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ABSTRACT

Schools are becoming more linguistically and racially diverse in K-12 settings, yet there is relatively little research that explores how language teachers incorporate student and community diversities in their pedagogies. Situated at one, northeastern public secondary school in the United States, my research offers a qualitative case study of language pedagogies through an intersectional lens to investigate the mechanisms and contexts through which inequities arise. Data is collected from the following sources: teacher interviews, classroom observations, teachers’ syllabi, and student de-identified work. My study employs intersectionality (Collins & Bilge, 2016; Crenshaw, 1989, 2010) as a primary theoretical lens and critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 2010; Gee, 2014a, 2014b) as a methodological strategy to study the construction and function of discourse in language pedagogies.

In each of these analytic contexts, this study examines how intersectional perspectives can illuminate language pedagogy and inform educational research. This work is grounded in the transnational history of the community that carefully depicts the rich cultural, linguistic, and ideological diversity of its residents from pre-colonial eras to the present day. This research offers insight into the power and privilege established by the English language throughout the community’s history and the conflicting values of different groups of residents who established themselves in the area.

Findings in this study suggest that language teachers position themselves as sensitive to multilingual student abilities and identities, report limited connection with the local community, and articulate constraints to the operationalization of student race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities in their language pedagogies. The use of intersectionality reveals that teachers’ avoidance of student characteristics such as gender, sexual identities, race, and ethnicity tends to
position White, heterosexual students as advantaged. Moreover, teachers’ distancing from these characteristics suggests that their pedagogies may de-privilege students who do not identify with these identities and can serve as a basis for perpetuating inequity, invisibility, and a lack of inclusion of certain student characteristics. This research intends to inform and support educators, teacher educators, and stakeholders in education as they consider cultural and linguistic plurality, inequalities that arise, and inequities that are sustained or persist across contemporary educational settings.
INTRODUCTION

The Dissertation’s Organization

The chapters of this dissertation offer an intersectional analysis of four world language teachers’ pedagogies at one public, secondary school in the northeastern United States. This work is grounded in the transnational history of a community whose underpinnings have been disavowed by its public secondary curriculum. To prove this disavowal, briefly defined as the denial of responsibility or knowledge of something (Disavowal, 2020), I draw upon intersectional theory to explore historical tensions in the study’s setting, a medium-sized northeastern city in the United States, from a pre-colonial era to the present. I consider how discursive elements across world language teachers’ perspectives and practices can be understood through an intersectional lens and how the inferences from dominant themes and critical discourse analyses, or the use of language in social contexts and how it is structured to convey a particular meaning or meanings (Gee, 2014a, 2014b), can be drawn. In each of these analytic contexts, I aim to offer insight into how these perspectives can illuminate language pedagogy and inform educational research.

In Chapter 1, “Introduction and Intersectionality,” I introduce the purpose of this study, that is, to demonstrate how an intersectional lens can reveal complex manifestations of power and inequities in world language pedagogy. Situating this research within the scholarship of intersectionality, this lens provides a broad and critical view of world language education in the United States and considers the role of power specific to language, race, ethnicity, and gender. In this chapter, I develop the unit of analysis for this study, world language pedagogies enacted by four teachers at one public secondary school. Therein, intersectionality serves as a critical
framework, offering the foundation and the language for examining connections across social
categories and contexts. Intersectionality advances the theoretical explanations made possible in
this analysis and provides a language for expressing how a failure to incorporate students’
diverse characteristics and the history of the community can maintain and emphasize inequalities
in world language education.

In Chapter 2, “Review of the Literature,” I shift my focus to the field of language
education to explore diversity and inclusive pedagogies in recent scholarship. In this chapter, I
consider how empirical research in world languages, and at times second language research,
examines socially construed categories of diversity, differences in perspectives between teachers,
students, and other stakeholders in education, and how certain aspects may complicate
understandings of diversity. Next, I investigate how recent scholarship advances the need for
teachers to draw upon the individual forms of diversity that students bring to their classrooms
and to foster inclusive world language pedagogies, briefly defined as teaching methodology and
practices that address and welcome variation in student identities. This chapter concludes with
considerations for linguistic diversity in language education, complemented with examples of
schools that have reconsidered monolingual policies and practices that aim to include
multilingual students and interact with communities.

In Chapter 3, “Bridgefield in Three Eras: A History Disavowed,” I illuminate how the
experiences of Bridgefield residents from a pre-colonial era to the present constitute a
transnational history that has been disavowed by the curriculum at Bridgefield High School. To
support this argument, I draw upon intersectional literature and examples drawn from the lives of
Bridgefield inhabitants as depicted in archival work. Through the rich cultural, linguistic, and
ideological diversity in Bridgefield’s history, I offer insight into the power and privilege
established by the English language throughout the community’s history and the conflicting values of different groups of residents who established themselves in the area. This chapter traces how schools at the turn of the 20th century aligned with “English only” policies and practices, consistent with the present-day ideology of monolingual English language policies in secondary schooling in the United States. I reflect on how the normalization of English and Eurocentric ideologies in American schools has functioned to suppress linguistic and cultural difference, reproduce institutional hierarchies, and limit social change.

Chapter 4, “Research Design and Methodological Approach,” presents the design elements and methodological and analytic strategies of this study. In this chapter, I discuss case study design, central research activities, and how my analyses proceed with the use of critical discourse analysis and coding strategies. I discuss the appropriateness of these design elements with respect to my analytical considerations, proceed with an explanation of my analyses of data, and provide additional information about the research site. This chapter concludes with a discussion of validity and reliability considerations that have been taken into account in this work.

In the following three chapters, I present the critical discourse analysis and coding results of interviews, course syllabi, and student work (Chapter 5), findings from classroom observations (Chapter 6), and a discussion of each of these findings in relation to the three research questions articulated in this dissertation (Chapter 7). These findings and analyses reveal prospective areas in which world language pedagogies at Bridgefield High School might connect with its students and engage with local communities. Supported by my analytic components, the dominant themes in these data offer insight into how and whether teachers integrate students’ abilities, experiences, and identities in their pedagogies, including instructional contexts where
my findings are nuanced by various factors. Within these analyses, I draw upon examples from teachers’ accounts of their practices, vignettes from classroom observations, and specific examples of course syllabi and student work.

In the following discussion (Chapter 8) and conclusion (Chapter 9), I discuss practical and theoretical implications for world language education in the United States and consider areas for future research. Reflecting upon my findings, I suggest areas where connections with students and communities ought to be more intentionally considered when teachers and teacher educators conceptualize and design their curricula. I extend my examination of teachers’ experiences and narrated accounts to consider how their expertise with languages and continuity with students may support their communities as academic, cultural, and linguistic liaisons between schools and families. Integrating recent scholarship presented in the literature review, I aim to bring the study full circle by developing three practical considerations for world languages, teacher education, and education, respectively.
CHAPTER I
THE INTERSECTIONAL INVESTIGATION OF DIVERSITY
IN WORLD LANGUAGE PEDAGOGIES
INTRODUCTION

This study examines how four teachers draw upon student diversity in identities, experiences, and abilities and how intersectionality can be understood in language pedagogies at Bridgefield High School,¹ a public secondary school in the northeastern United States. To investigate these aspects, this research is motivated by three guiding questions:

(1) How are student diversities such as experiences, abilities, and identities a resource in world language pedagogies?

(2) In what ways are world language pedagogies inclusive of multilingualism, race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities?

(3) What does an intersectional lens reveal about how student and community diversities are or are not taken up in world language classrooms?

Four teachers participated in this study, Julie, Robert, Lisa, and John.² All four participants are veteran language instructors, and each teacher has taught at Bridgefield for many years. Some participants also reside in this community, and each teacher learned the language(s) they teach during their secondary and postsecondary educational experiences. During the course of this study, teachers were considerate, welcoming, and gracious in their professional interactions with me. I acknowledge and am highly grateful for this opportunity they have afforded, which represents the practical underpinnings of this thesis.

¹ Bridgefield is a pseudonym.
² These are pseudonyms, and in some cases, genders of participants have also been disguised to protect participants’ identities.
Problem Statement

In the midst of heightened political polarization and efforts to prioritize educational demands in moments of conflict, K-12 education in the United States faces a paradox. As schools become more linguistically and racially diverse in contemporary settings, the need to support multilingual and multicultural students has grown (Banks, 2015; Stein-Smith, 2019). While world language classrooms pedagogy holds the potential to integrate students’ skills, interests, and identities, K-12 education places little emphasis on the development of multilingual skills. That more efforts are not made to accentuate language learning is a failure of U.S. education, as research demonstrates that world language education supports academic achievement for both monolingual and multilingual students, promotes cognitive benefits, and is positively associated with improved student perspectives of global communities (Fox, Corretjer, Webb, & Tian, 2019; Fox, Corretjer, & Webb, 2019; Tochon, 2009).

Studies (Krulatz et al., 2018) suggest that school-based projects can strengthen teachers’ awareness of cultural and linguistic diversity and foster mutual respect, tolerance, and dialogue among students, yet there is a heightened need for teacher support, as “many teachers report low levels of experience working with students of multilingual backgrounds” (p. 553). Moreover,

---

3 Data retrieved from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2019, 2020b): Between 2008-2017, the number of K-12 students in the U.S. who speak a language other than English at home has risen from roughly 4.7 million students in 2008 to more than 5 million students in 2017. Between 2015-2027, the percentage of public school students who are White is projected to diminish from 49 to 45%. In contrast, this percentage is projected to elevate for students who are Hispanic (from 26 to 29%), Asian/Pacific Islander (from 5 to 6%), and of two or more races (from 3 to 4%). The percentages of students who are Black and American Indian/Alaska Native in 2027 are projected to remain at 15 and 1%, respectively.

4 As reported by U.S. states and the District of Columbia, a total of 11 states have foreign language graduation requirements; 16 states do not have foreign language graduation requirements; and 24 states have graduation requirements that may be fulfilled by a number of subjects, one of which is foreign languages (American Councils for International Education, 2017).
knowledge of the relevance of student cultural and linguistic diversity to language development can support multilingual and multicultural competencies\(^5\) (Jessner, 2006) and prepare teachers for teaching in a globalized world. In addition to cultural and linguistic diversity, research (Possi & Milinga, 2017) points to the importance of teacher knowledge and awareness of other types of diversity such as gender, sexual identities, and disability. Aiming to eliminate “exclusion resulting from negative attitudes and lack of a response to diversity” (Possi & Milinga, 2017, p. 28), the examination of multiple representations of diversity can have implications for its application to educational contexts.

More precisely, there is relatively little research on “how world language teachers treat the ethnoracial,\(^6\) cultural, and linguistic diversity that their individual students bring to the world language classroom” (Baggett, 2018, p. 2). Recent studies (Krulatz et al., 2018; Stein-Smith, 2019) maintain that student diversity is a relevant curricular component in language pedagogy,\(^7\) and additional research (Al-Amir, 2017; Mills & Moulton, 2017) argues that teachers’

\(^5\) As one example, Jessner’s (2006) book includes a discussion of “cross-linguistic interaction” (CLIN), which includes transfer, inference, code switching, and borrowing in various expressions of multilingualism. Transfer across languages can affect “metalinguistic skills and [in] this way metalinguistic awareness becomes evident in both language use and language acquisition” (p. 71).

\(^6\) Recognizing that this concept is often contested and can be complicated to define. A challenge to accurately defining this term in scholarly work is to incorporate the multifaceted ways that variance between and within group identities may account for diversity. Otherwise put, dynamism in identity may at best muddle and at worst preclude accurate descriptions of this term. Recent research (Jiménez, Fields, & Schachter, 2015) adds depth to this discussion, urging scholars to grapple with this challenge to not treat group identities as merely “an outcome of various social processes” (p. 107).

\(^7\) One example of the ways Krulatz et al.’s (2018) research draws upon teachers’ development of these skills is through the use of “identity texts” during a year-long collaboration between two schools and one university in Norway. Very briefly defined, identity texts is an instructional approach that originated in Cummins’s (2001) work and promotes literacy and identity development through the creation of multimodal texts where multiple languages and cultures are present in the classroom. Examples of these texts are dual language books and bilingual stories.
recognition of different student profiles and their diverse goals for learning additional languages ought to be important considerations in contemporary language pedagogies. Moreover, teachers’ integration of various forms of diversity is one way that instructors can emphasize “diverse cultural practices, create interdisciplinary connections, and interact more readily in the community” (Mills & Moulton, 2017, p. 729). The ability to communicate these associations is vital to the field of second language instruction, as language classrooms across the United States have experienced a relative decline in the numbers of students who enroll in second language courses (American Councils for International Education, 2017).

The investigation of these associations is framed as intersectional in the proposed analytic way of thinking about diversity and conducting research. In this sense, intersectionality has been chosen to emphasize complex manifestations of power and inequities across race, ethnicity, gender, and other forms of diversity in lieu of principally relying on a methodological definition of the term. More clearly, it is not the employment of the term “intersectional” that makes intersectionality relevant to this examination; it is the “adoption of an intersectional way of thinking about the problem of sameness and difference and its relation to power” (Cho et al., 2013, p. 795).

Thus, this research does not intend to theorize about “diversity” in a categorical or cursory way. Rather, it aims to investigate fluidity and to consider how the process of language learning relates to representations of self (Marranci, 2003, 2009, 2011). For example, Marranci’s (2011) theory distinguishes how representations of self are both interpreted and understood through a dynamic of postcolonialism. In this sense, the investigation of how subjective interpretations of language pedagogy is represented using an intersectional lens implies pre-colonial and settler colonial histories, projected across participant variation in social contexts,
memories of objects and events, and autobiographical accounts. Settler colonialism can be defined as the displacement of an original population by Eurocentric settler colonizers, accompanied by the normalized exploitation of indigenous lands and resources and genocide and repression of indigenous peoples and cultures (Settler colonialism, 2017).

**Defining Diversity**

What does “diversity” mean? The ubiquitous term is complex and can be challenging to define. Generally, the concept of diversity often describes race, ethnicity, and a range of factors in an individual’s identity (Conway & Richards, 2017). Theorists (Tharp, 2015) offer different interpretations, such as the existence of differences, coded language for race, and a label for conflict between groups. Beyond these definitions, diversity is commonly characterized by several other distinctions, e.g., socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, ability, religion, political affiliation, and others.

In educational use, diversity tends to be employed as a universal, a catch-all phrase or a buzzword that tends to be paired with inclusion. More recently, secondary schools and higher education institutions across the country have made efforts to advance diversity, adopting practices and policies established during the Obama Administration (U.S. Department of Education, 2016) that demonstrate how inequities and opportunity gaps present challenges to access and completion of postsecondary education for racial and ethnic minorities. As initiatives to address inequities and promote racial diversity in K-12 settings have been adopted, diversity has been placed at the forefront of institutional priorities with hopes of establishing support to students and in the interest of developing inclusive campus climates.

While these efforts to incorporate diversity are important and pressing, recent attempts to raise awareness of racial and ethnic diversity across U.S. campuses often demonstrate how
Diversity continues to be misunderstood. As Stachowiak (2016), a professor who teaches about diversity in K-12 education, writes:

Diversity is a largely nebulous idea in this arena, but I do not find it much better understood in higher education, where it is generally understood as the body of services and programs offered to students, faculty, and staff that seek to ensure compliance with non-discrimination and policy law, and to affirm social member group differences (broadly considered) in curricular, co-curricular, and workplace contexts. (p. 117)

To the point of affirming social group differences, it could be that diversity in institutional settings ought to be reexamined. This is evident in K-12 settings, where schools make efforts to design diversity initiatives and training for faculty, staff, and students. These elements are not only not well-defined but often fall short of supporting non-White members and groups in ways that both expose and contribute to the vulnerability, pain, and suffering of those who have been discriminated against and oppressed by mainstream institutions.

Although institutional policies and programming have certainly made innumerable successful and important changes across U.S. campuses that promote diversity, foster inclusive environments, and enact the task of heightened awareness of difference and of inequities, it is clear that these efforts to promote diversity are not enough. Linking the framework of diversity to this study’s theoretical lens, its recurrent and perfunctory use in secondary and higher educational institutions tends to function as a euphemism for intersectionality yet without intersectionality’s critical edge. Linguistically, Ahmed (2012) discusses how the “arrival of the term ‘diversity’ indicates the departure of other (perhaps more critical terms), including ‘equality,’ ‘equal opportunities,’ and ‘social justice’” (p. 1). Though the term diversity may be more appealing to institutions in its broad, uncritical form, diversity will fail if it is not accompanied with a critical lens, one that more directly and intentionally investigates power, oppression, equity, and their intersection.
Moreover, the definitions referenced above fall short of being comprehensive in that they tend to omit what the term diversity implies, do not account for diversity across multiple social and linguistic dimensions, and obscure how distinct characteristics exist in social contexts of unequal power relations. To begin with what diversity implies, diversity involves entire pre-colonial and settler colonial histories that are often suppressed in institutional settings. Importantly, exploring diversity involves preserving the individual and group histories of those who have suffered, particularly through the settler colonialism that persecuted northeastern Indigenous peoples (DeLucia, 2018). Placing diversity within the historical contexts of those who have endured inequities and discrimination locates modern understandings of the term within a critical narrative. Without this consideration, an exploration of diversity runs the risk of obscuring important details within communities and the lives of their inhabitants.

Next, the term diversity involves communication about social and analytic categories in various contexts and forms of interaction. More directly put, defining diversity by its content simultaneously signifies omission, and yet it is precisely this failure that reveals how elusive these categories can be. For example, the chapters of this dissertation are attentive to diversity in a range of contexts: research interviews, informal discussions, classroom instruction, historical eras, student work, and world language syllabi. Considering difference within these contexts, I view diversity as a complex relationship rather than a socially construed outcome. Diversity can be viewed as relationship in that it comprises different group, social, and linguistic elements that establish meaning through a symbiotic interrelation and a process of individual identities that are constantly in flux.

Notably, as recent articles illustrate (Alim & Reyes, 2011; Rosa & Flores, 2017), power dynamics are often reproduced in ways that tend to privilege dominant White hegemonic
discourses in the United States. As such, these analyses adopt a conceptual and methodological approach to understanding how teachers engage with student, school, and community diversities in their instructional practices and how intersectionality can be used to analyze inequities and power dynamics therein. Within this analysis, I consider the history of the community in which the study is set, attend to nuance across analytic and social categories, and reflect upon power relations in the classroom, school, and community that are set in U.S. political and educational contexts. This research seeks to understand how teachers draw upon students’ abilities, experiences, and identities as resources and attends to how school and community diversities are or are not taken up in language classrooms.

This exploration of diversity is specific to the context of world language teachers and pedagogy at one secondary school in the northeastern United States. Recognizing the additional challenges to defining diversity in the intersection of social identities, fluidity and nuance across group identities, the complexities of diversity in world language pedagogy that follow are supported with intersectionality as a conceptual framework and critical discourse analysis as a methodological strategy. These tools contribute to the refinement of the main construct; each function to layer and examine diversity linguistically, critically, and theoretically.

Moreover, this study is specific to the practices performed by world language teachers in instructional and professional contexts. Within the portraits drawn in my narrative, no student is identified, and the anonymous student data that have been collected were gathered through discussions with teacher participants and my observations of world language classes. Finally, I am the primary instrument in this investigation, and the themes that have arisen in this research have been carefully constructed across different data sources over the course of approximately ten months.
Specific Aims

The intent of this qualitative case study is to investigate how teachers incorporate student diversity and how their practices are inclusive in world language pedagogy at one public high school in the northeastern United States.

Purpose

My study has two purposes: (1) to examine how an intersectional lens can emphasize complex forms of inequities across student, school, and community diversity in language education, and (2) to contribute to, support, and inform the field of education through the investigation of world language pedagogy.

Significance of Study

This study is significant in one practical, one theoretical, and one methodological way. Practically speaking, K-12 education in the United States presently faces a paradox. Students in K-12 settings comprise greater percentages of multilingual and multicultural students (Banks, 2015; Stein-Smith, 2019), yet U.S. education simultaneously places limited importance on multilingual skills. Although language learning in international settings is essentially ubiquitous (Devlin, 2018), the number of students who enroll in second language courses in the U.S. is comparatively small\(^8\) (American Councils for International Education, 2017). This is one of many components related to the relative decline of United States dominance across an international stage (Huygens, 2017), as it suggests that present and future generations of U.S. citizens will be limited in their capacity to participate in linguistically diverse global settings.

---

\(^8\) One in five or 20% of students in K-12 settings in the United States are enrolled in second languages (American Councils for International Education, 2017).
Although K-12 policy makers recognize the imperative of global readiness for college and career readiness (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010), their focus tends to be on global competition through curricular change, often overlooking opportunities to promote the dynamic processes of self-reflection and engagement with others. In this way, educational policy makers may claim to prepare present and future citizens to engage globally, yet they simultaneously fail to acknowledge the importance of integrating the development or strengthening of skills in languages other than English and the development or strengthening of intercultural awareness within students’ educational experiences. Given this practical consideration, I suggest that it is a misstep to not deliberately consider how second language experiences can inform and support secondary education in the future.

Additional support of this point can be offered in the pressing need to cultivate a productive dialogue of diversity and inclusion to counter brutality, violence, and oppression in the United States. Evidence of dialogic fractures can be found in recent social protests, such as the #BlackLivesMatter movement, as well as incidents in secondary education settings during sporting events (Blint-Welsh, 2018; Cook, 2018) and in classrooms (Brice-Saddler, 2018; Guerra, 2018).

Next, the theoretical contribution of this research relates to the apparent lacunae in the existing body of research (Baggett, 2018; Krulatz et al., 2018) that has yet to articulate how current and future student demographics are instantiated in language pedagogy, broadly construed. In the present study, I argue that the process of addressing this gap logically obliges the following correlated theoretical considerations: (a) to conceptually modify how “diversity” is described in language teaching and (b) to further grapple with the ways that present linguistic
articulations of the term are imprecise and otherwise fail to account for variance within and across groups (including within-individual variance).

Moreover, the cost of not investigating how educators might make language learning more relevant to and effective for students runs the risk of overlooking an opportunity for students to engage with linguistic and cultural diversity. Therefore, the exploration of intersectional dynamics in language pedagogy aims to contribute to the fields of education and language research, and by extension, these “examinations can lead to further exploration of hegemonic practices in their own cultures, including examination of privilege” (Baggett, 2018, p. 1).

Methodologically, I offer that this study’s investigation of the interaction of sociocultural context with student diversity in language learning is a relevant and essential methodological step that can inform language teaching. Recent studies (Gabaudan, 2016; Van Reybroeck, Penneman, Vidick, & Galand, 2017) support the relevance of sociocultural context as a robust and important area in language research. This study will address sociocultural context by investigating (a) school-related context, i.e. school size, school socioeconomic status, location (urban/suburban/rural), class size, and physical school and classroom environments; (b) communication during observations between teacher-student, student-teacher, and student-student with particular attention to the intersectional dynamics of gender, race and ethnicity, (dis)ability, and other social factors.

**Research Approach**

My dissertation offers a qualitative case study of world language pedagogies through an intersectional lens. Drawing on critical discourse analysis, I aim to study diversity in language
teaching as well as the discursive promises and constraints of the world language curriculum as enacted by four high school teachers at a public school setting in the northeastern United States.

This study is directed at the field of education. It responds to a considerable gap in the literature, advancing a need to explore the various ways that student diversity is instantiated in world language pedagogies. In my initial exploration of this gap, I conducted a study (Dion, 2019, 2020) at one independent secondary school in the northeastern United States to investigate how teachers interpret, rationalize, and go about teaching culture and diversity in their language pedagogies. Findings from this work suggest that student diversity may not be well-represented as a resource in assessments at this institution (i.e. assignments or assessments that were graded).

