishments. Of these children, I chose eight as
primary and two as secondary focal children, and I interviewed 10 classroom mothers.

There was a stark contrast between how carefully many white middle class parents
with the privilege of choice had considered where to place their children in school - how
stressful and well-researched and pondered and moralized the decision seemed to have
become - to how the Spanish speaking Latino immigrant parents described to me how
they enrolled their children in the bilingual TWI. All of the Latino parents that I
interviewed, with the exception of one, were in the bilingual program by chance. In other
words, these parents were already going to enroll their children at Washington
Elementary, and they happened to be enrolling their child on a day when either Ms. Juliet
or Ms. O were in the office, who could offer the option of the bilingual program in Spanish. For these parents, Washington Elementary was the closest school to their household, and/or their assigned school according to the catchment. Several of them had moved away to other parts of the city, yet had an older child in the school, and chose to continue sending their children there. During our interviews, the question of ‘school choice’ was a bit odd for these parents, who at times simply answered my question like Alejandra did, when I asked why they enroll their daughter at this school:

“Vivíamos sobre la 11 en la [Street name], entonces tenía la dirección que estaba más cerquita acá entonces por eso la agarraron acá”

[We lived on 11th and [Street name], so I had the address that was closest to this school that’s why they took her here].

Even though the majority of the Latino children ended up in the 1st cohort of the bilingual program incidentally, as the quote above illustrates, their parents expressed a high degree of satisfaction of being part of the program, and several felt quite strongly about it, and in particular, about Ms. O. Many expressed to me how wonderful and amazing she had been, not only with the children, but with the parents, for which they were very grateful. In fact, many parents, more so than the children, struggled with the transition to first grade, missing the kind of attention and communication they were accustomed to with Ms. O. The fact that they could communicate with her in Spanish was extremely valuable to them. Not only that, Ms. O was very personable and energetic, and the fact that she was from Latin America, and shared a similar cultural background with them was significant as well.
Avoiding Language Loss and Defending the Right to Language Maintenance

When I asked parents why they agreed to be in the program, many of them mentioned language maintenance as a major reason why they decided to enroll. More specifically, many of them expressed a desire to avoid language loss, bringing up specific stories or examples of people they knew, or of their own children. The following excerpt is from my interview with Estefania, the mother of one child in the bilingual program, and one of its earliest supporters:

S: Y, este, porque me acuerdo de usted que fue a la junta, a una de las primeras juntas.

E: Si me dijo precisamente [Yolanda], que iba a haber una reunión, para niños que iban a entrar al kinder. Y iba a ver un nuevo proyecto bilingüe. Y bueno yo me me parece buena idea, porque yo veo que muchos niños dejan de hablar el español. Y Luciana, este cuando empezó a ir a la escuela allá en la, en el pre-kinder, pues sí, ya empezaba a hablar como más inglés. Y ya luego unas cosas en español ya no las podía decir (hhh). Y, por eso, dice mi esposo, es mejor que tenga dos idiomas, es mejor dos idiomas que uno. Y yo veo que una, mi sobrina, igual tiene sus niñas, su edad de mi niño mayor, y no habla nada de español.

S: nada?

E: No. No les gusta hablar en español dice.

[S: And, because I remember that you went to the meeting, one of the very first meetings.

E: Yes it was precisely [Yolanda] who told me, that there was going to be a meeting for children entering kindergarten. That there was a new bilingual project. And well I thought it was a good idea, because I see that a lot of children stop speaking Spanish. And Luciana, since she started going to school, going to pre-school, well she started speaking more English. And then there were things in Spanish that she could no longer say. [Chuckles]. And, well that’s why, my husband says, its better that she has two languages, two languages are better than one. And I see that one, my niece, she has two daughters, the age of my oldest boy, and they don’t speak any Spanish.

S: Not at all?]
E: No. They don’t like speaking Spanish she says.]

Estefania not only knew or had seen several children who stopped speaking Spanish, such as her niece’s daughters, but she began to notice her own daughter shifting to speaking more English than Spanish at home once she entered preschool. From the beginning, Estefania became one of the most interested parents in the TWI bilingual program, seeing this as an opportunity to develop her daughter’s bilingualism and to avoid a similar fate as her relatives. She didn’t want her daughter, as she became older, to no longer want to speak Spanish. This is a pattern that was evident in most of my interviews with Spanish-speaking parents. Furthermore, not only was there a desire to avoid language shift or loss, but many expressed how learning Spanish was a connection to their own culture and to their family’s first language. Daniela and Amanda, two mothers that I interviewed together, discuss this:

S: ...me gustaría hablar poquito más de eso, de porque es importante para ustedes que sus niños sigan hablando español?

Amanda: Por eso mismo, porque yo, por ejemplo en los míos yo no quiero que se le olvide, como era el, el primer idioma, de uno. Como que siempre lleven esa cultura, sí, como, uff, dos idiomas, yo, contenta, muy contenta. No me gustaría, no, que se le olvide, su español.

Daniela: No pues a mí me gusta porque, para la cultura mexicana que nosotros tenemos, para que ellos, ellos sepan, cuando nosotros les decimos, les explicamos, como son las culturas de allá, uno les puede hablar así, uno le está hablando y el no está entendiendo español, o a veces habla con su abuelita o con su abuelito, y están hablando perfectamente español, entonces entiende, y es lo que a mi me gusta, porque imaginése, si el habla inglés, y la abuelita pues va a decir que me esta diciendo? no no te entiendo, o si quiere algo hacer una carta, el va a escribir y el no le va a entender. Es puro inglés. Pero me gusta porque el habla a México y el habla español, normal. Y me dicen sus abuelitos, dice, y pero porque si estas en Estados Unidos, y habla español el niño? Le digo porque el está en un, en una escuela en un programa bilingüe. Y el está hablando español y esta hablando inglés, le digo, pero ahorita está entrando mas español, y dice ah pues que bueno, dice, porque hay muchos niños que ya no hablan, a su edad ya no hablan español. Puro inglés. Dice, pues este, pues si, estoy muy contenta por, por el idioma, por el
S: …I would like to talk a little bit more about that, why is it important for you that your children continue speaking Spanish?

Amanda: Because of that same reason, because I, for example, for mine [children], I don’t want them to forget, the first language, one’s own. So that they always carry that culture, yes, like, uff! Two languages, I am happy, very happy. I wouldn’t like, no, that they forget their Spanish.

Daniela: Well for me, I would like it because, for our Mexican culture that we have, so that they, they know, when we tell them, when we explain to them, how are the cultures of over there, we can talk to them like that, you can talk and he is understanding Spanish, like sometimes he’ll talk to his grandmother or grandfather, and they are speaking perfectly in Spanish, so he understands, and that’s what I like. Because imagine, if he speaks English, and the grandmother is going to say, what is he saying? No no I don’t understand. Or if he wants to write a letter, he’s going to write and they won’t understand. Its only English. But I like it because he calls Mexico, and he speaks Spanish, its normal. And his grandparents tell me, but why if you are in the United States, does the boy speak Spanish? I tell them because he is in a, in a school with a bilingual program. And he is speaking Spanish and he is speaking English, I tell them, but for now he’s learning more Spanish, and they say oh ok, that’s good, they say, because there are a lot of children that no longer speak, at his age no longer speak Spanish. Only English. They say, well, yes. So I am very happy for, for the language, for the first language that we as Hispanos, and we can understand, and know what our son is saying…

Here, Amanda and Daniela make the connection between being able to speak Spanish, and for the children to feel more connected to their culture. Not only that, but they also feel its important to have the ability to communicate with family and loved ones in their countries of origin. For Daniela, this is in Mexico, and earlier in the interview, Amanda also talked about going to the Dominican Republic, where she is from, and how important it is for her children to feel comfortable and be able to communicate in
Spanish. Additionally, Daniela also mentions that being able to communicate and tell the children about her country, Mexico, and have the children understand that, is key. So, in other words, language is a connection to culture because it is also a connection to those family members who can talk about histories and traditions from back home. And, like Estefanía and many others, both women also mention that they would not want their children to forget Spanish, just like they know of other children who have, as Daniela mentions towards the end of the excerpt.

Another point Daniela expresses in our conversation is her son’s grandmother’s surprise at his Spanish fluency. Daniela reports the grandmother as asking, “pero porque si estas en Estados Unidos, y habla español el niño?” [but why if you are in the United States, does the boy speak Spanish?]. This was another pattern that became significant in my conversations with Latina parents, one that many of them, if not all, had encountered: the idea of having to speak English because this is the United States. This discourse took many forms. For some, it was perhaps genuine surprise at the unexpected, like the grandmother’s question. But in other cases, it seemed like a more pointed question, as in, why does your son not speak more English, if he is the United States? As in, people should speak English if they are in the United States, or Immigrants should speak English, if they are in the United States. Gaby, a woman from Ecuador whose son is in the program, expresses a similar encounter with this same discourse:

“Pero a veces la gente como le ve hablando mucho español, y lo ve hablando clarito siempre me preguntan, "y porque no habla inglés? y porque no le enseñan ingles?" y digo "no, él sabe hablar inglés, pero cuando él esta con una persona que habla español él va a hablar español". Entonces, eh. a veces como que es un poquito molestoso, no, que hay gente que, habla español y quiere hablar en inglés, por, yo siento ahora que que a veces, uno, no se, piensa que debe enseñarles a los hijos más
Gaby describes how “la gente,” [people], see how clearly her son, Jayson, speaks in Spanish and they automatically assume he does not know English by asking, why doesn’t he speak English? Or why isn’t he being taught English? Gaby describes the situation as bothersome, that people place so much emphasis on learning English that they forget their own language. Here, in fact, she switches from a general pronoun, uno (which I translated as 'one'), to an inclusive plural pronoun, by saying, that “one thinks that one should teach one's children more English, and then we forget our tongue,” and she follows this with the examples of how there are children in her own family that no longer speak Spanish, who may understand it, but that are ashamed to speak it. In other words, while Gaby herself has encouraged her son’s bilingualism, she knows that people in her family, and perhaps Latinos in general, have often emphasized English over their native language and lost that piece of themselves. Nonetheless, Gaby’s pride in her son’s bilingualism translated into her son’s own pride in his own bilingualism, and in the
classroom, Jayson was very comfortable and fluent in both English and Spanish, and was very proud of being able to speak both. In fact, Gaby was so grateful that her son was in the program that she described it to me as an act of fate, having been the one to snatch the last spot on the first day of school, making a last minute decision to switch him from an English kindergarten classroom into the bilingual program right then and there.

This discourse of Latino children of immigrants needing to learn English (at the expense of their first language) was something that made some parents unsure of the decision to have their children in the program, or that found them in a situation where they had to defend their choice (and their right) to maintain their children's language and foster their bilingualism. This is evident in Monica’s case in Chapter 7, where her neurologists advised her parents, Miguel and Manuela to take her out of the bilingual program, emphasizing that it was more important for her to first and foremost learn English. Because several children such as Monica, left or were thinking of leaving at the start of the TWI program’s second year, it became an uncertain time. It was Ms. A’s first couple of weeks as the 1st grade TWI teacher and already she felt that there was a need to convince parents to stick with the program, and in particular, Latino parents. This was her sense especially after the meeting where Monica’s parents decided to take her out of the program. Later on in the year, Ms. A shared with me that Estefania, earlier quoted above, had told her about a friend of hers who was questioning her judgement by having her daughter in the bilingual program, telling her that she was making a big mistake, that they were in America and so she should be speaking English, and that her daughter would flunk 5th grade. Ms A asked if her friend was ‘American,’ and Estefania said no, she was Mexican. While this did not make Estefania waver in her decision, since her daughter
was doing very well and reading in both English and Spanish, it was something important enough for her to share with the teacher. Estefania was in a situation where she had to defend her choice and argue for the benefits of this bilingual program. Ms. A, on her part, seemed very surprised by this kind of thinking: she had come from a bilingual charter school that always had a long list of waiting parents, and that it was never the case that parents needed to be persuaded to be in the program, it was quite the contrary (this charter school also had many more white middle class parents in the wait list).

This discourse also became evident in my conversations with Lizeth and María, when they were recounting their experience of gathering support from Spanish-speaking parents for the TWI program. In the following excerpt, Lizeth tells me how Mr. Davis asked her to get parents to sign a petition for the program, but that not all parents she approached were necessarily enthusiastic:

Lizeth: …recuerdo que el principal me comentó sobre que querían que aquí en la escuela tuvieran el programa bilingüe. Entonces a mí me emocionó mucho…Entonces… pero dijo que iba a necesitar la ayuda de nosotros para que firmáramos para que el programa fuera aprobado. Entonces pues sí, como a mí no me gusta… Yo anduve pues sí, viendo a padres, ¿verdad? Para que… o sea am… explicarles de lo que iba a tratar para que ellos nos apoyaran con su firma y si em… si recaudamos varias firmas pero pues, como siempre, hubo padres que nos contestaron mal, que porque… a pesar que eran hispanos nos dijeron que….que sus hijos no iban a necesitar el español. Que porque, cuando ellos regresaran a su país iban a poder estudiar como maestros de inglés, pero yo como les dije, yo les decía “¿cómo ellos van a ser maestros si no van a poder traducir al español?”… Entonces pues así surgió… bueno así me involucré un poco más sobre el programa bilingüe.

S: Hmmm. Y ¿te diste cuenta que había un poquito esa resistencia?
L: Sí
S: De los… A mí me ha tocado también…
L: Si, o sea es más como uno como Latino, ¿me entiendes? Porque si pues mis hijos hablan español... Pero bueno sí... Em... Pero creo ahorita en estos casos las personas de habla inglés son los que más, me imagino, que están buscando más lugares para sus niños... en el programa bilingüe. ¿Por qué? Porque ellos si necesitan el español. Y como uno, como Latino no pues, mi hijo habla y como que no le tomamos más interés a eso.

S: Si... No sé si mucha gente te dijo a ti esto, porque a mí a veces me dicen esto... “No pues el español yo se lo doy en casa. Van a la escuela a aprender inglés”. ¿Alguna gente te decía eso?

L: Si, si pero como hasta por- e incluso en las clínicas donde lleve a mis hijas la doctora dijo “Usted encárguese del español en su casa y en la escuela el inglés” A la mejor pues, por eso muchas personas se quedan con eso. En la casa yo le enseño el español y....sí.

[L: I remember that the principal told me that they wanted to start a bilingual program here in the school. So, that made me very excited, so...but he said he would need our help to sign so that the program would be approved. So then, well, yes, I don’t really like to...well yes I went to see parents, right? So that...um like...to explain what the program was going to be about so that they could support us with their signature, and yes, um, we did get some signatures, but as always, there were parents that answered us negatively, because, even though they were Hispanic they told us that, that their children wouldn’t need Spanish. That because, when they would return to their country they would be able to study to become English teachers, but I said, I would tell them, “how are they going to be teachers if they won’t be able to translate to Spanish?” So that’s how it got started...well that’s how I became more involved in the bilingual program.

S: Mmmm. Then, you became aware that there was some resistance?

L: yes

S: From the...its happened to me as well...

L: Yes, I mean its more like from us who are Latino, you know what I mean? Because yes, my children speak Spanish, but like yes, um, but now I think in this case people who speak English are the ones, I imagine, who are looking for more places for their children...in the bilingual program. Why? Because they do need Spanish. And because, us, who are Lation, well my son speaks so that we don’t become interested in that.
S: Yes. I don’t know if a lot of people told you this, because sometimes I’ve been told, “No well Spanish I give them at home. They go to school to learn English”. Do some people tell you that?

L: Yes, yes but even when, like in the medical clinics where I take my daughters the doctor said, “you take care of Spanish at home and in school they do English.” Maybe that’s why, a lot of people stick with that. "At home I’ll teach them Spanish" and (.) yes.]

Lizeth brings up several important points. First, she describes how they had parents who were not necessarily supportive of the idea, and that they weren’t interested because they felt they already knew Spanish, that they spoke Spanish with their children at home, so they didn’t need Spanish at school as well. Lizeth contrasts this with the strong interest she saw coming from the English-speaking moms, like Rebecca and Kimberly, who were involved in also making this program happen to begin with. She surmises that they are more interested in it because they “need” it for the Spanish, versus Latino parents who already could provide that at home. Finally, she points to perhaps one source of where this kind of thinking could be coming from, giving me the example of the doctor she sees at the clinic where she takes her daughters, who seemed to be encouraging her to keep up the Spanish at home, and to have her children focus on English at school. Of course, this doesn’t mean that the doctor would necessarily be against bilingual education, but it is one reason why Lizeth believes some people think this way, evident when she says “A lo mejor pues, por eso muchas personas se quedan con eso” [Maybe, then, that’s why some people stick to this (kind of thinking)].

María, the other Latina mom in charge of gathering signatures from Latino parents for the program, also described some hesitation from parents when she would ask them to
sign. She states that it was easier to get parents who were not necessarily part of this school to sign the petition:

S: Si, definitivamente y a la gente que le pedía la firma y les explicaba, ¿firmaban con gusto? ¿Se ponían a platicar? ¿Le preguntaban o...? ¿Lo recibieron positivamente...?

A: Yo antes de pedirles la firma yo les decía "Soy mama de un estudiante de escuela [Washington], que estamos pidiendo al director que la escuela tenga un programa bilingüe". En ese momento yo les decía a los papás que no importaba por qué grado empezaran. Pero que empezara a ser bilingüe, porque la mayoría de las personas que vivimos incluso acá en Philadelphia somos hispanos, de diferentes países pero hispanos. Y nuestros hijos tienen el mismo derecho que cualquier otro niño, de estudiar en su idioma o en el idioma que sea. Y pues la [00:42:20 Unclear] a nuestro idioma si es que somos mayoría, dale la prioridad y que algún día si tienen hijos pequeños que van a entrar aquí o si tienen... o si van a ser papás en un futuro tiempo, la escuela que esté preparada... para recibir a sus hijos y a todos los niños que estén cerca de acá.

S: Ujum

A: Hablando dos idiomas o los idiomas que la escuela pueda ofrecerle a los estudiantes... es lo que yo le decía a los papás y pues ya me daban una firma y así estuve con varios papás, como le digo la mayoría no eran de... que tuvieran niños acá porque los papás acá yo les decía y pues como que lo dudaban, no estaban muy seguros de firmar, me decían "no tengo tiempo" y pues ya hablando con otros papás de fuera de la escuela es como que un poquito más fácil.

[S: Yes, and definitely and to the people whom you asked for signatures and you explained (about the program), would they gladly sign? Would they start talking to you? Would they ask questions…or..? Did they receive you positively?

A: Well before asking for their signature I would say, “I am the mother of a student at Washington School, and we are asking the principal that the school have a bilingual program”. At that moment I would say to the parents that it doesn’t matter what grade they start in. But that they begin being bilingual, because the majority of people that live here, even here in Philadelphia we are Hispanic, from different countries but Hispanic. And our children have the same right just like any other child, to study his language or in whatever language. And well the, our language, if we are in the majority, to give it priority and if one day they have children they can start here or if they have, or if they are going to be
parents in the near future, so that the school is prepared, to receive their children and all the children that are near here.

S: hmm

A: Speaking two languages or the two languages that the school can offer students, that’s what I would tell parents and well they would sign, and that’s how it went with various parents, like I said the majority weren’t from…they didn’t have children here [at Washington] because the parents here I would tell them and they would hesitate, they weren’t too sure about signing, or they would say ‘I don’t have time’ and then well speaking with parents from other outside the school was like a little bit easier]

While María doesn’t actually describe Latino parent resistance in the same way as Lizeth, she does mention that some parents would avoid her, tell her they didn’t have time, or didn’t necessarily seem eager or interested in what she was offering or had to say.

Based on this, it would be naive to believe that Spanish-speaking Latino parents simply did not want their children to speak/learn Spanish in school. First, Spanish is the language most likely spoken at home by a majority of Latino immigrant households - or at least a mix of English and Spanish in a multigenerational home. This hesitation, lack of interest, or even resistance to a bilingual program from the Latino parents that María and Lizeth approached is more likely indicative of the incredible pressure Latino immigrants felt and the importance placed on the learning of English. This pressure probably comes from both societal pressures to assimilate and Latino immigrant’s own experiences of discrimination and/or of frustration from not knowing English - two things which are related.

In fact, when talking about the reasons for choosing this bilingual program, many stated that being bilingual would benefit their children in the future, and it would avoid some of the pain and frustration some of them had experienced from not knowing the
language. When I asked about their aspirations for their future, Daniela stressed the importance of bilingualism, and stated it in the following way:

No pues para el yo quisiera lo mejor que sea, em, más que nada, ser algo mejor, y ser bilingüe, hablando español e inglés […] que tenga un mejor futuro, para él. Así él puede viajar, ir para donde sea, no batallar no sufrir en esos idiomas porque a veces uno se siente, que uno sufre porque uno no sabe hablar un idioma.

[Well I would like for him the best that be, more than anything, to be something better, to be bilingual, speaking Spanish and English…That he has a better future, for himself. That way, he can travel, go wherever he wants, not to struggle not to suffer in these languages because sometimes one feels that one suffers because one doesn’t know how to speak a language].

I placed emphasis on that last sentence to highlight a subtle, yet important, theme that came up in my interviews with Spanish speaking mothers. The verb in Spanish sufrir - to suffer - has connotations similar to the English verb to struggle. Daniela alludes to this experience in this last sentence, and like Daniela, another parents, Andrea, also talks about her experience as an immigrant, which I will highlight in Chapter 7.

Immigrant Experiences

Taken together, what the interviews with the Latina mothers revealed was a very different reality to that of the English-speaking parents. Some told me about their journeys across the border, about their struggles as they adapted to a new country, a new language, on surviving on very little and making it on their own. Others simply alluded to some of these struggles. Sometimes, the questions they asked me were illustrative of their realities and concerns, such as the following exchange with Gladys, a mother from El
Salvador. At the outset of our interview, I explained my project, my interest in the bilingual TWI program, and my own background as a TWI teacher. As I was getting ready to begin asking her my questions, Gladys jumped in and asked what the requirements for being a teacher were - asking if she needed a “big” education in order to be a teacher. She explained that as soon as her little one entered school, she would no longer need to stay at home, and was thinking about what she could do. Because she already took care of several children at her home, and because she enjoyed working with children, she felt that could be maybe an option for her. I replied that, yes, she needed to have a university degree, but that there were several ways to become a teacher. I went on about the different ways to obtain a bachelor’s degree, including community college, and I explained that there were licensure requirements, including exams. I told her that she could start off by being a classroom aide, and gave her the example of an Argentinian woman who was an aide in the school and who was doing just that as a way to begin her career as a teacher. I told her that they didn’t pay very much, but that I could help her figure out the district process for applying, helping her get her “papers” through the district. She then asked whether this Argentinian woman I had mentioned spoke English. I answered yes. She replied, confirming her own thoughts out loud, “si verdad, se necesita el inglés” [Yes, really, one needs English]. She then told me about two English classes she had tried to sign up for, but that were full and that she was on the waiting list for, and that she wanted to take classes to obtain her GED. Thinking about other ways she could start to get experience, I suggested she could volunteer in the classroom. After thinking for a couple of seconds, she asked,
As I explained to Gladys the requirements for officially becoming a volunteer, I realized that this perhaps would not be an option for her, like it isn’t for many parents at this school. Not only might becoming a volunteer be hard for Gladys, I realized becoming a teaching assistant, let alone a teacher, would be even more difficult. Even the option of becoming a volunteer may have been hard to do, because of the clearances the district required. Mr. Davis was very cognizant of the barriers to volunteering for immigrant
parents, precisely because of the paperwork needed, and he was always thinking of ways that he could get parents to volunteer without having to go through the “official” documentation; by inviting parents to participate in particular events, for example. Many of the English speaking mothers, especially those who worked closely with Mr. Davis, were aware of this as well - in part because Mr. Davis constantly brought it up as a challenge for getting more of his parents to be in school.

This conversation, upon further reflection, became very illuminating for me. It shows how Gladys would first need to develop an adequate proficiency in English in order to take a GED class, after which she would need to enroll in university-level courses, such as at the Community College. And, even though Gladys has a tax ID number, it may not mean she has the legal status to be able to work. Our conversation went from discussing the option of becoming a teacher, to that of becoming a teaching aide, to that of becoming a volunteer, and at every turn, I realized how incredible the challenges were that lay ahead for Gladys to achieve this.

In general, throughout my fieldwork I found it harder to access the Latino immigrant parents and families. It was more difficult for me to get a sense of what life was like for many of these families, as compared to my English-speaking middle class families. Even though I interviewed several mothers - some at home, some at school - I only became close to one family, whom I visited at home on multiple occasions. After being part of the school program for a year, I had a very good sense of the experience of many of the mostly white, middle class families. This come from not only my contact and interviews with several of the classroom parents, but also, and importantly, from my involvement in
the NCA’s Ed Committee, and from participating in several events they planned and/or participated in. Furthermore, there was a strong social media presence that helped me understand these individual’s concerns, their values/opinions and the discourses they were part of and or responding to. In contrast, the Mexican and Latino immigrant communities felt invisible: I did not gain easy “access” to the lives outside of school of my Latino focus students, as I had originally hoped; parents weren’t connected through community organizations; there were no social media threads I could follow. I attended community events organized by Mexican/Latino organizations, only to once in a while run into one or two families there.

The Latina mothers I interviewed felt uncomfortable with the idea of meeting me in a public space - such as a coffee shop. They all opted for being interviewed at school, or for some, at home. Many of them only felt comfortable going out in public as a family; not necessarily on their own. Gladys, in fact, told me she had been sorry to miss some of the potlucks and events we had planned the first year; she said that her husband worked late and that she didn’t like going to those events on her own. In my interview with Estefania, one of the first I conducted, I was surprised at what she told me: when she first arrived in Philadelphia, she would stay at home all week, only going out once on Sundays, on her husband’s day off, so they could go to the market together. At that point, they did not have children, and they lived in a different area of the city. Estefania did not know the city and did not know English.

The social networks of the Latino immigrant families I interviewed were family-centered: many of them had brothers or sisters, cousins, or other relatives either in the
city or in neighboring places, such as New Jersey, Delaware or in Chester County. Before the TWI program, many of them did not really know other families that also attended the school. It was only through the TWI program that some of them started to get to know each other - at least from dropping off and picking up their children everyday. Thus, the idea of the “Mexican community” or "Spanish-speaking community” that Mr. Davis often mentioned, or that some of the white English middle class speakers talked about, wasn’t necessarily something that bore out. In other words, there was frequent mention of the Mexican “community,” just like the Indonesian community, Nepali community, Cambodian community, etc. - in a way that connoted a ‘togetherness’ and homogeneity within a group. The Latino immigrant families I interviewed did not seem to seek each other out and form community groups the same ways in which the term "community" suggests, and in the ways in which some of the middle class and mostly white new residents sought each other out through organizations like the NCA.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, I summarized some of the differences in the experiences of parents that were part of the "English-speaking" and "Spanish-speaking" groups, also illustrating the different ways they interacted with the school as an institution and with the teachers and administrators. I highlighted the discourses and everyday life experiences that were gestured toward during our interviews. While middle class mostly white parents were constantly defending their choice of 'opting-in' to a public school, Latino immigrant parents were defending their choice to foster their children's bilingualism in a program that begins with an emphasis on Spanish. For the former group of parents, this was an
impetus to help in school improvement - which supported yet also taxed the school in some ways. For the latter group of parents, this meant that some wavered in their decision and needed to be "convinced" or reminded often of the benefits of the program. Both of these required extra work from the teacher and the school.

The experiences and decisions that brought these families to this program are starkly different. At least, for the first cohort of students, many of the bilingual and Spanish speaking families ended up in the program by chance - they were there on the day that the Spanish BCA happened to be there and offer them the bilingual option. Many families were already planning to attend Washington or were already zoned for the school. While for at least two of the English-speaking families in the first cohort the same is true - it will likely not be so for the next generations.

Middle class mostly white families made a very conscious choice to live in a city neighborhood and attend this particular school. The centrality of the “school decision” in their lives was one of the distinctive qualities of the experiences of the middle class white families I spoke with, while the discourse of school choice seemed irrelevant for the majority of Latino working class immigrants I spoke with. For them, their choice was made long ago, by traveling for miles and dangerously crossing the desert in harsh conditions and uncertain outcomes. Risking their life, what they knew, for economic opportunities in a different country, was their way of “choosing”. They chose United States schooling for their children. For them, the school around the corner that best allows them to survive, to go to work, and to earn a better living for their children was what mattered.
That is not to say, however, that Hispanic families did not desperately desire a program like this. In subsequent years of the program I witnessed parents plead to get their child into the program - now that the word has spread - and then being turned down because of class size limits. Once parents learned about this option they would try to switch their children if they had already been placed in another classroom. This also created tensions with other teachers, especially in years when there was under-enrollment in the English classrooms and a full-to-capacity TWI bilingual classroom.

In TWI programs such as the one at Washington School, there will be a stark contrast in how “school ready” the middle class children will be as compared to the children who come from families with not only less material resources but different orientations to American school literacy and the kinds of valued activities and ways to spend time at home. This is a challenge for the teacher in terms of behavior management, lesson planning, differentiating activities, and recognizing individual talents and different funds of knowledge in an overcrowded classroom with lots of accountability pressure.

In terms of the parents, Latino immigrant parents have different needs that the school and the teacher need to address. These include not only translation and interpretation services, but also, help in navigating American institutions, understanding certain forms, policies and procedures. Furthermore, in this case, Latino immigrant parents' work schedules would sometimes limit the amount of time they spent at home and what they could do in terms of academic help. On the other hand, middle class parents, who were mostly white, had different priorities that they wanted to see the school or the teacher address. These included lunch and recess time, snack time, and approaches
to the curriculum - specifically, several seemed to express a desire for more "play-based" activities. Sometimes they wanted to help the school by looking for grants that teachers could apply to, or other similar programs - which, while well-meaning, seem to place more pressure on the teachers. At other times they offered their time and/or expertise in the SAC - School Advisory Council. In particular, though, the most taxing types of involvement where when these parent's children were not doing well in school - like Santiago and Jane's case illustrated.

I began the chapter by discussing the lofty goal that some had for the program, of bringing these different communities together. As I hope to have showed, this is a difficult, delicate task, as there are many more differences other than language between the families. This is something that Ms. O and I also talked about in our interview, as the following exchange shows:

Ms. O: I hope that they—I had a really hard time this year forming community with these people, like, como que si tenía que estar como demasiado detrás de ellos pa' que ellos quisieran avanzar cosas, y ciertos padres si se hicieron amigos y se unieron y entonces se ayudan con los niños y eso pero no hubo como un, un cross-cultural, como que los gringuitos con los gringuitos y los blanquitos, ¿entiendes a lo que quiero decir?

[I hope that they—I had a really hard time this year forming community with these people, like, like I had to be after them all the time so they would get things started, and some parents did become friends or get together and then they could help each other out with the children and all that, but there wasn't like a, a cross-cultural, like the gringuitos were with the gringuitos and the white parents, you know what I want to say?]

S: Mm-hmm.

Ms. O: And that was disappointing. I felt like, I don't know. I felt like that wasn't going to happen, I guess, as much or that at least somehow, some cross-cultural, but it didn't, and I think probably parents more like [Jane y Esteban] por el nivel de educación a lo mejor hubiesen [inaudible] [012:38] and I hate to, I don't know. I hate that that happens. I hate that people cannot,' cause I feel like I
can make that difference, I think, I feel like you can make those adaptations and think this is my community and this is my community, this is my community and this is my, and there's millions of our communities and you can be part of each.

Ms. O, the first teacher in the TWI program, took it upon herself (and felt pressure to) to try to bring families together, by organizing potlucks (which Jane insisted she do) and picnics. There were also gatherings or meet-and-greets for future parents or over the summer with the incoming cohorts. These additional events were often awkward encounters - and yet, Ms. O felt there was a way to somehow bring these groups together, which she tried to in different ways throughout the year. This was a lofty goal and a hard task the first year. However, the hope and optimism around these TWI bilingual programs, which Rebecca, Ms. O, and many others shared - might only be realized, though, through the children themselves acting as those 'bridges', as their friendships continue on through elementary school. What is clear, as the next chapter will show, is that children had no problem interacting with each other, regardless of any potential "language barriers" - or otherwise - that existed. The classroom was alive with the constant chatter, talk, and play of these children who, regardless of differences in linguistic, cultural, race, or class background, were first and foremost five- and six year old children making their way through kindergarten, learning to get along in the classroom and with each other.
Chapter 6: Martín and the Pink Crayon: The Organization of Children’s talk in a Two-Way Immersion bilingual classroom

The classroom was a-buzz with activity. It was filled with the constant, quiet chatter of twenty-four 6-year-old children working at their tables. Crayons moved back and forth across papers, filling animal silhouettes with color as children worked on their reading response to the book that had just been read aloud: La Gallinita Roja. The room is large and bright, with light blue-green walls that are filled with charts of letters and words in Spanish. A number line, and above it, the Spanish alphabet, line the large white board that is mounted on one end of the room. There is a lively blue carpet on the wooden floor, with a sea-themed animation and all the letters of the alphabet. Tables, in all different shapes - rectangular, circular, and square - are arranged around the room, with four chairs, with bright blue covers on each, placed around the tables. I joined a table of four children, and set my recorder in the middle. At this table there was bubbly bilingual Maria, whose family immigrated from El Salvador and who speak mostly Spanish at home with adults and English with her sister; Juan, whose mother is Venezuelan and who speaks both English and Spanish at home; Sandy, who speaks mostly Spanish at home and whose family immigrated from Mexico; and Michaela, who comes from an Italian-American English-speaking home and whose first experience learning Spanish has been the last four months in this classroom. As they talked about drawing the chicken from the story - Sandy, Michaela and Maria lamented the fact that they were missing a pink crayon. This is how their conversation went:
Michaela: ...but you have to ask Lilly if you can have the pink, cuz we don't have one.

Maria: We don't have one?

Michaela: nope.

Sandy: (gasping) aaahhh! Nosotros teníamos pink

[ahh! we used to have pink] (moving around crayons)

Sandy: tu rompiste este rosado [you broke this pink one]

Maria: Necesito rosado, pero no hay.

[I need pink, but there isn't any]

Right then, Martín, who speaks mostly Spanish at home with his Mexican parents, and who sat at the table adjacent ours, without uttering a single word, got up and brought us a pink crayon, smiled, and sat back down at this table.

This conversation, aside from illustrating the importance of crayons in the life of these kindergarteners, shows the kind of bilingual, multimodal, multiparty conversation that was the norm in this kindergarten TWI bilingual classroom. The children were often working at their tables in small groups, and went in and out of multiple conversations, alternating languages as easily as they alternated topics and exchanged crayons. In the previous chapter, I sketched out the parallel lives of the parents of the children enrolled in this TWI bilingual program. In this chapter, however, I show how in the classroom, the opposite was true: children's lives were very much intertwined. For at least six hours of every week day, children - who came from all different backgrounds - spent all day learning together, playing together, singing together, eating in the same cafeteria, running around in the same playground, and working around the same tables. Even when children did not yet speak the same languages, there seemed to be no barriers to their
communication: the classroom was alive with constant chatter and overlapping conversations in both Spanish and English - and all the varieties in-between.

This chapter builds upon the tradition of the study of classroom discourse, which has been pivotal in expanding our understandings of the interactional and co-constructed nature of learning and identity development (e.g. Cazden, 2001; Erickson, 1982; Heath, 1983; Mehan, 1985; Philips, 1970). Interaction is not only constitutive of social order in the classroom, but is also an empirically observable behavior whose analysis can be employed in order to understand what is happening from children’s perspective (e.g. Goodwin, 1990). I first briefly review research that has specifically analyzed classroom discourse in two-way immersion settings. Many of these studies focus on language choice, and examining when, how, why and by whom are language choices initiated and sustained. Invoking the notion of the values of languages and larger power dynamics in society, these studies have revealed much about classroom interactional patterns. I add to this literature by examining classroom interaction through an analysis that uses the participation framework as the unit of analysis and considers the spatial arrangements of children's situated activity. Specifically, by using a Goffmanian interactional frame as a unit of analysis, I show moments of language socialization in which students become participants of conversations in multiple languages even before they can necessarily produce utterances in their second language. Thus, I present an analysis of moments of interaction in the classroom which reveal processes of peer language socialization and the subtle nuances of communication that children were learning, that went beyond learning two standard codes of English and Spanish. Finally, I end with a discussion on what this analysis reveals, what it does not, and what it suggests about future trajectories of the
Student Interaction in TWI Settings

There is a small but growing body of literature that qualitatively examines classroom interaction within two-way immersion programs with an ethnographic and/or sociolinguistic lens. A majority of these studies focus on language practices and factors associated with language choice (Ballinger & Lyster, 2011; Carranza, 1995; Lee, Hill-Bonnet, & Gillispie, 2008; Volk & Angelova, 2007). These studies overwhelmingly show the preference for the use of English by students. Some studies attribute this preference to language ideologies of English as the norm (Carranza, 1995; Coyoca & Lee, 2009; Volk & Angelova, 2007), English as dominant cultural capital (Fits, 2006; McCullum, 1999; Palmer, 2009; Volk & Angelova, 2007), and the particular language policies enacted by teachers and staff (Lee, Hill-Bonnet, & Gillispie, 2008).

Many of these authors share a concern for the influence of the larger sociopolitical context, and specifically the status of Spanish and its speakers - and consider this an important factor in students' language practices. These scholars use the Bourdiesieun concepts of cultural capital and symbolic dominance to understand and explain the linguistic patterns they document in their research contexts. In their analysis of language use and choice of 1st graders in a 50/50 program, Volk and Angelova (2007) provide data to illustrate how Spanish speakers more often accommodated to English speakers than vice-versa, and that even when Spanish speakers insisted on following the Spanish only rule, English speakers resisted the rule and continued using English. The
authors argue that the contexts for learning - both the classroom contexts and the larger socio-political context, mediated students' language choices, along with the dominant language ideology of English as the norm. Similarly, although not necessarily focusing on language choice, Palmer (2009) illustrates the way white middle class students dominated classroom discussions when there was no structured management of student participation by the teachers. Palmer attributes this to a "tendency to assert a symbolic dominance (Bourdieu, 1991) on the classroom community, [and] to claim power as native English speakers despite the programmatic emphasis on Spanish in the TWI program" (p.89).

Two studies of classroom interaction within two way programs stand out for their focus on peer-to-peer interactional patterns. Coyoca & Lee (2009) analyzed language brokering events in the classroom, and while this practice has been widely researched in community and family settings, little is known about it within classroom context. Through analysis of video recordings in the classroom, the authors illustrate how language-brokering events in the classroom can be opportunities for collaboration and negotiation in order to make meaning, or they can also be moments that restrict learning opportunities and position students as needing help, and as not being able to accomplish certain tasks on their own. The authors illustrate how brokering is a “complex, interactional social phenomenon that gets negotiated moment to moment,” (p. 266) and that “brokering can sometimes be assumed and imposed upon the individual” (p.275). They argue that language brokering, in particular what they term ‘unidirectional brokering’, where one student translates for another, has implications for defining
legitimate participation (and participants) in this classroom community, and recommend that teachers gain a “critical awareness” of the possible effects of this language practice.