In that study, teachers were asked to participate in an approximately 30-minute individual interview that was audio recorded. This study was approved by the University of New Hampshire’s (UNH) Institutional Review Board (IRB). Teachers’ responses were then transcribed and examined using narrative and pattern coding processes (Saldaña, 2016). In the first-round coding process, clauses from transcripts were classified into one of the following elements: culture type, orientation (who, what, where), purpose, setting, evaluation, characterization, theme, and result. After codes were established, a second round of coding was conducted to develop the thematic organization to group the codes into relevant themes. This process resulted in the identification of four major themes that reflected how teachers make decisions to incorporate culture and diversity in language pedagogy.⁹

⁹Recognizing the limitations of this study in number (n = 17) and setting (i.e. one independent secondary school), these results are in no way intended to be taken as representative of a generalized report of “how second language teachers incorporate culture and diversity in their practices.” Rather, this study represents one way to offer insight into how teachers at this specific institution described the ways they teach these constructs.
From the narrative and pattern coding processes, interview responses were grouped into four major themes defined as follows:

- **Theme 1: Cultural diversity in teaching practices:** instructors’ decisions to incorporate cultural diversity as a resource in their classroom teaching practices.

- **Theme 2: Student diversity in assessment:** teachers’ integration of student diversity in world language assessments (i.e., work that is graded).

- **Theme 3: Students’ interests in teaching practices:** students’ exploration of a variety of cultural products (e.g., music, art), various regions, scientific innovations, and political systems, among others as a component in their world language coursework. Student interests differ from student diversity in assessments in that they do not explicitly draw upon students’ linguistic, cultural, and racial diversity.

- **Theme 4: Teachers’ experiences, interests, and identities:** teachers’ curricular choices in teaching culture based on their own experiences, interests, and identities.

Figure 1.1 visually depicts the frequency of each theme. Specifically, three of 17 teachers report including students’ diversity in assessments, and many instructors (15 of 17 or 88.2%) reported incorporating cultural diversity of the languages being taught in teaching practices.

Student interests were also factors influencing teachers’ decisions; over half (10 of 17 or 59%) of participants reported incorporating student interest in various cultural in-class activities and instruction. However, regarding student interests, no teacher in this study reported situating student interests in their language assessments. This does not preclude the possibility that
teachers may incorporate student interests in assessment. However, the examined data show no evidence of student interests in teachers’ assessments.

**Figure 1.1. How teachers make decisions about diversity in the instruction of culture (n = 17)**

Additional findings from the study include 36 variations in the ways that teachers described teaching cultural diversity. However, descriptions of “materials” as cultural in this limited context fail to account for the integrative nature of culture in language pedagogy, e.g. the sociocultural context in which language instruction takes place, various institutional characteristics, and students’ and teachers’ perceptions of what might be considered “culture,” among other possible limitations of the term.

Drawing upon these findings and buoyed with the historical, empirical, and practical evidence in the existing body of literature, I have constructed a qualitative case study to examine how an intersectional lens can be used to research the understanding and inclusion of the notion of diversity in world language pedagogies.

---

10 Including my own inferences as a researcher
Conceptual Framework: Intersectionality

This study draws on intersectionality (Collins & Bilge, 2016; Collins, 2019; Crenshaw, 1989, 1991, 2010) as its primary theoretical framework. Intersectionality can be characterized as a “travelling theory” (Said, 1983), as it takes different forms between people, ideas, time periods, and situations. While traveling theories emerge from and share similarities with other traditions, their unique theories are exported to contexts different from their own. Broadly defined, intersectionality can be defined as a way to investigate and understand “the overlapping and conflicting dynamics of race, gender, class, sexuality, nation, and other inequalities” (Cho et al., 2013, p. 788). Although intersectionality has been applied to legal contexts, social divisions, and feminist theories for over two decades (Anthias, 2012), the use of this lens is relatively more recent in academic and political applications. In this study, intersectionality is employed to analyze the ways that race, gender, ethnicity, and other forms of diversity interact in language pedagogy, emphasizing the mechanisms and contexts through which individual inequalities arise.

This framework is justified by its theoretical analysis of the complex manifestations of power and inequities across different forms of diversity in world language pedagogy. After a discussion of intersectionality’s history and establishing its relevance to my work, contemporary critiques are considered. Next, I present intersectionality’s connection to (1) critical inquiry and praxis and (2) relationality and power. As a compliment to engaging with identity in intersectional theory, I extend Marranci’s (2003, 2009, 2011) theory of self as a basis for which language can mediate between self and identity. As I examine how intersectionality can attend to language pedagogy, I consider power relations both through their intersections and across domains, namely interpersonal, disciplinary, cultural, and structural contexts.
**Intersectionality’s Origins**

The concept of intersectionality existed long before the 17-letter term’s first articulation. Though work framed as “intersectional” emanates from several disciplines today, its roots can be traced to 19\(^{th}\) century feminist thought among Black, Latinx, Indigenous, and Asian-American feminists. In the United States, Truth (1851) advocated for women’s suffrage, Black rights and against slavery, drawing on her identity to illustrate how these movements were failing Black women. Wells (1892/1969) combatted prejudice and violence against African Americans and women, leading international campaigns against lynching and rape. Her leadership was not only unusual for a Black women’s public activity, but she also inspired American women to fight for racial and social reform (Pinar, 2006). Cooper (1892/1998) described the unique position of being female and African American and what it meant to be confronted by an issue that is both a “woman question” and a “race problem” yet was “an unknown or unacknowledged factor in both” (p. 112). McDougald (1925/1995) wrote about the conflicts Black women experience between sex and race and how efforts for equality are continually thwarted. Many other feminists and social justice advocates contributed to the fight against discrimination and inequity in efforts toward social reformation during this time in a manner that understood the concept of intersectionality, even if that term was not explicitly used.

By the late 20\(^{th}\) century, intersectionality extended a lens through which to examine inequities during a period of considerable social change. As Latin America, Asia, and Africa engaged in decolonial struggles, global women’s and civil rights movements had emerged, and the Cold War and apartheid in South Africa each came to an end, these movements communicated a break with long-established forms of domination (Collins, 2019). A shifting worldview of social inequities caused by colonialism, racism, sexism, and nationalism called for
a different way of thinking about social change. Positing the “interconnectedness of people, social problems, and ideas” (Collins, 2019, p. 1), intersectionality builds upon the possibility that social transformation is possible.

It was during this turbulent time that intersectionality was first articulated as a metaphor. Foregrounding how race and gender are intertwined, Crenshaw (1989) is credited with coining the term. As a metaphor, she uses it as a way to expose how unimodal thinking can impede legal reasoning, disciplinary knowledge, and efforts to promote social justice. Crenshaw (1989) centers her analysis on the theoretical erasure of Black women to demonstrate how multidimensionality in Black women’s experience contrasts with a “single-axis framework” (p. 57), referring to the identification of race and gender discrimination that is limited to the experiences of the most privileged group members. She argues that dominant conceptions of race and gender discrimination thereby “condition us to think about subordination as a disadvantage occurring along a single category axis” (Crenshaw, 1989, p. 57). Thus, a singular, limited focus on discrimination tends to compound marginalization for those who are “multiply-burdened” (Crenshaw, 1989, p. 57), as these forms of discrimination exist in ways that cannot be understood by discrete sources alone.

Two years later in the Stanford Law Review, Crenshaw (1991) writes about the violence that has routinely shaped Black women’s lives, citing how examples of “battering and rape, once seen as private (family matters) and aberrational (errant sexual aggression), are now largely recognized as part of a broad-scale system of oppression that affects women as a class” (p. 1241). Moreover, the process of conceptualizing this violence as social and systemic instead of that which formerly was individual or scattered incidences has shaped the experiences of
women, African American, other non-White populations, and LGBTQ+ communities (Crenshaw, 1991).

On the other hand, this view has also been critiqued, as it tends to conflate or disregard difference across or within groups. In response, Crenshaw (1991) focuses on two forms of male violence, specifically battering and rape, to consider how Black women experience the intersecting patterns of racism and sexism. Noting that intersectionality is represented neither within feminist nor antiracist discourses, it is “because of their intersectional identity as women and of color within discourses that are shaped to respond to one or the other” (Crenshaw, 1991, p. 1244) that Black women are marginalized within both.

Building upon these observations, Crenshaw (1991) continues, developing intersectionality with the exploration of how race and gender interact in shaping structural, political, and representational components that affect Black women. These aspects are structural in that they involve how the intersection of race and gender make violence, rape, and reform “qualitatively different” (Crenshaw, 1991, p. 1245) for Black women; political as they engage with laws that are intended to address equality yet paradoxically marginalize the issue of violence against Black women; and finally, representational, as they delve into popular cultural portrayals of Black women that become yet another source of disempowerment. Within these considerations, Crenshaw (1991) identifies other patterns of subordination that intersect such as the vulnerability of immigrant women who rely upon even the most abusive spouses for citizenship status and non-English speaking women who, without independent access to information, can be intimidated or threatened to silence.
Simultaneously yet not in collaboration with Crenshaw (1989, 1991), sociologist Patricia Hill Collins (1990) articulated intersectionality as an analysis of inequities and oppression that are entwined and influenced by systems of race, gender, class, and ethnicity. In early intersectional work, distinctions within these systems of oppression were known as “interlocking oppressions” and “intersecting oppressions” (Collins et al., 1995, p. 492), referring to macro-level and micro-level phenomena respectively. Macro-level or interlocking oppressions describes social structures that create social positions, and the micro-level or intersecting oppressions describes individual and groups within social positions (Collins et al., 1995).

Initially, Collins (1990) developed three intersectional frameworks to assist with thinking about and analyzing intersectional theory. More recently, Collins and Bilge (2016) expanded the core ideas into what are now six frameworks. These frameworks, what some refer to as branches, are social inequality, relationality, domains of power (divided into structural, disciplinary, cultural, and interpersonal power relations), social context, complexity, and social justice. I briefly introduce them here and will discuss them again below. Rather than a set of comprehensive factors that appear equally in any given and specifically this project, these frameworks appear and reappear as “guideposts for thinking through intersectionality” (Collins & Bilge, 2016, p. 27) as a theoretical tool. Following this chapter, I return to the frameworks in the latter half of the dissertation.

---

11 At this time, Collins (1990) referred to intersectionality as an analysis of Black feminist thought. Thereafter, she adopted Crenshaw’s (1989) term and employs intersectionality in subsequent work.
**Intersectionality and Education**

Long since early advocates publicly fought for equality and justice and over three decades after the term intersectionality was first articulated, both intersectionality and the social and interpersonal conditions it connects have evolved. Contextually framed in intellectual history as “an analytic sensibility, a disposition, or a way of thinking” (Carastathis, 2016, p. 4) intersectionality offers a methodological challenge to world language pedagogy. That is, it suggests a way of thinking to which educators may not be accustomed, “urging us to grapple with and overcome our perceptual-cognitive habits of essentialism, categorical purity, and segregation” (Carastathis, 2016, p. 4). In particular, intersectionality advances the integrative nature of these relations, noting that a superficial preoccupation with “difference” (Cho et al., 2013) in a temporal or categorical sense is not the intent of this work. More explicitly, this study’s use of intersectionality in language pedagogy is important because it offers a way of understanding complexity, social inequities, and power dynamics in addition to insight into ways that people experience life based on complex and dynamic identities.

More recently, intersectionality has traveled particularly fast, expanding across different global contexts. International nonprofits have adopted intersectional strategies in their organizational approaches such as Asian Women Immigrant Advocates (Unites States), Ka-Mer (a Women’s Center, Turkey), Southall Black Sisters (Britain), GAMA (Afro-Uruguayan Women’s Support Group, Uruguay), and others (Hancock, 2016). Intersectionality has also been used in the politics and the media, although many underscore its misuse and overuse in the latter. In this sense, intersectionality may appear to be omnipresent as the tensions it raises and its commitments to social justice persist. Despite its misuse, intersectionality is a useful tool to
engage with social issues and power dynamics that privilege some and render others subordinate or erased.

**An Intersectional Orientation in World Language Pedagogies**

In its application to world languages, intersectionality provides insight and the language for understanding difference in world language classrooms. It recognizes that social characteristics such as “race, class, gender, sexuality, dis/ability, and age operate not as discrete and mutually exclusive entities, but build on each other and work together” (Collins & Bilge, 2016, p. 4). Accordingly, intersectionality as a conceptual tool strengthens the capacity to understand inequity in language classrooms and articulates how inequalities may be interacting with diversity in various contexts.

Recent studies (Al-Amir, 2017; Baggett, 2018; Mills & Moulton, 2017) call for world languages to integrate the diversity of its individual students in its classrooms, citing examples of oppression, prejudice, racism, classism, and marginalization experienced by students. Although an intersectional lens can be a challenging, complicated tool to use, it is through these complicating factors that they are applicable to this investigation of diversity. Collins and Bilge (2016) support this connection, noting that intersectionality’s core themes of “social inequality, power, relationality, and social context are intertwined” (p. 29), heightening the complexity of an intersectional analysis.

Moreover, intersectionality’s articulation of how different social characteristics can build upon each other and add complexity to human experiences is applicable to my work. For example, consider a world language student who is a recent immigrant to the United States in a Latin class. Then, consider that this student is Black, of lower socioeconomic status, and transgender. The intersection of these individual characteristics contributes to different
experiences for students and clearly situates the importance of the problem, how do teachers draw upon individual student characteristics in their pedagogy? In addition, I search for areas in my data that advance possibilities to reconsider the purpose of world language curriculum. It is my hope that the use of intersectionality in language research will contribute to the core themes that intersectionality assumes.

**Critiques of Intersectionality**

In recent years, the proliferate use of the term “intersectionality” has been met with skepticism. Critics argue that the metaphor of intersectionality is imprecise (Nagel, 2019) and suffers from complicated power struggles both across disciplines and in unique circumstances (Knapp, 2005). Other concerns situated within feminist and women’s studies stem from whitening of intersectionality (Bilge, 2013), apolitical or disembodied applications of intersectional theory (Jordan-Zachery, 2007), and the removal of Black women as essential intersectional subjects (Alexander-Floyd 2012).

Most often, intersectional theory tends to be critiqued for being inherently vague and ambiguous, described as “difficult” or “complex” (Collins & Bilge, 2016, p. 29). While complicated, this rather generalized view of intersectionality fails to make distinctions between intersectionality’s inherent difficulties and those that are attributable to its interdisciplinary use. On the other hand, this critique is incisive, correctly noting that the various uses of intersectionality across different fields are not straightforward. Adopting a different view, Cho et al. (2013) argue that it is “what intersectionality does rather than what intersectionality is” (p. 795) that sustains the core of intersectionality. That is not to say that certain aspects of intersectional theory, including its core grounding in and commonalities with feminist and other
theories, are to be overlooked. On the contrary, these critiques can promote a deeper understanding of intersectional theory.

Among other contentions, feminist theories argue that the concept of intersectionality emanates from Western, educated, affluent, and democratic societies (Henrich et al., 2010) that assume that all women experience the same types of oppression (Herr, 2014). Different feminist theories such as transnational feminism also advocate for the complexities of oppression, including multiple genres of resistance (Collins et al., 2019). As examples, Mohanty (2013) advances the limitations of the “scholarly view from above of marginalized communities of women” (p. 967) and articulates in Feminism without borders (2003) how understandings of difference are neither contained within lines drawn by the academy nor the confines of the geography of the United States. As a limited response, early iterations of intersectionality (Collins, 1990; Collins et al., 1995) engage with this critique, distinguishing between intersecting or micro-level and interlocking or macro-level systems of oppression. More recently, Collins and Bilge’s (2016) frameworks for thinking about intersectional theory, including four distinctions within the domains of power framework that are explained below, serve as additional modes of support.

Without dismissing concerns about how engaging with intersectionality can be complicated, nor disputing its limits, I contend that intersectionality is a relevant intellectual form of critical inquiry and praxis that is well-positioned toward illuminating individual and group inequities. Although critics point to the limitations of complexity across difference, intersectional theory provides an opportunity to thoughtfully and critically engage with diversity and inequities. As a result, its use can widen understandings of education and advance critiques of theory and pedagogy, particularly in their connections with social inequity.
Intersectional Frameworks

Intersectionality as an analytic tool can illuminate complexity within people’s lives and social contexts, so it aims to portray how certain factors, such as race and gender, work together “in diverse and mutually influencing ways” (Collins & Bilge, 2016, p. 27). The following six frameworks that Collins and Bilge (2016) develop can be used to organize ideas that frequently arise in intersectionality’s use. As these intersectional themes emerge in my study, they take on different forms and appear in various ways. After the explanation of each framework here, I return to the frameworks again in Chapters 4 and 5.

1. Social inequality: Several recent applications of intersectionality refer to social inequality, although not all contemporary definitions assume this framework. However, the existence of intersectionality is predicated by those who either witnessed social inequities or experienced them personally. Recognizing that social inequities are often caused by multiple factors, intersectionality promotes a view of social inequities as a combination of social interactions in different categories (Collins & Bilge, 2016).

2. Domains of power: The idea of social inequities involves power relations, in particular those that are influenced by neoliberalism, nationalism, and capitalism (Collins & Bilge, 2016). Understood through an intersectional lens, power relations are also influenced by a combination of mutually constructive and competing factors that are understood in both intersecting, or micro-level, and interlocking, macro-level ways. Within this framework, Collins and Bilge (2016) offer an additional conceptual mechanism for analyzing relations across structural, disciplinary, cultural, and interpersonal domains of power.
   a. Structural: This refers to how social contexts are organized. In both Chapters 3 and 5, I refer to the structural domain of power on two levels: how U.S. education
and Bridgefield High School are structured, and in Chapter 3, this domain is historically considered through the lens of the Naimkeak Mill company in Bridgefield.

b. **Disciplinary:** The disciplinary domain involves how power can be disciplinary by privileging some for whom certain options are viable whereas for others, the same options, such as college access, are out of reach. This organization can be extended to situations where rules and their implementation may be applied differently (Collins & Bilge, 2016).

c. **Cultural:** Extended through the pervasiveness of global social inequities, the cultural domain exposes the myth of equal opportunity. An example of this in the public, secondary setting of this study exists in the capitalist and political messages that all students can “get ahead” or “succeed,” yet does not account for immigrant students who either cannot apply for financial aid or who have little or very limited prior exposure to English.

d. **Interpersonal:** This domain refers to the lives of people, how they relate to one another, and “who is advantaged or disadvantaged within social interactions” (Collins & Bilge, 2016, p. 7) to highlight how varying individual combinations of categories such as race, gender, and citizenship can position individuals differently.

3. **Relationality:** To build upon complexity, here in language teaching, social inequalities, and the relationship(s) between identity, thought, and language, relationality is an integral theme of intersectionality. Relationality can be defined as thinking that rejects either/or binary thinking, embracing a both/and frame (Carbado & Crenshaw, 2019; Collins &
Bilge, 2016). The focus of relationality therefore “shifts from analyzing what
distinguishes entities, for example, the difference between race and gender, to examining
their interconnections” (Collins & Bilge, 2016, p. 27). Rather than minimize or reject
differences, intersectionality advances both/and thinking as a way to negotiate differences
that exist within scholarly and political traditions (Collins & Bilge, 2016).

4. **Social context**: Just as with Crenshaw’s (1989) articulation of the invisibility of Black
women in legal applications, the examination of power dynamics and integration of
relationality are reliant upon their existence within a social context. Moreover, I aim in
this work to show how competing perspectives can arise in the social context of world
language classrooms and pedagogy and how emphasizing these different views is
important to intersectionality.

5. **Complexity**: The preceding four frameworks above are not only entwined but also
complex, and the idea that intersectionality “complicates things and can be a source of
frustration for scholars, practitioners, and activists alike, who are looking for a neat, tidy
tool to apply” (Collins & Bilge, 2016. p. 29). In this study, I recognize the seriousness of
this complexity and engage collaboratively with my participants to construct a detailed
analysis of world language pedagogy.

6. **Social justice**: It is often the case that global social inequity can illustrate how complex,
ostensible solutions may be in the aims of social justice. While the inclusion of this
framework has been debated, Collins and Bilge (2016) agree that this idea is not requisite
to intersectional theory. However, they argue that its inclusion better positions its use
among social justice advocates, thereby expanding its adaptability. While this framework
and its aims are important, I do not directly engage with this framework in my analyses throughout this study.

**Relationality, the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis, and Poststructuralism**

To circle back to the discussion of relationality above, I consider two additional concepts that build upon the ways that relational thinking can manifest in an intersectional lens: the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis (Evans & Green, 2006) and poststructuralist arguments (Norton Peirce, 1995; Thomassen, 2017), including critical feminist poststructuralism (Weedon, 1991, 1997) as alternatives. In cognitive linguistic theory, the Sapir Whorf hypothesizes that language can influence how individuals perceive reality in two ways: “linguistic determinism (the idea that language determines non-linguistic thought) and linguistic relativity (the idea that speakers of different languages will therefore think differently)” (Evans & Green, 2006, p. 96).

Although critiques (Pinker, 1994) to this hypothesis point to the fault of equivocating thought with language as a universal, findings in linguistic anthropology and language research suggest that “language can and does influence thought and action” (Evans & Green, p. 96).

As a way to engage this argument, poststructuralism contributes to this conversation in its criticism of all forms of presence including the presence of a subject, identities, or structures. Poststructuralists adopt the stance that representation is not to be seen as the reflection of presence (Thomassen, 2017). Rather, it argues that presence, in the form of identities, should not be understood as representative of a human, structural, or other form of essence (Thomassen, 2017). While the question of representation tends to divide poststructuralist debates, the application of poststructuralism can be useful as a metaphorical map, one that can help consider identity, thought, language, and teachers’ and students’ positioning within schools in relation to each other and as subjects within a particular sociocultural milieu.
Building upon poststructuralist debates, critical feminist poststructuralism functions to expose power relations associated with the personal (Weedon, 1997), whether the personal appears as differences in gender, race, class, ability, and sexual identities (Kelly & Gauchat, 2016). This consideration of critical feminist poststructuralism layers my primary intersectional lens with its useful theoretical tools that engage with and enable change. As examples, Weedon (1997) emphasizes how gender is a cultural construct that ought not be tied to biology, given that meaning is constructed from both discourse, social context, and individual understandings. Critical feminist poststructuralism can also be used to expose how literary discourses have often been “implicitly patriarchal, marginalizing gender and rendering women passive recipients of culture rather than its producers” (Weedon, 1997, p. 139).

Additionally, critical feminist poststructuralism has extended my thinking about my study, its findings, and my historical exploration of the Bridgefield community. Within this theory, language constructs meaning, and meaning is neither fixed nor “guaranteed by the world external to it” (Weedon, 1997, p. 171). In this view, the construction of meaning is never a neutral process or act; it inherently involves questions of power (Weedon, 1997). As an example drawn from chapter 3, the patriarchal sources that function to marginalize and suppress women are visible through depictions of immigrant women in the Bridgefield community in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

In regard to social identities in language education through the lens of poststructuralism, Norton Peirce (1995) argues that social identity theories must take into account how unequal power relations affect language students in specific social interactions and contexts. Calling for the critical reevaluation of multilingualism and a focus on ambiguity inherent in language and language practices, Norton Peirce’s (1995) work has inspired poststructuralist world language
literature (McNamara, 2011; Scholz, 2010). In addition, these critical perspectives can foster reflection on the relationship of students and teachers to the languages they speak, positioning the relation of language as a relation of power (McNamara, 2011), including where power in language can be enforced and/or disrupted.