Also focusing on peer-to-peer interactions, Angelova, Gunawardena and Volk (2006) investigate the process of peer teaching in a first grade two-way immersion classroom. Using a sociocultural lens to understand teaching and learning, the authors illustrate how students were both peer teachers and learners; they all had the opportunity be the expert or novice depending on the situations; and they used various strategies to collaborate actively with each other, including (in order of most commonly used according to authors): repetition, scaffolding with cues by language expert (peer or teacher), code-switching, invented spelling, use of formulaic speech, and non-verbal communication. Bilingual students had a special role as dual language experts; they helped mediate interactions and learning in both classrooms.

The majority of these studies have treated language as a bounded system, as a particular linguistic code, to which certain ideologies are attached, which is quantifiable in its use, which gets brokered for and by. In part, this distinction may be borne out of the TWI programs themselves - which overwhelmingly label students, spaces, and times as either 'Spanish' or 'English' (Volk & Angelova, 2007; Lee et al., 2008). Indeed, this separation is often what the description of the TWI model calls for (Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Howard, Sugarman, Christian, Lindholm-Leary, and Rogers, 2007), and what some have critiqued as espousing a monoglossic language ideology (Garcia, 2012). While pedagogically such separation might be useful, others worry that it creates rigid definitions of speakers and practices, and limits the fluid language use of bilinguals - also
referred to as translanguaging (Garcia, 2009). More recently, scholars have built on the concept of translanguaging to understand how it can be applied purposefully in practice (Palmer, Martínez, Mateus & Henderson, 2014).

This analysis builds on this classroom research in TWI settings, and contributes to it in two main ways. First, I understand language to be part of students' communicative repertoires, which takes into account all the semiotic resources students employ to make meaning. This includes not only English and Spanish, but also gestures, body language, and interactional stances. Second, I focus on interaction through the analysis of participant frameworks and children’s interactional stances in the course of everyday activities (Goffman, 1981). In other words, I examine the interactional dynamics in this classroom in order to understand, simply, what do children do and learn through interacting with each other? What are students doing and accomplishing through acts of communication - which may include both English and Spanish? I use the concept of participation framework as the organizing unit of analysis, in part, inspired by research on first language socialization.

Language Socialization

As reviewed in Chapter 2, understanding the acquisition of language as a culturally-embedded process of language socialization informs this analysis, and insights from this field have been particularly instrumental in the present analysis. Ethnographic studies of language socialization of young infants have shown the importance of multiparty interactions, especially because children have shown the capacity to learn
language by overhearing and monitoring conversations, even when not directly addressed (Akhtar, 2005; Blum-Kulka & Snow, 2002; De León, 1998, 2011). De León's research on first language socialization among a Mayan Zincatec community is particularly relevant. De León uses the participation framework as the unit of analysis of multiparty interactions, arguing that becoming a competent language user involves more than just inhabiting a speaker or a hearer role, and especially because "situated activities constitute the locus of the learning process" (p.84, 2011). Thus, participant frameworks allow the analyst to examine the various roles participants take up in coordinated activities.

Through the multimodal analysis of various interactions, De León illustrates how infants in this community are able to "occupy different spaces in the participation framework - as a 'focal' proto-speaker, an addressee in interactional routines, or an overhearer in triadic interactions" (p. 91, 2011). Within her analysis, corporeal arrangements, gestures, and gaze - especially those of the infants - become significant means of communicating alignment of participants within the interactions. Importantly, De León (2011) notes that "...the overhearer participant status affords children with observation, attention inference, and participation long before they speak" (104), and that indeed, overhearing is more central than previously thought of in theories of learning and acquisition. In an analogous fashion, in this analysis I aim to highlight the theoretical space that can be opened up by analyzing bilingual classroom interactions through the lens of participant frameworks. In other words, the guiding question in this analysis was, first, and foremost, what is happening during everyday classroom interaction in this space? Before selecting, a priori, a particular linguistic code or switch to be the focus of analysis, I sought to understand, from a broader perspective, what happens when children, from different cultural, racial,
class and linguistic backgrounds, are together everyday interacting throughout the course of their classroom activities? As I will show in the following pages, using the participant framework as a unit of analysis for these interactions is a productive way to understand bilingual classroom interaction, providing snapshots of peer communicative socialization - where children socialize each other into different interactional routines, linguistic styles, and ways of speaking.

The Interactional Organization of one Kindergarten Classroom

In this kindergarten classroom, there were three main classroom arrangements: 1) whole group lessons and discussions, where children are seated in rows on the rug and the teacher is seated at the front of the group, with an easel and whiteboard to her side and spanning along the wall; 2) At their tables, where children are seated in groups of 4 in round or rectangular tables arranged in close proximity in the classroom; and 3) literacy centers, where children are in groups of 4 or 5 and spend some time in different areas of the classroom depending on their assigned literacy centers for that day. While there is considerable time spent in whole group lessons, students also spend a good amount of time at their tables as well, making student interactions - unmediated by adults - quite common throughout the day. Even though students are expected to work quietly at their tables, conversations amongst tablemates are usually the norm. Thus, much of the data for this study comes from audio and video recording at student tables during table work or literacy center work.
Given these various classroom arrangements, what characterizes the organization of talk in this classroom are constantly shifting participation frameworks. In other words, children, while not always the addressed recipients of utterances, are constantly ratified and unratiﬁed participants of conversations that happen in multiple languages and multiple modalities. Much happens in that space, as children are motivated as participants in conversations that may occur in a language in which they may not be able to produce utterances yet - simply by their physical positioning at their tables or during whole group or small group lessons. The introductory conversation is a good example. Below, I have reproduced the conversation, adding diagrams that demonstrate the spatial-temporal layout of the conversation. The speech bubbles are shown in chronological order, from top to bottom.

**Example 1: Martín and the Pink Crayon**

1. Michaela: ...but you have to ask Lucy if you can have the pink, cuz we don't have one.
2. Maria: We don't have one?
4. Sandy: (gasp) aaahhh! Nosotros teníamos pink
   \[aahh! we used to have pink\]
   (moving around crayons)
5. Sandy: tu rompiste este rosado \[you broke this pink one\]
6. Maria: Necesito rosado, pero no hay
   \[I need pink, but there isn't any\]

7. Right then, Martin, who speaks mostly Spanish at home with his Mexican parents, and who sat at the table adjacent ours, without uttering a single word, got up and brought us a pink crayon, and sat back down at this table.
The conversation is diagrammed in the following sequence:

*Figure 6.1*
Figure 6.2

We don't have one?

Figure 6.3

Nope.
(gasping) ahhh! Nosotros teníamos pink (moving around crayons)

Tu rompiste este rosado.

Figure 6.4

Necesito rosado pero no hay

Figure 6.5
This conversation begins with Michaela informing Maria that she'll have to ask Lilly for a pink crayon, since they don't have one. Sandy, who often claims she doesn't speak English, jumps in when she gasps and states that they used to have pink, and after moving around the crayon boxes, accusing one of her classmates that he had broken the pink one. Maria, continuing the conversation in Spanish after Sandy's utterance, laments her need for a pink crayon, and the apparent lack of one in their box. Just then, Martin, who at this point was an overhearer sitting at the adjacent table, inserts himself into the interaction by solving the table's problem, and bringing them a pink crayon from his own table - without uttering a single word.

We see several things occurring in this interaction. First, we have a multiparty bilingual conversation, where the participants have varying levels of proficiency in English and Spanish as part of their communicative repertoires, yet given their
configuration around a table, all are participants to conversations that occur in both languages - this is indicated by the dotted line around the circular table in the figures. Michaela addresses Maria, in English, informing her that there is no pink crayon at their table. Sandy is an unaddressed recipient to this particular utterance, yet by virtue of being at the table, a ratified participant. And while she often claims she cannot speak English ("yo no se hablar inglés", she has often stated), she adds to the conversation several turns later, in Spanish. María moves easily between English and Spanish, comfortably expressing herself in both, as does Juan, who remained uncharacteristically silent during this exchange. Thus, at this table, there are conversations that occur in both languages, in which all students are participants, and though at times are silent observers, they are nonetheless being socialized into conversations that serve to expand their communicative abilities in their lesser known language.

Second, this vignette illustrates another normal occurrence in this classroom - that of constant conversations which include flexible and shifting frameworks where students go from unratified over hearers of a conversation to participants - and in the course of doing so changing the on-going interaction. This is what happens when Martín, without uttering a word, solves the pink crayon problem. He goes from being an overhearer, outside of the conversation, to a participant - as figure 6.6 illustrates.

This everyday interaction in the classroom illustrates the fluidity with which children move in and out of multiple conversations using multiple languages. This is one of many examples in the data corpus of the multiparty nature of conversations, which often go from two to many participants in the course of interaction. And given that in this
kindergarten classroom there are many instances and opportunities for student talk, unmediated by the teacher, and that these tables are in close proximity to one another, we can imagine then how these multiparty conversations are constantly occurring, constantly overlapping during the course of the school day. Thus, we can represent this communicative panorama in the following diagram:

![Diagram](image)

*Figure 6.6*

This feature of the organization of talk in this classroom allows us to see the moments of interaction that are also moments of linguistic and communicative socialization. In the aforementioned example this process of socialization is more implicit: by virtue of being a (at times silent) participant in interactions, one is nevertheless being socialized as a participant in that interaction, and over time, into that community of speakers. Concomitantly, there are also moments in interactions where this socialization might be
more explicit. By that, I mean that there is more explicit “teaching” of language that may be going on during interaction, as the following example will show.

**Example 2: Tara & Landon**

Tara and Landon have sat next to each other all year, and have developed a strong friendship and connection. Tara is a blond, sensitive girl whose parents speak English at home and is the youngest student in the classroom, and Landon is a curious boy who communicates comfortably in both English and Spanish, loves math, and speaks Spanish at home with his Mexican parents. They sit together at Mesa Azul, as the following diagram shows, and are joined by Anita, who loves school, is an avid reader, and speaks Spanish at home; and Monica, who also speaks Spanish at home,\(^7\) and is a caring classmate and eager to please. Maestra Laura is Monica's individual tutor, assigned to her due to her diagnosis of mild autism. She is a Cuban woman with many years of experience as an educator.

---

\(^7\) Statements on home language practices are from my observations of interactions between children and parents at drop-off or pick up, and from my conversations with parents throughout field work.
The following transcript shows students working on a response to a book that had just been read aloud. Their task was to draw and write about what they would imagine themselves to be when they grow up. The transcript is shown in two formats: a table with a column for each participant, and as a series of diagrams that illustrate the spatial arrangement at the table of this interaction.

At the beginning of this transcript, there are two simultaneous conversations - one between Landon and Tara in English, and between Maestra Laura and Monica in Spanish, as the following table shows. Each column represents each speaker - simultaneous talk is indicated with double lines // as well as with writing on the same row. (Lines 1-14 in Table 6, Figures 6.9-6.11). In the diagrams, speech bubbles are organized vertically according to the order in which they are said, in other words - temporality is shown vertically from top to bottom.
Table 6: Dialogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Maestra Laura</th>
<th>Monica</th>
<th>Anita</th>
<th>Landon</th>
<th>Tara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hey! Take a look!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Que?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I'm a mommy bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No la ese va aquí, Me imagino que soy</td>
<td>Say, &quot;I imagine that I'm a mommy bird&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>// Que tu quieres?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soy que soy un // pajarito mamá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cuz you draw it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Que soy la ese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is me the mommy bird</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>That's you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Que soy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>That's you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>//un</td>
<td>//yes, I'm the mommy bird.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.8
Tara and Landon are chatting about what they imagine themselves to be and what they're drawing. In line 5, Landon instructs Tara to "say 'I imagine that I'm a mommy bird'" - which Tara interpreted to mean, *say in Spanish*, given that her response was 'soy que soy
un pajarito mamá'. Maestra Laura is trying to decipher what Monica wants to write about to help her spell the words, as can be seen in the directives on lines 5 and 9. In line 12 and 14 she is dictating the words for Monica to write. During this time, Anita is silent.

Moments after this interaction, at timecode [00:07:39.05], Maestra Laura redirects Monica to write a caption that fits her own drawing, given that Monica wanted to copy what Tara or Anita were doing. Maestra Laura instructs Monica to describe her drawing of a duck, but Anita jumps in by saying its a bird, which Maestra Laura picks up on, then adding that Monica perhaps imagines herself to be a farmer - un granjero (Lines 18-23, Figures 6.12-6.13). Monica rejects that suggestion, saying she doesn't want to be a farmer, mentioning it multiple times (although mumbling it the second time). Anita jumps in again, asking, perhaps surprised, una granjero? Then, Landon, an overhearer at the table until this moment, jumps in by correcting the gender agreement, twice stating, 'granjera no granjero'. Then further explaining, "si es niña es granjera. si es niño es granjero" [If it's a girl it's granjera, if it's a boy it's granjero]. However, neither Maestra Laura nor Monica pay attention to Landon's comment, since Maestra Laura is still trying to help Monica come up with an alternative of what she imagines herself to be. (Lines 24-29, Figure 6.14). After a momentary pause, Tara and Landon continue chatting about their drawings in English.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line/Timecode</th>
<th>Maestra Laura</th>
<th>Monica</th>
<th>Anita</th>
<th>Landon</th>
<th>Tara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[00:07:39.05]</td>
<td>Yo quiero estar como este mira</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Pero tu hiciste un pato?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>No! // Ese es un pájaro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>// Tu tienes que poner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ese es un pájaro=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>=es un pájaro. Tienes que ponerle ‘me imagino que soy’ entonces pones aqui que cosa que es lo que tenien el el (p) un granjero’ pon aqui ‘Me imagino’. No pongas un granjero=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>//Uno? No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>//no quiero ser granjero//</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>(mumbling) //no quiero ser granjero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>granjero?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Eh? //Y que cosa eres tu?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>nada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Que fue lo que dibujaste?//</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7: Dialogue**
Figure 6. 11

Figure 6. 12
The classroom set up, and the combination of children at the tables allows for constantly overlapping, multi-party conversations that occur in multiple languages and modalities, as this conversation shows. Tara and Landon are conversing about their own drawings and sentences, while Maestra Laura is helping Monica with her own. Anita, also present at the table, is an unaddressed participant in both of these conversations, given the table set-up and their proximity. However, Anita has been attending to the conversation between Maestra Laura and Monica, given that she jumps in at the moment when Maestra Laura and Monica begin to negotiate what sentence Monica will write, about what she imagines. Landon, then, also jumps in the conversation, correcting the gender agreement.

Landon, who easily communicates in both English and Spanish, contributes to both conversations. Anita is not part of the conversation between Tara and Landon - but
is nonetheless an unaddressed participant - she is listening to their conversation. Likewise, Tara is a silent participant to the exchange regarding what Monica will write and Landon's correction. These are moments that serve as opportunities for language socialization. Children are constantly participating (whether silently or not) in conversations that occur in the linguistic code which they are in the process of learning. Simply by virtue of their physical positioning, children are participants in conversations. Given the research from language socialization studies reviewed above, this seems like a key role in the learning process, and in fact, as DeLeón states, it "highlights the interactive work in which both hearers as well as speakers and other participants engage" (p.82, 2011, emphasis original).

In the space of shifting from an overhearer to a participant many things can potentially happen - one, a student may always be addressed in what others perceive as the students’ dominant or more comfortable language, perhaps reinforcing an identity of either an English speaker or a Spanish speaker, or a student may reject an utterance spoken in a language he or she perceives not to understand and demand that it be translated, instances which often occurred in this classroom. A student can simply be a silent participant, attending or not to a conversation in a different language. But in this program, at some point, all students are expected to become participants in conversations that involve both standard English and standard Spanish, along with a range of other varieties in between. Thus, towards the end of the year, students were participants in, and eventually began responding to, conversations in the language that they were beginning to add to their repertoires.
These two examples reinforce the idea of the importance of the role of the silent observer, and quite crucially, the role of talk and interaction amongst students at their tables or centers. Additionally, understanding language as one out of many ways to communicate, as part of an individual's communicative repertoire, allows us to see these as moments of socialization into different ways of interacting and communicating. This is further illustrated in the following example, which shows how students are not simply learning different languages, but are experiencing (and experimenting) different ways of expressing oneself and of aligning with others through interaction.

Example 3. Analysis of a Literacy Event: No David!

The next data point occurred during "Centro de Lectura" - or reading center, which takes place on the rug in the classroom library. During this literacy center, each student is expected to choose a book and read it to or with a partner. In this instance, two of the girls on the rug chose to read a popular and well loved children's book in the classroom by author David Shannon - No David! - about a little boy, David, who gets into trouble all the time. The book in this classroom is the Spanish translation of the original.

The main participants in this event were Kelsy, Adriana, and Zoe. Kelsy is an energetic African American 6-year-old who lives with her grandmother and who travels from a different part of the city to attend this program. Kelsy, who speaks English at home, has quickly emerged as a 'leader' within the girls in this classroom, and is eager to learn and participate in Spanish during whole-group lessons. Adriana is a good natured, well-liked bilingual student, who is the youngest of three in her Dominican American
household. She lives with her mother, whom she speaks to in Spanish, and her older brothers, whom she speaks to in English. All three siblings attend this school, and while at one point they lived in the neighborhood, they have since moved to another area of town. Zoe is a wide-eyed curious six-year-old, the oldest of two girls, who lives with her parents several blocks from school in a renovated three story home. Zoe and her parents moved to Philadelphia from Brooklyn, finding Philly a much more affordable place to call home, that still offered an urban lifestyle and diverse environment. She is white and speaks only English at home, although her parents are eager to learn more than their "peace-corps" Spanish (for dad) or high-school Spanish (for mom). Zoe often plays "maestra" at home, and makes her younger sister listen to her lessons, as she blabbers away using her growing Spanish repertoire along with her own made up Spanish words.

Kelsy was paired up with Maria, and was sitting close to Zoe and Adriana, whom I sat next to first so I could read with them, putting down my cell phone on the floor to record our conversation (see diagram below). Adriana had the No David! book in her hands, and the girls were just beginning to read this book as I joined them. Transcript 1, represents this interaction in two columns: the first illustrates the decoding of the text, in bold, and the second column displays talk about the book.
While there are many interesting things happening in this short segment, I would like to highlight the ways in which the girls orient to each other and to the book. At the beginning of the transcript, in line 7, Zoe, in a very teacher-like voice and role, requests that Adriana tell her what the book was about. Adriana, taking on the role of 'student', asks whether she’ll have to talk about each page, and right then, in lines 11 & 12, I interfere and change the activity at hand from discussing the book to reading/decoding the text in the book. I do this when I say "Mira" - and clear my throat, a signal that I am about to begin reading, point to the words on the page, and begin. The girls join in on line 13.
The next couple of turns, I model reading the words by sounding them out, elongating vowels and sounds. The girls react to the book and comment on it - such as in line 18: ewww, and in line 19 when Adriana comments how David 'have a worm' coming out of his dirty face. Zoe continues enacting a teacher role in various turns in this interaction - in line 29 - “that’s not ‘No David’ (and begins reading)” - correcting Adriana's previous utterance, and again in line 49 - “No! Yasta! This doesn’t say David”. When asked by me how she knows it doesn’t say David, she says that because it starts with a J, saying the letter name in English, then repeating it in Spanish, la jota. This spurs a side conversation about Jay/J also being Adriana’s brother’s name. Both of Zoe's
statements are statements of fact, in which she confidently describes the text - referred to as "that" or "this", which she recognizes does not correspond to the words that Adriana has spoken aloud.