Examples from other poststructuralist discussions about how contrasting contexts are represented in world languages, particularly colonial and post-colonial examples, can present alternative views in the curriculum. Similarly, a poststructuralist conception is also relevant in the adoption of a view of “identity as a site of conflict and struggle, negotiation, compromise, and potential transformation” (Hourdequin, 2012, p. 136). Derrida’s (1996/1998) reflection in *Le monolingualisme de l’autre* explores the complexities of his experiences being raised and educated in colonial Algeria throughout World War II. However, this experience is not his multilingual identity but the erasure of this possibility, in favor of a monolingual colonial language policy. Drawing a parallel with the English-language policies established in Bridgefield in Chapter 3, the colonial policy in Algeria forbade languages other than French in the education system and public life.

An interesting poststructuralist feature in Derrida’s (1996/1998) work is that he experienced not only alienation and violence in the imposition of the monolingual policies but also became attached to French as his language of socialization: “I suffer from and enjoy [jouis de] what I am telling you. . .Yes, I only have one language; yet it is not mine” (p. 2). Derrida’s (1996/1998) perspective on monolingualism and multilingualism is relevant to the history of the Bridgefield community, world language pedagogy, and students at Bridgefield High School, so I draw upon this form of poststructuralism to emphasize how the social and cultural contexts of mono- and multilingualism may conflict.
Building upon poststructuralist connections between language, thought, and identity, I recognize that multilingualism is a complex phenomenon that has preoccupied historical and contemporary scholarly discussions across disciplines\(^{12}\) (Cenoz, 2013; Ostapenko, 2018). To be clear, my approach to defining multilingualism centers on a broad and inclusive framing as “more than one.” Briefly, multilingualism can be defined as “using or able to use several languages” (“Multilingualism,” 2021). This definition is supported in recent literature, such as Li’s (2008) description of a multilingual individual as “anyone who can communicate in more than one language” (p. 4).

Alternatively, in my use of multilingualism in this study, I do not engage with proficiency levels, differing modalities, or terminologies used to describe linguistic use, patterns and circumstances of use, and linguistic dimensions that intend to identify similarities and differences across individuals. Purposefully, it is my aim to celebrate the linguistic abilities of teachers, students, and staff at Bridgefield. Additionally, this interpretation is practically relevant to my study of multilingualism from individual perspectives, as teacher participants in this study consistently employ this term when describing students, instructional practices, and methodologies.

Moreover, I recognize multilingualism as a complex, observable individual and social phenomenon in my investigation of language pedagogies at Bridgefield. In recent years, the study of multilingualism has involved divergent trends that are both holistic, i.e., interconnected and parts of a whole, and atomistic, i.e., focusing on specific elements of a language (Cenoz, 2013). Specifically, my investigation of teachers’ language pedagogies relates to a holistic view

\(^{12}\) Noting that topics and themes studied vary widely across education, language policy, linguistics, neurolinguistics, psycholinguistics, and sociolinguistics (Cenoz, 2013).
of multilingualism, one in which I highlight teachers’ creativity and instances where their practices are sensitive to students’ linguistic interactions, experiences, and abilities in more than one language. I note that there are, at times, specific structural, or atomistic, aspects of language that teachers draw upon in their pedagogies that are exemplified in my findings. Taken as whole, my approach to research in this multilingual pedagogical context relates to how teachers enact their practices and methodologies within the social contexts of Bridgefield High School and the relationships that exist across individuals to establish meaning in more than one language.

**Intersectionality, Identity, and Theories of Self**

Given that intersectionality is not a theory of identity and in recognition of widespread debates among scholars and within the politics of identity, it is important to acknowledge that identity is not the focus of this study, nor do I propose to engage with these scholarly debates on identity. While it may be the case that intersectional theory has been used in various applications to examine individual and group identities and to foster deeper understandings of each, I engage neither with understandings of identity nor the shaping of politics of identity in this study. Recognizing that these are complex entanglements of identity and that their construction and function involve interpersonal experiences, political consciousness, and analyses of social problems among innumerable other considerations, the decision to not focus on identity in this research also stems from my concern that doing so would simultaneously offer a narrow interpretation of identity and inaccurately overemphasize and conflate identity in intersectional theory. Therefore, my focus, which is supported by intersectional scholarship (Collins & Bilge, 2016; Collins, 209), is placed on a combination of structural analyses and intersecting influences on social inequalities as critical inquiry and praxis.
In lieu of conflating identity with intersectional theory, I alternatively draw upon Marranci’s (2003, 2009, 2011) theory of self to interpret the experiences of language teaching while considering prospective tensions between identities and social environment. In the dynamic of postcolonialism, Marranci (2011) argues that young immigrants face the challenge of how they are represented and understood. For instance, the words ethnic, minority, citizens, and subjects exist as “ideas that can be shared, passed from person to person, or from group to group” (Marranci, 2011, p. 815). Drawing a parallel with “world” languages in this study, these words are mental representations that advance the perception that “what is real and important is the map” (Marranci, 2011, p. 816).

To address the meaning of mental representations, Marranci (2011) considers how people in everyday life “do not conceptualize themselves as ethnic, minority, a subject, or even as a citizen of a particular state” (p. 816). To illustrate, I offer the example of a European colleague who was characterized as Black during an institutional training about diversity. When asked to offer a stereotypical “Black” response to a projected question, he politely and apologetically responded that he did not identify as Black, questioning how the school had placed him in the category. In turn, his frank response provoked adverse reactions among non-White colleagues, articulating his self-described racial identity as hurtful to the non-White members of the community. This example implicates not only the fallacy of representation that turns upon geographical origin but also questions representation and being understood.

In addition, Marranci’s (2011) work articulates the tension between “how ‘ethnic minorities’ are represented, discussed, and imagined, and how the single individuals (…) actually perceive themselves in relation to this environment” (p. 818). This view of identity as culturally construed (Marranci, 2011) appears to conflate a range of factors in so-called
“minority” students’ identities that stem from various backgrounds and ideological approaches. Conceptually, I deliberate with the tension of being labeled as immigrant or minority that is imposed upon students at Bridgefield High School and how it may conflict with student conceptions of self in world language classrooms.

Within this tension, I consider the importance of language and its relation with representations of self. In “We Speak English,” Marranci (2003) positions language as a symbol of resistance to assimilation within host societies. As one of the most fascinating human skills, language is more than a mode of communication. It frequently becomes a symbol of belonging to a group and can offer insight into the socio-political positions of immigrant communities (Marranci, 2003). Evidence of this symbolic relation can be found throughout Bridgefield’s history in chapter 3, where the French-Canadian communities organized “La Survivance” (Samson, 2000, p. 88), a social doctrine, to preserve their cultural and linguistic heritage, and in Bridgefield High School, where the predominance of English sharply contrasts with the Bridgefield community.

**Intersectional Analytic and Interpretive Considerations**

For conceptual analytic and interpretive considerations, applying an intersectional lens in this study includes the challenges of interpreting and depicting the ontological context of what language teaching practices are (i.e., how they appear in practices and are described by teachers), the epistemological context of how I look at language teaching as a researcher, and the structural contexts that might position social categories, a critique (Anthias, 2012; Cho et al., 2013) of intersectionality. An examination of the interactions of race, gender, ethnicity, class, and other forms of diversity will be emphasized during classroom observations employing ethnographic methods; teachers’ interviews, their curriculum artifacts, course syllabi, and student work will
also provide valuable information throughout this investigation. Within this project, I also intend to investigate how practice can inform theory and vice versa.

**Researcher Positionality**

In this study, I participated in the lives of four world language teacher participants and life at Bridgefield High School during the course of several months. I did not know my participants prior to this study. Throughout the course of this study, I shared my admiration for the work in which these colleagues engage, an appreciation of their individual interpretations of language teaching, and their collegiality. At my first meeting with the department, the teachers were considerate, if tentative, and open to engaging with this work. While more detailed descriptions of my participants will be offered as I build their cases in chapter 6, I have worked throughout this study to attend to the voices of my each of my participants, voices that should be considered individually, collectively, and in the larger context of school and community.

One of the main ethical considerations in this study is that my work in the same discipline and my opinions about this topic bias me. My second language teacher identity and professional and educational experiences are lenses through which I engage in this study during observations, interactions with teachers, and my analyses. Viewed differently, this experience has been instrumental in my broader understandings of language instruction and helped strengthen my commitments to social justice. It has expanded my worldview of language teaching that previously was relatively sheltered in my instructional experiences with privileged student bodies at private secondary boarding and day institutions across the United States.

Moreover, my social identity influences the descriptions and inferences I make. I am a White woman, middle class, bilingual speaker of English and French, cisgender, heterosexual, and aware of my privileged status. As I work to engage with a critically conscious perspective, I
understand the precarious use of intersectionality as a White woman. Although I have lived abroad and my peculiar experiences with language are somewhat distinctive, I am a product of American public and private schools and universities. I also attended a military academy, an institution with a predominantly White, male student population, where I was discriminated against for my gender. Lauding conformity, homogeneity, and masculinity, this was a particularly oppressive environment. Although a more expansive discussion of this experience is outside the scope of the present study, they relate to how I may interpret or emphasize certain components of intersectional dynamics as my primary conceptual lens. Similarly, this lens is present in my exposure of the unique combination of linguistic and gender-based disavowals that occurred in Bridgefield's history, specifically the injustices that afflicted female, non-English speaking immigrants.

In response, I offer three explanatory ways to manage these potential biases: (1) Different from my own experiences, I am asking these teachers how they consider diversity in their sociocultural context and how their teaching reflects this process. (2) Since I am the primary instrument performing teachers’ interviews and participant observations, I may also be biasing these design elements. Having established these explanations, data collection in this study has been triangulated across four heterogenous data sources. Thus, triangulation represents one way to address my biases through its support of consistency and frequency of findings. I have also conducted member checks and engaged with follow-up conversations and questions with the classroom instructors when appropriate. In the analyses, critical discourse analysis is used methodologically, and intersectionality and disavowal are employed theoretically. Each offer language and analytic components that further support the mediation of my biases. (3) Potential risks to language instructors are minimal and the suggested benefits seem to outweigh this
concern. This research represents an opportunity to further engage with the content taught and to share in and reflect on pedagogy in a differently. Throughout this project, instructors may also benefit from their participation and engagement as a form of professional development and collaboration.

**Conclusion**

In the chapters that follow, I integrate an intersectional lens in my analyses of data. The four world language teachers at Bridgefield High School who engaged in this study participated in interviews, engaged in classroom observations, and shared their course syllabi and student work. In addition to the use of an intersectional framework (Collins & Bilge, 2016; Crenshaw, 1989, 1991, 2010), I consider Marranci (2011) as a conceptual basis upon which language can mediate between self, cultural understandings, and identity. Methodologically, I employ a case study design (Hancock & Algozzine, 2017; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Therein, an emphasis on individual representations of world language teaching will focus on the social and linguistic, drawing upon critical discourse analysis (Gee, 2014a; 2014b; Fairclough, 2010) to analyze participant interviews and observations employing ethnographic information. Following these analyses, practical and theoretical implications for the field of education are discussed.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

They will no longer be afraid of each other, of this one because of his religion, or of that one because of the color of his skin, or of that other one because of his speech. That time will come. We have to believe it will come.

-Maryse Condé, 2017, para. 8

We are seeking more sophisticated ways that our pedagogies can engage our students’ daily realities in healthy, life-affirming ways that do more than sustain their cultures but sustain their lives as well.

-Wong & Peña, 2017, p. 135

INTRODUCTION

This review of the literature attends to the complexities of diversity and inclusivity, drawing from scholarship in language education to establish the empirical groundings for this study. Throughout this investigation, I situate current knowledge of substantive findings as well as theoretical and methodological contributions across teachers’ perceptions of diversity, the implications of teachers’ understandings of diversity for teaching practices and teacher education, and deliberations with inclusive pedagogies and linguistically diverse students and communities in language pedagogies.

Centrally, this literature review demonstrates that despite the call (Al-Amir, 2017; Baggett, 2018; Krulatz et al., 2018; Mills & Moulton, 2017; Possi & Milinga, 2017; Stein-Smith, 2019; Wedin, 2020) for the integration of student and community diversities in world language classrooms, there is little research that explores how teachers draw upon student diversity to establish inclusive pedagogies in their methods and practice in world language research. In addition, this review includes recent scholarship in intersectionality that analyzes how individuals experience complex inequities that are based on a range of factors in their identities that are often compounded by competing and conflicting historicized influences.
World Language Pedagogical Practices

Although studies maintain that diversity ought to be an integral curricular component in language teaching practices (Baggett, 2018; Krulatz et al., 2018; Prieto-Bay, 2007; Stein-Smith, 2019; Wedin, 2020), relatively few studies explore how world language educators integrate various forms of student diversity in their pedagogies. Recognizing that the majority of U.S. world language educators are White (68%, National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2011-12), teachers’ abilities to enact pedagogical changes also assumes their capacities to develop a critical consciousness about their own identities and those of the languages and cultures they teach (Glynn, 2012). The term critical consciousness is used to signify the willingness and capacity to see how power and privilege work to systematically advantage some while simultaneously disadvantage others (Radd & Kramer, 2016); this practice is important in its relation to inequities and oppression as the result of socially constructed ideologies.

Recent efforts to incorporate diversity-related components in world languages appear in the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL, 2016) revised world-readiness standards for language teaching. These 11 standards are organized by five goal areas, often referred to as the five C’s: communication, cultures, connections, comparisons, and communities (ACTFL, 2016), that are developed through the associated standards. Two standards that relate to diversity include students’ ability to evaluate diverse perspectives in the target language and culture in the connections goal and the use of the language to “investigate, explain, and reflect on the concept of culture through the comparisons of cultures studied and their own” (ACTFL, 2016, para. 4) in comparisons.

Next, a collaboration between the National Council of State Supervisors for Foreign Languages and ACTFL (NCSSFL-ACTFL, 2017) established what they term as “Can-Do
Statements,” describing proficiency benchmarks across varying levels of linguistic competency that are organized according to interpretive, interpersonal, and presentational modes of communication. Similar to the updated world-readiness standards established one year prior, several aspects of these standards suggest an emphasis on diversity; however, the focus of these statements is prominently placed on individual student production. For example, an advanced proficiency designation measures students’ capacity to navigate diversity in products and practices across different languages and cultures, to interpret and negotiate meaning across global contexts, and to engage with complexities in pluricultural identities across cultures (NCSSFL-ACTFL, 2017).

Most recently, ACTFL (2019) revised its position statement, placing diversity and inclusion at the fore. Entitled “Diversity and Inclusion in World Language Teaching and Learning” (ACTFL, 2019), this statement emphasizes diversity and its commitment to inclusion across world language teaching and learning contexts. It aligns world languages in the United States with “continuous reflection and evaluation of its specific practices and initiatives to promote diversity and inclusion” (ACTFL, 2019, para. 1). ACTFL (2019) explains that its commitment to world language contexts that are inclusive of diverse community member backgrounds and perspectives will be enacted through four approaches: engagement with local and global communities, professional learning opportunities, a commitment to recruiting and maintaining a world language teacher workforce that is more representative of its student demographics, and “demonstrating the positive role diversity plays in language education through processes, practices, and outcomes supported by evidence-based research” (para. 3).

Without a doubt, this updated position statement reflects a wholesale emphasis on diversity and inclusivity in world languages. However, how ACTFL (2019) intends to foster
diversity and inclusion remains, perhaps intentionally, somewhat vague. Alternatively, evidence in scholarly research points to various strategies that world language educators can assume in their practices. To begin, there is a need for world language teachers and teacher educators to reflect on the social and local realities of the students and communities they teach (Burnett, 2011). As a support to pre- and in-service educators, one study (McGowan & Kern, 2016) found that directly engaging world language educators in a one-time intervention about racism and power hierarchies resulted in a significant increase in attitude changes about privilege and oppression among 14 of 19 pre-service teachers. In a different approach, Wooten and Cahnmann-Taylor (2014) found that the use of performative theatre was helpful to pre-service world language teachers as they interrogated the relations between race, language, and power.

Building upon these considerations, Wedin (2020) argues that language teachers ought to adopt an active role in challenging coercive power relations by supporting students’ diversity. Regarding the unique characteristics that students bring to world language contexts, teachers can support and work collaboratively with their students by offering a wide range of linguistic resources that simultaneously aim to affirm student identities and offer space for identity negotiation, an aspect that is particularly important for students who are at risk of marginalization (Possi & Milinga, 2017; Wedin, 2020).

In another study (Baggett, 2018) that explores five world language teachers’ beliefs about their teaching practices, their students, and the reasoning behind why non-White students are not present in their classes, findings suggest that teachers’ adoption of inclusive practices and

\[13\] In this study, McGowan and Kern (2016) use the term, “foreign,” recognizing that both a foreign and world language designation is flawed. Foreign, in as much as it designates “other,” implies exclusion. See Chapter 3, p. 3 for my brief discussion of “world” as a questionable ideology.
development of critical consciousness varies. Specifically, through the analysis of descriptions of students, reports of their practices, and accounts of student enrollment, three of five teachers “did not appear to actively position their classrooms as sites of inclusivity and critical practice” (Baggett, 2018, p. 12). Conversely, the remaining two instructors seemed to situate their classrooms as inclusive, maintained practices that aligned with the national standards (ACTFL, 2016), and reported advocating on behalf of various student groups.

However, linguistic and cultural diversity involve more than skills, attitudes, and knowledge that teachers can develop. Byram and Wagner (2018) argue that language teaching ought to be linked to other disciplines, and coordination between world language teachers and teachers of other subjects can align content in thematic and relevant ways. In addition, cross-curricular opportunities can support language teaching, fostering student reflection “on their own identity as well as the dynamic processes of communication in which they engage in many different contexts” (Byram & Wagner, 2018, p. 148). Infusing cross-curricular discussions of diversity in world language teaching practices implies influencing teachers’ decisions about curricula, enhancing their abilities to think critically about difference, privilege and power, and deepening their engagement in local and global settings.

World language educators and scholars reiterate the importance of adopting practices that are inclusive and develop students’ critical consciousness in language pedagogy (Baggett, 2018). Without a doubt, inclusive pedagogy is an important consideration in world language teaching practices that can challenge teachers as they strive to support their students, nurture critical consciousness, and break with mainstream education. Recent scholarship (Anya, 2020; Cashman & Trujillo, 2018; Prieto-Bay, 2007) suggests that, in order to establish more inclusive pedagogies, teachers ought to reconceptualize several assumptions about language education,
such as materials that are used and teachers’ pedagogical practices. For example, in order to reshape world language practices to be inclusive, teachers ought to adopt “a view of the classroom as a multilingual, border-crossing space; address and problematize diversity rather than trying to minimize it; and revisit our role as teachers” (Prieto-Bay, 2007, p. 36).

Cashman and Trujillo (2018) argue that materials and practices in Spanish as a Heritage Language (SHL) courses should feature adequate representation of queer Latinx identities, a term they use interchangeably with LGBTQ+,\(^{14}\) to “refer to people whose sexual and/or gender identity do not align with social norms that collectively fall under the label of heteronormativity” (p. 124). Their analysis of nine textbooks specialized for use in SHL courses reveals a general pattern of “erasure, stereotyping, and dehumanizing discourse” (Cashman & Trujillo, 2018, p. 138). As one solution, language faculty can be instrumental in the establishment of inclusive pedagogies through their engagement with humanizing practices and “ongoing commitment to challenge and reframe oppressive discourse” (Cashman & Trujillo, 2018, p. 138).

Other studies highlight teachers’ efforts to develop inclusive practices and the challenges they face when determining curricular adaptations. In one study, Taylor (2008) situates the competing institutional and societal contexts in which teachers developed their practices against their decisions to build inclusive practices and attend to tensions among competing discourses of collective identity. Findings in this study show that while all teacher participants valued cultural diversity and incorporated it into many class activities, teachers “had never framed or tapped into students’ linguistic capital as valuable forms of literacy” (Taylor, 2008, p.103).

\(^{14}\) The term LGBTQ+’s initials stand for lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans(gender), and queer or questioning. The plus sign “acknowledges a vast array of additional identities such as intersex, asexual, two spirit, and straight ally” (Cashman & Trujillo, 2018, p. 138).
On the other hand, examples of classroom practices that create space for students’ multilingual identities do exist. Wedin’s (2020) study highlights a monolingual language policy that was adapted for multilingual students who had recently arrived at a school “to facilitate positive development for all students in school by including their varying linguistic resources” (p. 3). Additional research emphasizes a need for a greater and sustained attention toward fostering inclusive, supportive teaching environments that support development in teachers’ and students’ identities (Liao & Maddamsetti, 2019; Wedin, 2020).

In particular, inclusive pedagogies ought to be carefully considered when multilingual and other marginalized students are present, as they are particularly susceptible to exclusion. Inclusive pedagogies in world language practices can be positively associated to students’ sense of belonging, their willingness to participate, and their capacity to learn independently (Freeman & Li, 2019; Glass et al., 2015). Recent research adds depth to this discussion, urging scholars to grapple with this challenge to not treat group identities as merely “an outcome of various social processes” (Jiménez, Fields, & Schachter, 2015, p. 107).

In addition to linguistic diversity, additional research (Possi & Milinga, 2017) points to the importance of teachers’ knowledge and awareness of other types of diversity, such as gender and disability. Aiming at “eliminating exclusion resulting from negative attitudes and lack of a response to diversity in race, economic status, social class, ethnicity, language, religion, gender, sexual orientation, and ability” (Possi & Milinga, 2017, p. 28), this study of inclusive classrooms was conducted to examine learner diversity and its implications for educational practices. Findings suggest that student background differences “can perpetuate exclusionary practices to some learners” (Possi & Milinga, 2017, p. 42) and supports teachers’ ongoing training to accommodate students of various background characteristics.
In other considerations for inclusive pedagogies, Coda (2017) discusses how critical issues such as the consideration of diverse sexual identities of the students are often not addressed within the world language experience. As knowledge, power, and discourse are implicated in this erasure of students’ identities, Coda (2017) posits queer theory and pedagogy as a different way to think about world language education that can establish world languages as a critical and self-reflective space for both students and teachers. Queer theory can be defined as a framework that deconstructs heteronormative pedagogical practice, positioning identity as being produced through discourse and having no internal essence (Foucault, 1978/1990).

As a form of resistance to binary and oppositional thinking, queer theory also draws upon psychoanalytic method. As Britzman (1995) writes, “Queer Theory insists on posing the production of normalization as a problem of culture and of thought” (p. 154). In thinking beyond the limits of curriculum, queer theory and pedagogy suggest possibilities for practice through a questioning of knowledge and normalization. For example, in world language pedagogy, “language carries particular forms of knowledge and is implicated in the production of knowledge and culture” (Coda, 2017, p. 78). Queer inquiry in language teaching, as proposed by Nelson (1999), encourages questioning the formation of sexual identities and the use of techniques that do not assume a specific identity. Thus, queer theory and pedagogy can foster new avenues of thinking and promote inclusivity among student identities in world language classrooms.

To consider world language inclusivity in written communication, teachers’ course syllabi are important documents that communicate teachers’ expectations, course organization, policies, and assignments. Whether or not world language teachers’ course syllabi are accessible to all students relates to inclusivity (Scott & Edwards, 2019), recognizing that all lengths and
formats can present barriers to student access. Among additional features teachers can implement when establishing inclusive pedagogies, students report appreciating instructors who are “flexible, focused, and easy to communicate with outside of class” (Scott & Edwards, 2019, p. 36) as well as world language instructors who are attentive to speaking at a reasonable pace and allowing space for student errors.

**World Language Teaching Perspectives and Preparation**

Importantly, the relationship between teachers’ instruction of world languages that integrates student diversity is further complicated when considering differences across student and teacher perspectives in language pedagogy. Although research suggests that a majority of world language students express an interest in learning about culturally diverse content (Drewelow & Mitchell, 2015), other studies point to a misalignment between students’ and instructors’ perceptions of the value of culture in world language instruction (Al-Amir, 2017; Mills & Moulton, 2017). More specifically, students “placed significantly more value on cultural practices and products than instructors valued in their course goals” (Mills & Moulton, 2017, p. 729). Taken as a whole, these studies suggest that a greater understanding of students’ beliefs about cultural differences in addition to their diversity can equip world language educators with the capacity “to think critically about curricula [and] actively display its value and meaning to students and other stakeholders” (Mills & Moulton, 2017, p. 731).

Moreover, the consideration of student diversity in world languages may promote discussions among teachers about how critical cultural awareness (CCA) can be practically integrated into world language curricula and schools’ communities. CCA can be defined as “an ability to evaluate critically and on the basis of explicit criteria of perspectives, practices and products in one’s own and other cultures and countries” (Byram, 1997, p. 53). At its origin, CCA
was central to Byram’s (1997) model for intercultural education that was developed through the Council of Europe (2020). According to this model, the integration of CCA offers students opportunities to build skills that heighten their cultural awareness and understandings in real-life global issues.

As one way of integrating CCA, teachers can develop connections between themes and lessons in ways that can prepare students “to enter into intercultural relationships with a greater awareness of the multifaceted nature of culture” (Nugent & Catalano, 2015, p. 75). Through this lens, world language pedagogies are poised to incorporate critical thinking about cultural diversity, the diversity that students bring to the classroom, and reflect the aims of recent literature in identity construction (Jovés et al., 2015; Krulatz et al., 2018).

In addition, as Krulatz et al. (2018) suggest, school-based projects and activities can strengthen teachers’ awareness of cultural and linguistic diversity and foster mutual respect, tolerance, and dialogue among students, addressing the issue that “many teachers report low levels of experience working with students of multilingual background” (p. 553). One way this issue has been addressed in scholarly literature is to view student diversity as a resource and to develop activities, projects, and in one study, service-based methodologies (Martí, 2018), that specifically integrate student cultural and linguistic diversity.

As one example, Conway and Richards (2017) examine responses from 12 world language teachers in the implementation of culturally responsive teaching to meet students’ needs. Culturally responsive teaching can be briefly defined as a pedagogical approach whose intent is to foster learning that is more relevant to and effective for diverse students (Gay, 2010). Through world language teacher interview data and self-assessment, this study reveals the complexity in how teacher participants’ understandings of student, linguistic, and cultural
diversity can impact practice and learning. For teachers, a lack of this type of understanding might “lead to essentializing cultures, leaving some learners feeling they are not accepted” (Conway & Richards, 2017, p. 32).

One teacher in this study, Dominique (a pseudonym) describes how she draws upon the interrelation of identity, language, and culture in her teaching. Reflecting on her experiences, Dominique expressed feeling “uncomfortable about what we determine to be culture, especially if I am looking at the French culture. Whose culture? The upper class? The working class? The people who live in Normandy?” (Conway & Richards, 2017 p. 38). This response questions the imprecision of cultural diversity and reveals Dominique’s aim to teach beyond reinforcing dominant cultures and her efforts to develop a critical consciousness in her pedagogy.

Related to teachers’ adoption of critical perspectives and the examination of their beliefs, studies (Abreu, 2016; Watson, 2013) suggest that Afro-Hispanic diversity in particular is often missing from world language pedagogies. In an investigation of 241 Spanish students and nine Spanish instructors’ perspectives through surveys with both closed and open-ended questions, Abreu (2016) found that Spanish students had relatively narrow perceptions of cultural, ethnic, and racial diversity among Spanish-speaking populations, irrespective of study abroad and travel experiences. Although teachers in this study conveyed “a deeper understanding of diversity within the Spanish-speaking world, it is interesting that this understanding did not seem to be conveyed to learners” (Abreu, 2016, p. 186). This was true not only for beginning-level students but also students in upper-level Spanish courses and suggests that teachers may benefit from making a greater effort to help students build knowledge of racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity in world languages.
To consider racial diversity through an equity lens, another important consideration is whether students have equitable access to world language courses. In an analysis of enrollment data collected from four large local education agencies in North Carolina, data shows that there was a statistically significant negative relationship between enrollment and racial status in world languages. This tells us that on average, public secondary world language courses tend to have lower enrollments of non-White students. Specifically, Baggett (2016) suggests that Black male and female students, Hispanic male and female students, and American Indian male students are underrepresented in world language classes, although the levels of representation varied by racial and gender status (chi-square = 3645.2, df = 11, p < 0.001). Importantly, this finding was true when taking school average student demographics into account. Implications of this work include the need to examine the intersecting status of race and gender identity and how they contribute to multiple inequities (Crenshaw, 1989) in public school world language contexts.

Situating the relevance of inequities and the realities of students’ and teachers’ lives in the framework of world language world-readiness standards and goal areas (ACTFL, 2016), educators must also recognize “the fear, uncertainty, and pain that interrupts our otherwise often too-comfortable European-American life” (Ennser-Kananen, 2016, p. 558). Osborn (2006) argues that world language teachers must recognize the impact their power and privilege can have on the construction of social reality and that they ought to “explore the ways in which we can change to move that reality into a socially just one” (p. 65). In response, as one strategy to engage with one’s reality, Ennser-Kananen (2016) suggests that in world language education, teachers and students can adopt new roles and relationships, participate in public discourse as allies, protestors, and challengers, and engage in these conversations as critical agents of change.
Next, distinction in the way cultural diversity is interpreted can challenge world language students and teachers working collaboratively to inform and construct meaning about diversity in a language classroom. Teaching about diversity in a contemporary American climate offers world language teachers and students the opportunity to interrogate issues such as racism in the lens of language and culture, and these “examinations can lead to further exploration of hegemonic practices in their own cultures, including examination of privilege” (Baggett, 2018, p. 1). Rasheed (2018) supports this claim, suggesting that “now more than ever the role of the other has been put into question and marginalized in a redefinition of an ‘American national self-protective identity’” (p. 231). More recently, racial incidents across secondary schools in the United States during sporting events (Blint-Welsh, 2018; Cook, 2018) and in classes (Brice-Saddler, 2018; Guerra, 2018) point to a lack of a coherent curriculum around diversity and an instrumental need for cultivating a productive dialogue of difference.

As one way to develop world language curricula that may ethically ground students in work related to social injustice with diverse populations (Duffy et al., 2014), teachers may benefit from service-learning activities, projects, and methodological approaches. Martí (2018) suggests that students’ perceptions of diversity may benefit from engagement with and critical thinking about the social communities in which schools are located. In this study, she develops a service-oriented activity that details relevant instructional components yet relies primarily upon students’ autonomy and further development. Set in a Spanish-speaking social community or neighborhood, Martí (2018) considers that service-oriented activities may also be positioned as collaborative exchanges between schools with socioeconomic or cultural differences. While the planning and development of this activity required perseverance on the teacher’s part, findings
show that students’ experiences were overwhelmingly positive, and they also developed an active role in their communities (Martí, 2018).

Although cultural diversity can assume a specific context in world language curricula in the form(s) of cultural products, practices, and perspectives, the ways that teachers interpret and make decisions about teaching can vary widely. For instance, as teachers shape their practices, they may or may not strive to present culturally diverse components in cross-curricular ways. In particular, culturally diverse content has become a growing source of interest through the lens of developing engaging, content-based questions in world language curricula (Tedick & Cammarada, 2012). This is evident in secondary school language curricula with the Advanced Placement (AP) Language and Culture courses (College Board [CB], 2019). In the AP courses, for example, cultural products, practices, and perspectives are explored through six themes: global challenges, science and technology, contemporary life, personal and public identities, family and communities, and beauty and aesthetics (CB, 2019). Although AP teachers are encouraged to design their lessons around contextualized essential questions involving real-life, problem-solving tasks and thematic literature, the recommended ways in which teachers choose to go about teaching the material “can be varied, depending on available authentic materials, teacher-developed resources, and commercially produced materials, as well as teacher creativity and student interest” (CB, 2013, p. 31).

More recently, cultural diversity in language teaching continues to evolve. Despite theoretical and methodological advancements to the instruction of culture in language classrooms, studies maintain that language teachers struggle to integrate culturally diverse components with linguistic content in present-day settings (Byrd, Hlas, Watzke, & Valencia, 15 This reference cites the AP French Language and Culture course. However, this is true for all AP language courses.
This is somewhat surprising, given the integrality of cultural understanding and communicative competencies as articulated elements of global competence in world language curriculum (ACTFL, 2016). Additional support of culture’s intrinsic role in language teaching can be found in NCSSFL-ACTFL’s (2017) Can-Do statements, advancing the development of students’ intercultural and language proficiencies.

Despite a heightened focus on teaching culturally diverse content, the ways that scholarly literature conceptualizes world language “content” as “cultural” accounting for variation in teaching practices and evolving methods incorporative of different student profiles, remain unclear. Further, world language teachers at all levels of experience may benefit from added resources “not only for cultivating sophisticated understandings of culture and intercultural communicative competence (ICC), but also for integrating these constructs into their curriculum development in ways that foster both culture-as-content and language learning” (Martel & Pettitt, 2016, p. 171).

Further, preparing students to interact in intercultural settings is an integral component of a standards-based world language curriculum (NCSSFL-ACTFL, 2017). ICC in world languages\(^{16}\) can be defined as combining language skills with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes in ways that inspire students as “intercultural citizens” (Byram, 2008). Intercultural citizenship in this context can be defined as combining the aims of ICC in language teaching with the aims of citizenship education, emphasizing the strengths of each. Otherwise put, intercultural citizenship

\(^{16}\) Recognizing that “world,” or linguistic placement on the map, and “foreign,” unknown or strange, are ideologies that ought to be critically interrogated.
blends the comparative analysis of cultures in language teaching with a focus on action in the world in citizenship education.\textsuperscript{17}

In teachers’ instructional efforts to promote students’ ICC and inspire them as intercultural citizens, the integration of authentic and culturally diverse materials into teaching practices represents one way that world language teachers can orient their practices toward the development of communicative competencies. Nugent and Catalano’s (2015) study investigated how critical cultural awareness can promote ICC in world language teaching practices. In this way, ICC “presents, defines, and clarifies the importance of preparing students with the attitudes, knowledge, and skills needed to participate in intercultural relationships of equality” (Nugent & Catalano, 2015, p. 75). Through this lens, world language practices are poised to incorporate critical thinking about cultural diversity, reflecting the aims of recent literature in identity construction (Jovés, et al., 2015; Krulatz et al., 2018).

**Student Diversity and Identity in Language Pedagogies**

To examine how students’ identities, home languages, religions, cultural knowledge and other aspects of identity might be incorporated as resources, Krulatz et al. (2018) suggest that schools ought to consider student identity as instructionally relevant materials. In this study, researchers designed an identity text project that involved professional development sessions, lesson planning, and material creation in small groups. Originally implemented in Canada, identity texts is an instructional approach that is “based on the assumption that academic growth can be promoted through identity construction” (Krulatz et al., 2018, p. 556). In these projects, students engage in “cognitively challenging projects on self-selected topics that are relevant to

\textsuperscript{17} On the other hand, a weakness of ICC in language teaching is a lack of action in the world. A weakness of citizenship education is its “lack of criticality of ‘our’ cultures and the limitation to a national perspective” (Byram, 2008, p. 59).
their personal interests and lives” (Krulatz et al., 2018, p. 556). In practice, language teachers can implement the use of identity texts to expose students to other cultures and backgrounds represented in the classroom. In this sense, identity texts can affirm students’ identities while simultaneously introducing them to other cultures and backgrounds.

Related to the construct of identity, Jovés et al.’s (2015) work with “funds of identity” demonstrates how teachers can emphasize language students’ interests with a teaching unit that prompts students to create personal artifacts. According to Esteban-Guitart (2012), “funds of identity” can be defined as a set of resources that have been “historically accumulated and culturally developed; they are socially distributed and transmitted; and they are essential for constructing one’s identity and for defining and presenting oneself” (p. 177). In practice, the concept of “funds of identity” involves students’ investment of their identities by creating artifacts, which can then become “educational resources used by teachers to affirm student identities and foster their academic development” (Jovés et al., 2015, p. 68).

Thus, funds of identity pedagogical practices can be part of a self-created definition and relates to aspects of one’s identity that is significant to them. This exploration can be geographical, social, cultural, institutional, or practical such as activities, music, or work (Jovés et al., 2015, p. 70). Through group work between students and researchers, funds of identity can be adopted to foster knowledge of and connections between home, school, and community. Although ethnographic work in households was not undertaken, ethnographic literature was provided to teachers to support them in the “incorporation of social and cultural resources accumulated from families regardless of their economic, social and cultural conditions” (Jovés et al., 2015, p. 72). As linguistic difference is an important aspect of diversity that advances the opportunity to negotiate identities as language learners, these studies (Krulatz et al., 2018; Jovés
et al., 2015) emphasize the importance of instructional approaches that incorporate the student role as a social factor to draw upon students’ cultural and linguistic identities in language learning practices.

In regard to concerns that arise from the incompatibility of monolingual English educational institutions and the linguistically diverse students and communities they serve, the placement of multilingual and non-native English-speaking students in dominant language contexts can create academic, socioeconomic, behavioral, and emotional risks (Piller, 2016). This creates a double, or amplified, challenge in world language contexts where students learn content through a new language as they build linguistic skills in multiple languages, each often different from their own. Consequently and viewed through an intersectional lens, language rarely functions alone and often relates to multiple disadvantages.

As one way to engage with these concerns, a growing body of research considers debates encircling the educational embrace of additive approaches, defined as educational approaches that claim to promote the minoritized linguistic practices students bring to the classroom along with the development of standardized language skills (Rosa & Flores, 2017). Although the emphasis on respect for linguistic practices of minoritized students in their homes may seem encouraging, Flores and Rosa (2015) question some of the underlying assumptions of additive approaches, such as the so-called objective set standardized linguistic English practices that are deemed “appropriate” (p. 150) for academic use.

Specifically, Flores and Rosa (2015) position these standardized practices within raciolinguistic ideologies. Raciolinguistic ideologies can be defined as those which “conflated certain racialized bodies with linguistic deficiency unrelated to any objective linguistic practices” (Flores & Rosa, 2015, p. 150). Put differently, racialized ideologies construct speakers who are
positioned as “linguistically deviant” (Flores & Rosa, 2015, p. 150) even while engaging in linguistic practices viewed as normative by privileged White speakers. Thus, a raciolinguistic perspective seeks to reposition racialized perspectives outside of normative White perspectives and to foster pedagogical innovations that engage with linguistic minority students in ways that do not implicate the reproduction of normative White speaking linguistic practices (Rosa & Flores, 2017; Flores & Rosa, 2015).

To consider not only the tension between monolingual educational institutions and the multilingual students and communities they serve but also raciolinguistic ideologies and the limits of additive approaches in education, there are several practical considerations for world languages. What are some of the ways that world languages can respond to these challenges? Which activities can integrate students’ minoritized linguistic diversity with the pedagogical linguistic task of engaging with a presumptively “new” language in an academic context? How might teachers reflect on the international cultural and linguistic student diversity in world language classrooms?

An exponential growth in nationality, ethnicity, religion, and language has resulted in greater intersecting influences of diversity (Pauwels, 2014), some scholars suggest that minoritized languages and student bilingualism runs the risk of being “invisible” (Gkaintartzi et al., 2015, p. 60), advancing a need for educational institutions to implement multicultural and intercultural approaches. Among pressing responsibilities, research in language and language education is integral to the design and implementation various approaches (Kramsch, 2015) in that it can accentuate the diverse linguistic and cultural factors present in classrooms. While Gkaintartzi et al. (2015) suggest that teachers “do not see a role for themselves in the
maintenance of their pupils’ heritage languages” (p. 70), this finding would benefit from additional exploratory research in multiple educational contexts.

Related to teachers’ roles in connecting their pedagogies with students’ diverse abilities, Bruen and Kelly (2016) suggest that students may also be unaware of the linguistic diversity present among their peers in world language classrooms. To explore how world language educators can engage with students’ linguistic diversity in their pedagogical approach, a series of activities that incorporated students’ multilingual identities were designed and implemented at four different research sites. Taken as a whole, 17 languages were present among student participants, and German and Japanese were chosen as the examined languages due to their dissimilar structure and orthography (Bruen & Kelly, 2016). Findings in this study show that “fewer than one in four participants were aware of the languages spoken by their class group” (Bruen & Kelly, 2016, p. 15) prior to this study.

Moreover, the majority of students in this study reported a host of positive correlations between the use of these activities, the affirmation of their identities, and their abilities to foster supportive relationships with their peers. Students also claim to have a greater understanding of the target language in comparison with structural components in their native languages. Examples of positive feedback from students includes: “it helped things click in my mind,” “showing a grammar point from two different languages reinforces the point,” (and) “it cemented things in my head” (Bruen & Kelly, 2016, p. 12). The majority of students in this study were in favor of the inclusion of multilingual activities in future lessons. In addition, these findings complement empirical outcomes in other studies (Gkaintartzi et al., 2015; Pauwels, 2014) that suggest that teachers also have limited awareness of student linguistic abilities.
Given intersectionality’s relatively more recent applications to educational contexts, it is not surprising that no studies were available in scholarly research that apply an intersectional lens in world language education contexts. However, a handful of studies in language pedagogy research draw upon intersectionality to examine disadvantages and inequities in language education. To build upon the discussion of student linguistic diversity and multilingualism in educational settings, one two-year ethnographic case study (Qin & Li, 2020) examines how three young, immigrant students negotiated racialized masculinities in language learning classrooms. In an analysis that focused on how gender ideologies intersect with racialized discourses and systems of oppression, they sought to understand how these factors influence adolescent immigrant identity negotiation. Findings in this study suggest that students’ masculinities were shaped by racism, heteronormativity, and linguistic discrimination. In fact, this study also showed that not only were the students in this study subject to marginalization and discriminatory practices, but they were each also subject to unique forms of harm and oppression.

In the intersectional examination of language, culture, and community engagement, Ramirez and Ross (2019) examine secondary dual-language learning education programs. Dual-language education programs combine English language learning students who share a common non-English language with native English language speakers. Academic instruction in these programs typically involves the 50% to 90% use of the non-English language. Although there are several important considerations for students and educators in dual-language settings, the

---

18 Recognizing that the investigation of empirical studies in world languages with intersectionality as a conceptual framework remains in progress.
particular focus on the role of students’ community in their development in both languages is an important dimension.

In dual-language education (and language education more broadly), establishing a link between students’ languages and communities is integral to “fostering students’ identities while also maintaining sustainable practices in the community” (Ramirez & Ross, 2019, p. 182). In dual-language educational settings, teachers are viewed as “language facilitators that support student-community engagement” (Ramirez & Ross, 2019, p. 182). As rich resources language education programs, the intersection of languages, schools, and communities can communicate the value of bilingualism, demonstrate its relevance to global contexts, and support students’ identities.

Moreover, language teachers who expand their curriculum to be inclusive of their schools’ communities can offer a meaningful way for students to engage with authentic community and linguistic resources. Other research (Lindholm-Leary, 2012) that investigates how language teachers draw upon the intersection of student identities and communities maintain that teachers’ cross-curricular efforts are also important as they reflect upon students’ linguistic development.

In addition, studies with a focus on language learners with disabilities through an intersectional lens contribute empirical examples of structural and cultural power domains of intersectionality (Collins & Bilge, 2016). For example, Schissel and Kangas (2018) present the obstacles that language learners with disabilities face and how they are often marginalized by existing educational policies and practices. More likely to be classified as “long-term English learners” (LTELs) or in special education, the combination of assessment and education policies
contribute to the overrepresentation of language learners with disabilities in each designation (Schissel & Kangas, 2018).

**Intersectional Researcher Positionality**

To critically reflect upon my researcher positionality, reflexivity, and how my researcher-situated identity may be examined through an intersectional lens, I consider studies that use intersectionality to investigate language researchers’ unique identities, their choice of topic(s), how they related to their participants, and to what extent they negotiated identities when conducting and communicating their research in scholarly venues. In particular with my qualitative study utilizing ethnographic methods and critical discourse analysis, I interacted directly with my participants, and although I address my research biases more holistically in Chapter 4 and recognize the utility of my methodological approach, it is nevertheless the case that I have, with the guidance of my chair and committee, been the primary instrument that has conducted, interpreted, and represented my data.

Specifically, relatively few empirical studies engage with researcher identity through an intersectional lens in language research. The topics of researcher identity and positionality in language research can be complicated, as individuals who conduct research that explores how people use, learn, and teach languages may also share similarities with their participants. How researchers, important stakeholders in language education, negotiate identities and influence knowledge construction are important considerations.

Cho and Yi (2019) investigated three United States-based Korean female researchers in language research using multiple qualitative data sources over three years. Findings in this study show that researcher identities held complex cross-linguistic and cross-cultural roles that were compounded by several factors. For example, researchers’ interests from their life and graduate
experiences in addition to “accessibility, familiarity, and researcher’s self-identification” (Cho & Yi, 2019, p. 423) had an influence on their research topics and relationships with their research participants. In addition, the three female participants negotiated identities to position themselves in ways that connect with their own research participants and studies in a process that was relational, dynamic, and contextual.

Among other language studies in intersectional researcher identity, Mayorga-Gallo and Hordge-Freeman (2017) draw upon their perspectives of two female, non-White women and scholars, discussing how they negotiated their multiple identities and perceptions to gain and sustain access in the field. They found that sharing a common language with participants in their research did not facilitate access to their research communities, and they call for future research that examines methodological particularities when navigating multiracial and multilingual spaces. Recommendations from this research include the suggestion that researchers ask why and how their participants speak with them (Mayorga-Gallo & Hordge-Freeman, 2017) so they can navigate marginality and privilege in the field and unpack their field experiences.

In ethnographic investigations of critical reflexivity and reflection, Giampapa and Lamoureux (2011) explore language, identity, power, and positionality by and of the researcher in multilingual fields in China, Spain, Canada, and the United States. To examine methodological approaches and critical interpretations of research, they engage with critical self-reflection during their pre-, in-, and post-field experiences. Findings suggest that the use of multiple voices in the community requires a multifaceted approach to address how diversity of participants can shape data collection, analysis, and interpretation (Giampapa & Lamoureux, 2011).
Conclusion

Critical reflection and engagement with various forms of diversity, inclusive pedagogies, and the integration of student abilities, skills, and identities in world language pedagogy can advance the relevance of student and community diversities as a resource that support teaching practices of heterogeneous student bodies. In addition to its potential to deepen teachers’ understandings and awareness of diversity, teachers’ efforts to orient their pedagogy towards including the diverse characteristics of their student bodies can simultaneously reflect interest in and engagement with students’ lived experiences. Moreover, the adoption of strategies that reflect the scholarly call for language classes that are inclusive, critically aware, and responsive to students’ diversity can support students and communities in meaningful ways.