### Table 9: Transcript 1, Pt.2: Adriana, Zoe & Kelsy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoe:</th>
<th>Adriana:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nooo (1.0) (turns page)</td>
<td>nooo (1.0) (turns page)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eww muack</td>
<td>eww muack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe: (laughter) (2.0) [Noo Daaavviiiiid]</td>
<td>Zoe: (laughter) (2.0) [Noo Daaavviiiiid]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe:</td>
<td>Zoe:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(giggles)</td>
<td>(giggles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe: (1.0) Na [na]</td>
<td>Zoe: (1.0) Na [na]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adriana:</td>
<td>Adriana:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He barfin'</td>
<td>He barfin'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe: =That's not 'No David', (starts reading)</td>
<td>Zoe: =That's not 'No David', (starts reading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe: David, ven</td>
<td>Zoe: David, ven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adriana: (1.0) ven ven aca</td>
<td>Adriana: (1.0) ven ven aca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: Aaa</td>
<td>S: Aaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe: Aaa</td>
<td>Zoe: Aaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adriana: [Aaaaaaaa</td>
<td>Adriana: [Aaaaaaaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe: [aaaa</td>
<td>Zoe: [aaaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: [quii</td>
<td>S: [quii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls: Aqui</td>
<td>Girls: Aqui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: Immediatamente!!! (imitating mother's character voice)</td>
<td>S: Immediatamente!!! (imitating mother's character voice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe:</td>
<td>Zoe:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da....ayy...David!</td>
<td>Da....ayy...David!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adriana=vid!</td>
<td>Adriana=vid!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adriana: Pa....rrrraaa</td>
<td>Adriana: Pa....rrrraaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe: rrrrraa [Ah]</td>
<td>Zoe: rrrrraa [Ah]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofia:</td>
<td>Sofia:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ya]</td>
<td>[ya]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofia: Para ya!</td>
<td>Sofia: Para ya!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(flip page)</td>
<td>(flip page)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Adriana: No David!</td>
<td>47 Adriana: No David!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 In unison: 'No juegues con la comida'</td>
<td>48 In unison: 'No juegues con la comida'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Zoe:</td>
<td>49 Zoe:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'No juegues'-NO! yasal this</td>
<td>'No juegues'-NO! yasal this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doesn't say David</td>
<td>doesn't say David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: How do you know that?</td>
<td>S: How do you know that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe:</td>
<td>Zoe:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because it starts with a J, la jota (says letter name in Spanish)</td>
<td>Because it starts with a J, la jota (says letter name in Spanish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adriana:</td>
<td>Adriana:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEY! you say my brother name!</td>
<td>HEY! you say my brother name!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S:</td>
<td>S:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay?</td>
<td>Jay?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adriana:</td>
<td>Adriana:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That's my brother name, Jay!</td>
<td>That's my brother name, Jay!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(laughter)</td>
<td>(laughter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: Como el nombre de la letra? (like the name of the letter)?</td>
<td>S: Como el nombre de la letra? (like the name of the letter)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: =Dice, 'No, jijjuegues</td>
<td>S: =Dice, 'No, jijjuegues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adriana:</td>
<td>Adriana:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'con la comida'</td>
<td>'con la comida'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: (repeats) 'con la comida'</td>
<td>S: (repeats) 'con la comida'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout this interaction, Kelsy has been reading with her partner, Maria - and was sitting close to us on the rug. But, later on in this interaction, as we continue to read
the book, the dynamic changes when Kelsy joins our trio, which happens around line 20 of Transcript 2, below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Book Aloud</th>
<th>Talk/Reactions to Book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S: Vete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A: vete al cuarto-to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S: muy bien a tu?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A: cuarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S: cuarto-y mira como se siente David? (and look how does David feel?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Adriana: hh ma:ar! hhh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Zoe: he's mad!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A: yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Zoe: (2.0) ohhh you skipped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Adriana: ohhh yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(giggles/laughter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>S: aaaaateeeerr[iizzaa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A: [iizzaa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sofia: de una[aaa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Adriana: [naaa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sofia: vez!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>(turn page)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Zoe: ewwwwww hehe eww</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Adriana: ew hahahaaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sofia: shhhhh (whispers to quiet down)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sofia: (3.0) deja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Adriana: deja [pa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sofia: [deee]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Adriana: deee[ee]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Kelsy: [ew he pick][in his nose]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sofia: [hacer]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Adriana: [hace]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Zoe: [he pickin][his nose]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sofia: [eso]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Adriana: [eso]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Sofia: ahora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Adriana: ahoora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>K: [eeeeeeewwww][ww]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Sofia: [miiiiisis][mo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Z: [ewww right]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Kelsy: he picking his nose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Adriana [?]: He did</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Zoe: He did!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Sofia: (2.0) (resumes reading) recoge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Adriana: recoge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Sofia: looos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Adriana: loooos juuuu[jueueeet]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Sofia: [jueueeetes]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Zoe: [jueueeetes][flip page]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 45 | K: [uuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuu
In lines 18-20 of Transcript 2, Zoe and Adriana react to the picture of David picking his nose as we flip the page. Here, only Adriana follows my lead in decoding the words, while Zoe begins to follow Kelsy's lead in reacting to and commenting on what we're reading - in lines 25 & 28, and in lines 33 & 35. After a momentary pause, I continue reading, with Adriana following and Zoe joining in on line 44 - and as soon as we flip the page - perhaps anticipating what is next, Kelsy reacts - and Zoe and Adriana join in, on a very long "uuuuuuuu!". In line 54, not only do we get the loudest, most excited reaction - but also, it becomes the beginning of a longer turn in which Kelsy takes the floor and momentarily shifts the activity from decoding the text on the page to talking about it and telling her own story. Kelsy tells her own story of being in trouble, or being in the corner or 'timeout', like David.

| 48 | Adriana: dentro |
| 49 | Sofia: (1.0) de |
| 50 | Adriana: de (2.0) caaaa[aaasaa |
| 51 | Sofia: [ssssssaa |
| 52 | Zoe: ssaa. No david |
| 53 | Adriana: [vid! (turn page) |

| 54 | K: uuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuu he got uuUUUUUUuuuuuuuuu |
| 55 | Zoe: uuuu u cryin? he cryin? |
| 56 | Adriana: he cryin |
| 57 | S: Awww. Why is he cryin? Where is he? |
| 58 | Zoe: oooo because he-ummmm= |
| 59 | Kelsy: cuz he's in the corner |
| 60 | Zoe: he's in the corner |
| 61 | Kelsy: he's in timeout |
| 62 | Sofia: (barely audible) he's in timeout |
| 63 | Zoe: Um-and and he] knocked the vase over |
| 64 | S: [(gasp--------)no lo habla visto! miliiira. Que paso [entonces?] (ohh I hand't seen it, look. What happened then?) |
| 65 | Z: [the flowers] those [flowers were those flowers= |
| 66 | Kelsy: [one time I got in in in |
| 67 | Zoe: =were toooo[oo preetyyyyy aaawwwwwwww |
| 68 | Kelsy: [one time lil goooot in |

*Table 11: Transcript 2, Pt. 2 - Adriana, Zoe & Kelsy*
Once Kelsy becomes an active participant in our interaction, Zoe orients towards her, shifting her footing by not only abandoning her teacher role, but also, taking on a learner role. Zoe follows Kelsy's lead in reacting to the book by repeating her reactions and statements, as in line 28 when she repeats "he pickin his nose", or in line 55, "he cryin", or in line 60, "he's in the corner". Moreover, she begins to emulate Kelsy's way of speaking - which is particularly evident in line 79, when Zoe utters, "that not good. that not good". Copula deletion, a feature of Black English, (Rickford, 1999; Smitherman, 1977) is normally not a feature of Zoe's everyday talk, but it is a common feature in Kelsy's talk. Zoe's stylization of her talk during this interaction is an alignment to Kelsy and Adriana. This stylization was evident when minutes later in the recording, Zoe, looking at my phone which I was using as a recording device, asks me, "how does it reflect your voice?" - going back to her usual English cadence and intonation.

Thus, what is evident throughout this interaction are well-coordinated shifts in footing. In the first part of the interaction, Zoe and Adriana take up teacher and student roles respectively - with me as an adult figure scaffolding the decoding of the text. However, when Kelsy joins in the interaction - she not only goes from unratified overhearer to active participant, but also changes the interactional positionings, effectively taking the floor, and modeling a different way of participating in this literacy event, by reacting effusively to the situations in which naughty David, the book's character, gets himself into. Once Kelsy takes the floor, she directs our conversation into talking about the book, and all of us - Zoe, Adriana and myself, orient towards her. Kelsy becomes the model that Zoe and Adriana orient to and follow - by imitating not only her ways of reacting to the book, but also her way of speaking.
This interaction illustrates how children scaffold each other into reading the text on the page; how they follow each other's lead in reacting to the book, and how they show alignment towards each other by how they listen to one another and imitate each others' ways of speaking and participating in this event. Zoe is guiding Adriana to connect written letters with their corresponding sounds in Spanish, and Kelsy is guiding the girls into participating in the story by making connections to the characters and reacting to his actions. Throughout this interaction - and various others that occur on a daily basis in this classroom - the children are socializing each other into different ways of speaking and different ways of participating in classroom and literacy events. Children in this classroom, then, are learning much more than simply 'codified' English and 'Spanish' - children are learning different Englishes/Spanishes/Spanglishes and the particular stances and embodiments one can take on during the course of interaction. The children in this classroom experiment and play with language, in some ways "trying it on" by imitating others around them. In a very real sense, children are learning to embody different ways of being - by not only learning a 'language' other than the one most often spoken at home, but also, by learning the subtle, nuanced ways of communicating, of expressing oneself, that create particular stances and alignments towards others.

Understanding children's language and languaging as part of their communicative repertoires allows us to go beyond simply looking at the use of either English or Spanish or L1 or L2, and to notice different instances of communication and interaction. A point Rymes makes about communicative repertoires is that in instances where interlocutors do not share some of the same tools for communication, it's important to pay attention to "who accommodates to whom" (Rymes, 2010, p. 532). Volk and Angelova (2007) argue
that in their classroom context, there were more instances of the Spanish speakers accommodating to the English speakers, and attribute that to English as the dominant language and English speakers as dominant. Similarly, Palmer (2009) makes the case that white middle class children will have a tendency to dominate the floor, if teachers aren't successful mediators of classroom interaction - and that this is related to their symbolic dominance as part of the white middle class. While I do not deny that power relations in the world outside the classroom will have an influence on the power dynamics in the classroom, it is important to also pay attention to the social hierarchies formed within the classroom that are created through interaction and become part of the classroom culture.

Within the social world of kindergarteners, interaction and the directionality of accommodation is not neutral, but I argue that it follows the logics of the social hierarchies and dynamics of the social world of these 5 and 6 year olds. Here, it is important to note that both Zoe and Kelsy held important positions in the social hierarchy of this classroom community - both emerged as leaders. Nonetheless, Zoe sought out Kelsy more often for friendship and acceptance - thus it makes sense that she would accommodate to her in social interactions. Academically; however, Zoe excelled and was more often positioned as a model of good behavior, so many times other students followed Zoe's lead and took on the role of students when she positioned herself as a teacher and a knower. This is not unrelated to her privilege as a white middle class child, and the advantages of a well-resourced home that prepares Zoe for success in school literacy, that is recognized and more highly valued (given the pressures on teachers and accountability systems for learning) than the strengths, literacies, or funds of knowledge which other children may bring.
Studies on peer language socialization have shown how children in peer groups across geographical and cultural contexts create their own social hierarchies through discourse and interaction - and through interaction negotiate power within their relationships and social configurations (Goodwin and Kyratzis, 2011). What this analysis shows, and other moments in this corpus, is that who accommodated to whom and in which situations varied - there were other instances where Zoe emulated her interlocutors' intonation while talking to one of her Hispanic classmates - and instances when Kelsy sought out Adriana's help in decoding a different book in Spanish. What this analysis does not show; however, is the kinds of changes in these children's trajectories of socialization, and whether and how as they grow older, the larger discourses around them will affect the ways they communicate and the kinds of stances they'll take towards each other and towards various ways of using language and communicating.

By illustrating how Zoe interactionally aligned with Kelsy by emulating her way of speaking I am not claiming that Zoe will become "fluent" in stylizing her talk in ways consistent with Black English, instead, I wish to illustrate the subtle ways in which children can learn to show alignment with each other, and that one of those ways to show alignment is through your way of speaking - and given that this is a two-way immersion classroom, this is indeed what Zoe is learning to do - learning to speak another language, as part of a lofty goal of being able to communicate with others and to become a more competent intercultural individual. Perhaps this is the micro-interactional version of the greater goal that many parents who seek out "diversity" for their children are aiming for - an experience that some were left out of by growing up in homogenous environments. A diverse classroom, and having a diverse group of friends, means learning to communicate
with others and create social environments with others whose communicative repertoire is different than yours, with the often deep cultural and class and racial differences that go along with that as well. This suggests that diversity can be more than a mere co-presence, but a constant experience of sharing, learning and interacting with others who each bring a distinct linguistic and cultural socialization trajectory. What will get valued in the classroom environment and outside of it as the children grow older, however, is yet to be seen.

Finally, it's important to note that the classroom arrangement, and particularly the arrangement of children at the tables, is done very intentionally by the teacher, placing children of different language abilities with each other, so that at each table, there are children that are considered "English speakers", "Spanish speakers" and "bilinguals". Indeed, the underlying theory of two-way immersion and the literature are explicit in this guideline for teachers and administrators of TWI programs. In fact, part of what motivates this arrangement, and the whole premise of TWI, is the idea that children will learn language from each other and that both the children that speak "the majority language" and those that speak "the minority language" will have the opportunity to take turns being the language experts. In part, this analysis validates that claim. Although, as will be evident in the next chapter, it is not always the case that children get to be the “language experts” of their perceived dominant language all the time.

**Conclusion**

Interactional patterns in a classroom vary widely, especially in a classroom organized around student work and independence. Although IRE and IRE-like sequences
continue to be part of whole group classroom discourse, I argue that another significant feature of classroom talk is the multiple, constantly overlapping, constantly shifting student conversations that emerge throughout the day. Participation frameworks in the classroom are in flux, and children are always in a position of ratified - or unratified - participants of conversations that occur in multiple languages. At times this language is one that is not yet part of a child’s repertoire, or that the child is beginning to understand but may not quite yet produce. Yet, by becoming a participant in these conversations, the child is being socialized into becoming a member of that linguistic community - not just acquiring the words and phrases needed to express ideas and accomplish social acts, but taking up the stances, roles, and attitudes that go along with the many aspects of communication. This happens for both children that are learning English and those that are learning Spanish. Furthermore, at any point in time, children go from bystanders to a conversation to active participants, influencing the course of interactions as they do so. In this sense, children move across participation frameworks fluidly just like they are learning to move across different languages and ways of speaking. In a bilingual classroom where children come from different linguistically and culturally diverse homes, these become important moments in which students, through interaction, actively create their own social worlds - orienting towards each other in different ways.

This fluidity across participation frameworks becomes a productive space for learning and socialization - particularly in this context of a two-way immersion bilingual program in a gentrifying community. Given the larger social processes of gentrification and immigration that converge in this time and place to create this program - the diversity of the children and families that it brings together, at least in this 1st cohort, is quite
unique. Looking at how children move in and out of different participation frameworks by using their communicative repertoires - which are constantly expanding - and how they take interactional stances vis-a-vis each other and the content of their interaction is a productive interactional moment worthy of analysis. The participation framework as the unit of analysis in examining classroom discourse in TWI bilingual settings allows us to capture moments of socialization and the different interactional roles children can take up during interaction. It allows us to account for the important role of silent participants and overhearers, and the effects of easily shifting participations frameworks. Furthermore, expanding our analytical tool kit in this way helps us understand communicative dynamics in bilingual TWI classrooms in their full sense. In other words, it allows us to consider children's interactions, of which language choice is one element, and allows us to account for more than just the speakers.

The importance of spatial arrangements in face-to-face interactions, as this analysis showed, required that I represented such spatial arrangements in the written transcripts. In this chapter, I have offered not only a different lens with which to analyze classroom discourse that is especially suited for bilingual classrooms, but also, an alternative approach to representing such discourse in text. Scholars have shown the importance of transcription as the first moment of analysis and interpretation (Bezemer & Mavers, 2011; Bucholtz, 2000; Ochs, 1979), and here, I offer one that takes into account spatio-temporal relations. Of course, like similarly-oriented multimodal transcription methods, this becomes quite tedious and our current word processing software may prove to be too clumsy for the task - as the potential misalignments in this document attest to. One limitation of this analysis is that it was based on audio recordings and ethnographic
field notes - thus, no visual record was available to account for the many ways children communicate through their gaze, their postures, and expressions. Having such record might require a different kind of representational scheme, and one that would surely provide rich insights on peer communicative socialization processes in bilingual classrooms.

Looking at these everyday interactions as moments of socialization reminds us of the complicated social worlds of five- and six-year olds, who at an early age begin forming the associations that later solidify to links between sounds, letters, speakers, and ideas. By focusing on situated activities, this analysis provides a snapshot in time - it does not, as aforementioned, provide us with the data on longitudinal patterns of interaction that over time might begin to solidify into recognizable academic and social identities for the students. In the following chapter, however, I do just that by following what I call students' trajectories of raciolinguistic socialization, in which race and class dynamics affect how children become socialized into inhabiting roles of good student and good bilingual, or the opposite.
Chapter 7: But mom! I don’t want to be a Spanish Boy: Trajectories of Raciolinguistic Socialization

This chapter is about the ways in which race and class impact trajectories of socialization in the classroom - a process I refer to as raciolinguistic socialization. Raciolinguistic socialization brings to the fore the processes by which language socialization is inextricable from racialization. If language socialization as a term captures the linguistic processes through which one is socialized to become a competent member of a cultural and social group, then raciolinguistic socialization simply recognizes how race and racialization are also inseparable from this same process. Furthermore, in line with the concept of raciolinguistic ideologies (Flores & Rosa, 2016), the term raciolinguistic socialization captures the ways in which race and class impact how language and literacy abilities are evaluated, both formally in educational settings, and informally, in adult reflections of children’s growth. Finally, it refers to the ways children are socialized into raciolinguistic ideologies which naturalize connections between languages and racial and classed backgrounds. I illustrate this process through the stories of four students in the program, and show how the intersection of race, class, and language impact children’s trajectories in distinct ways.

Race/Class

In the context of the United States, class is essential to constructions of ethnicity and race (Omi & Winant, 1994; Urciuoli, 1996; Weis, 2010). Omi & Winant, for example, describe class and race (and gender) as “regions’ of hegemony”, which are not only
“socially constructed,” but also “consist of a field of projects whose common feature is their linkage of social structure and signification” (p.68, 1994). Yet, scholars have traditionally focused on one or the other. For example, Critical Race Theory within education centers race as the organizing structural determinant of educational experience (e.g. Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 2005); while sociologists of education explain educational experiences and outcomes through the lens of class (e.g. Lareau, 2011; Weis, 2010). Yet, at the same time, both the definitions of the concepts of class and race are debated within those fields - it is not my intent to provide an overarching definition for them. I believe, as these case studies illustrate, that both must be understood together - particularly in relation to education.

Thus, when I refer to ‘class’ - I use it as a term to refer to the socio-economic position of particular families, given their professions and their education. I also explore the values, ideas, and practices that I found associated with particular families, that differed along class lines. When I refer to race, I refer to the socially created categories which have become the norm for organizing people into groups based on assumed shared physical and cultural traits, such as being Black or white. I also refer to processes of racialization - thus, given that the categories of race are socially and historically constructed, racialization refers to the process through which these categories are created and maintained.