World language teaching practices that integrate students’ diversity and the development of a critical consciousness can aim to de-center whiteness, reject normative views of education, and foster critical reflection on and engagement with local and global communities and cultures in its curricula. Understandings of the interrelation of various forms of diversity in world language curricula promote the interrogation of the relationship between language and power. In an aggregate view of world language instruction that strives to integrate individual student diversity, to promote critical engagement in local communities and the world, and to establish classrooms that are inclusive in its instructional practices, an extended goal of this work is to counter the perpetuation of injustice and inequities in educational contexts.

Simultaneously, this review has established that in world languages classrooms across the United States, teachers (68%, NCES, 2011-2012) are majority White. This suggests that in their approach to world language pedagogy, educators may benefit from critical reflection on their own identities and privilege (Baggett & Simmons, 2017), the roles they can assume for non-
White students and populations, and relationships that they can inspire in their schools and communities.
CHAPTER III: BRIDGEFIELD IN THREE ERAS: A HISTORY DISAVOWED

INTRODUCTION

Despite the transnational\(^{19}\) history that has transcended each moment in Bridgefield, its history has been disavowed by a curriculum that largely (re)produces knowledge centered in Western colonial modernity. Disavowal, defined as the denial of responsibility or knowledge of something (Disavowal, 2020), can be traced to its scholarly origins in the psychoanalytical work of Sigmund Freud (1924, 1927, 1940). Used as a German verb, “verleugnen” (Freud, 1927), to disavow, and as a noun, “verleugnung” (Freud, 1940), a disavowal, he described disavowals as realities that are simultaneously known to exist and understood yet denied. In one sense, a disavowal of perceptions extends potential benefit in situations where realities may be uncertain or painful, thus a means of survival. Their traces, however, are not entirely forgotten. They persist. Although his theory evolved, Freud (1927, 1940) fundamentally referred to disavowal as a split of consciousness. Specifically, he illustrates the concept with a theoretical split of the ego in two clinical examples.

Early traces of disavowal in Freud’s (1927) work appeared in “Fetishism.” In this paper, he describes the cases of two young male patients, each of whom had disavowed the death of his father. Freud (1927) writes:

It was only one current in their mental life that had not recognized their father’s death; there was another current that took full account of the fact. The attitude

\(^{19}\) I have chosen to use the term transnational, what some researchers may term as “international,” to refer to histories in cross-linguistic and cross-cultural settings. Given that the history of the Bridgefield community has ties to transnational and transcultural opportunities and experiences in life, its history engages in regular and sustained practices across national borders (Louie, 2006).
which fitted in with the wish and the attitude which fitted in with the reality
existed side by side. (p. 156)

Although neither man developed psychosis, an important aspect of reality had been disavowed.
Freud (1927) continues, describing how the ego can be split and the evidence that two possible
juxtaposing thoughts can be present in the psyche. Despite their incompatibility, the two attitudes
appeared to have no influence over one another. In this sense, these attitudes were not
disavowals “of” knowledge but disconnected “between” two different spheres of the ego.

Over a decade later, in “Splitting of the ego in the process of defence,” Freud (1940)
further develops how the ego can adopt two opposing positions, conscious and unconscious
ideation, when it encounters psychical trauma. Illustrated with the case of a very young boy who,
faced with the threat of castration assigned to his father as punishment for self-stimulation upon
the sight of the female genitals, adopts two opposing perceptions as a solution. First, he
recognizes the threat of castration by displacing the importance of his own body, and yet he now
believes to understand that this act is possible, having witnessed the girl’s, and also his mother’s,
anatomical differences. In addition, the boy has also developed a fear of his father. In the
conscious ego, he disavows this knowledge, and rejects reality, but can only do so provided that
he deny, or render to his unconsciousness, the absence of a female phallus.

Thus, Freud’s (1927, 1940) concept of disavowal is a disavowal of absence, a failure to
acknowledge the significance of a perception, accompanied by an independent attitude that
allows for a juxtaposed rejection and acceptance of reality in the split ego. Importantly, Freud
(1940) does not believe this absence was unique to psychosis; he theorizes that a split ego can
occur in all individuals. For example, in his clinical description of incomplete mourning, Freud
(1927) offers evidence that disavowal can occur in everyday life and among adults. For Freud
(1940), the unconscious has the capacity to disrupt knowledge and to reveal possibilities outside of rational, conscious thought.

Feminist psychoanalyst Layton (2019) writes about how her starting point for a psychoanalytic ethic of disillusionment, or the undoing of disavowal, began with Freud (1927, 1940). For Layton (2019), the study of history, specifically U.S. history, conjures “a horrific sense of dis-illusionment, a loss of comforting illusions” (p. 110). Through the undoing of disavowals, space can be uncovered to address justice and to “imagine historical alternatives” (Layton, 2019, p. 110). I particularly like Layton’s (2019) description of these experiences. Similarly, I felt a horrendous disillusionment as I read about injustices tolerated by transgenerational residents in the Bridgefield community that are presented in three eras below.

**Disavowal in Educational Psychoanalytic Theory**

More recently, theoretical applications of disavowal have been grounded in educational psychoanalytic theory. In particular, disavowed knowledge builds upon Freud’s (1927, 1940) concept of the split ego, adopting the stance that the unconscious is not a passive entity but an active subject, one that can disrupt educational discourses. Taubman (2012) refers to disavowed knowledge as knowledge from the unconscious that “reveals to us what we do not know, and how we are already always implicated in what we do know and what we resist knowing” (p. 21). Thus, the splitting of the ego comes at the expense of a split ego that never heals, a disavowal in which one “prefers to keep that knowledge out of view, on the periphery of consciousness, and to act as if one did not know it” (Salvio & Taubman 2021, p. 6).

To layer to psychoanalysis in education and teaching, Chimbganda (2017) focuses on how educational experiences can be discriminatory and alienating. In response, she considers how psychoanalytic paradigms can be applied to the experiences of children in schools who
experience difficulties stemming from difference, such as difference in race and sexuality. Chimbunga (2017) suggests that teaching, teachers’ ideologies, and their attitudes can be complicit in these experiences and argues that schools out to intentionally consider their responsibility for and responsiveness to social traumas that affect students.

In regard to how educational experiences may bring forth disavowal(s), there is ample evidence of splits, or divides, in education that are impacted by disavowals between knowledge. To begin, if one were to teach the exact same content to different students, there likely would be different outcomes (Taubman, 2012). In the study of U.S. history, there are several examples of disavowed, intersectional race and class inequities that, according to Layton (2019), are always in the interest of U.S. capitalism.

Additionally, this exploration of Bridgefield’s transnational history has 1) enhanced my understandings of disavowed knowledge that exist within my own conscious and unconsciousness and 2) opened up a space for intersectionality to be better understood and enlivened. This exploration has helped me grapple with how I can alternate between what Layton (2019) describes as two states of consciousness: in one state of consciousness, I enact my racial, linguistic, and class privilege, and in another, I research and read about the Bridgefield’s history, making connection with historical intersectional inequities and injustices that contribute to my understandings of history and the present.

As an example from my instruction of colonial and imperial French history, I was aware of, yet in my disavowal pushed to the periphery, the need to focus on colonial histories of those who were oppressed and nonexistent in traditional, White European literary texts. Drawing on an example in the present study, the use of the term “world” languages is based upon the department’s categorization, yet I consider how placing language geographically is an ideology
that ought to be critically reevaluated. That is, the use of the term “world” seems to negate, and even erase, the role of modern colonialism, positioning it as ambiguous.

Other recent examples of disavowal show that socio-emotional educational frameworks are influenced by a disavowal of race, class, sex, and the body (Stearns, 2019). In particular, the disavowal of these characteristics in the curriculum exposes interpersonal and cultural domains of power, highlighting what is absent and the failure to recognize the implications of this absence. Drawing a parallel with this study, the Bridgefield High School curriculum disavows its history and tends to suppress the linguistic and cultural diversity of its students. At the same time, instructors recount their own and their students’ struggles to adapt to a public school curriculum that reproduces White, mainstream institutional priorities.

In this theoretical application of disavowal, I acknowledge that there is no universally accepted definition of the term. Similarly, the use of disavowal has a rather complicated history, with clashes over meaning, applications, and usage (Zepf, 2013). Disavowal has been extended to processes and outcomes of processes at the individual and aggregate levels. Further, I recognize the tension between the application of disavowal outside of clinical context to an empirical educational setting and acknowledge that my use of the term does not engage with a full repertoire of Freud’s (1927, 1940) interpretations of the term, which extend beyond a translation of “denial” in English. For example, Freud (1927, 1940) also translated the term as “disguise,” “controvert,” “rejection,” and “repudiate” (Zepf, 2013, p. 40), among other variations in German interpretations.
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20 However, a critical examination of different conceptual applications of disavowal is outside the scope of this study.
Despite its limits, I contend that disavowal nevertheless holds considerable promise in application to Bridgefield’s transnational history and educational setting. I accentuate disavowal’s use as relevant in the extension of educational perspectives beyond curricular norms, the power of unconscious knowledge to shape realities, and the examination of how various implications of absence are manifest in contemporary educational settings. To this point, my use of disavowal represents a signifying element within the process of my analysis and an interpretation that enlivens intersectionality, Bridgefield’s history, and curriculum theory in striking ways.

**Intersectionality**

To support this argument, I use intersectionality as a prism to examine how Bridgefield’s history has been disavowed by the curriculum at Bridgefield High School. Therein, I explore how different domains of power contribute to the perpetuation of inequities, punctuated with examples drawn from the lives of Bridgefield inhabitants. This chapter and the three that follow build upon this narrative, considering how, practically speaking, one might view this tension as an opportunity to reconsider the purpose of world languages in U.S. curriculum, and specifically, how the curriculum might connect with the lives of its students and communities and disrupt narratives of Western colonial modernity.

As a Eurocentric projection, a colonial modernity framework originated as a Latin American critique of modernity, suggesting that it obscures the structures of violence, death, and oppression that have accompanied developments in modern societies (Maldonado-Torres, 2008). In recent years, historical and philosophical theories underscore the pitfalls of modern West-centric education and specify a need to reinterpret post-colonial modern Western education (Schilling, 2008; Bowden, 2009). This contemporary shift precipitated a break in modern
epistemological frameworks, positing the urgency of “knowledge and schooling that are historically enveloped” (Baker, 2012, p. 6). Moreover, the call to incorporate this knowledge is an important step in acknowledging centuries of invisibility (Hancock, 2016). This recognition evokes other images of invisibility: Du Bois (1903) describes a veil of race, where entire populations live their lives in plain view; Crenshaw (1991) calls for the intersection of racism and sexism in feminist and antiracist practices. Across differences in race, nationality, gender, and class, “visibility is an important part of the work that needs to be done” (Hancock, 2016, p. 75), one that is well-positioned within understandings of intersectional theories.

Across this historical horizon, the operationalization of intersectionality demonstrates interpersonal, structural, cultural, and disciplinary inequities in Bridgefield. I consider how a respect for difference has been cultivated in this community, moments where sensitivities toward difference were not expressed, and whether divergent voices in Bridgefield were embraced by the community. These voices are expressed in many different languages; they are spoken by Indigenous Peoples, immigrant workers in textile manufacturing companies, residents in different neighborhoods, and students attending Bridgefield High School, the setting of the present study. Throughout this exploration, I reflected on how the normalization of English in what became the United States has functioned to suppress linguistic and cultural difference, reproduce institutional hierarchies, and limit social change.

Three Eras in Bridgefield’s History

Although several important moments have marked the city’s history, this chapter is organized around three specific eras. The first era presents ideological differences between Indigenous Peoples and early European settlers. A modern understanding of the term
“indigenous” is based upon the criterion of individuals’ self-identification; it stands for historical continuity with pre-colonial societies, a link to territories and natural resources, distinct social, economic, or political systems, and non-dominant groups of society who “resolve to maintain and reproduce their ancestral environments and systems as distinctive peoples and communities” (United Nations, 2020, para. 3). In this era, I frame how European settlers resolved conflicts according to their Eurocentric doctrines and beliefs, often disregarding those of the Indigenous communities inhabiting the land. The second period highlights the rapid transformations and urbanization during the industrial era. During this period, there was an influx of international immigrants to Bridgefield. This era ends with the fall of textile manufacturing preceding World War II. Next, the third period chronicles the city since World War II, its role as an international refugee hub, and new opportunities in the technological and industrial industries. This era also presents characteristics of Bridgefield High School, the world language curriculum, and participants in this study. The chapter concludes with a brief discussion of the novel coronavirus, and the school’s adaptations during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Drawing on this study’s design and purpose, I highlight two related aspects within these historical periods: the diversities of community residents and residents’ attitudes and beliefs about this diversity, and how dialogues of linguistic and cultural difference are constructed in historical texts and expressed in policies and practices at Bridgefield High School. I sought to
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21 In the use of “indigenous,” I recognize that the term and existing synonyms such as Aborigine, American Indian, First Nations, and Native American can be contested by various tribal groups, “especially when used in an international, totalizing, and universal way” (Peters & Mika, 2017, p. 1229). Where some groups may not embrace indigenous, others adopt it. There is no current consensus for the correct usage of these terms.
understand how these pivotal eras, layered across Bridgefield’s history, could be examined and understood through an intersectional lens with attention paid to acts of disavowal. Specifically:

1) I consider how power and inequities have manifested themselves in the city’s history and are disavowed; and

2) How the city and Bridgefield High School function to contribute to and/or disrupt the perpetuation of social inequalities.

The portraits of Bridgefield that follow depict shifting relationships in the lives of its residents from the pre-colonial era through the present. This history traces how Bridgefield has transitioned from the pre-colonial and industrial periods to its modern-day opportunities in technology and education. In these eras, differences in ethnicity, gender, and language were marked by the everyday practices, working lives, and social relationships of its citizens. During the peculiar time during which this chapter was drafted, language research serves as one medium to inform educational research. Placing the present study’s setting in its sociocultural and linguistic origins demonstrates their complex interrelation in the Bridgefield community. The transformations in this community also provide rich context to my study’s purpose: how intersectionality can emphasize complex manifestations of power and inequities in world language pedagogy.
From Pre-colonial Diversity to the Present: Three Eras in Bridgefield’s History

I. Ideological Differences Between Indigenous and Early European Settlers

I will weep for the season on bitterness fed,  
For my kindred are gone on the mounds of the dead;  
But they died not by hunger, or wasting decay,  
The steel of the white man has swept them away.  

-Anonymous in Potter, 1856, p. 9

In the pre-colonial era, the northeastern United States was characterized by extraordinary diversity. Each Indigenous community inhabiting the region spoke a different language, was governed by their own political system, developed their unique art forms, and had individual spiritual beliefs. Early archival work has established northeastern tribes as connected to the larger Algonquin family and subdivided into smaller, local groups that were sustained by the Remminner river (Samson, 2000). By the early 1600s, European settlers had begun to establish colonies in the Northeast and encountered the Indigenous populations who inhabited the land. Early Europeans relied upon the Indigenous Peoples’ skills and knowledge to assist them with life on a new continent.

During this time, cultural differences between Indigenous Peoples and Europeans were evident. European settlers were shaped by English common law, meaning they were accustomed to a legal system governed by courts and procedures. The newly arrived settlers had little, if any, familiarity with Indigenous beliefs that hinged upon “consent, custom, and kinship” (Wilkinson, 2017, p. 2). As one example, living systems of spirituality for Indigenous populations transgressed European definitions of power. In comparison, the intricate explanations, beliefs, and insights of Indigenous spiritual practices hold no equivalent to European understandings of power and spirituality. Although European and Indigenous groups interacted in a variety of different ways and the diversity of these relationships varied, both sides often experienced
challenges to interpreting differences between perspectives, in particular with discussions of economic gain and religion (Richter, 2017).

These challenges were met with violent conflicts between Indigenous populations and early European settlers from the end of the 1600s to the early 1700s. By early fall of 1724, the Indigenous populations had become more irritated by the English settlers’ encroachments upon the lands that had been claimed by the Indigenous groups in the surrounding valleys and rivers (Potter, 1856). The Indigenous Peoples “became so exasperated, that they broke over all bounds of restraint, and kept up a continual series of annoyances against their English neighbors” (Potter, 1856, p. 146). These annoyances often involved killing cattle, burning haystacks, and committing robbery. The European settlers attributed the aggravations to the influence of a French Jesuit priest, Sebastian Ralle, who had spent 30 years living with North American Indigenous populations (Potter, 1856).

In response, European settlers organized attempts to kill Father Ralle that were met with cries of revenge by the Indigenous groups and sparked ongoing expeditions, resulting in destruction and death for over nine months. This period became known as both “Father Ralle’s War” and “Lovewell’s War” (Potter, 1856) after militia captain and ranger John Lovewell. Although the outcome of these hostilities was a draw, the end of this period marked a turning point during which the spirits of the Indigenous groups throughout the region were degraded by pandemics, physical violence, enslavement, extermination, re-education, assimilation, and migration. These conflicts had taught them that “they were not safe in their homes, that the adventurous whites would seek them there, and be avenged of them” (Potter, 1856, p. 163).

During this period, the Indigenous Peoples experienced oppression on both structural and interpersonal levels. They experienced the latter in that this oppression involved the early settlers
and Indigenous People’s individual identities, how they related to one another, who was advantaged, here the European settler colonizers and disadvantaged, the Indigenous groups, within social interactions (Collins, 2019). The former involves the significance of European ideologies and doctrines in shaping and solving disagreements, including how the relationship between different groups is organized and structured. To engage with this complexity, intersectionality examines the structural forces that shape this oppression: namely, the relatively unchecked powers of the European settlers.

Early critiques of intersectionality questioned whether it could accurately distinguish how oppression functions (Carastathis, 2016), resulting in a distinction between “interlocking oppressions” and “intersecting oppressions” (Collins et al., 1995, p. 492) to refer to macro-level and micro-level phenomena respectively. Macro-level or interlocking oppressions describes social structures that create social positions, and the micro-level or intersecting oppressions describes “how each individual and group occupies a social position within interlocking structures of oppression described by the metaphor of intersectionality” (Collins et al., 1995, p. 492). In its application to Indigenous oppression, they experienced a micro-level humbling and violence such as pandemics, enslavement, physical violence, assimilation, and extermination while enduring a macro-level oppression that established a social structure and unequal power dynamic in which the White, European settlers were “avenged” (Potter, 1856, p. 163) of the so-called wrongs that had been inflicted upon them.

During this time, pre-revolutionary treaties, such as the Treaty of Casco Bay in 1725, were drafted in attempts to avoid continual disputes. In lieu of a treaty that “finally settled these violent conflicts” (Samson, 2000), the establishment of treaties exhibits additional misunderstandings and fundamental differences across Indigenous and European groups. For
example, Indigenous tribes are described as tributaries of the King of England that were structured under English common law (Wilkinson, 2017). In addition, the language in which the treaty is written offers evidence that Indigenous governance structures were rarely considered in its drafting.

Over the course of the next several decades, other treaties were drafted. Their ink-soaked parchment paper made veiled attempts to address differences between individual groups of Indigenous Peoples and European settlers. Written in English and through the lens of European doctrines, the final drafts often did not reflect the preceding conversations and agreements between Indigenous and European groups (Wilkinson, 2017). In over 75 years that followed, wars between various groups persisted. As the colonists continued to expand their settlements across the region, the Indigenous populations that remained retreated to more rural northeastern areas; some were enslaved, intermarried, hidden, and others left to settle in Canada.

As the curtain closes on the first era, I accentuate how European settlers disavow innumerable aspects of Indigenous life, imposing their doctrines, educational system, language, religions, and customs on Indigenous groups. Specifically, European settlers disavow Indigenous languages, gender, and governance structures in the drafting of European treaties whose primary beneficiaries were White Europeans. Positioned as intersectional, interpersonal and structural forms of oppression (Collins, 2019) interact in this era to subordinate the Indigenous Peoples, and the ensuing inequities they experienced were insurmountable, resulting in the displacement of Indigenous populations across the region.
II. Settler Colonialism Through the Industrial Revolution

Using the popularity of immigrant exclusion to pack their rallies, Bridgefield’s textile workers heard of the importance of controlling the foreign influx that was linked with the evils of women and children competing with the men for their jobs.

- James Hanlan, 1979, p. 152

In the latter half of the 1700s, Bridgefield and the towns along the Remminer river began to prosper. The river was used at this time to transport passengers and commercial goods. Ferries, barges, and boats filled with travelers frequented the river. Barges traveling downriver often contained bricks for construction sites, lumber, and other construction supplies, and on the return trips, groceries such as fish and salt were often transported (Samson, 2000). In the 1760s, the Industrial Revolution had arrived, and by 1776, the colonies had declared their independence from England.

In Bridgefield, the Industrial Revolution set the stage for an influx of residents, both local and international. By 1846, Bridgefield’s population had expanded to 10,000, and it was the first community to request to become a city in the state legislature (Samson, 2000). At this time, the Naimkeak Mill Company operated four factories for the production of cloth. In addition to the Naimkeak Mills, the Sharp Mill Company was comparable in size to Naimkeak with 8,000 spindles (Potter, 1856), and the Bridgefield Printing Company introduced the printing of textiles to the area (Hanlan, 1979).

Consequently, the industrial growth and urbanization in the area was tremendous. This expansion quickly began to transform the town and its workforce. Construction commenced and “continued with a rapidity seldom known to this country, noted for the rapid growth of its towns and cities” (Potter, 1856, p. 558). At the same time, there was an influx of women and children who came to work in the cloth and textile production companies during the 1840s. In 1849, the starkest gender disparity was recorded: 45% more females than males resided in Bridgefield;
women during that year comprised over 64% of the work force in the town (Hanlan, 1979). Between 1850 and 1860, this disparity gradually diminished, and by the end of 1860, men remained outnumbered by 32% (Hanlan, 1979).

**Figure 3.1. Female workers in the Naimkeak mills in the late 1800s**

Over the next decade, news of Bridgefield’s prosperity began to spread internationally. By 1869, over 1,500 French Canadians had emigrated to the area (Perreault, 2010), and Bridgefield became a booming mill town. During this era, 40% of the population working in the mill was French Canadian, and substantial percentages of immigrants from Germany, Greece, Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden were also employed by the textile companies (Samson, 2000). Unlike prototypical town histories where achievements of the prosperous are heralded and the poor often ignored, it was the latter, the culturally diverse working class, that shaped communities in this century. More precisely, it was the communities’ linguistic differences and
differences in birth origins that may have delayed, or perhaps impeded, the development of a
class consciousness (Parmet, 1982).

Irrespective of a prospective delay or impediment, economic inequities are not addressed
by class alone. The use of intersectionality highlights the significance of social institutions, here
the Naimkeak mill company, in “shaping and solving social problems” (Collins & Bilge, 2016,
p. 16). Positing capital as intersectional in that it is intertwined with individuals who produce
labor, in this case the Naimkeak workers (Einstein, 2014), this framework reveals “how race,
gender, sexuality, age, ability, and citizenship relate in complex and intersecting ways to produce
economic inequality” (Collins & Bilge, 2016, p. 16). While there are instances where Naimkeak
appears to have allayed residential and community development concerns, there are other
examples, such as with immigrant and linguistic discrimination, where policies accountable to
economic forces contributed to social unrest.

**Bridgefield’s Textile Industry and Neighborhood Establishment**

To start, the Naimkeak mill company provided a host of benefits, such as free cooking
school and residential housing, for its employees (Langenbach, 1978). However, the company’s
residential community development plan did not proceed according to its original design.
Although Naimkeak employees were generally required to live in company housing, Naimkeak
was somewhat flexible with this requirement. Several mill employees were allowed to reside in
local neighborhoods “where they could maintain their own unique traditions, customs, and
culture” (Parmet, 1982, p. 1464). As the company’s housing was built, it was also organized
according to “cultural and ethnic lines rather than on division of work in the factory” (Hanlan,
1979, p. xviii).
Figure 3.2. Cooking school in the Naimkeak Mill Company in the early 1900s

Thus, family and community life fostered both within the company’s housing and in local surrounding neighborhoods served as invaluable resources that could help individuals and groups in times of need (Hanlan, 1979). Neighborhoods also provided a variety of services to newly established members of the community. These reinforcements were a great asset to immigrants, who along with the lack of complete paternalism on behalf of the mill company were sustained by the “reassurance, introductions, advice, and assistance” (Hanlan, 1979, p. xviii) provided by other families in local communities. In this sense, the established families in these neighborhoods provided a vital alternative to international immigrants whose “language, culture, or religious traditions could make life in the predominantly native-born company boarding houses a traumatic situation” (Hanlan, 1979, p. 55).

By 1880, distinct urban neighborhoods had been formed. In the city census of 1882 and 1884, the city marshal designated each street according to its ethnic composition (Hanlan, 1979, p. 149). For example, in Ward 5, the marshal made 15 ethnic classifications according to the city censuses of 1882 and 1884. In these documents, the majority of residents were classified as
American (42.6%), Canadian (25.4%), and Irish (28.3%). The additional 12 classifications\(^{22}\) comprised 2% or less of the approximately 8,000 residents in Ward 5 (Hanlan, 1979, p. 149). Although it may appear that “Americans” represent a large proportion in Ward 5, some of the diversity in each ward was concealed by the designation of children of immigrants as “American.”

In addition, these percentages were more revealing about the neighborhoods and its residents when subdivided into individual streets. For example, 60% of the residents were French Canadian on Ward 5’s Elm Street in 1884 (Hanlan, 1979). In French Canadian neighborhoods, parishes, bilingual French-English schools, convents, concert halls, orphanages, retirement homes, a hospital, a credit union, and a life insurance company were established during this time (Perreault, 2011). French Canadians at this time comprised over 38% of the workforce in Bridgefield, and by the turn of the century, there were over half a million French Canadians living in New England (Samson, 2000).

**Linguistic Diversity and Discrimination**

Despite the diversity of birth origin and possible delay to classism in Bridgefield, there is evidence that discrimination and in some cases oppression of certain communities of immigrants in the late 1800s was commonplace. Individuals who were both female and immigrants were subjects of criticism in the workplace, in public, and in print. In one instance, women who had been arrested during raids on houses of prostitution were publicly named in local newspapers that described them “in pejorative terms and often identifying them by ethnicity” (Hanlan, 1979, p. 151). One French Canadian woman named Mary L., afraid to reveal to her overseers that she

\(^{22}\) The 12 classifications include German, English, Scottish, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, Poland, Prussia, Sweden, France, and China.
neither understood the nature of her job nor spoke English, “caught her long dress in the machinery and eventually required amputation of a leg” (Hanlan, 1979, p. 153). There are many stories like Mary’s in Bridgefield that ignominiously caricature its immigrant, non-English speaking residents and workers as “woefully” and “pathetically ignorant” (Hanlan, 1979, p. 153), overlooking, or perhaps refusing to acknowledge, important cultural and linguistic differences.

When viewed as intersectional, these inequities exemplify what Collins and Bilge (2016) refer to as the disciplinary domain of power, or how power is wielded differently, and different treatment is afforded to different individuals or groups. For immigrant workers who did not speak English and were women, the intersection of linguistic difference, here repackaged as a “problem,” and gender, in the mills where women were paid less than their male counterparts, contributed to economic, personal, and social inequities. That this injustice was perpetuated not only in working and social life but also in print suggests the pervasiveness of how immigrant women are situated within gendered understandings of Bridgefield’s history.

In addition, the youngest immigrant residents experienced education differently than their English-speaking peers. A growing budgetary concern in the 1870s in public schools was that more teachers would have to be hired to educate non-English speaking school-aged factory workers in what was perceived as “a prolific foreign element” (Hanlan, 1979, p. 153). Although the potential hiring of teachers demonstrates a commitment to education, it represents one that is entrenched in political, punitive, and exclusionary measures for immigrants who are children. Layering intersectionality in educational settings, an intersectional view of formal schooling underscores the fact that schools, and by extension their stakeholders in the community, participate in the politics of education. That is, formal education in the United States, exemplified here with the exclusion of non-English speaking, immigrants, helps reproduce social
inequities and in this sense “represents a contested site of knowledge production” (Collins & Bilge, 2016, p. 166).

In response to the educational demand, evening schools opened, and child workers attended classes at night after they had completed their full-time jobs. This way, the immigrant children could attend school and work in the mills for the lowest paying jobs, and the mill companies could comply with the law. More generally, U.S. schools are often viewed as sites that foster critical consciousness among students. However, for the heterogeneous Bridgefield population, schools functioned to suppress social change and uphold ethnic segregation, demonstrating a lack of resources and support for its vulnerable citizens. Otherwise put, these schools intended to assimilate young immigrant and minority students to Western norms and values. As intersectionality shows, this version of assimilation in U.S. education “ignored the fact that becoming American often meant upholding racism, sexism, and xenophobia by learning how to practice the discriminations that they engendered” (Collins & Bilge, 2016, p. 166).

Viewed differently, the night school option also provided an opportunity for adult immigrant workers to build their literacy skills and pass the citizenship test. Although engaging these comparatively oppressed children in learning and shared forms of knowledge within a community is a feature of critical education consciousness, an intersectional view of this system considers these night classes as a way to perpetuate exclusion (Collins & Bilge, 2016), routinely privileging non-immigrant, native English-speaking students over the “foreign element” (Hanlan, 1979, p. 153) of immigrant children who are classified as “problems” compared to their English-speaking counterparts.

During this era, the most criticized form of immigrant diversity was their inability to speak English. For example, French Canadians were depicted by newspapers as “undesirable or
hopelessly incompetent” (Hanlan, 1979, p. 151). Beyond the flawed, vituperative reasoning that intellectual capacity is correlated with speaking English, this view of linguistic diversity as a problem invalidates the rich histories of immigrant and Indigenous populations in this community. In response, different populations of immigrants worked to preserve their cultural and linguistic heritage. For example, the French Canadian residents established a cultural response in the form of a social doctrine called “La Survivance” (Samson, 2000, p. 88). The philosophy of “La Survivance” advanced the premise that French culture and religion relied upon the preservation of the French language. In addition to its social and linguistic importance, this social doctrine served as symbol of resistance to assimilate (Marranci, 2003).

However, this resolve to not assimilate was perceived as a threat by the English-speaking population in the area. In response, “prejudice and discrimination against Franco-Americans and other non-English speaking ethnic groups became common” (Samson, 2000, p. 88). In addition, the Naimkeak and other textile manufacturing companies’ overseers viewed these linguistic and cultural differences as deficiencies. This lack of respect and value for languages other than English extended to other international populations who were drawn to Bridgefield. The title of a newspaper article written in the October 1, 1919, issue of the Bridgefield Bulletin, represents this perspective of the Bridgefield residents toward non-English speaking immigrant groups in its headline: “Must Learn English: In Order to Keep at Work Some Must Go to Night School” (Samson, 2000, p. 88).

At this time, a new law was passed that required all residents to read and speak the English language. In response, the Naimkeak company began hanging posters that signaled the following to its employees:
After October 1, 1919, no person or corporation shall employ any person between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one, who cannot read or speak the English language, unless such person can produce a certificate properly made out showing their attendance at some such evening school if the district in which they reside maintains such an institution. (Samson, 2000, p. 93)

However, linguistic and cultural differences continued to impede communication and collaboration across different groups working and residing in Bridgefield. Naimkeak’s owners no longer shared a common language, culture, or neighborhoods with their workers, and it became evident to the owners in the form of a worker strike in 1886 that the company ought to designate “ethnic representatives in supervisory level positions” (Hanlan, 1979, p. 159). These bilingual representatives were often in demand and worked to mediate relationships between the workers and the Naimkeak owners. As an example of intersectional relationality, or the thought that “entities that are typically treated as separate are actually interconnected” (Collins & Bilge, 2016, p. 195), this nuanced interactive understanding, albeit fueled by economic gain, between Naimkeak and its workers emphasizes local social contexts and linguistic difference.

The Naimkeak Mill Company’s Decline

By the early 1900s, Naimkeak had become the world’s largest cotton textile factory. With over 15,000 employees, the mill company’s production was substantial: over 50 miles of cloth was woven each hour (Samson, 2000). Naimkeak’s annual payroll was $7.8 million (Samson, 2000). Yearly, the mill consumed 55.6 million pounds of cotton; full-time wage for a 58-hour workweek was $10.55 (Samson, 2000). In 2020 currency, this would be approximately $280 weekly (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2020).
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23 8,500 men and 7,000 women (Samson, 2000).
24 Yearly, the mill consumed 55.6 million pounds of cotton; full-time wage for a 58-hour workweek was $10.55 (Samson, 2000). In 2020 currency, this would be approximately $280 weekly (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2020).
Despite the fact that immigrant workers at the time were paid relatively small wages and often injured on the job, there were few public protests (Parmet, 1982). The mill company often funded community improvement projects, footing some and in some cases all of the costs for sewage, water, roads, and fire protection. Motivated by the company’s interest in influencing the town’s development and public life, these efforts were not entirely altruistic (Hanlan, 1979).

Although production by the mill company continued to prosper through World War I, this prosperity did not last. In the early 1900s, textile production companies in the southern United States began to outproduce their northeastern and other rivals. The overall effect of this competition resulted in a series of pay reductions and higher average weekly hours (Samson, 2000). During this pivotal time, other industries, such as shoe manufacturing in Bridgefield, began to flourish. Due to recent reductions in wages and the potential for cutbacks and strikes in the textile industry, many Bridgefield residents felt secure having at least one family member employed in shoe manufacturing (Kilcrease & Lazdowski, 2019). During the course of 100 years, over 70 shoe factories established themselves in the area (Kilcrease & Lazdowski, 2019); this influx contributed to the economic strength of Bridgefield at a crucial point in its history. While the mill was able to sustain some production at a lower rate in the following decade, the Great Depression in the 1930s proved a force too powerful to overcome. The mill company filed for bankruptcy and closed its doors on Christmas Eve, 1935 (Samson, 2000).

In summary, I emphasize how factory owners and lawmakers in the Bridgefield community abused their financial and legislative powers to brazenly disavow the linguistic diversity of Bridgefield residents in this era. Echoing the treaties written in English by White
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25 $7.8 million in 1912 is estimated to be approximately $200 million in 2020 currency (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2020).
European settlers in the first era, the establishment of “English only” policies precluded workers from speaking their native languages and functioned to suppress transnational influences in the community. Moreover, stakeholders in the Bridgefield community commit a second disavowal in the lack of recognition of female immigrants as integral to the workforce and community in this era. Considering this disavowal in intersectional theory, immigrants who were also female had the unique misfortune of being publicly discriminated against and labeled in hurtful, stereotyped, and invective manners. Taken as a whole, this turbulent period of transformation in Bridgefield is simultaneously strewn with injustices that have contributed to linguistic policies and unequal power dynamics in present-day educational and professional settings.

III. Post-World War II to the Present: New Opportunities

A significant number of Bridgefield-area residents continue to feel strongly enough about their ethnic heritage to maintain the mother tongue in the home. Individuals who once sought to distance themselves from their ethnic identity in order to avoid possible ridicule are now researching their history and demonstrating pride in their roots.

-Gary Samson, 2000, p. 117

The closing of Naimkeak and other mills was detrimental to the city of Bridgefield; it remained in a recession thereafter. The closing of these textile companies also contributed to a fragmentation of Franco-American and other communities across the city. The population of the area that had been called “Le Petit Canada” (Samson, 2000, p. 95) began to spread to other areas of employment in the region. Thus, the French language was no longer spoken as frequently, and a greater assimilation to English ensued.

Through the 1950s, approximately 60% of the mill space was rented to different firms. One mill in 1957 became infected with anthrax and was torn down, “its beams incinerated, its bricks soaked in chlorine and buried” (Woodard, 2016, para. 12). Down the street from the infected mill, a slaughterhouse released toxic remains waste into the river (Woodard, 2016).
the ‘60s, the city began a federally-funded urban renewal project, and in the ‘80s, technological industries and developers became attracted by the ample, unique spaces of the abandoned mills.

Although many of its residents sought work in surrounding areas, Bridgefield maintained a relatively high proportion of its residents whose native languages were not English. For example, of the 88,282 residents of Bridgefield who were asked about their mother tongues in the 1970 federal census, 27,777 (or approximately 31%) responded that theirs was French (Perrault, 2011). From 1918 for the remainder of the century, nearly every elected mayor of the city was French American (Dion-Levesque, 1957). In 1980, Bridgefield began to officially serve as a United States international refugee site. Programs that assist newly arrived refugees and immigrants provide support in the forms of job placement, classroom support for school-aged children, English language instruction, and case management programs (International Institute of New England, 2020).

From the 1990s to the present, the city has made efforts to rebuild, attracting growing technological and other industry firms that are drawn by available space in the abandoned mills. Developers have transformed the mills and other areas into restaurants, loft apartments, and other commercial spaces. High-tech businesses and a growing university campus now expand across the city.

**Present-day Bridgefield**

Today, the city of Bridgefield is a mosaic of diversity. Although the demographic of its inhabitants is different, and the Indigenous population has greatly diminished, information from the most recent census (United States [U.S.] Census Bureau, 2013) estimates that more than

---

26 It is estimated that in the area surrounding Bridgefield there are approximately 1,000 Indigenous Peoples (Samson, 2000).
70 languages are spoken in this community, such as Spanish, French, Arabic, Slavic languages, languages of India, Chinese, Tagalog, Portuguese, Mon-Khmer (Cambodian), French Creole, German, Polish, Urdu, and others. Bridgefield has served as an international refugee site for over four decades; nearly one in seven inhabitants (13.6%) is foreign-born (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013).

Concurrently, the city welcomes international residents and is invested in assisting its new residents by developing civic, economic, and linguistic opportunities in the community that are contracted by the U.S. Department of State in the Bureau of Population and Migration (Department of Health and Human Services, 2020). Three volunteer agencies (VOLAGs) that provide sponsorship and initial resettlement assistance to families. Several nonprofit agencies contribute with affordable English language lessons, driving school for adults, and cultural and educational events to advance civic engagement in the community (Milligan, 2019). In the city each August, a “We are One” festival celebrates Bridgefield’s rich cultural and ethnic diversity, highlighting the differences across Latino, Indigenous, and African communities in the Western Hemisphere (Robidoux, 2017).

Similar to neighboring regions in the northeastern United States, Bridgefield is not without its problems: it continues to battle the opioid epidemic and drug addiction (Sullivan, 2018), and approximately 15% of its residents (or 16,500 people) live in poverty (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013). In addition, a linguistic barrier exists for non-English speaking refugees and immigrants. For the newly arrived children in the community, this challenge often manifests itself as difficulties with academic work; the district and schools in the Bridgefield system make efforts to address these challenges through additional resources to students.
In reflection upon Bridgefield transformations since World War II, I highlight how the linguistic disavowals presented in the first two eras persist. Linguistic diversity in the Bridgefield population remains robust, yet monolingual English policies are pervasive in Bridgefield Schools. Although there is empirical evidence that monolingual policies can be adapted to be inclusive of multilingual students (Liao & Maddamsetti, 2019; Wedin 2020), Bridgefield’s public schools appear firmly positioned in monolingual policies and practices. Thus, an intersectional lens can illuminate how immigrant students who are multilingual may be labeled or placed in “English language” classes that perpetuate segregation and exclusion in educational and social contexts.

**The Present Study: Bridgefield High School**

Bridgefield High School is a public, urban, secondary school in the northeastern United States. It opened in 1923 as a middle and high school and became exclusively a high school in 1924. Its students are comparatively more disadvantaged than their peers in schools within the state and nationwide. Intersectionality’s origins (Crenshaw 1989, 1991) theorize about how black females experience inequities that are compounded due to the intersection of their unique personal characteristics. In addition to examining race and gender, this study extends intersectionality beyond these characteristics, as student inequities at Bridgefield High School stem from the conflation of varying levels of English proficiency, designated by the school as
English Language Learners (ELLs), various citizenship statuses, and lower socioeconomic status (SES).

Each morning, I participated in hallway duty with my participants before classes began. This duty offered an opportunity to engage in an educational space where students spend large amounts of time and where some students challenged social inequalities by “questioning the school’s curriculum and often by rejecting the school’s rules and regulations” (Collins, 2016, p. 168). This space also served as a medium through which I witnessed how teachers perform their duties and how they engage with the school and the curriculum differently, investigating potential tensions between student-dominant spaces and teacher-dominated classrooms.

As students and faculty walked through the main entrance each day, they greeted one another. Some faculty and staff stopped briefly to discuss current events, the weather, and school-related items. Dozens of students regularly sat in the cafeteria before school to eat breakfast and socialize. Several teachers dashed from the faculty copy room to their classrooms, each carrying large stacks of freshly made white paper copies. Students chattered as they walked through the main entrance. Linguistically akin to international airline terminals, students entered speaking several languages in addition to English: Bosnian, French, Portuguese, Spanish, Swahili, and others.

One morning, I witnessed a student’s series of social disruptions to school regulations. According to the teachers on duty, this student “was having a bad day.” Circling around a Dasani

27 A note on language: In addition to its use at Bridgefield High School, the term “English Language Learning (ELL)” is a pervasive classification in US public schools. Drawing upon racialized ideologies, I suggest that the use of this term ought to be critically questioned for its positioning of speakers as “linguistically deviant” (Flores & Rosa, 2015, p. 150), specifically while they engage in linguistic practices viewed as normative by privileged White speakers.

28 Recognizing that there are a number of citizenship statuses students may hold, such as Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), resident, undocumented, and U.S. citizen.
vending machine, he continually attempted to retrieve a bottle of water from it despite not having deposited money into the machine. The student walked around the back of the machine, investigating. At this point, teachers surveilling these actions requested that he return to the cafeteria, after which he began to beat his fists against his head. In lieu of acquiescing, he walked over to a staff member’s desk, flipping through papers inside the desk. Again, he was asked to stop and return to the cafeteria. After this second reproach, he began to hit his fists against his head and then against the wall. At this point two teachers circled around him, walked him into the cafeteria, and calmly spoke with him. They were, as I was, worried that he would harm himself.

Following this altercation, I was told of a different incident that occurred during hallway duty, a group disruption that was demanding for students, faculty, and staff. The day after Donald Trump’s victory in the 2016 presidential election, a group of White students eating in the cafeteria stood on the tables, told their immigrant student peers they would soon be leaving, and then began to strike the cafeteria tables with their hands, chanting in unison, “Make America Great Again.” For the students who had recently arrived in the United States and feared being deported, this was a harrowing event. According to teachers, it took some time to not only manage but to work with students during and after this traumatic event that caused turmoil and brought students to tears.

I speculate that both the catalysts for and the fear invoked by this social outburst stemmed from many sources, such as economic instability, growing youth unemployment rates, cutbacks in public funding for social services, fears for safety, security, and deportation. There are other pernicious examples of social disruptions at Bridgefield High School. One week before my observations began, a student brought a gun to school and was arrested. At the end of each
day, a local police presence regularly surveys the school. An intersectional commonality behind these seemingly disjointed forms of protest, represented as challenges to the school’s rules, is that the individuals behind these disruptions are linked within a capitalist global system that is articulated “through unequal relations of race, gender, sexuality, age, disability, and citizenship” (Collins & Bilge, 2016, p. 138).

**School Enrollment, Statistical Measurement, and Resources**

At one time, Bridgefield had over 2,000 students enrolled. The construction of a new high school in an adjacent town in 2008 drew a large proportion of this population away from the school. During the 2019-20 academic year, Bridgefield High School’s enrollment was approximately 800. Compared with other public high schools in the state, Bridgefield consistently performs lower in reading and math achievement, on average. In 2018, 21% of the student body was proficient in mathematics, and 39% was proficient in reading. In the same year, 44% of students enrolled at this school were non-White, and 61% of students qualified for free and reduced-price lunch. The school had the third-lowest graduation rate in the state (73%). Over 15% of students (approximately 120 students) were English language learners, 30% were multilingual, and approximately 30% had documented disabilities.

The school district has several language services available to its multilingual students and families. For example, bilingual liaisons are hired to facilitate communication between families and schools, and translators and interpreters are also available for written and oral communication. In addition to providing resources to multilingual students and their families, the school has specific curricular options for English language learners (ELLs).29 For instance, there
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29 Recognizing that the school’s designation as such is an ideology that ought to be questioned, as referenced above, see footnote 8, p. 22.
is an ELL department staffed by two full-time teachers who instruct English courses for
beginner, intermediate, and advanced ELL students as well as courses with a focus on academic
writing, study skills, and U.S. civics. The ELL teachers also coordinate English language
proficiency testing for students each semester.

These resources, however, wash over the general stance in American schools that not
speaking English is a “problem” to be solved. ELL students, here drawing a parallel with
immigrant children working in the mills in the early 1900s, are required to take day-long tests in
English proficiency, are segregated from their peers in their ELL classes, and in many instances
that I witnessed, hesitant to ask questions in English without rehearsing the question beforehand.
While the school, similar to the mandatory night schools for child immigrant workers at the
Naimkeak mill factories 100 years earlier, is providing a space and an opportunity for students to
develop technical skills and build social capital, one can also see how the intersecting power
relations of linguistic, class, nationality, and race differences “routinely privilege some students
over others” (Collins, 2016, p. 165). Thus, public schooling at Bridgefield High School offers a
context in which students can learn to both assimilate and criticize this structure that reproduces
social hierarchies.

**Federal Grant and Curriculum Redesign**

In the 2019-20 academic year, Bridgefield High School received a federal curriculum
redesign grant for $500,000. Through my observations, interviews, and discussions with
teachers, I documented 10 curricular and resource-related components that were modified as a
part of the redesign process. Of the 10, four components are technological:

1) The daily schedule was altered to a block schedule format (78-minute classes) with an
advisory period that meets daily for 40 minutes.
2) The school has purchased an advisory curriculum in the form of one book, *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective Teens* (Covey, 2011). This book and its use as an advisory curriculum are discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.

3) Teachers must attend and are offered reimbursement for two professional conferences of choice during the academic year.

4) Counselors work to place students in internships at local businesses and hospitals.

5) All students have freedom to request late arrival and early dismissal if they do not have first or last periods. Previously, this option was only an option for upperclassmen in good academic standing.

6) When students are not in class, they are assigned to a study hall period. In prior years, students could opt to visit the cafeteria or library.

7) The school purchased a set of Google Chromebooks for the department to use in classes. The Chromebooks are stored in self-charging stations in a Chromebook cart that is kept locked in department members’ classrooms.

8) New desktop computers were purchased for teachers.

9) Paid volunteer opportunities for students such as those assisting with technological needs at the school were created.

10) Flatscreen TVs were purchased, installed, and mounted into each teacher’s classroom.

Of these 10 modifications, all four teachers in this study reported that the daily block schedule has had the most pronounced impact on the world language curriculum. Teachers in this study often discussed how they were approximately two months behind in their curriculum, a result of instructing their students two to three times a week instead of five. On the other hand,
one participant noted that a positive aspect to block scheduling is that it is far less cumbersome for her personally because she prepares for five different courses each week.