Adding language to the mix adds an additional layer of complexity - given the ways in which different immigrant groups fit or don’t fit into the racial politics of the United States. Urciuoli (1996) explores this relationship of class/race/language in her study of Puerto Ricans in New York - arguing that not only is the white middle class our
cultural default or “cultural starting point” (pg. 28) in the United States, but also that
class has been key to racializing discourses. Thus, there is a very strong race and class
conflation where some things are automatically associated with others. Urciuoli explains
this dilemma:

The race/class conflation always implies a hierarchy and an imbalance of power:
someone is “lower” and someone else “higher”. When racialized individuals try to
beat the conflation by changing others’ perceptions of them, their efforts remind
one of the myth of Sisyphus, eternally condemned to push the boulder up the
mountain […] Being “low class” and Puerto Rican or black are unmarked with
respect to each other, habitually and typically associated. Like a default setting,
this conflation is the normal point of reference unless it is specifically (never
permanently) reset” (pg. 27, Urciuoli, 1996).

Furthermore, language plays a crucial role in this process. For the Puerto Ricans in her
study, she states:

Hegemonically, Spanish itself is regarded as a barrier to class mobility because it
displaces English. Accents, 'broken' English, and 'mixing' become signs of
illiteracy and laziness, which people are morally obliged to control through
education. Not controlling language results in 'bilingual confusion'. (p. 26,
Urciuoli, 1996).

As we will see in this chapter, this kind of assessment of the role of Spanish only
pertains to racialized individuals. In other words, the critical link that exists between
language, race and class, works differently for differently classed and racialized
individuals. Just like both race and class play a significant role in shaping students'
educational experiences, so too do race and class affect evaluations and perceptions of
language use within educational spaces.
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Raciolinguistic Ideologies and Language Socialization

Bilingual schooling spaces are ripe with metacommentary through which often competing language ideologies seep through. These ideologies play out in the official language policies and program structures of school, as well as in the teachers and students’ communicative behavior as well that of families’ expectations of learning. Schools are also contexts of socialization on multiple levels - in fact, one could say that the goal of bilingual programs is the linguistic socialization of its students (whether that goal be bilingualism or a transition to English, in the case of transitional programs). Furthermore, there is a reciprocal relationship between language socialization and language ideologies: children are socialized into particular ideologies, and ideologies have an effect on the socialization process. In other words, “language ideologies influence the sociocultural contexts that shape language socialization, and language ideologies are also among the many cultural values socialized through language use” (Riley, 2011, p. 493).

In this chapter I argue that raciolinguistic ideologies impact the language socialization of children at school in differential ways based on the children and family’s own racial and classed position. Flores and Rosa conceptualize raciolinguistic ideologies as those that “produce racialized speaking subjects who are constructed as linguistically deviant even when engaging in linguistic practices positioned as normative or innovative when produced by privileged white subjects” (2015, p. 150). Raciolinguistic ideologies recognize that ideologies about language are never divorced from their speakers, and that the processes through which the indexical links are made between forms of speaking (and
other signs) and types of people are not divorced from racializing processes through which certain racial categories are created and maintained. A raciolinguistic perspective decenters actual linguistic practices and instead focuses on a hegemonic, normative listening subject - a white gaze that construes racialized bodies as linguistically deviant regardless of objective linguistic forms produced (Flores & Rosa, 2015; Rosa, 2016).

The structure of a Two-Way Immersion program lends itself to a regimenting of languages and speakers, because of the way it classifies children as either English-speakers or Spanish-speakers and to a preoccupation with a “balanced” number of each of these. In reality, while some children may be dominant in one of the languages at the beginning of school, many children have been exposed to both - especially Latino children from bilingual homes and bilingual extended families. In fact, it may be the case that children classified as “English-speakers” may be closer to the monolingual end of the spectrum, along with very recently arrived immigrants from Spanish-speaking countries. But other than these cases, children come from bilingual homes and everyday experiences, even when they get labeled as “Spanish-dominant”. For example, the majority of children who were Spanish-dominant in the TWI program at GW also had older siblings and cousins, uncles and aunts, and at least one parent with whom they also spoke with in English; they had experiences in pre-school or day care which more often than not were in English; and they had access to media and a linguistic landscape around them which was in English (and other languages - such as Vietnamese, Mandarin, or Thai which were visible in the surrounding areas close to the school). Nonetheless, because of how TWI programs are ideally structured, children get sorted into these two categories.
This categorical regimenting becomes interactionally reinforced through everyday talk and interactional routines in the classroom. In the kindergarten classroom, Ms. O often directly referred to some of her students as “English-speakers”. She used this to get their attention - along with the contextualization cue of switching to English as the medium of whole-group instruction. The explicit labeling of “English-speakers” meant she was referring to the small group of children who were English-dominant and came from English-dominant homes: Michaela, Lilly, Zoe, Tara, Kelsy, and Devon - the three white children and the two African-American children in the classroom. Both of these strategies - switching the language of instruction to English and explicitly naming students as “English-speakers” were meant as “short-hand” or efficient short-cuts to get the children to access the content of the lesson, to pay attention to a particular linguistic element, or as a directive to placate their behavior. The following excerpt illustrates one instance of this occurrence. The students were on the rug and Ms. O was reviewing the words they were learning that began with the letter \( h \) - which in Spanish is silent. She was reviewing the word, ‘hamaca’, and explicitly asked the “English-speakers” what it meant:

Ms. O: A ver, English speakers, what do you think hamaca is?

Michaela: Apple!

Ms. O: Haa:amaca. What does it sound like? We get on it, we get on it, we

Lilly: A swing!

Belén: (levantando la mano, diciendo suavemente): Yo se, yo se, yo se, yo se, yo se

Ms. O: we tie it, we tie it to trees, a veces...

Belén: Yo se
Zoe: (calling out) A SWING!
Ms. O: good job Zoe!

(there are many other voices, then the phone rings)
Lilly: I said that!!!

Perhaps because she wanted to ensure their participation and/or their understanding, Ms. O specifically calls on the “English-speakers” to define and answer her question - even when Belén was raising her hand to answer as well. Belén, a bilingual student confident in both English and Spanish, was eager to answer. Yet she was not the target of Ms. O’s question, she was not included in the group Ms. O refers to as “English-speakers”.

The sustained labeling of these six children as the “English-speakers” during the first year of school contributed to a naturalized connection between them and English - and by omission excluded the other students from also being recognized as English-speakers. Not only that, the implicit labeling which occurred during a switch to English to address these particular children - whether whole group, small group, or individually, reinforced this notion on a daily basis. Indeed, it is communicatively instinctive for a bilingual individual to address her interlocutor in the language which they feel most comfortable speaking - and thus sometimes unnatural to address a learner in language he or she is in the early stages of learning. Yet, that is the theory behind immersion situations. And, as I illustrated in Chapter 5, addressing children in the language in which they are learning makes them participants and thus socializes them as legitimate participants in the communicative exchange - even if they are still in the process of learning.
Thus, Two-Way Immersion programs such as the one at George Washington Elementary, which are situated in a context of gentrification and recent immigration, give means to a process of raciolinguistic enregisterment - that is, the semiotic linkage of certain codes to certain racialized speakers, where English is enregistered as belonging to the white middle class children as well as the (one or two) African American children\textsuperscript{8}, and Spanish is enregistered as belonging to the brown Hispanic/Latino working class children. And it is against this backdrop that children are socialized in the classroom and school context - their individual trajectories of socialization in school thus impacted by their race and class and their language abilities judged accordingly.

1. Racialization and class anxieties

The way in which race and class are confounded in the wider social context, as was discussed previously, creates a particular anxiety for those who are the exception to these normalizing linkages. In the context of South Philadelphia, of recent immigration from Spanish-speaking countries and particularly from Mexico, there is a direct connection between being Mexican and being a worker or low-income working class. Mexican men are the ones staffing many if not most of the kitchens of the city’s restaurants, and a small minority has managed to open their own restaurants and shops in particular areas of

\textsuperscript{8} In this chapter, I limit myself to addressing the experiences of the white and Latino children in the program. It is beyond the scope of this chapter (and dissertation) to address the experiences of the two African American children in the 1st cohort of the program, yet an important topic worthy of investigation that I plan to pursue in future research.
South Philadelphia. Mexican men and women staff these local establishments. Mexican workers are often invisible to the mainstream, English-speaking city dweller.

Given this backdrop, it was perhaps not surprising to Ms. O to hear that Santiago, coming from a middle-class background, a mostly white context, and who had a white mother, rejected the idea of being a “Spanish boy” - as the vignette in the introductory chapter illustrated. The “Spanish Boy” story illustrates how Santiago, at his young age, has already formed a model of personhood of who or what a “Spanish boy” is, and he has rejected that as something he does not want to be. And while his parents saw this bilingual program as an opportunity to counter that notion that Santiago had, ironically, it was his mothers’ class anxieties in the context of racialization that ultimately led to the decision to leave the program.

Santiago

Santiago was an energetic kindergartener. He was curious and active, always moving around. His parents, Jane and Esteban, are both professionals: Esteban is a lawyer trained in Costa Rica and Jane is a school psychologist. Jane is a white blond woman from central Pennsylvania, and Esteban is a dark-skinned Latino from Costa Rica, and they are both bilingual. In my interview with his parents, Jane acknowledged he's a "tough nut to crack", at times stubborn, and at times moody. For Ms. O, his teacher, he was consistently a behavioral challenge, and she sometimes wondered if he had ADHD, since he could rarely sit still in the classroom, he had trouble finishing tasks, sitting in on the rug, and following the classroom routine - a routine he was not used to at
his previous Montessori school, where he had the liberty to move around freely and choose his learning tasks for the day. He also struggled with the very limited recess time allowed, which ranged from 10 - 15 minutes daily, after 10-20 minutes inside the cafetera for lunch.

The reason Santiago's parents chose to enroll him in the program were the fact that it was a bilingual, two-way immersion with a model that began with 90% Spanish, and that it was free, as opposed to the expensive Montessori school he had previously attended. When discussing the pro’s and con’s of the program in our interview, Santiago's parents mentioned their desire to have Santiago develop a sense of his cultural identity:

J=Jane, Mom, E=Esteban, Dad, S=Sofia (researcher)

E: u:m (.) bilingual program (.) getting in Spanish what ninety percent of (.) the time everyday

J: at his old school he was getting it one lesson [a week]

E: [one lesson] half and hour a week (.) know and you know we're biracial

S: hm hmm

E: he thinks like (.) I don't know I mean

J: we want him to develop his Spanish identity]

E: [indecipherable like] you know he’s hispanic

J: hispanic

E: he’s mix

E: [so:] he not blue eyes [no] es un (.) you know blanquito como con

E: [ru=] pelo rubio [so] (. ) to get more (. ) identify with his own culture

S: yeah

E: or half a culture [what ever you want to call it]
Importantly, Esteban first uses the term “we’re biracial” and then describes his son as not a “white boy with blue eyes and blond hair”. Esteban, a dark skin Costa Rican man living in the US, married to a white blond woman, living in a wealthier part of the city, mentions his son’s physical appearance as a reason for wanting his son to develop his identity as a mix-race child. It seems that Esteban is aware of the ways in which his son will be racialized as Latino, particularly in an upper middle class, mostly white context. Later on in the interview, they discuss Santiago's struggles in understanding his heritage, mentioning that he still struggles with that concept, and he at times is resistant to speaking Spanish at home:

J: oh he= the other day we were saying it's woah the multicultural fair at my school and we're like we're gonna make arroz con leche (.) to share with you friends for to show them your Costa Rican heritage or whatever and like /cuz/ remember you're half Costa Rican and you're half German ah Irish whatever my side of the family is (laughs) and he's like 'but I wasn't born in Costa Rica' I'm like 'it doesn't matter you can still be Costa Rican if you weren't born in Costa Rica’ so he's like= he just confu= he's still like a little confused like if you weren't

E: I mean you're from Costa Rica but I was born here (.) [um]

J: [I'm like okay so you're] American but we're talking about your heritage

E: yeah

J: and he's just like= so yeah he's still having like a hard time like wrapping his mind around all that kind of stuff

In the excerpts from our interview above, Jane reports a conversation between her and Santiago, where he objects to her imposing a ‘Costa Rican heritage’ on him since he ‘wasn’t born in Costa Rica’. And while she concedes in her reported conversation that
indeed, he is ‘American’, Jane mentions he’s ‘confused’ and ‘having a hard time’ understanding what ‘heritage’ means. Moreover, it is important to note the differences in the terms Jane and Esteban choose to describe their son. I have highlighted these phrases in the two excerpts above, and have reproduced them in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jane</th>
<th>Esteban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“His Spanish identity”</td>
<td>“We’re biracial”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Hispanic”</td>
<td>“.he’s mix”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Costa Rican-or half Costa Rican and half Irish and German”</td>
<td>“[so:] he not blue eyes [no] es un (.) you know blanquito como con [ru=] pelo rubio [so]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Ok you’re American, but your heritage…”</td>
<td>“.culture…or half a culture whatever you want to call it”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 12: Jane an Esteban’s labels for Santiago*

While Esteban makes references to the mixedness of his racial background - by using the term ‘biracial’, ‘mix’ and referring to his son’s physical appearance, Jane uses the terms Spanish and Hispanic, and then names Santiago’s heritage as Costa Rican, later adding her side of the family’s Irish and German heritage. Note the variety of terms and labels chosen by Jane: Spanish, which can refer to the named language, but is also often used to refer to someone’s cultural background; “Hispanic”, which most often is used to refer to ethnicity, and finally the terms Costa Rican, Irish, German and American - all labels to ascribe identity based on a real or imagined belonging to a nation-state. In contrast, the terms Esteban chooses to use, ‘biracial’, ‘mix’, and essentially, non-white, are racializing terms - terms that refer to ways of characterizing individuals based on assumed biological or physical traits. The difference in descriptors alludes to the distinction Urciuoli (1996)
makes between ethnicizing and racializing discourses. Whereas ethnic discourses are based on cultural origins and evoke the notions of the hard-working immigrant, racial discourses are based on assumptions of natural origin. Urciuoli explains that “when people are talked about as a race… the emphasis is on natural attributes that hierarchize them and, if they are not white, make their place in the nation provisional at best” (p.15). And while racializing discourses are those that mark difference in more problematic ways, both ethnicizing and racializing discourses are forms of marking difference from the white, middle-class, unmarked American (Urciuoli, 1996). In Santiago’s 7-year-old experience, he is already being socialized into a marked identity he is assumed to be (Hispanic/Spanish/Costa Rican), yet whose defining quality he is still in need of developing (Spanish language proficiency). Santiago is resisting both forms of discourse that mark him as different for something he is assumed to possess, yet at the same time label him as a project in need of developing that which will make him assume such identity in its fullest (Spanish language).

In the classroom, there were times when Santiago’s struggle with understanding this (imposed) identity label on him were also apparent. Ms. O, the teacher, told me the story of when the children started asking her about race, during MLK day at the school - a day I had not been present in the classroom. The following day, we were sitting in her classroom after school, and she started telling me about this episode, and how nervous she had gotten about the children asking her about race, particularly when responding to problematic racial commentaries. As she was telling me about this episode, she had asked, how do you explain to 5- and 6-year-olds what race is?
So Ms. O [the teacher] proceeded to tell me that she had all the kids on the rug and read them a story about MLK, then they started talking about race. (I think one of the kids may have asked or something)). Ms. O. began telling them that race means maybe your background or the color of your skin. Ms. O. told them, Maestra is white but she’s Latina because her parents are from Spain and she grew up in Venezuela. She asked, what do you think Kelsy is? The kids answered ‘Black’ and Devon? ‘Black’. So then they started asking Ms. O what they each were, and she would tell them – tu eres Latino, tu eres blanco/you are white, etc. Then Santiago asked, “what am I ?” And Ms. O responded, “Tu eres Latino”. Santiago responded with a disappointed, whiny, “Awwwww!!!” that Ms. O voiced in her retelling of this story. Then Ms. O asked, “why AWWWW?? You don’t want to be Latino?”

Commenting on this episode, Ms. O. turned to me and said, he thinks he’s white! (FN 1.22.2015)

Ms. O’s comment was said in jest, as she had at other times made statements such as ‘El vino a aprender que es Latino en este salón’ [He’s come to learn he’s Latino in this classroom]. Ms. O often stated that children do not like being different, particularly not being singled out as being ‘the different kid’ in the class. Ms. O saw the promise of this bilingual program in the ability to counter those experiences, and understood Santiago’s presence in the program, and his parents’ decision to place him there, as a way for him to understand that there are all kinds of people who speak Spanish, that there are many ways of inhabiting an identity as Hispanic or Latino. Indeed, Santiago’s relationship to Spanish and his Costa Rican heritage was not necessarily always negative, as is evident in some of his interactions in school. Here is an excerpt from my field notes:

When they were cutting out the calaveras, Devon ripped his by accident, and he was about to cry until I told him it would be alright and using tape and glue I started to fix it so it would be just like before. Since it took me a while to do this, I was at his table and that’s when Santiago began:

Santiago: who speaks the best Spanish?

Yo: aquí o en el mundo? [Here or in the world?]
Santiago: en el mundo [in the world]

Yo: No se, ¿tu que piensas? [I don’t know what do you think?]

Santiago: I think Costa Rica. [I think Costa Rica]

Yo: why/porque?

Santiago: Because they speak lots of Spanish there

Yo: Pero también en otros países hablan español, como en México. [But in other countries they speak Spanish too, like in Mexico].

Santiago is pretty inquisitive, and I love that when I speak to him in Spanish, he’ll reply without hesitation. Usually in English, but sometimes in Spanish, like when he said – ‘mundo’ after I said it. (FN 2014.10.28)

This kind of growth and openness to Spanish is something Santiago’s parents wished would happen. Indeed, slowly Santiago began realizing that understanding Spanish during whole group lessons placed him in a position to help other classmates - although he didn’t always feel comfortable using Spanish in his answers. Ms. O often reported that Jane and Esteban were really enthusiastic and grateful to her, happily reporting how much Santiago was speaking Spanish at home. This sentiment was echoed during our interview, when Jane and Esteban stated that Santiago was less resistant to Spanish at home. Yet, these happy reports were often couched within long laments of other things that, Jane in particular, was concerned about.

Initially, Jane had been very hesitant to enroll Santiago in a public school, and during the time he was in the program, Jane experienced a high degree of anxiety over multiple issues, from the physical appearance of the building, to the management of recess/lunch time, the underfunding of the school, safety issues, etc. In our interview, Jane recalled her first impression of the building as dark, old, and depressing - that while
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she loved the idea of the program, she didn’t like the physical appearance of the building. Esteban didn’t find the building so objectionable, in fact, he even mentioned it looked like his own school in Costa Rica. After a meeting with the principal and several other visits, what convinced Jane to enroll Santiago was the principal’s offer for her to be on the interview committee for the new Kindergarten teacher. As soon as Jane spoke on the phone with Ms. O, she was convinced she was “the one” and was excited that after the formal interview, the committee agreed and decided to hire her.

Given the ways in which race and class are conflated in the American imaginary, Santiago’s parents – specifically his mom’s anxieties, were heightened, not only by the ways in which her son is or will be categorized/racialized as non-white, but also in what seemed like a constant effort to mark herself and her family as middle class. Thus, Santiago’s own refusal towards an imposition of a “Spanish boy” identity seems to mirror some of the middle class anxieties Jane seemed to experience in a public school setting that served mostly lower income families of color. It is important to note that there was a strong gender component to this story - the fact that Santiago was a very energetic boy, and the ways in which school seems to be geared towards the interest of girls in particular, also had much to do with his challenge in conforming to the structured schedules and routines of school. While his parents attributed his misbehavior to immaturity and a need to be active and get "his wiggles" out, there was never any doubt or worry about Santiago's academic development, in fact, it was quite the opposite. His parents reported that he knew all his letter sounds in both languages, and that he had been doing "advanced math since he was four". This lack of doubt in his academic abilities is part of a middle class advantage and upbringing that fosters skills that correlate with
school related skills (Heath, 1983; Lareau, 2011), and one which I also discussed in Chapter 5.

Even though Santiago did not show his mastery of skills in the ways the teacher expected (finishing tasks, doing work that was orderly, writing neatly and coloring in the lines, etc.), there was no doubt in the classroom about his abilities. In other words, while Ms. O struggled with Santiago's behavior, and while she complained that he did not produce good work, there also was no real concern over his academic development. Had Santiago been Black and/or working class, given the kind of written work he produced and his behavioral patterns, his cognitive and linguistic abilities would most certainly have come into question, and his hyperactivity and disrespect for authority figures would have most likely earned him harsher behavioral consequences.

As was clear in the interview, by the time it was conducted Santiago’s parents had already pulled him out of the program. Jane and Esteban reported that coming back from a month in Costa Rica, Santiago's anxiety over school had worsened, that he was depressed and sad and did not like going to school - and that ultimately, his mental health and well-being were more important to them. They figured they could try to develop Santiago's Spanish and Latino identity through other means - namely, visiting Costa Rica twice a year, perhaps even spending the summers there, continuing to foster Spanish at home and with friends, and perhaps even getting a Spanish tutor. All options they could afford as a middle-class family.

There are many factors that converge onto Santiago’s story: his parents’ desire for him to feel positive about learning and speaking Spanish, as a naturalized way of also
feeling comfortable and proud of his heritage; the different ways that Jane and Esteban characterize such heritage and impose both ethnicized and racialized labels onto his identity; Jane’s white middle-class anxieties towards an underfunded public school that serves mostly low income families of color and her efforts at marking a difference to them; and finally, the lack of concern over any academic development. Thus, Santiago’s case illustrates the racialized and classed process of socialization, particularly in the crucial years of entering schooling institutions. Santiago is being socialized into understanding that he is racially different from his white peers, in ways that involve a naturalized connection to a language he is yet to learn (or in the process of learning) and a country from which he is not (but his father is). Furthermore, this goal of acquiring and developing Spanish is one his parents will have to devote considerable time and resources to meet, given that they will have to provide this language education as supplemental to his monolingual English schooling. Santiago’s story also illustrates the local ideology and classed notion of who the public schools are for in this large urban city; and while the attitudes among the middle class are changing (ideologies that accompany the process of gentrification), Santiago’s parents feel they have been “burnt once” and will not again consider public schools. Santiago is caught in a double bind: while he is racialized as different from his white middle-class peers, he is also different from his working-class Latino (and other) peers.
2. Class and race privilege

Class and race privilege, in particular, act in invisible ways, manifesting themselves in the forms of good grades, positive assessments of behavior, positive evaluations, and constructions of ideal or model home and family lives. Moreover, in a very heterogeneous schooling context, such as this Two-Way Immersion program, not only do class and racial differences come into sharp relief, but also, different raciolinguistic trajectories of socialization become particularly notable.

Zoe’s trajectory of socialization is a telling counter-example to Santiago’s, especially because in many respects, their families occupied similar class positions. While there is also a significant gender factor to consider in these trajectories, I will limit myself to discussing their raciolinguistic trajectories.

Zoe

Zoe is a wide-eyed, fair skinned white child, with brown hair and brown eyes, who loves school and often goes home to play "maestra" with her little sister, Grace. Zoe's mother, Mary, currently runs a blog for parents, and before used to work as a PR executive for a non-profit. Zoe's father, John, is a social worker who runs homeless shelters in the region, and who is currently working on his doctoral degree in social work. Zoe's parents moved to Philadelphia from New York City, finding Philly a much more affordable place to call home, that still offered the diverse environment and city life they were seeking.
When I asked Zoe’s parents about the reasons they had chosen this program, they talked about their desire for Zoe to be “surrounded with diversity” – as well as the idea of her learning another language and having peers from diverse backgrounds. Zoe’s mom explained:

And immersion is something we had talked about before, you know…the added bonus is the Two-way immersion, and that its 90% in Spanish, that that really spoke to us and it, I think it, it also made, I think it also added another layer of, to our decision to live in a city and the reasons we want to live in a city, and to to surround our kids with diversity…At least, and that's probably my small town bias, too a little bit, but the two-way immersion I think to sort of have Zoe you know immersed in kids with very different backgrounds than her. And also the way that they can work together to communicate it kind of fascinates me, because I know the Spanish speakers initially had very little English a lot of them and Zoe had no Spanish so, that, I think, can be so good for kids to learn, and socialize and figure that out together.

When I asked if initially Zoe had had any trouble adjusting to the all-Spanish classroom, her parents explained that Zoe is a very flexible child – they stated:

J: John, Zoe’s father M: Mary, Zoe’s mother

J: we had expected the first few weeks to be hard, and they weren't. [...] She's a flexible kid[...] and she's linguistically strong, we feel like[...]its a good fit for HER. This isn't for every kid, you know, we feel like its a good, the the strength of language in the immersion experience is a good fit for her.

[...]

M: anytime she can roll her r's, she will roll her r's. and its, it is, she does have a command - SUCH a command of the English language, um, probably, she's probably advanced in that way, and she's been speaking very very well from the time - I have a video of her when she was 14 mo. old she was signing, um, somewhere over the rainbow and you can understand every word

What is important to highlight in this comment is the idea of a language immersion program as being a “good fit” for those with advanced commands of
language. Immersion programs, whether they be two-way or not, bring to the fore a focus on language and development that might otherwise be absent from a mainstream classroom. This focus on language and scrutiny over its development is something that plays out differently depending on the racial position of the children speaking it, a point I will return to later on.

The perception of Zoe as an academically advanced child was something that permeated to the classroom, where Zoe was positioned as a successful, model student from early on. As has been documented in the literature, Zoe’s literacy activities at home, as part of a middle-class household with two college educated parents, put her at a relative advantage in gaining the kinds of skills required to be successful at school at an earlier and more evident pace than some of her working-class classmates (e.g. Heath, 1983; Lareau, 2003; Weis, 2010). While Zoe was not necessarily reading before kindergarten, Zoe’s parents read to her every night since she was a baby, something they recalled during the interview. This comfort with books and stories transferred to the classroom, where she confidently approached the task of reading and writing. Early on in the school year, during morning time when children practiced writing their names, Zoe quickly began writing her classmates’ names, and adding phrases such as ‘I love ___’. Because of where Zoe sat, she was facing the classroom’s word wall, where she could see all her classmates’ names. I noted this in my field notes:

*On Tuesday I arrived at 9am. The classroom was quiet [...] They were practicing writing down their names in wide-lined paper, as they do every morning. I noticed that Larissa has improved in writing her own name, and so has [student's name] (although he struggles with the 's'). Zoe was able to write her name from the beginning - I wonder if she gets bored - on her paper she had written the names of Lilly and Michaela. On her paper, at the top, she wrote 'I love Ms. O' and made a*
drawing of a face (I imagine its Ms. O's face), and then a column where she had written Lilly's name several times, then her own name Zoe (much bigger), then Michaela's name. I noticed she had been looking at the word wall where the little fishes have each of the students' names written on them so she could write them down. (Translated from FN 2014.10.13&14).

Part of learning is being able to strategically use resources to help one become more independent, and Zoe was using the word wall precisely in the ways in which every teacher would want the wall to be used. Additionally, Zoe’s teachers and classmates could more easily attribute her proficient writing to an inherent ability as opposed to an earlier acquisition of schooled literacy skills due to earlier exposure at home - and this became one of the everyday instances in which she began to be seen by the teachers and her peers as a good student. Because Zoe had begun to acquire concepts of print more readily than some of her classmates, and began successfully performing some of the early classroom tasks, which generalized into an attribution of “smartness” and “being a good student”.

By this I do not mean to diminish Zoe’s own progress, motivation, and excitement for learning and being in the classroom - she indeed was a very motivated student who was happy to be in school and to “do” school. What I mean to illustrate in this analysis is how Zoe’s positioning as a good student was as much because of what she did as it was a product of how she began to be habitually interactionally positioned vis-a-vis her classmates, and the more general point of how attributing a particular quality to a student (in this case, “smart”) becomes a powerful frame through which all their utterances and actions are later interpreted, which in turn contributes to the habitual and continued attribution of such quality.
The following excerpt illustrates how Zoe is positioned as a knower and a helper to her classmates. The excerpt below is from an audio recording at Zoe’s table. Zoe, Larissa, Adrian and Daniel sat together all of kindergarten year. Larissa was often absent due to health issues, and came in to kindergarten without knowing how to write her name (as I described earlier and something I will address later in this chapter). Previous to this excerpt, Zoe had been ‘testing’ Larissa on her letter knowledge. Zoe would write down a letter in Larissa’s notebook and Larissa would have to say it out loud, an utterance which was evaluated by Zoe as either correct or incorrect. The excerpt begins with Larissa declaring that she is done, and Zoe excitedly informing her tablemate David that indeed, Larissa is done and that she did a good job. At this point, perhaps seeing Zoe get a bit too excited and out of her chair, Ms. O walks over to the table and joins the interaction:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript</th>
<th>Translations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z: good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. O: //good?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L: una vez yo -te acuerdas cuando fui con Maestra Connie y me sabia todas las letras (hablándole a Ms. O).</td>
<td>L (to Ms. O): one time I- remember when I went with Ms. Connie and I knew all the letters?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. O: Claro que si mi amor porque así vas avanzando</td>
<td>Ms. O: of course my love that's because you are making progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L: y me gane una carita feliz.</td>
<td>L: and I earned a happy face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. O: si señora (flipping pages) este es el de matemáticas, ok? quiero que hagas los numeritos, hasta el 50. Ya los sabes hacer hasta el 50 solita? Sin mirar?</td>
<td>Ms. O: Yes, ma'am (flipping pages in Larissa's notebook). This one is for math, ok? I want you to do your numbers, up to 50. You know to do up to 50 on your own? Without looking?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z: Maestra? I taught her. [00:11:39.15] (flipping pages) - this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. O: Beautiful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z: I taught her all that.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. O: IS she doing good?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z: yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. O: Ok very good. Ahora los escribes tú. Now she needs to practice // by herself</td>
<td>Ms. O: Ok very good. Now you write them (to Larissa). Now she needs to practice // by herself. (to Zoe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z: //she missed some. But the letters, no! She never missed any.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. O: Muy bien mamá, vamos pues, sigue. (AU 2015.03.18_A01)</td>
<td>Ms. O: Very good mamma, let's go, continue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Transcript - At Zoe's Table
In this interaction, Zoe is taking on the ‘teacher role’ and Larissa the ‘student role’. These interactional roles are reinforced when Zoe reports to David how well Larissa did, and when Ms. O joins the interaction, first to remind Zoe to quiet down and sit at her chair, then asking Zoe to report on Larissa’s progress by asking “how is she doing?”. This question reinforces Zoe’s role as someone being able to evaluate Larissa’s progress, which she takes up easily and automatically, replying that Larissa is doing a good job. Larissa, perhaps asserting her own agency and taking ownership of her progress, reminds Ms. O of the time she went with Maestra Connie, the special education teacher, to perform saying all the letters of the alphabet. Ms. O, in a warm and caring tone, replies that yes of course she remembers, and that she is making progress. Ms. O then flips through Larissa’s notebook and tells her to practice her numbers up to 50. Zoe then asks for Ms. O’s attention to proudly show her all that she taught Larissa, flipping through the pages of Larissa’s notebook. Again, Ms. O asks, ‘is she doing good?’ to which Zoe replies ‘yes’, which Ms. O follows by stating that now Larissa has to practice by herself. Yet, not having finished her report on Larissa’s progress, Zoe interjects by stating that Larissa missed some numbers, but that she did not miss any of the letters. Ms. O continues walking around the classroom checking other students’ progress after saying ‘good job, now continue’ - which was an utterance directed at Larissa, in Spanish, to commend her for doing well, as was reported by Zoe.

A crucial point in these interactions is the fact that Zoe is testing Larissa on her knowledge of the letters of the Spanish alphabet. Spanish is Larissa’s first language, the language that is most spoken at home and the one she is most comfortable in; in contrast, Spanish is Zoe’s second language, one she hears mostly (and probably only) at school,
given that her parents and extended family are English speakers. Yet, because of Zoe’s comfort with print and confidence with her knowledge of the Spanish alphabet, she remains the ‘expert’ in this interaction. The idea behind the theory of two-way immersion programs is the fact that students can take turns being the ‘experts’ to teach each other their language - yet in this instance, we see that is not always the case.

It is also important to point out that the interactional roles of the “tester” and “testee” were not exclusive to Zoe and Larissa; in fact, David and Alejandro were doing the same thing in a simultaneous, parallel conversation in the excerpt shown above, with David being the evaluator and Alejandro being the evaluated. At other tables, this was also a common dynamic. I noticed this began occurring after a trip to the Aquarium in the winter, where Ms. O required all the children to be able to reach particular benchmarks: to know all the letters in the alphabet and to be able to count to 50. Each student was tested by Ms. O and Maestra Connie, and would not be allowed to go if they did not achieve this. Thus, while the interactional roles and exchange I describe above was not necessarily unique to Zoe and Larissa, it is an example of how Zoe was continually positioned as a student who had the knowledge and skills to be able to assess her classmates own’ progress, and quite crucially, that it was—regardless of the fact that it was in her classmates’ dominant language—a language that she herself was learning.

Because a superior knowledge was attributed to Zoe, there were missed opportunities in which Larissa, and other classmates, would have been able to take on the “teacher” role. During the spring, I observed Zoe and Larissa reading together several times. The same day as the recording above I observed the girls reading together. Taking
on her habitual teacher role, Zoe would decode the words in the book as she pointed to them, reading the book to Larissa. I captured this moment in my field notes:

_The first thing that caught my attention today is Zoe and Larissa doing the same thing they were doing yesterday, where Zoe was “la maestra” and she was “testing Larissa”. But this time, instead of numbers, they were reading a book titled, “La cocina”. I noticed Zoe read the word ‘cocina’ as ‘coquina’ - or something similar - in other words, she made a miscue, but Larissa did not correct her. I wasn’t sure if I should intervene, and tell Larissa that she could check to see if the word Zoe pronounced was correct. But I decided not to say anything. I did place the recorder at their table to record their interactions. (FN 2015.03.18)_

Eventually, I did intervene in this interaction and encouraged Larissa to listen to what Zoe read, and to think, does this make sense? I reminded her that she knew Spanish, but that Zoe was learning it, and that she could help Zoe if she read a word that Larissa didn’t recognize. This, I believe, did little in boosting Larissa confidence in reading relative to her classmate, Zoe.

Another example of how a white middle-class position advantaged Zoe in the classroom in direct and indirect ways is an instance where Ms. O did a read aloud using a book Mary had bought for the classroom. The weekend before the following instance, Mary’s mother, a former principal, was visiting from out of town. Mary and her family had invited Ms. O to Barnes and Noble so that she could pick out a book for the classroom that Mary would purchase. They chose two beautifully illustrated award-winning stories that had been translated into Spanish; two books which Zoe had at home (in English). The stories they chose were complex stories that required making inferences on the part of the readers; stories that might require some scaffolding to understand, especially given the vocabulary in the Spanish translations. The day when Ms.O read the
book aloud to the students, Zoe was privileged in multiple ways: in the way she was allowed to participate, in the way in which she already knew the story plot, and in how the hardest questions were eventually addressed to her, given the lack of response from the students and the expectation that Zoe would be able to answer the teachers’ questions.

Thus far I have analyzed the way Zoe’s class privilege advantaged her in multiple ways in the classroom, in a way that was mutually reinforcing of her being constantly positioned in the classroom as a good student, regardless of the language being spoken. Perhaps because of Mary’s enthusiasm for her daughter’s bilingual development, and because of her regular praise for her daughter’s Spanish, Zoe was quite confident and motivated to learn Spanish. While some of the other Spanish learners often stated they “didn’t know Spanish”, I never heard or recorded Zoe making this statement. On the contrary, mid-way through the year, Zoe not only began peppering her English with as much Spanish as she knew, but also confidently reported to me that she knew how to read in English and in Spanish. Zoe’s mom also often posted about Zoe’s progress learning Spanish on social media sites, as the quote below demonstrates:

My daughter is #bilingual! I love listening to her read her Spanish books at bedtime (and translating for me - complete with an exasperated eye roll – when I don’t understand). When she was reading tonight, she kept giggling and saying “silly gatito!” Since I don’t speak Spanish, I wasn’t sure what was so funny, but at least I know she understands what she’s reading!

The fact that Zoe’s race or ethnicity never comes up in her parent’s discussions of her acquisition of Spanish; that her language mixing is never seen as a problem, but rather the opposite, as a sign of bilingual development and learning; and the way in which she is positioned as an expert being able to evaluate her classmates’ knowledge of Spanish, is
indicative of her white privilege. In other words, the invisibility of her whiteness stands in stark contrast to how much Santiago’s racial/cultural/national heritage was summoned, discussed, and talked about. Zoe’s language development in English will never be of concern, and for that matter, nor will her Spanish. For working class immigrant children, both their Spanish and their English come in to question. Furthermore, her identification with Spanish as a heritage language as part of her culture and identity, is also not at play. We can imagine Zoe's mother's enthusiastic posts about her child's developing bilingualism as not something that Santiago's parents would necessarily post - in other words, there is an expectation that he should be bilingual, given his heritage.

In Zoe’s case, the complete absence of any forms of racialization illustrates how whiteness operates. Furthermore, it illustrates how her positioning as advanced, relative to her peers, is due in part to her class privilege and the ways in which her home experiences prepared her for the kinds of activities that are required to be successful in school. This, along with her own motivation and self-confidence to “do” school resulted in a habitual explicit and implicit positioning of her as a ‘good student’ in whole classroom discussions as well small group and pair work. Her use of Spanish was often noted and praised, both at home—excitedly by her mother—and at school. I too was often guilty of noticing the students’ learning of Spanish much more readily than those who were also learning English - and while this is a product of a model designed to teach in Spanish first and for a majority of the time in the early primary grades, it is also a product of the fact that Spanish is less available as compared to English, both in the mainstream media and in most of the everyday experiences of the children. Zoe started sprinkling her sentences with Spanish words and phrases as she began learning them, and
this was particularly evident when she interacted with Larissa. For any teacher, this is an exciting moment where students are using their repertoires to communicate. Yet unfortunately, the mixing of English and Spanish is not created equal - not all mixing was a sign of learning and ability, as was the case with Monica in the following section.