Within the new block schedule format, I witnessed five different daily schedules during my observations:

1) A White day: 78-minute block schedule classes and advisory period meets.
2) A Blue day: 78-minute block schedule classes and advisory on a different schedule.
3) A Silver day: 42-minute classes; all classes and advisory periods meet.
4) A late start day (weather-related): 55-minute classes; no advisory.
5) A day with a special schedule for a sports assembly at 2:00 pm: All classes and met for 50 minutes; advisory period did not meet.

In addition to these five iterations, there were two additional daily schedules that I did not observe: one for early release and one for midterms and final exams.

**World Language Curriculum**

In the world language curriculum at Bridgefield High School, students may enroll in one of four languages: Spanish, French, German, or Latin. The school’s course of study program requires that a 1.0 elective credit, or one year comprised of two 0.5 credit semesters, be completed. Within that requirement, students may choose from a combination of languages, art, and music courses to meet their diploma requirement. However, students who consider higher education are often required to complete two consecutive years in a language to meet the requirements of many colleges and universities. In the department, Spanish I-V, Spanish for Native Speakers I and II, French I-IV, and Latin I-IV, and German I-IV were offered in the 2019-20 academic year. However, 2019-20 was the last year in which German and Latin would be offered, in part due to low enrollment. The school, however, maintained a commitment to
German and Latin students during that year, allowing only upperclassmen to fulfill their language requirements for colleges and universities.

Gender and Multilingual Ratios in World Language Classes

The nine different courses, two advisory periods, 29 total classes observed, and over 50 hours spent observing during the 2019-20 academic year were split approximately equally between male and female students with a slight overall skew towards female students. However, two courses did not follow this trend: Spanish for Native Speakers and Spanish 1F. The Spanish for Native Speakers course had seven male and two female students, and Spanish 1F featured 11 female and two male students. When asked, the teacher participants stated that little information was available to them for students who may identify as non-conforming or non-binary in gender preference from school guidance and administrative departments. In addition, information about students’ gender pronoun preferences and preferred names was available to teachers and counselors online.

In addition, there was a high proportion of multilingual students in several classes I observed. The breakdown of the percentages of students who were multilingual in observed classes and the languages spoken by students was as follows:

1) **Spanish for Native Speakers**: 9/9 (100%) multilingual students
   a. 9/9 Spanish
2) **Spanish 1F**: 2/13 (15%) students
   a. 1 French, 1 Arabic
3) **Spanish 1H**: 3/16 (23%) students
   a. 2 Spanish, 1 French
4) **Spanish 2A**: 9/17 students (52.9%)
   a. 1 Albanian, 2 Bosnian, 2 Nepali, 3 Spanish, 1 Tagalog.
5) **Spanish 2B**: 7/22 (31.8%) students
   a. 1 French, 1 Arabic and an African dialect, and 5 Spanish
6) Spanish 2C: 8 of 23 (34.8%) students
   a. 1 Bosnian, 4 Spanish, 3 African languages
7) Spanish 2G: 2/16 (12.5%) students
   a. 2 Spanish
8) Spanish 3/4F: 2/9 (22.2%) students
   a. 1 Spanish, 1 indigenous language of South Sudan.
9) Latin 2/3: 1/6 (16.7%) student
   a. 1 Spanish
10) Advisory 1: 8/14 (57.1%) students
   a. 4 Spanish, 1 Dinka, 1 French, 2 Swahili
11) Advisory 2: 5/10 (50%) students
   a. 1 Arabic, 1 Bantu, 1 Bosnian, 1 Chinese, 1 Nepali

Participants

The participants in this study are four instructors at Bridgefield High School in the World Language Department. These teachers generously opened their doors, their teaching, and their lives to this study. They are veteran instructors of world languages: two Spanish, one Spanish and Latin teacher, and one French teacher. On average, they have been teaching for nearly 28 years. Participants are all American citizens; three of four teachers were born in the United States. All four participants are non-native speakers of the languages they teach; each participant has taught at another school or schools.

In order to protect the identities of the participants, the following protocols have been put into place:

1) Pseudonyms were used for all participants.
2) Some of the genders of participants were disguised.
3) When appropriate, some participants’ biographical information has been disguised.
In addition, the administration at Bridgefield High School has been supportive of this work and may have knowledge of who participated in this study, yet they were not provided details about the level of participation of each teacher.

**The Novel Coronavirus and #BlackLivesMatter**

Although a more detailed discussion of coronavirus is outside the scope of this study, the uncertainty of the pandemic has exposed the disavowals referenced in this chapter. As social protests and the #BlackLivesMatter movement counter incidents of police brutality against African American citizens and communities, intersectionality illuminates the interlocking systems of oppression in which the amplified powers of police forces are “exerted most heavily on the most structurally disenfranchised populations” (Collins, 2016, p. 149). Moreover, the novel coronavirus continues to infiltrate the social milieu, scientific and political communities, economic stability, health and educational sectors, and the lives and livelihoods of every inhabitant on the Earth. The resulting uncertainty that modern societies face has contributed to instabilities on a broad scale. The world is experiencing an international pandemic, a persistent traumatic event.

In the majority of the United States, stay-at-home orders were issued to slow the spread of the virus and reinforce social distancing guidelines. Many American stay-at-home orders permitted residents to leave their homes to buy groceries, visit the doctor, exercise outdoors, and purchase other essential items. Social distancing recommendations required that a minimum distance of six feet be maintained between people in public spaces. In the wake of a ban on
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30 Specifically, the majority of the United States under stay-at-home orders means 43 states in which there was a statewide stay-at-home order; seven states had either a partial stay-at-home or no guideline (Johnson & Fritz, 2020).

31 In addition, inhabitants of well over 100 countries adopted some form of quarantine or stay-at-home order in the spring of 2020 (Dunford et al., 2020).
public gatherings, innumerable events, conferences, sporting events, marathons, celebrations, weddings, and funerals were banned, postponed, or canceled. Public transportation systems were either partially or completely shut down for extended periods of time, highlighting inequities across lower-income and minority groups who depend upon public transportation. Restaurants, non-essential businesses, public places of worship, parks, and museums were also closed.

By March 30, 2020, approximately 4,000 people had lost their lives in the United States (McMaken, 2020). In the same month, 10 million Americans had applied for unemployment benefits (Long, 2020); the U.S. had experienced its greatest economic decline since the Great Depression. By the end of April 2020, unemployment rates soared to 14.7%: 20 million additional Americans had filed for unemployment (Tappe, 2020). On May 27, 2020, the death toll struck a somber note, marking the day that 100,000 people in the United States lost their lives to the disease (Center for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2020b); on September 21, 2020, that number rose twofold; and by February 2021, over 500,000 American lives had been lost (Tompkins et al., 2021).

In Bridgefield specifically, COVID-19 has had a deleterious impact on the community. At the outset of the pandemic, over 1,300 hospital employees were furloughed or had pay reduced (Cousineau, 2020). The pandemic has resulted in greater difficulties managing the influx of drug addiction and mental health patients. By mid-June 2020, nearly 1,500 people in Bridgefield tested positive for COVID-19, representing 30% of cases statewide.

32 It is estimated that these groups are also disproportionately affected by the novel coronavirus (Tan et al., 2020).
When Can We Go Back to School?

The majority of U.S. daycares, K-12 schools, and colleges and universities moved to online instruction in mid-March 2020, affecting over 5.7 million public school students and 5.7 million private school students in the United States (NCES, 2020a). The youngest in U.S. communities are experiencing the pandemic differently, with little understanding of why they cannot leave the house or visit friends and family. These children are particularly vulnerable; a portion of their childhood, their innocence, and freedom has been stolen. My daughters were in kindergarten and second grade at a local public school during this time. One night, after the first six weeks of stay-at-home orders, I tucked my second grader into bed. Holding on to a hope that persists throughout the crisis, she asked, “Mommy, when can we go back to school?”

Inequities Compounded in Poor, Minority Families

While COVID-19 may touch the lives of all those across domestic and international settings, it has a more pronounced negative effect on low-income, ethnically diverse families in the United States (CDC, 2020a). Moreover, the children in low-income, ethnically diverse households are particularly susceptible and at risk of food insecurity, homelessness, domestic violence, and other injustices. Although the data is still emerging, available data has identified higher hospitalization and death rates for Black/African American and Hispanic/Latino groups when compared to White or Asian groups (CDC, 2020a). Viewing these inequities as compounded by the virus, the children of minority families are particularly at risk. The move to online schooling has created an additional layer of inequity for these children: equitable access, equitable access, equitable access.

---

34 Additional studies are in-progress to confirm these data and seek to understand the disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on the health of racial and ethnic minorities.
limited availability of childcare, and enhanced implications for children and parents who may no longer be receiving income or regular meals.

**Bridgefield High School, Inclusivity, and COVID-19**

In the rush to accommodate these uncertain circumstances, Bridgefield High School has made several modifications. A survey sent to families inquired about the resources available to students at home prior to the move to remote instruction. This survey was written in nine languages: Albanian, Arabic, English, French, Haitian, Portuguese, Spanish, Swahili, and Vietnamese. A critique of this survey is that it was distributed in an online email format that may have precluded some families from responding. Other modifications that were made include: prioritizing the distribution of school lunches to families, providing internet access and computers to students in need, expanding IT services that previously had limited capacity, and training teachers for remote instruction.

In addition, the school’s administration removed their letter grade system to require teachers to assign either “pass” or “incomplete” at the end of the semester. For students who received an “incomplete” at the end of the semester, the school created three options for the completion of outstanding work: (1) makeup work could be completed over the summer; (2) students may attend a virtual lab in the summer; and (3) students can retake a course or courses in the fall if needed. To address the incompatibility of the daily school routine with students’ lives and responsibilities at home, students are required to check in with their advisory instructor daily, yet do not have to “attend” each class or check in with subject area teachers each day.

During the first two months of remote instruction, world language teachers experienced difficulties converting materials to online formats and assessing their students’ work. One Spanish teacher explains his frustration that the administration provided some guidance on
student workloads, yet many of his students struggled to turn in their assignments. He adds, “Some my top students aren’t producing anything” (Teacher B, personal communication, April 7, 2020). Another Spanish teacher echoes, “I have a number of students who have just ‘checked out’ – either submitting very little work or none at all. Most, however, are doing the best that they can” (Teacher C, personal communication, May 15, 2020). Although teachers express frustrations, they seem to be in favor of the policies that have supported students’ continuity in the spring semester.

Finally, as Bridgefield High School continues to modify its policies during the pandemic, I have thought about how this instability also represents an opportunity. Without the possibility of anticipating or knowing what the next year may bring, world languages at Bridgefield High School might rethink how they connect with their students, families, and the Bridgefield community. Rather than a scramble to fit the existing curriculum to an online format, this instability offers the possibility of reconceptualizing it, by engaging with local organizations and bringing divergent voices into classrooms in virtual settings. Put differently, the uncertainties that members of this educational community face, such as food insecurity, safety, and poverty, are not new to this school, yet how teachers conceptualize and design their pedagogies to address students’ daily realities, equity, and care could be.
CHAPTER IV: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

INTRODUCTION

As I reflect upon the methodological components that follow, I consider how this study benefitted from participants’ ingenuity during the data collection period. When I met with the World Language Department in October 2019, they proved to be a detail-oriented group. Producing their large desktop paper calendars, they expressed an interest in having classroom observations begin at the start of the spring semester and proceed without interruption until I was finished in March, before teachers and students became “too cranky” after spring break.

Accordingly, rather than introduce me intermittently to their students, it was they who requested that my observations of their classes be scheduled early in the 2020 calendar year. This option was in the best interest of their pedagogical design. Thus, I was able to establish myself as a consistent presence throughout the spring semester and to complete this study according to my original design and timeline. Beyond this fortuitous detail, teacher participants were responsive to my questions during post-data collection months, when I created formal fieldnotes and innumerable minor questions arose. They demonstrated their dedication to professional responsibilities throughout this study and an interest in and responsiveness to my scholarly project.

As I introduce my methodology, guiding questions, and analytic and interpretive techniques, I consider how this study offers a window into how world language pedagogies were enacted by four teachers prior to the coronavirus pandemic, school closures, and sweeping changes to educational practices at Bridgefield High School. Put differently, one might view the findings discussed in Chapters 5, 6, and 7 as a closing curtain on educational experiences prior to COVID-19, a peculiar pause in face-to-face social interaction, and the transition to online
instruction for an unknown period of time. At the same time, this study documents details from
the initial months of online instruction, as reported by teachers through email and Zoom
interviews. For teachers and students at Bridgefield High School, my classroom observations
suggest a level of trust and communication between my participants and students that was
established in a face-to-face setting. I think about how these relationships might be fractured by
school closures and how Bridgefield students may no longer have a consistent, perhaps trusted,
al adult presence in their lives.

Finally, in the establishment of my study’s design methodology, one additional
modification was made to the study after its approval by my chair and committee members. At
the outset of school closures, I modified the IRB protocol to conduct Zoom interview
conversations with my participants. In addition to meeting with my participants via Zoom, I
emailed my participants with follow-up questions and member checks, defined as soliciting
feedback from some of my participants as findings emerged (Merriam & Tisdale, 2016). As I
proceed with my methodology in the chapter that follows, I begin with the reiteration of its aims
and purpose.

**Specific Aims**

The intent of this qualitative case study is to investigate how teachers incorporate
diversity and how their practices are inclusive in world language pedagogy at one public
secondary school.

**Purpose**

The purpose of my study is to examine how an intersectional lens can emphasize
complex forms of inequities across student, school, and community diversity in language
education. An additional intent of my research is to contribute to the field of education through the investigation of the ways this analysis may inform and support world language pedagogy.

**Research Questions**

My dissertation focuses on the following guiding questions:

RQ1. How are student diversities such as experiences, abilities, and identities a resource in World Language pedagogies?

RQ2. In what ways are World Language pedagogies inclusive of multilingualism, race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities?

RQ3. What does an intersectional lens reveal about how student and community diversities are or are not taken up in world language classrooms?

**Research Design and Data Sources**

My study incorporates the following design components, each of which has been designed to address my guiding questions:

1. Qualitative interviews with teachers (RQ1, RQ3)
2. Classroom observations employing ethnographic methods (RQ1, RQ2)
3. Copies of teachers’ syllabi were requested to examine areas that support emerging themes. Observed syllabi are those in the considered academic year. (RQ1, RQ2)
4. Student de-identified work. Student work was collected when possible to provide an additional layer to data analyses. (RQ1, RQ3)

---

35 I.e., in the term(s) and academic year(s) the study occurs.
Qualitative Research Approach

Methodological strategy of inquiry

In this project, case study methodological strategy is employed, collecting data from multiple sources with participant interviews, observations employing ethnographic methods, and an examination of course syllabi and student work. Case study design, an in-depth description and analysis of bounded systems (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016), is appropriate for this study as my case is intrinsically bound and defined by its unit of analysis: teachers in the world language department at one public high school in the northeastern United States. Further, this empirical inquiry intends to investigate intersectional dynamics in real-life contexts (e.g., the phenomena are limited to individual world language teachers, classes, and syllabi at one public secondary institution), with particular interest upon where “the boundaries between phenomenon and context may not be clearly evident” (Yin, 2014, p. 16).

My study’s methodological design employs critical discourse analysis (henceforth CDA, Fairclough, 2010; Gee, 2014a, 2014b) to examine data collected from qualitative interviews and observations employing ethnographic methods. CDA is appropriate in that it emphasizes the way versions of the world are produced in discourse and fosters the development of detailed descriptions of participants and social contexts. In addition, CDA is characterized in part by its commitment to addressing relations between discursive and non-discursive elements and dimensions of social change (Fairclough, 2010). The use of CDA assists me with the intended outcome of this study: to present a descriptive analysis of language, power, and social context in a constructivist (anti-realist) re-creation of each individual teacher’s experiences and practices (i.e., in the form of bounded cases). Conceptually, intersectionality builds upon my CDA
methodological construction, emphasizing how various forms of diversity interact and the mechanisms and contexts through which individual inequalities arise.

Engagement with CDA as a methodological strategy includes the following components: For interviews, as teachers recount their experiences, discuss culture and student diversity into their teaching, and explore their perceptions on these topics, CDA is appropriate as it guides my analyses of teachers’ language and its role in shaping teachers, their language pedagogy, and inequalities that may arise. In the analysis of my interview data, CDA analyses can attend to discourse in social contexts, nuances, and contradictions across contexts.

To examine these data, I began broadly in my analyses by examining transcripts, fieldnotes, and memos to analyze language and its use in teachers’ practices and classroom interaction. I also considered socially construed roles (e.g., teacher, student) within context and language(s) across participants that produce(s) common social meanings (Merriam & Tisdale, 2016). Next, I analyzed the data for descriptions of multiple representations of diversity in language teaching pedagogy. Finally, I examined data across sources to understand where instances of inequalities are sustained and may persist, where they may be overcome, and where multiple factors may further complicate various inequities in language pedagogy. As an inequitable obstacle that can be overcome, Julie described how she grades her native Spanish vs non-native Spanish speakers on different grading scales to promote equitable academic opportunities in her classes. For example, she may not remove points for missed or incorrect accents and was less strict when assessing spelling errors for her native Spanish speakers.

Further, I thought intentionally about how I would build each case: For the interview questions, I graphed differences across cases to highlight similarities/differences and nuances, dependent upon individual differential factors and responses. For classroom observations, I
reviewed and documented each case, explicitly looking for cross-case comparisons and analyses. Teachers’ syllabi and expectations also offered one way to directly compare each case in its course design, the types of assignments, assessments, frequency of different types of language skills, projects, readings, media, and writing they require of their students. In addition, I looked for variation in the types of assignments that appeared, such as blogs, online dialogue, language lab work, virtual reality, field trips, or social media. None of these latter forms of engagement was presented in available data, although that it not to say that these types of assignments do not exist.

I consider reflexivity as I construct my case, navigating the various ways that my text is one version of language pedagogy. Further, language in this context is not an abstraction (e.g., grammatical set of rules), and in this context, I place a dual focus on the language teaching practices themselves and the resources teachers draw upon in language instruction. Given CDA’s focus on addressing the “social wrongs of the day (in a broad sense, injustice, inequality, lack of freedom etc.” (Fairclough, 2010, p. 231), I place a focus on the analysis of sources and causes of inequalities in addition to the possibilities of overcoming inequities. In the identification of certain inequalities that may arise, I consider how they are constructed, spoken about, and the resources that are used to sustain them.

As examples, I consider how my observations of world languages present little evidence of racial and ethnic diversity in teachers’ pedagogical performances. When I asked Lisa how race and ethnicity may come up in her classes, she responded, “It doesn’t necessarily come up in French. We’re not in a seminar of seniors talking about their identity, right?” (March 11, 2020). Also from interview data, the same participant responded in a way that confounded me. She states, “We have such a mix of race and ethnicity in our classes; it doesn’t really come up” (Lisa,
March 11, 2020). When I asked John how race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities come up in his classes, he responded, “No, I haven't encountered anything like that at all. I mean, not even at the high school level” (April 29, 2020). This finding was supported by teachers’ syllabi and student work that heavily focused on grammatical content with little evidence of diversity in world language pedagogies.

**Research Setting**

This study is set at Bridgefield High School. Bridgefield High School has a student body of approximately 860 students (2019-20) and has a graduation rate of 73%, the third lowest graduation rate in the state in 2018. Students in this school are 61% economically disadvantaged, based on measures of free and reduced-price lunch, and the student body is 39% diverse. In the 2019-20 academic year, the year during which I conducted this research, Bridgefield High School received a $500,000 Barr grant for a curriculum redesign (Barr Foundation, 2019). To this point, my research intends to be mutually beneficial, and I have offered to share my findings with the school and administration as they consider their redesign. In addition, this school is situated in a town that has served as an international refugee site since 1980 (for additional background on the community and its history, see Chapter 3).

In Bridgefield High School’s present program of studies, four languages are offered: French, Spanish, German, and Latin. World Language courses are taken as elective credits; they are not designated as a formal diploma requirement. However, five elective credits (five courses total with a duration of one year per course credit) are required by the school in order to
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36 The references for institutional statistics in this section have been removed to preserve the setting’s disguise and protect my participants. As important ethical considerations, anonymity, care of participants, and the mitigation of institutional risk have been identified and protected in fieldwork and publications (Boellstorff, Nardi, Pearce, & Taylor, 2012).
graduate. Each language course has the designation of “College Prep” in its description, which contributes to my initial impression that language learning at this school is cast as a curriculum component intended for those interested in higher education. Alternatively, this linguistic designation may dissuade students who struggle in other courses or who are not intending to apply to colleges and universities from enrolling. Of the four languages, the Spanish offerings are the most extensive. There are also two Spanish courses for native speakers: Spanish for Native Speakers 1 and 2 (Courses 1161/1162). Each of these courses for heritage language learners requires teacher recommendations. In addition, Spanish 4, Spanish 5, and French 4 are offered as Honors courses. In the program of studies (2019-20), I note that German and Latin courses are only be offered to upperclassmen.

**Participants / Target Population**

Participants in this study include four world language instructors at one public secondary school site. The inclusion criteria are second language instructors who are interested in participating in the study. Exclusion criteria comprise teachers who are not in the World Language department (i.e., teachers in other departments). Teachers of any second language, both novice and experienced teachers, were invited to participate.

**Full and Partial Teacher Participants**

The intent of this work was to have all participants be full participants in the context of school life. However, the recruiting process resulted in two full and two partial participants (four total). Full participation designates the two teachers who were interviewed and who also participated in classroom observations. In the spring 2020 semester, some teachers were either not available for or did not wish to engage in classroom observations (e.g., due to a sabbatical or maternity leave, among other reasons); these participants became my two partial participants.
Partial participants were interviewed but did not participate in classroom observations. All participants, partial and full, were also asked to share their course syllabi and provide examples of de-identified student work.

**Sampling Strategy**

Criterion sampling, a type of purposeful sampling, was used to select participants (Kuzel, 1999; Patton, 2002). Criterion sampling involves selecting participants that meet a specific criterion of importance (Criterion sampling, 2006). In this study, the criterion that drives this type of sampling is the designation of second language teachers in the world language department. While limited in number to approximately six participants, employing this type of sampling emphasizes the strength of an in-depth understanding of perspectives related to the phenomena I am interested in studying. The designation of teacher in the World Language department is the integral attribute of this study due to its focus on language pedagogy. An additional reason this criterion is important is that it supports the possibility of gaining insight into intersectional dynamics in the curriculum and facilitates a many-angled view of pedagogy.

**Recruitment**

To recruit participants in my study, I contacted two public secondary schools’ department chairs and principals to gauge a possible fit for this study. Both secondary schools expressed an interest in participating. Following the recommendation of my chair and committee, I limited this study to one educational context. I chose to conduct this study with the secondary school whose disadvantages were more pronounced. Specifically, Bridgefield High School is statistically more economically disadvantaged, has higher percentages of students who were multilingual and non-White, and has the third lowest-graduation rate in the
state. Next, I recruited all members of the secondary institution’s World Language department to capture a heterogeneous range of perspectives and practices across languages. In the recruitment stage, I wrote a synopsis of my study’s purpose, design, and data collection methods. The world language department chair then proposed my work to teachers to gauge their interest in participating. During this process, I reflected on possible power dynamics of principal and department chair approval versus the willingness of all department members to engage in this research in addition to other financial, temporal, or relational influences/constraints on teachers that may affect their participation in my study.