3. Classed and Raced Marginalization

Being racialized and marginalized by a lower-class position doubly impacts children, even in programs that are meant to advocate for them. This manifests itself in multiple, everyday activities. For example, children who enter kindergarten without knowing how to write their name, not knowing how to hold a pencil or a pair of scissors, or any other school related skill are disadvantaged because there is an expectation that they should enter kindergarten already knowing that. Although kindergarten is not mandatory in the state of PA, kindergarten teachers usually expect exposure to school through other means: through head start, pre-school, day care programs, and/or from exposure to print at home. Children who enter kindergarten without knowing these skills become not only a source of concern in terms of their cognitive abilities and motor-skill development, but also, often become indicative of a non-supportive or problematic family situation. Such was the case for children like Larissa, Devon, Tony, and Monica (among others), whose inability to perform a school-related and expected skill was immediately identified. TWI programs are such that there are children entering kindergarten knowing how to read, while others come in without knowing how to recognize their names, creating a difficult range of abilities for the teacher to manage, particularly a novice teacher.
It is important to mention that this concern is something I myself often shared, both as a former teacher and as a participant observer in this classroom - and that this analysis is not meant to critique teachers who become concerned with children who come in with little familiarity with ‘how to do school’. It is meant to show how the system is one in which such are the expectations for families and caregivers: to enroll children in kindergarten that in many ways are already prepared to do school. For some families, this can seem counterintuitive (e.g., don’t kids go to school to learn?). And furthermore, it is meant to show how dramatic the differences can be between the different children (and families) that enroll in TWI bilingual programs in contexts of great inequality. Moreover, the system is such that it creates expectations of student learning that fall on the teacher. For example, students must be reading, according to a literacy assessment, at a particular level by the end of kindergarten. Given this expectation, against which a teachers’ success will be measured, the number of children in the kindergarten classroom (24), and the lack of an instructional aide, it is understandable how children without prior knowledge and exposure to print become an immediate “red flag” in terms of how much the teacher will need to focus on such students in order for them to meet the benchmark. And it is also understandable how much a teacher might want parents to also work with their children at home, given the limited amount of time she will be able to provide one-on-one instruction at school.

Thus, one way students (and families) are racialized is when they do not conform to the (middle-class) expectation of working with their children at home on school-related literacy skills, which becomes particularly salient when the families are from non-dominant backgrounds. In other words, there is a way in which some families, when they
conform to the middle-class norm of working on literacy related activities at home, become ethnicized and fit into a model-minority category. Yet, when families are not white and do not conform to the middle-class norm of working with their children at home, their children's lower performance on school related tasks is attributed to this lack of parental or family involvement. It is important to point out the subtle differences that exist between racialization and the kinds of “culturally relevant” insistence that Ms. O communicated to parents. Because of the benchmarks, because of the pressure to perform, and the limited time and (human) resources in the classroom, Ms. O constantly asked parents to work with their children at home. When they did, Ms. O immediately would notice the difference, and would communicate that to the parents. Ms. O was very pro-active in her communication with parents, and because of her own cultural background and personality, had close relationships with many of them. This subtle difference comes from understanding the kinds of institutional expectations for success and the great effort that must be made for children to meet those, particularly when they are off to a “later” start. It also comes from her desire to see these children learn and succeed in school, and from a firm yet understanding authoritative voice that pleads with parents from a place of wanting to see them succeed in the United States. This is a subtle yet crucial difference in this attitude versus one that assumes parents who do not work with children at home simply “do not care”.

The institutionalized and normative expectation for the acquisition of school literacy skills becomes important in the trajectories of raciolinguistic socialization of children because of the ways in which an advanced acquisition of literacy skills translates to evaluations of linguistic and bilingual abilities, as I have already shown in Zoe’s case.
Both Larissa’s and Monica’s cases illustrate examples of how an “unreadiness” for school or a disability, respectively, become major concerns for students’ development, and in the latter instance, enough to garner removal from the bilingual program.

Larissa

Larissa, like many of her Latino classmates, enrolled in the TWI program because of chance—this was the school that happened to be closest to where Andrea, Larissa’s mother, had moved to, and on the day she came to enroll her daughters, the bilingual counseling assistant, Ms. Juliet, happened to be in the office to assist her and to suggest the bilingual program for her daughter. In my interview with Andrea, she described some of the challenges she faced as an immigrant and a new parent in a new, strange country:

(00:32) A: =porque llego en un país extraño me entiendes un país que tu no conoces no sabes ni donde están las calles y llegar así pues no saber ni en donde vas a vivir …

(01:37) A: si porque (.) oh es como te dijo es un lugar extraño donde uno [no conoce]

(01:39) S: [hm hmm] si claro=

(01:41) A: =es como cuando van a empezar los niños en escuela no sabes ni que escuela [ni como] es por dentro ni sabes que lo que tienes que hacer [si] por que yo con Fernanda cuando ella empezó la escuela yo sufí demasiado

(01:54) S: si

(01:54) A: en momento en que llega y no sabes ni hablar ingles

(01:57) S: claro

(01:57) A: ni para escribir lo [por lo sena] [pero] ten= entendían, al fin y al cabo te entendían, te hacían el papeleo y ya estaban dentro-
Andrea describes the process of Fernanda, her oldest daughter, starting school as one in which she struggled - in fact, she uses the word ‘sufrir’ - to suffer. Not only is she in a different country with different kinds of institutions and different affiliated processes, she does not understand the language nor does she know how to go about asking for the information she needs as a parent of a school-aged child. Thus, not only is language a barrier, but also, becoming a parent and having to deal with institutions like schools is a process that Andrea was not familiar with prior to moving to the United States. When this interview took place, Fernanda was in 2nd grade and she was struggling in school. Her teachers in particular were worried about her ability to read. Andrea blamed Fernanda’s troubles on the fact that she skipped kindergarten:

(02:21) A: ella empezó allí primero ella no tuvo kinder
(02:24) S: okay
(02:24) A: she started there first but she didn’t have kinder

(02:27) S: okay

(02:24) A: because she is a November baby

(02:27) S: hm hmm

(02:28) A: and you know that if they’re from November they lose a year automatically [because she doesn’t make the cut off]

(02:30) S: [a:h of course] [uh huh]

(02:33) A: [so then] she didn’t have kinder and then=for her it was really tough I blame it on that that she has those problems

(02:39) S: yes
Given what Andrea is explaining, this was clearly a hectic time for her: she was pregnant with her third child; her second child, Larissa, suffers from asthma and was constantly getting sick; and her oldest daughter, Fernanda, was having trouble in school. It was unclear from the interview if Andrea had support from a partner or the girls’ father—what was clear is that her immigrant, working-class situation did not lead to the kind of “supportive” household that is considered ideal by teachers and schools for literacy development. Andrea herself is navigating mother responsibilities as well as providing for her daughters. In particular, what is striking from this excerpt is the phrase “no sabe ni como agarrar las tijeras” [she doesn’t even know how to hold a pair of scissors]. This phrase mirrors a particular teacher discourse of the kinds of knowledge and skills that children are expected to come to school knowing - and a phrase, I would assume, Andrea heard from one of her teachers during a parent conference.

As was mentioned previously, Larissa entered school without recognizing or knowing how to write her name, something that was quickly noticed by the teacher as a
sign of the need for more intensive attention. Another source of concern in Larissa’s case was the amount of days she was absent - this frustrated the teacher given how much she knew she had to work with Larissa in order to get her to the kindergarten benchmarks by the end of the year. Ms. O also constantly insisted that Andrea work with Larissa at home, something Ms. O doubted was actually happening. These factors, along with the occasions in which Larissa come in to the classroom seemly unkempt, added to the impression that Larissa wasn’t being taken care of properly at home - both physically or academically.

In the classroom, Larissa sat next to Zoe the whole year. In the beginning of the year, Larissa reported to me that she did not know English - “yo no sé inglés” (FN 2014.10.30) - yet by the end of the year, she, like Zoe, was peppering her Spanish with as much English as she knew. Larissa preferred Spanish in her interactions with her classmates, and was usually shy about speaking English with them. Zoe, especially once she began acquiring more Spanish, sought to include Larissa in their work and conversations by addressing her in a mix of English and Spanish.

One day in the spring, during a nutrition class given in English (by a part-time nutrition teacher as part of an organization not associated with the school district), Zoe asked me if Larissa spoke English. Given that it was April, and that Zoe and Larissa had been sitting at the same table for 8 months, this question took me by surprise. I was sitting at Zoe and Larissa’s table during the nutrition class, helping the students at the table make their pizzas. The nutrition teacher was walking around giving instructions to the class. As soon as I began recording at the table, Zoe asked me the question:
S: mmmm que ricoooo!

Zoe: does she understand English? Larissa?

S: Yo creo que si. Háblale en inglés. (p)

Z: I don’t know if she does.

S: Entiendes inglés Larissa?

(silence)

S: (to Z) You never talk to Larissa?

Z: en Inglés=

Nutrition Teacher (to whole class): =all right I see our teachers making one too, how exciting. Do you guys want to make one?

Niños: yes!

By virtue of asking me in English and talking about Larissa in 3rd person, Zoe assumed that Larissa did not speak English, given that she was sitting at the same table as us, only a couple of inches away. I replied to her in Spanish, saying that I believed Larissa did speak English, and encouraged Zoe to talk to her (in English). Zoe replied to me that she’s wasn’t really sure if Larissa spoke English. I asked Larissa, in Spanish, if she understood English, but she did not verbally respond. Given the limitations of audio recording, I do not have the visual information to confirm whether Larissa answered non-verbally (in the form of a nod or a negative head shake), or if she just stayed silent. Then, addressing Zoe, I asked if she ever talked to Larissa. Zoe, in Spanish, answered my question: she never talks to Larissa in English. Our chatter came to an end when the nutrition teacher began addressing the whole group again. What’s noteworthy in this
interaction is not only Zoe’s assumption that Larissa did not speak English, but her assumption that she herself only spoke to Larissa in Spanish, and her confidence in her ability to do so. As I have illustrated in the various interactions in this chapter, Zoe addressed Larissa in a mix of English and Spanish, and constantly used English with her classmates at the same table (Daniel and Adrian). While it is true that Larissa began the year with less of a command of English, she had been in school for the past 8 months and her bilingual repertoire had expanded, just like Zoe’s had.

As the nutrition class continued, Zoe took it upon herself to translate for Larissa some of the teacher’s instructions in English. Zoe would also repeat my own instructions for the table (which I gave in Spanish). I have highlighted in bold these instances. At the end of this portion of the interaction, Zoe finally asks Larissa directly if she speaks English:

12 NT: Alright guys the first thing we're going to do is use our hands to flatten down our bread, use your hands, push it down, use your hands push it down. Good job.

13 Z: me hambre.

14 NT: just like they flatten out the dough in the pizza shop. Good job. Alright my friends excellent!

15 Z: (laughter) I don't want string cheese!

16 NT: Ok are we ready?!

17 SS: yeah!

18 NT: The next thing we're going to do, is find our little spoon, everybody find your baby spoon. Tiny spoon.

19 Zoe to Larissa: Larissa!
NT: alright, boys and girls

[shhhhh]

NT: Oh I need you to listen we need to know what to do.

Z: [[inaudible]]

NT: we're gonna go, one at a time, I'll tell you when to start, don't do anything yet, ok? we're gonna use our little spoons to take oneee, twooo, threee scoops of sauce and [put it on our bread

Z: [tres (translating for Larissa)-]

NT: and then we're going to use the spoon to spread the sauce out, and we're gonna pass the sauce to our neighbor so Jashua go ahead why don't you start and take your three

Z: no Lariss!

S: deja que termine, va a ser tres. unooo,

Z:mmmmm (p) tres


NT: one two three and we're gonna pass to our neighbor. Good job!

(Nutrition teacher continues giving instruction in English to the whole class)

[00:02:45.05]

Z: where's alejandro?

S: fue al baño. (p) pero échale bastante Larissa para que cubras tu pan. Esooo con ganas. muy bien.

Z: nooo! no, no más.

S: me toca! si? gracias. una, todavia no termino, dos, tres.

NT: (continues giving instructions in English)
39  [00:03:21.01]
40  NT: you guys are doing a lovely job! spread the sauce out with your spoon!
41  S: (to L) Si quieres poquito más échale mas. (p)
42  [00:03:27.21]
43  Z: Si hay más Larissa. (p)
44  [NT: Wonderful I like the way you are just sitting there ....]
45  [00:03:33.02]
46  Z: (to L) Speak English?
47  L: (barely audible) yeah
48  Z: Wha? Que?
49  L: Yeah!!
50  Z: oh. (4.0) Need to learn even more English?
51  (no audible response)

In lines 19, 25, 27, 29, 36 and 43, Zoe is directing her speech towards Larissa, in an effort to guide her in the process of making pizza. During this time, Larissa stays quiet. In line 46, Zoe finally asks Larissa if she speaks English. In line 47, Larissa’s first response to Zoe’s question is a very quiet ‘yeah’. Zoe, not hearing very well, asks a clarification question, beginning by first using the English word ‘What’, then quickly switching to the Spanish equivalent ‘que?’. Larissa, more emphatically and perhaps with a slight annoyance in her tone, responds ‘Yeah!’ . Zoe, in turn, replies with a pensive, ‘oh’. And after four seconds, asks Larissa if she needs to learn even more English.
Whether Larissa responded or not, or whether she understood or not, or whether she chose to ignore Zoe’s question, is unclear, given that there is no visual information of this conversation.

A few days after this interaction, I again observed and recorded the girls working together at their table, and in this instance, both used their bilingual communicative repertoires with each other. As they did so, they also negotiated roles to collaboratively draw a puma. In the following transcript of an audio recording conducted in the spring, Zoe uses her Spanish repertoire and Larissa her English repertoire, and together they draw. As I approach the table, Larissa informs me that she cannot draw a puma, and I ask if Zoe is helping her:

1 S: Buenos días niñas!=
2 L: este yo estoy-yo soy la puma
3 S: tu eres la puma? (p) lo están dibujando juntas?
4 L: Aja. Esque yo no puedo. No puedo hacer esto.
5 S: Y Zoe te está ayudando?
6 L: mhm.
7 Z: I'm helping her.
8 S: Que bien niñas. Me gusta que trabajen juntas.
Notice that like in previous interactions, I reinforce Zoe’s role as the ‘teacher’ or ‘helper’ by asking Larissa if Zoe is helping her, and that Larissa positions herself as not being able to do it, by stating ‘yo no puedo’. I applaud their working together when I say ‘que bien niñas’, and state that I like it when they work together. As they continue working, they begin negotiating what comes next, Larissa using English, and Zoe using a mix of English and Spanish:

9 (quietly working)
10 L: no no no!
11 Z: verde?
12 L: color! (ina) color! (Pronounced in En.)
13 Z: but you could pick whichever 'color' (Spa.) you [want

14 L: [rainbow rainbow rainbow! (p) I want rainbow

15 Z: Este es rosado=

16 L: =rainbow!

17 Z: rojo

18 L: Es rainbow! I want rainbow I want rainbow

19 Z: rainbow? es no color rainbow in here

20 L: Blue blue no blueeee. blue. (p) blue, No Red!

21 Z: red? (p)

22 L: This red. Blue and red. Blue red.
23  Z: blue red? (p) amarillo?
24  L: mmm no!
25  Z: rojo? rosado?
26  L: rosado si!
27  Z: Un momento Larissa.
28  L: No! Lapiz primero!

The girls are negotiating what color to use for their puma. Notice in line 13, Zoe uses the word ‘color’ and chooses to pronounce it in Spanish, in the midst of her English sentence, and also uses Spanish syntax with the phrase ‘es no’ in line 19. Larissa has named all the colors she would like in English. And finally, at the end of this portion, Larissa gives the directive of ‘Lapiz primero!’ to suggest that they draw in pencil first, before they color.

Zoe obliges, and takes two pencils from the crate. The following portion is a video transcription - a short segment which I captured with my phone camera:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>29</th>
<th>(Zoe takes two pencils from the crate, measures them up to each other, then gives one to Larissa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>(Larissa takes pencil. Zoe begins drawing, and barely audibly saying 'tail' as she draws it. Larissa is sitting closely, almost cheek to cheek with Zoe, looking on as she draws, with her pencil in hand. Then Larissa changes her mind, returns the pencil to crate and states:)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>L: I want color. I want color. (Larissa reaches the basket, as she does so covers the drawing area in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Z: UN MOMENTO LARISSAAAA!! Rosado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>L: Me color. Me color.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Larissa colors, and then looks up at Zoe again, who again nods in approval. Then Zoe comes closer to observe Larissa's work, and states:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Z: harder, harder press. muy bien. muy bien Larissa muy bien.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>M: Maestra! [Ven !! Esta bonito?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>C: [marrón ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>M: Maestra! Esta bonito?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>S: Mira que bonito Puma!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>M: Me ayudo hacerlo ah-ella.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>S: Ella como se llama?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>M: Zoe!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>S: Zoe te ayudo muy bien.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 14: Transcript - Zoe & Larissa*
In this portion, their non-verbal negotiations are key to their interaction, and in particular, Larissa’s assertiveness at getting to do her part: color in the puma (Lines 31 - 33). This begins at Line 31, when she exchanges her pencil for a colored crayon, stating that she wants a color instead by stating ‘I want color’. Once Zoe is done drawing the figure, in Line 32, she reaches for Larissa crayon, but Larissa reaches her hand back away from Zoe’s grasp, smiling, and stating ‘Me color, me color’ in Line 33. Here, Larissa asserts the original role she wanted in the first place: to color in what Zoe had drawn with a pencil. Zoe concedes, but still retains the teacher ‘authority’, when Larissa looks at her for approval as soon as she is about to begin coloring, doing this twice (Lines 33 - 34).

Although Zoe and Larissa are still positioned in their familiar roles as expert and novice, Larissa becomes more agentive than in past interactions. The puma and pizza interactions occurred a month after the collaborative reading episode aforementioned in Zoe’s section. By then, perhaps Larissa was growing more confident in her own skills. In the nutrition class, she resolutely tells Zoe she does indeed know English, and in their interaction a couple of days later, uses her English repertoire to collaboratively draw a Puma. Here, she is slightly more assertive in playing a more active role in their activity, although Zoe - whom Larissa considered a more capable artist - is still guiding her and nodding in approval.

Across various activities, Zoe is positioned as the expert: at drawing, at reading (in Spanish), at recognizing numbers and letters in Spanish, and even, at being bilingual. This happens across time and multiple, everyday interactions, in which people like
myself, like her teacher Ms. O, like her mother, and like other classmates like Larissa, interactionally position her in evaluative and teaching roles vis-a-vis her classmates. Zoe continues to be socialized as an expert across a variety of classroom activities regardless of the language being spoken. Larissa, on the other hand, begins the year being positioned as already behind and disadvantaged: she cannot even write her name. Just like Zoe is socialized through constant interactional positioning, so too is Larissa. Larissa more consistently asked for help from the classroom teachers or her classmates, and also more often asked for our recognition and approval. Yet we see that these positionalities aren’t fixed - that Larissa begins to assert her agency throughout her interactions with Zoe in the spring. Noteworthy is the fact that she takes ownership of the puma drawing, by stating that Zoe helped her (with the implication that the drawing is her own), and when she states that she does indeed speak English.

Towards the end of the year, Larissa had made much progress in her literacy skills, and Ms. O was quite pleased and expressed this excitement. Of all the students in her classroom, Ms. O was proudest of Larissa and thought she had improved the most, given how well she did on her benchmark exam (FN 2015.02.10). In fact, Ms. O was somewhat worried that Larissa may be exhibiting behaviors normally associated with dyslexia (which Ms. O was sensitive to since she has it herself) - and expressed this concern to me on this particular occasion, when she was asked to fill out a behavioral questionnaire for Larissa - one normally used to help doctors diagnose children with ADHD. Ms. O did not think Larissa had ADHD (nor did I). It was unclear to us why Ms. O had been asked to fill out this form for Larissa, and whom the request had come from (Larissa’s mother or her doctor or the social worker). This is indicative of the
pathologizing of children who do not exhibit the kinds of literacy skills associated with performing the kinds of tasks that are assumed to be benchmarks indicative of normal cognitive and literacy development. In many ways, Larissa illustrates the great potential of bilingual programs to support children like her and families like hers. Yet in other respects, it also shows how her class and racial marginalization continue to position her as ‘disadvantaged’ and how this translated to being positioned in the classroom as below and behind her classmates - even in a classroom that was meant to uphold her as a linguistic expert that could help her English dominant classmates. Furthermore, her positioning also precluded her bilingual development and acquisition of English to be recognized.

The interview with Andrea, Larissa’s mother, illustrates the institutionalized discourses and expectations of what children should know prior to entering school (“no sabe ni agarrar las tijeras”) yet also the incredible struggles of an immigrant parent (“no sabia ni que hacer”) to understand life in a different country, in a different language, and the necessary interactions with bureaucratic institutions that are not always welcoming or have bilingual staff to assist parents. Furthermore, Larissa’s case illustrates the invisibility of her bilingualism vis-a-vis her English-speaking classmates’ (such as Zoe), not only because of the structure of the program, but also, because of the sociolinguistic expectations for children like Zoe and Larissa.

Monica

Monica is the daughter of Mexican immigrants, Manuela and Miguel. Miguel, a tall, broad man, works at the kitchen of a bar in my neighborhood. Monica has a wide
smile, thick, beautiful black hair, and is one of the tallest children in the class. In kindergarten, she often greeted me excitedly when I walked in the classroom by saying, “Te quiero mucho, maestra Sofia!” [I love you, Maestra Sofia!]. Monica was diagnosed with mild autism and was assigned a one-on-one teacher that would be in the classroom with her every day. Throughout the course of kindergarten her teachers expressed a concern over Monica getting her languages confused. Furthermore, the special education teacher that provided support services for her, Ms. Connie, often expressed frustration at not being able to help Monica, because she didn’t speak Spanish. In a crucial way, Monica’s case illustrates the challenges the school’s faculty and staff faced and their unpreparedness (and for some, unwillingness) for meeting all the students’ needs. In part, this was also a failure of the school administration to bring all the staff into the project of the bilingual program, something I discussed in Chapter 4.

In the fall of the second year of the bilingual program, when the kindergarten students had entered first grade, there were several rumors going around about certain children leaving the program, and in fact, several students did leave. One of these students was Monica. At the beginning of first grade, a meeting was organized with Monica’s parents, the principal, the special education teachers and the bilingual teachers. This was called to discuss Monica’s parents’ desire to move Monica to the English program. The meeting had come about when Ms. O learned that a separate meeting had been previously held with the parents and the special education teachers without her knowledge - and that after this meeting, the parents had expressed a desire to move Monica. Ms. O was very upset, as was the principal, since they did not know what had been discussed and from whom the suggestion had come that Monica be moved to the
English program. It was understood that perhaps the special education teachers felt that
they could not help Monica given that she was learning in Spanish, yet they could only
support her in English - further promoting a belief in her “language confusion”.

Ms. O, the teacher, had insisted the principal be present at this meeting, yet the
principal, sick with the flu, was not able to attend. I was part of this meeting, and for
some of the time, acted as the interpreter. There were many adults present, including the
teacher leader, a monolingual English teacher who often filled the role of assistant
principal, and the special education teachers, both white monolingual women. One of
these teachers, the special education coordinator, sat at the table, on her laptop, working
during the entirety of the meeting - only looking up once when she introduced herself.
Also present was Ms. O, who often took on the role of TWI program coordinator; Laura,
a program manager from the district office, originally from Spain, who was a key
supporter of the bilingual program and the bilingual teachers, and a former TWI teacher
with years of experience herself; Stacey, the speech language pathologist, a young white
American bilingual woman; and myself.

We took turns introducing ourselves, I translated for the teachers who spoke
English. Many of us tried to advocate for Monica to stay in the program. We highlighted
the ways in which our bilingualism had benefited us to advance professionally, and what
a gift it was to be bilingual. When we asked why they wanted to move Monica to the
English program, Monica’s dad, Miguel, explained that he had been learning some
English at his workplace, and that when he would try to gauge how much Monica knew,
he felt surprised that Monica could not answer some things he felt were basic, that even
he knew. In other words, he wanted, and perhaps expected, Monica to know more than he did, given that she was in school and should be learning more English than he had acquired working in a kitchen. Miguel seemed to be torn over the decision, yet Manuela, Monica’s mother, seemed resolute. It was clear they had already made a decision, and nothing we could say would change that. In my field notes I capture what Monica’s mother stated as the main reason for moving her:

When we asked why they wanted to change her to the English classroom, [Monica’s mother] said that as her mother, from what she saw at home; but that it was also the neurologist that said, that sometimes for children its not good to be in a bilingual program if they don’t know English well.

(Translated from Field Notes 9.16.2015)

As an advocate for Latino children and bilingual education, I was livid at this neurologist, and asked Monica's parents to consider whether this neurologist would have said the same thing had he been Latino, or even bilingual. Yet, they had come in to this meeting with their minds made up, and decided to take her out of the bilingual classroom.

For Monica, Spanish is seen as a potential barrier to her school success and later social mobility. She is being socialized into an institutionally sanctioned diglossia where, for a student like her, Spanish belongs at home, and English at school. Monica’s case illustrates the raciolinguistic ideologies, in particular in relation to language acquisition, that dominate many schooling and medical establishments. It illustrates the assumptions from the monolingual school staff, in particular the special education teachers, about who should be or should not be in the TWI bilingual program, and the assumptions in the part of the medical professional, in this case the neurologist, over who should or should not be
enrolled in a bilingual program. In both cases, the assumption is that a Mexican child who speaks Spanish at home with her parents, who has had exposure to both languages at school (English during pre-K and Spanish during K), who is designated as a student with special needs due to an autism diagnosis, and who comes from a working class immigrant family is not the kind of student suited for a Spanish-English bilingual program. Yet, this is exactly who these programs are meant to serve.

Monica’s case also illustrates a failure on our behalf, the bilingual teachers present at the meeting, to acknowledge all the other ways in which we were privileged, as lighter skinned Latina women from middle and upper middle class economic and educational backgrounds. Our trajectories are starkly different from that of Monica and her parents, and particularly the conditions under which we all arrived to the same country, finding ourselves in the same room. In our case, our class positions and educational backgrounds are such that our bilingualism is framed as an asset and has been key to our professional career paths. Furthermore, we were all socialized in contexts in which we were not racialized nor minoritized, and where Spanish was the majority language and the one spoken at home. We were upset by many things that transpired in that meeting; Ms. O commented that it was a lack of education on Monica’s parent’s behalf on the benefits of bilingualism, but Laura also pointed out the fear in the father’s comments, of having sacrificed so much to be in this country, and not see their daughter make progress in the language which they considered to be the key to her success. We discussed how that fear might come from experiences of racialization and discrimination that many of our students and our families face.
Ms. O was upset on multiple levels. She was upset at how little support the school showed for her Latino families. She was livid at the principal, and argued that he would not have missed this meeting had the family who wanted to leave the program been white (although later found out he was genuinely ill). She felt that even though he claimed he didn’t, Mr. Davis (the Principal), was catering too much to the white middle-class families, and leaving her Latino parents behind. She was upset at the rudeness of the special education teacher, who did not deem it necessary to actively participate in the meeting, to even look up from her laptop and give these parents a moment of her attention. She was exhausted of having to constantly fight an uphill battle on two fronts: convincing and educating Latino parents—who get multiple, conflicting, and discriminating messages from others—of the benefits of bilingualism, and constantly having to advocate for her students and families with the school faculty and staff, the majority of whom were monolingual and who were not educated themselves on the methods and theories of bilingual education, and who knew little of the model being implemented at their own school.

Conclusion

Race and class position structure the experiences of children and families in schools, yet they do not determine these experiences in fixed ways; on the contrary, as these ethnographic case studies illustrate, they work in divergent ways, yet always co-articulating, crossing paths, intertwined and mingled, distinct yet inseparable. The trajectories of raciolinguistic socialization for each of these students appears quite
different; and different institutional factors come in to play for each of them and their families. Particularly in the years of early schooling, where the development of language and early literacy skills becomes quite scrutinized by schooling institutions, processes of racialization (or lack thereof) become key factors in children’s socialization. The absence of any concern over Zoe’s development of language, or literacy, or identity is illustrative of her privilege as a white child, coming from a well-resourced home and college educated (and beyond) parents - something her parents are well aware of. The scrutiny over the linguistic “confusion” that learning in both languages could cause Monica, and the raciolinguistic ideologies of language acquisition on the part of educational and medical professionals, along with a trajectory of sacrifice and discrimination Monica’s family had faced, contribute to the decision to take her out of the bilingual program. The expectations for schooled literacy in kindergarten that neither Larissa (nor her mother) met as a result of class marginalization contributed to her positioning as needing help, which, along with her raciolinguistic positioning, contributed to the invisibility of her emerging bilingualism and precluded her from inhabiting the role of Spanish language expert. Finally, the constant demarcation and labeling imposed on Santiago along racial, ethnicized, and cultural lines results in a refusal of becoming a “Spanish boy” and a rejection of the language he is meant to already possess; a rejection and refusal that begin to loosen and soften as Santiago becomes more comfortable in his TWI bilingual classroom. Yet, in the context of racialization, public school underfunding, and a clash with middle-class values and ideas about what schooling should look and feel like, both Jane’s anxieties and Santiago’s behavior worsen and result in Jane and Esteban’s decision to find alternative schooling options for their son.
What we see in all of these cases are social actors acting within institutional constraints and discourses, and responding to such conditions. Raciolinguistic ideologies on who should be learning in two languages and for whom these bilingual programs are meant are prevalent; and people, and particularly children, become socialized into these ideologies. These ideologies account for the divergent ways in which the same practice of language mixing could be seen as a sign of development on Zoe’s part, yet a sign of linguistic and cognitive confusion on Monica’s part. They also account for how Zoe’s emergent bilingualism is much more visible and celebrated than that of Larissa’s, or even Santiago’s. Moreover, all of these stories illustrate the particular way in which language development becomes a central area of concern in bilingual programs and becomes highly scrutinized and tested over the course of the early primary years.
Chapter 8: The Peril and Promise of TWI Programs

As gentrification transforms more urban communities across the United States – communities that simultaneously continue to be receiving sites for multilingual immigrant populations – it behooves us to understand how these changing demographics impact the landscape of public schooling, and how these processes interact to form fertile grounds for programs such as two-way immersion bilingual programs. Because TWI programs tend to attract a diversity of families of different class, cultural, linguistic and economic backgrounds – they create what Mary Louis Pratt called ‘contact zones’: “social spaces where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power, such as colonialism, slavery, or their aftermaths as they are lived out in many parts of the world today” (1991, p. 33). Yet, if there is a critical understanding of the processes that result in inequalities, these 'contact zones' might also be potential coalition-building spaces, places that strive to create more equitable social conditions and that build more empathetic human relationships. In the following concluding remarks, I first summarize the contributions that I make through this study, followed by some of the implications for practice, and end with a rumination on future possibilities.

Contributions to the Field

This ethnographic study adds to our understanding of TWI bilingual programs in multiple ways. First, it sheds light on the larger social dynamics that come to bear on their creation. By examining how Washington's TWI program came about, and the differences between the people that it brought together, I seek to stress one of the ways in which implementing these programs becomes a great challenge. While this program is unique in how it was begun, given the particular
context of the city of Philadelphia and the underfunded, competitively-oriented school district, I believe it is not unique being situated in a space where immigration and gentrification are simultaneously changing a city's landscape. Other large metropolitan areas in the country are experiencing such changes, and, as the growing literature on gentrification and education attests to, more middle class, mostly white parents are turning towards public schools to educate their children - schools which traditionally serve lower-income children from non-dominant backgrounds. How schooling institutions adapt to this challenge, as they also continually strive to adapt to meet the need of their growing immigrant population, is of critical importance.

**Theoretical and Methodological Interventions**

By proposing the concept of raciolinguistic socialization, I hope to make a theoretical intervention in how we understand the dynamics of power and privilege and how those play out in bilingual TWI contexts. In other words, I bring together an analysis that takes into account the effect of class and race in our understanding of children's language socialization. I show how perceptions and evaluations of children's language abilities and language and literacy development are deeply affect by classed and racialized positionalities, and how through everyday interactions over a period of time, those positionalities come to presuppose identities for students. These identities may include being a 'good student'; being a student that is a 'capable bilingual', or one that is getting their languages 'confused'. These identities and evaluations are products not so much of actual linguistic practice but of raciolinguistic expectations.

Additionally, by using participant frameworks as the unit of analysis in classroom interactions, I propose a distinct method of studying children's bilingual interactions from what the current TWI literature offers. While I build upon already existing classroom discourse studies
in TWI contexts, I offer an alternative way of analyzing interaction that can contribute to our understanding of the process of language learning and socialization in the classroom. Furthermore, focusing on interactional dynamics, in which choice of language is one characteristic, can help us understand children's communication in their full sense, and understand children's social dynamics from their perspective. Additionally, taking a communicative repertoire perspective can help us see the ways in which children come to learn the subtle nuances of communication, and how they can take up stances and show alignment towards each other by using their full communicative repertoires.

Finally, part of understanding the classroom interactional dynamics, as well as children's trajectories of raciolinguistic socialization, requires a knowledge of everyday life in the classroom, the culture of the school, and importantly, of different families' experiences. Engaging in a long-term study of one particular place allowed me to focus on taken-for-granted social interactions that were part of our daily lives in the classroom, to focus on children and families, on teachers' daily lives in and out of the classroom, and to consider these in relation to the wider social processes they constitute. Like other ethnographers and anthropologists of education, I add to the literature an ethnographic study that, while particular in nature, sheds light on some of the complicated social dynamics that are part of educational institutions and beyond.

**Implications for Practice from a Raciolinguistic Perspective**

TWI programs toe the line of continually, and through everyday practice, enregistering language to racialized and classed types of speakers – and yet offering the power to break those same enregistered stereotypes of personhood. Indeed, Santiago's "Spanish boy" story circulated throughout the year to show that a TWI program could have the potential to break the negative
semiotic representation that Santiago had made of what a “Spanish boy” was. His parents, as well as the teacher, articulated this goal in various ways, and hoped that his participation in this program, with time, would expand his representation of Spanish speakers to different notions and kinds of people, especially to one he would hopefully be comfortable embracing (out of his own will, as opposed to accepting any one of the imposed identities).

Thus, I argue that the goal of these programs, can be the countering of such rigid notions of speakerhood – the opening up of possibilities not only of speaking, but of being. Stereotypic notions of who Spanish speakers are, such as the notion Santiago held of a “Spanish boy”, might be broken through learning about the great diversity of traditions and cultures of Spanish-speaking people around the world, a diversity represented by many of the children and families. At the same time, a crucial piece would be the critical study of the history and trajectories of Spanish-speakers, with examinations into the political economic conditions in Hispanophone countries and local contexts. The best place to start for this kind of study would be in each of these families' own immigration stories.

Some of the classroom implications of a raciolinguistic perspective might be easily-implemented recommendations, such as an attention to the way Latino children develop English that is equal to the attention that white children and other "English speakers" receive for developing Spanish. It might involve referring to children as 'bilingual speakers' from the beginning, as opposed to calling one group 'English speakers' and another 'Spanish speakers'. For teachers, it might also involve trying to break one of our most natural inclinations in communication as bilinguals, that of accommodating our young interlocutors to the language of their preference and of their dominion. Instead, teachers might push themselves to take the less instinctive path by interacting with children as legitimate participants in the linguistic communities to which we are socializing them, while also providing enough scaffolding along the
way. And most importantly, accepting the kinds of languaging practices that many bilingual children already bring.

Other implications might prove to be more elusive. For instance, how do we level the playing field in the classroom, in the acquisition of literacy, for children from non-dominant backgrounds, when they are in the same classroom as children who will already come armed with the tools to acquire schooled literacy more easily? How do we ensure that children who come from economically disadvantaged households, who might not have acquired the schooled literacy skills as fast as their peers, still be considered an 'expert' or a 'role-model', either for the minority language or for another skill? These questions, this study and its author, cannot answer alone, and in fact, it is this question that many anthropologists and researchers of education have historically sought to answer: how do we close the achievement gap? Except that in TWI programs, the 'achievement gap' is represented in one room, with children sitting side by side.

These implications for practice seem naive and superficial at best, because they would be useless and unsuccessful without the kind of critical understanding of language (and literacy) upon which they rest. Until we promote an understanding of the classed and racialized nature of language use and evaluation, a historical understanding of the socially constructed nature of language, and an examination of the relationship between language and power, truly transformational implications will elide us. Language, and languaging, is fundamentally about speakers, and reflects their histories of migration and classed and racialized social positions in the world. While the explicit goals of TWI programs are to educate bilingually, all those involved in their undertaking must understand that language and schooling are never just about language or learning. They are about hope, aspiration, and identity. As I hope this study has illuminated, TWI programs involve lofty goals not only for children’s better, brighter futures, but a collective desire for a better tomorrow for all.
On February 16th of this year, there was a nation-wide protest. Under the banner of #DayWithoutImmigrants, millions of immigrants marched and protested, demanding not only a recognition of how vital their labor is to this country, but also, better working conditions and respect for their human rights. In the upheaval of the recent election, and its aftermath, I often thought of the children and families of Washington’s TWI program. I thought of the immigrant families, most of whom are mixed status families, whose parents are undocumented and children are citizens, and how they must be feeling. I thought of the white middle class families and children, and what it must mean to perhaps witness the effects of the overt racist discourse that this election brought to the surface, to know classmates and their parents who are directly affected by this, and whether that was ever discussed in the classroom, among the children, or at home. By this point, I no longer had daily contact with them, save for the social media of the mothers who had befriended me. On February 15, I noticed that María, one of the Latina moms involved in getting the TWI program started, and now the mother of a TWI 1st grader, posted on Facebook about the march. She shared the following publication, with a message encouraging parents not to take their children to school. I wondered how many would actually follow suit.
The next day, I had my answer through the post of another mother, Mary. Mary wrote that on that day, only nine students in Zoe’s 2nd grade class attended school, and only 14 students attended Zoe’s sister, Grace’s, kindergarten class. She said that the students were kept home for the Day Without Immigrants strike, and that the principal not only excused, but also explained their absences in his morning announcements to the whole school. Mary stated that her children understood exactly why their friends were absent and why it was crucial that they stood up for their rights and the rights of their families. She then expressed the following:

After dinner in our primarily immigrant Philadelphia neighborhood, we were walking home and came upon a protest of immigrant families passing our house. The girls and I raced to catch up and join them. [Zoe] surveyed the crowd and said, “Do you think my friends are here?” [Grace] responded, “They’re ALL our friends!”

Reading this post reminded me of the profound lessons that being in a TWI can provide and the great potential there is in bringing together children and families from disparate experiences, despite the challenges that this entails.

In our increasingly divided, segregated cities and towns, programs such as this TWI that bring together such a diverse group of people seem rare. Even in “diverse” neighborhoods, such as the one around the school, people from different walks of life rarely interact meaningfully, aside from service encounters, in food establishments, or for a few, with neighbors. And while Zoe and Grace have come to see their Latino immigrant classmates as their friends, and perhaps have come to know, and from their time at Washington will understand, some of the issues and challenges they face, as middle class white children, they will not face those same challenges. They may become future allies, they may become individuals who work towards a more equitable future in different ways, as their parents do, yet they will still experience life through the privilege that a middle-class whiteness affords. In the classroom, this privilege operates in invisible ways that continue to advantage some children and disadvantage others. Given this situation, TWI
programs have the potential to become transformative spaces where families and students can come to deal with social differences in productive ways, while at the same time operating as spaces where inequality persists and is reproduced. Thus, they compellingly merit the attention of educational researchers and professionals.
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