**Benefits**

Participants may benefit from the opportunity to share their stories, engage in the conversation, and reflect on their own experiences. This research also has the potential to inform Bridgefield High School’s curriculum redesign and in this sense may be mutually beneficial. In addition, these experiences can be characterized as professional development. As a corollary, this study holds broader educational value as it empirically documents the ways that teachers engage with student diversity in addition to the intersectional analysis of these data. Teachers would also be contributing to a more developed understanding of language teaching. All participants in this study were offered a $200 Visa gift card and be invited to a post-data collection debriefing, a social gathering with food. The use of my personal out-of-pocket funds for these gift cards was approved by UNH purchasing, the College of Liberal Arts Business Services Center, and the UNH controller’s offices. I have also offered to share my findings and insights with world language instructors and school administrators and personnel to inform their curriculum.

---

37 Risks can be found in ethical considerations; see p. 27.
Methods

1. **Qualitative interviewing.** In order to address my research questions, I used a semi-structured interview guide. To refine my interview protocol, I piloted the interview guide four times with secondary language instructors at a different institution. The interview guide is enclosed; see Appendices. Prior to and during observations, subjects engaged in innumerable pre- and post-classroom observation conversations, informal interviews, and discussions that were documented in my written notes. After classroom observations were complete, subjects engaged in one, approximately 60-minute interview that was audio recorded, transcribed by Rev.com, and coded. The timeline (see Appendices) began with UNH’s IRB approval, and this interview process was completed throughout the course of one academic term. The primary instrument is the primary investigator. Interview questions asked teachers about their experiences and biographical details; how they see their students (i.e., who their students are to them); to discuss their experiences teaching at their particular institution, in their city, and in their state; to tell the story about materials that are integrated in their classes; how these components came to be part of their classes; and their views about incorporating student diversity in the curriculum. Participants were also asked to bring a curriculum artifact that they use in their practices, which was photographed; to tell the “story” of that artifact; and to describe their views of how student diversity is considered as a resource. Interview questions are enclosed (see Appendices).

2. **Observations employing ethnographic methods.** I conducted over 50 hours of classroom observations in this study. Observations were recorded in two ways (1)...

---

38 More information about Rev.com can be found [here](#).
through informal jottings that were later transformed into formal fieldnotes and (2) via an informal classroom observation protocol instrument that I developed based upon my research and interview questions.\textsuperscript{39} To test the protocol instrument, I piloted it by observing two secondary language classrooms at a different institution. After each day of observations, memos were written and audio-recorded by the primary investigator. This informal tool can be found in the Appendices. In addition, I offered teachers the opportunity to reflect on these observations in collaborative ways by reviewing conversations with me using stimulated-recall methods (Lyle, 2003) to interpret and analyze the classroom instruction. Stimulated-recall methods have been used extensively in educational research in teaching and can be defined as “introspection procedure(s) in which (normally) videotaped passages of behavior are replayed to individuals to stimulate recall of their concurrent cognitive activity” (Lyle, 2003, p. 861). Although there can be limitations to employing this technique in research, such as inferences about cognitive processes from teachers’ verbal accounts, this method has potential to contribute to both (a) teachers’ reflections, methods, and activities and (b) my own understandings of these components in complex, interactive contexts. Observations focus on the linguistic (Gee, 2014a) as a medium for interaction and social structure as part of the interaction. That is, a dual focus is placed on teaching practices themselves in addition to the resources that are drawn upon in pedagogy. A positionality statement adds to this discussion vis-à-vis my positionality and researcher biases (see Chapter 1).

\textsuperscript{39} More information about the development of this instrument can be found in “Observational guiding questions and protocol” (p. 121, below).
3. **Course syllabi.** Teachers’ course syllabi were requested to further examine how intersectional dynamics can be understood in language pedagogy and to provide an additional layer of support to, or potential conflict with, other collected data.

4. **Student de-identified work.** This data represents an important dimension for my analyses. I requested de-identified examples of student work from each participant, including but not limited to the forms of projects, essays, audio recordings, skits, portfolios, art, and presentations, among others. These data were examined for patterns of agreement and inconsistencies across sources.

**Data Collection**

Data was collected on a rather limited timeline from January 2020 through June 2020 at Bridgefield High School. Follow-up conversations were conducted with teachers via email through September 2020, and member checks remained ongoing via email until October 2020. All aspects of data collection were completed at that time, resulting in six months of active data collection and approximately 10 months of communication with teachers.

Data was collected from multiple sources, and I recruited participants in this study to engage in one-on-one recorded and informal interviews. These interviews offer a sense of how these language instructors engage with diversity in their language pedagogies and how their insights help shape their language instruction. I observed teachers as they performed their roles in the classroom, teaching languages and interacting with their students. The observations, documented through participant observation, fieldnotes, written memos, and on occasion, through my assistance with tasks such as passing out worksheets and monitoring group work, did not contain any information that may identify individual students. Students that are specifically mentioned during classroom observations are identified anonymously as “a student in the class”
for example. Finally, I collected additional data in the forms of teacher syllabi, teachers’ curriculum artifacts, and student de-identified work. To document these additional data, I made copies of the syllabi and student work electronically, and the curriculum artifacts and classroom materials, arts, posters, and other décor were photographed.

**Procedures**

**Data**

a. (1) During interviews, I used a digital voice recorder to capture the conversations. I took notes during the interviews to record significant comments and details when possible. (2) During observations, I wrote informal jottings during observations and recorded audio and written memos directly after each day of observations. Data collected from interviews and classroom observations were transcribed by Rev.com, a transcription service. (3) Copies of teacher syllabi and student de-identified work were made. Initial analyses of interview data, observational data, and course syllabi occurred in three phases: (a) first-round in vivo coding, or placing an emphasis on the actual spoken words of participants, to explore initial relevant themes (Saldaña, 2016); (b) second-round focused coding, or re-coding the transcript focusing on a particular guiding theme, involved searching for the most frequent codes to develop the most prominent categories (Saldaña, 2016); and (c) third-round axial coding was used to thematically organize dominant and less-dominant codes and to identify different dimensions in constructs (Saldaña, 2016). Analyses of course syllabi and student de-identified work accounts for discourse, nuance, and contradictions across contexts. In the first-round coding process, clauses from transcripts were classified into one of the following elements: type of diversity, orientation (who, what, where), purpose, setting, evaluation, characterization, theme, and result. After initial codes were established, a second round of coding was conducted to develop the thematic
organization by grouping the codes into themes specific to different forms of diversity, and a third round of axial coding designated dominant themes from sub-themes across data sources.

b. Interpretation of the data addresses the research questions by providing narrated examples of second language teachers’ experiences, biographical details, and insights.

c. All participants and the school were given a pseudonym.

d. All data is stored in password-protected files in UNH box. No one else has access to the data except my chair, Professor Paula M. Salvio. As data are often useful for archival research and reanalysis purposes many years after initial data collection, data will be kept secure and de-identified indefinitely. After the study is complete, audio and video recordings, transcriptions, photographs, and copies of syllabi will be kept indefinitely for future research.40 Data will be used for academic presentations at professional conferences, for publication in professional journals, and for future research. De-identified data may also be shared with other researchers.

**Interpretive Techniques and Trustworthiness**

**Methodological considerations**

The interpretation of the interview and observational data and course syllabi began by (1) reading the interview transcripts, analyzing observational field notes, and studying other documents or items, such as photographs of curriculum artifacts, course syllabi, and student work; (2) categorizing strategies such as coding and thematic analysis; and (3) connecting strategies (Maxwell, 2013, p. 105). In addition, during data analysis, memos were audio-recorded and written to provide additional reflections and thoughts about methods, goals, analysis, theory, participants, and findings. As an integral part of my data analysis, memos helped me cognitively

---

40 This information will also be conveyed to the research site, principal, and participants and included on participants’ consent forms.
work through my observations and interviews, adding fresh insights to my existing data. Member checks with participants were employed for interviews and observational field notes when appropriate. Ongoing research was conducted to examine differences between organizational, theoretical, and substantive categorizing and contextual strategies.

Employing CDA as a methodological strategy began with the interview data; participants’ discourse was examined with a focus on each text as an entity in and of itself (i.e., not for secondary inferences such as attitudes or events beyond the texts). The concern of my analysis is therefore with dialogue itself and how it can be read. Specific to this form of analyses, my conversation analysis turns to how language pedagogies are constructed from dialogue. The interview format involved asking each participant the same questions, which allowed me to compare responses, look for similarities and differences across responses, and benefit from increased simplicity with initial coding.

One suggestion that allows for rather than restricts the diversity of participants’ accounts of their practices is to generate contexts in a way that “the connections between interviewee’s accounts and variations in functional context become clear” (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 164). To build this into my strategy, the interview guide that I have created allows for detailed questions with follow-up questions that can be asked if certain responses are not offered. Moreover, the interview is considered a conversational encounter where diversity in responses is emphasized.

As a corollary, the analytic processes as I analyze interview transcriptions, observational data, and course syllabi proceeded with a great amount of consistent, diligent, careful reading, rigorous rereading, and grappling with the data. I concentrated on the detail of the data, “however fragmented and contradictory, and with what is actually said or written, not some
general idea that seems to be intended” (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 168). First, I searched for patterns, differences and consistencies in the data. Next, I considered the function and context of discourse used and formed “hypotheses about these functions and effects and searching for the linguistic evidence” (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 168). Therefore, these analyses have been guided by CDA as a framework that focuses on dimension in the construction and function of discourse.

Further, interpretive techniques for the observational data involve examining the use, the context, and the function of discourse in classroom settings. I scoured my notes and memos for similarities, differences, juxtapositions, and contradictions. Several tools that Gee (2014b) writes about assisted me with CDA as I proceeded through these analyses. For example, the “doing and not just saying tool” (Gee, 2014b) underlines the importance of considering not only what the speaker is articulating but what one is trying to do or accomplish in saying it. Other mechanisms that I considered include: (a) how the context is reflexive (e.g., how is what is being said helping to shape or create meaning, is the speaker replicating or transforming/changing the context of the dialogue in small or significant ways) and (b) an analysis of the discourse on macro, meso, and micro levels to stimulate my analysis of how words and grammar are being used to strengthen or weaken the significance of various items or concepts and not others (Gee, 2014b).

**Observational Guiding Questions and Protocol**

As a rationale for my approach to classroom observations, I drew upon three guiding questions that integrate themes from my research and interview questions with (an) additional question(s)/theme(s) of the participants’ choice. These three guiding questions served as a framework from which I created an informal protocol instrument that I implemented during observations:
1. **Student diversity:** How is student diversity incorporated in world language pedagogies?

This question was divided into students’ experiences, abilities, identities, and “other,” which may later be subdivided dependent upon categorization and thematic possibilities. I then used this informal tool to document different variations of diversity in an Excel spreadsheet; fieldnotes, memos, and notes were also recorded during post-observational discussions with participants.

2. **Inclusive pedagogies:** How are world language pedagogies inclusive? This theme is attentive to engagement with and inclusion of students’ characteristics, such as race, ethnicity, ability, gender, gender expression, and sexual orientation; non-heteronormative views of gender and sexual orientation represented in practices and materials; how the use of films, media, music, readings, and visual/audio representations of people/communities are (and are not) included in world language classes; and additional ways that a discourse of inclusion is/is not established in world language teaching practices and methodology.

3. **Identity:** Do teachers include discussions of identity, either related to students’ identities or through the lens of class, race, and gender (or the interaction of two or more) in present-day settings? This theme is attentive to activities, readings, film, or other materials that explore discussions on “identity” “postcolonialism” “secularism” and ideas of class, race, and gender. I am also preoccupied with how world language teachers integrate populations and/or histories of those who have been and continue to be marginalized.

4. **Participants’ topic of choice:** Are there any items or topics the teachers would like me to focus on during observations? As an additional procedural consideration, I discussed the possibility of a focus on an item or topic(s) of the teachers’ choice with participants during each observation that we could review together as they work through their curriculum reform. The
teacher’s item became a fourth theme in my approach to classroom observations, and this theme altered across observations, dependent upon participants’ request. To document these themes, I printed a hard copy of the informal tool and used one protocol for each observation. I then created Excel spreadsheets to track these data across observations and participants. The review of these protocols was an asset during post-observational discussions with participants, member checking, and the first two coding phases.

I also developed a pre-observational protocol, a condensed and adapted version of two existing protocol instruments, aligned with these guiding questions as an additional organizational tool that helped me to be more intentional with my participant observations (see Appendices). However, since my classroom observations were back-to-back each day, I found that it was not practical to use this tool, as very little time was afforded between classes. In addition, the time I did have was spent engaging in conversation with teachers about their practices and my observations. However, if this study were replicated, this pre-observational tool may be helpful in observations that are distended or allow for time to meet with teachers beforehand. This tool would also be beneficial in future studies that aim to document disparities between how the class was planned versus how the class unfolded and to empirically document additional items, objectives, and activities.

Finally, I considered multiple linguistic components when documenting, analyzing, and studying these data. Specific to this study, CDA attends to discourse in multiple languages (English, French, German, Spanish, and Latin). As intonation and accent contribute to meaning in social contexts, if I had questions about specific items, I asked the instructor for clarifications. As I progressed through these analyses, I considered additional components of the social context that were relevant to the meaning of the data. After I felt that I had exhausted these possibilities,
I reflected on how “words and grammar being used privilege or de-privilege specific sign systems (e.g. Spanish vs. English, technical language vs. everyday language, words vs. images, words vs. equations, etc.)” (Gee, 2014b, p. 142).

In addition, I documented and noted whether different instructional approaches and pedagogical methods were employed when observing Bridgefield High School’s Spanish for Native Speakers courses versus courses not designated as such, as the goals, motivations, and the methodological approaches to attaining these goals (when considered) may differ. I also analyzed the differences between prominent topics in the classes, subsidiary topics for the course during any given observation, how they interrelated, and the social interaction and alterations between two languages (e.g., Spanish and English).

**Validity and Reliability**

Validity is addressed in part with method and informant triangulation, defined as using several data collection and data analysis tools to address any one research question (e.g., members who participate in interviews are also required to participate in classroom observations). Although the concept of validity in qualitative research can be controversial, Maxwell (2013) refers to qualitative validity as the “correctness or credibility of a description, conclusion, explanation, interpretation, or other sort of account” (p. 122). In this use, qualitative “validity” does not refer to any kind of causal inference to which an account can be compared and is quite different from quantitative validity; however, the “conception of validity threats and how they can be dealt with is a key issue” in qualitative research (Maxwell, 2013, p. 123). Two specific threats to validity in this study are researcher bias and reactivity in each component of the study. An issue with observations employing ethnographic methods in addition to reactivity is the short-term involvement with the setting. Further, interpreting ontological complicity
(Packer, 2018) in a way that enhances validity necessitates ongoing work. For qualitative reliability, core evaluative processes and guidelines for ethnographic methods and interview protocol should be more intently examined and clarified. To the point of fidelity to subject matter (Levitt, Motulsky, Wertz, Morrow, & Ponterotto, 2017), fidelity can also be addressed in the consideration of how my perspective influences and guides my interpretation of data and through member checks with teacher participants to solicit feedback about the data and conclusions from those being studied (Maxwell, 2013, p. 126).

**Ethical Considerations**

**Risks**

There are several inherent risks within this study. Teacher participants in this study invited me into their classrooms, permitted my observation of their teaching practices, and were interviewed throughout my study. In this sense, teachers opened themselves to a certain vulnerability in their professional lives through an investigation of their practices, methods, experiences, and instructional insights. Teachers also drew upon their personal experiences, and their recounting of personal stories in these contexts conjured a range of emotions and memories, representing (an) additional risk(s) to participants.

Further, these data have the potential to be shared with their administration and school personnel as they engage in their school-wide curriculum redesign. In addition, participants volunteered their time, classroom spaces, and interview responses to my research; this carries the risk of the unknown and uncertainties about how their responses, syllabi, and practices are

---

41 In addition, due to the nature of working with human subjects, there is always the possibility that there may be unforeseen or unexpected consequences for the participants and the researcher. 42 Therefore, it is imperative to protect the individual identities of participants through pseudonyms, creative substitution, and disguising genders, among other strategies.
perceived by me as a researcher in addition to the wider academic community in the forms of my dissertation, conference presentations, and additional publications. Students were also present during classroom observations, which carries risk in that my presence could be disruptive to teachers’ classroom practices and students’ engagement with their work. Teachers in this study have also taken risks by thinking more about student diversity in the curriculum and their engagement with my research.

Participants were not at risk of physical or financial harm. All information has been kept confidential and participants were provided with a consent form (see Appendices). Any additional identifying information was also kept confidential when communicating with participants, staff, and administrators, and I employ pseudonyms for all individuals in my data and this dissertation. I have disguised the location of the school by the use of “A public secondary school in the Northeast” as a broader geographical designation, with the pseudonym “Bridgefield,” and by disguising identifiable historical details and historical figures in Chapter 3.

Consent

Participants were informed of confidentiality, the purpose of this study, that their participation was voluntary, that the interviews were recorded, that I documented observations through written notes, and that the data will be stored indefinitely. Each participant was provided with and signed an informed consent form. All participants are adults and therefore over 18 years of age. The IRB consent form is included in the Appendices.

---

43 In addition to unforeseen potential risks that can and may arise when working with human subjects.
Limitations

This study proposes qualitative methods with a limited number of individuals at one site and cannot make external claims to generalizability. Conclusions that could be inferred are therefore “embedded in the contextual richness of individual experience” (Ayres et al., 2003, p. 871). Two ways this potential loss of contextualization from the coding process can be addressed in the study’s design involve making case-specific interpretive choices within and across-case analysis and intuiting which can be defined as “the critical reflection on and identification of themes as they are found in the accounts of multiple respondents” (Ayres et al., p. 875). Specific to interviews with teacher participants, this form of inquiry can also involve “a sensitivity to unspoken or indirect statement, which is central to interpretation” (Poirier & Ayres, 1993). As an example, one participant cried during an interview, demonstrating emotional engagement with the story she told. However, it is not clear how far overreading can be taken in terms of making conclusions and inferences. For ethnographic conclusions and inferences, Fine and Hancock (2017) point to challenges in “mediating among organizational structures, public problems, and social theories,” in which one may pose limitations to the other(s) (p. 262). Suggested future directions for this research beyond this dissertation include (1) extending the discussion to other institutions/varied social settings and (2) including students and, when possible, their families as active participants.
CHAPTER V: CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AND CODING FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the results of coding and critical discourse analysis (CDA) of interview data and findings from course syllabi and student work collected from my full participants. I begin with a description of interview data and a presentation of the themes that emerged during the three-step coding process. Next, I describe my engagement with CDA and discuss its contribution to the construction of my hypotheses that articulate what my participants were trying to do, say, and build in the language they use. To clearly depict this process, I offer one to two excerpts from each participant’s transcribed interviews. Following these analyses, I present my findings from student work and course syllabi, considering how they offer methodological support to and otherwise nuance my inferential claims across data sources. The connection of these findings to my inferences and guiding questions is presented in Chapter 7, and the relationship of these findings to available empirical literature is articulated in Chapter 8. Practical considerations for world language pedagogy and implications for future research will be discussed in Chapter 9.

Presentation: Semi-Structured Interviews

Teachers’ Interview Transcripts

Teachers’ audio-recorded interviews were transcribed to Microsoft Word documents by Rev.com. The majority of interviews were conducted in-person, and I conducted one interview via Zoom. During interviews, I used my semi-structured interview guide (see Appendix B). The length of participant responses varied from 32 to 58 minutes, with a mean interview duration of 43 minutes. The average length of each transcribed Microsoft Word document was 30 pages.

---

44 My request for a modification to an online format was approved by UNH’s Institutional Review Board in March 2020.
although there was considerable variation around this average. I note that John’s interview, via Zoom, was shorter in duration than the other three participants. My interview with John was the only time I spoke with him during this study, although I interacted with him via email multiple times during data collection.

**Coding Results from Interviews**

The transcribed semi-structured interviews were thrice coded, and the codes emerged from my coding process were not pre-existing. The first round of coding was in vivo coding, treating each document as a primary source text, investigating word frequencies and then conducting a line-by-line analysis. In the second round of focused coding, I grouped portions of texts into conceptual categories. After the first and second rounds of coding, I identified 25 codes across sources. In order to further consolidate these codes thematically and to facilitate a more meaningful analysis, I extended the coding process to a third round of axial coding to create “meta categories” (Saldaña, 2016). The final round of coding resulted in three themes and one sub-theme. Table 5.1 and Figure 5.1 below present the findings of my interview coding process. Following these displays of data, I describe each theme from the highest to lowest frequencies in my data with examples.

---

I note that John teaches only one Spanish course at Bridgefield High and three additional classes at the public middle school nearby. John taught full-time at Bridgefield in prior years.
Table 5.1. *Themes resulting from semi-structured interviews after three rounds of coding*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Julie</th>
<th>Robert</th>
<th>Lisa</th>
<th>John</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ adaptations to school-level change</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student multilingual identities</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraints to student race, ethnicity, gender, &amp; sexual identities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-theme: Teachers’ knowledge of diversity in Bridgefield community (historical/present)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.1 *Interview themes by participant (n=4)*

*Teachers’ structural adaptations to school-level change*

This theme refers to teachers’ descriptions of alterations made in response to structural and emergent school-level change. Examples of these adaptations include changes in
pedagogical practices due to change in student populations, the school’s new schedule(s), and policy-related changes, such as the removal of extra credit. In reflection on my semi-structured interview guide, I recognize that the question, “What is a typical day like at this school?” was unexpectedly loaded during the first year of block scheduling at this institution. As a result, the responses from each of the four participants were further in depth than I could have anticipated at the conceptual planning stages. Interestingly, this theme is consistent across observational data sources; Chapter 6 presents more detailed information about this finding in classroom pedagogical contexts.

*Teachers’ integration of student multilingual identities*

This theme is defined as instances in which teachers describe their incorporation of student multilingual identities\(^46\) in their pedagogies. Student multilingual identities involve world language methods and practices that are designed to integrate students’ linguistic skills in multiple languages, including areas where teachers create space for students to explore a topic or topics based upon their multilingual identities. This theme is thus based upon teachers’ integration of students’ multilingualism, birth origins, and nationalities in their curricula, and on occasion, teachers’ language incorporates difference in linguistic abilities in the instruction of world languages.

Specific examples of episodes where teachers include student identities involve student cultural projects whose topics are students’ families and ancestral countries, the sharing of personal or family items with the class, such as bringing in Guatemalan traditional clothing, the exploration of films such as *El Norte* (Nava, 1984) in the Spanish for Native Speakers class,

\(^{46}\) Again, I define multilingualism broadly as “more than one.” For more information about my approach to multilingualism in this study, see Chapter 1.
pairing students together for projects based upon their native countries of origin, personal narrative writing in Spanish classes about their countries and lives, and vocabulary exploration specific to the location of student’s birth origin, such as Puerto Rico. As additional examples, I note that teachers also articulated an awareness of students’ differing abilities in Spanish and English, such with differences across spoken, auditory, and written forms of communication within and between languages.

*Teachers’ constraints to student race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities in instructional practices*

This theme is defined by teachers’ articulations of constraints to the incorporation of student race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities in world language pedagogies. To be clear, teachers’ definitions of race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities were not solicited from participants in advance. Rather, their interpretations of each construct were inferred from the data. It is important to note that when directly asked in multiple ways how they incorporate race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities into their curricula, teachers articulated far more constraints (*n* = 35) to the inclusion of these characteristics than they did tangible forms of these characteristics in their practices (*n* = 22). Put differently, teachers reported over 35% more *constraints*, defined as limitations or restrictions on something (Constraint, n.d.), to including these factors than they did examples of incorporating race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities in their curriculum. This finding is consistent with my observations of classroom practices where there was little evidence in available data of these characteristics in classroom practices.

During interviews, it struck me how forthright my participants were in their articulations of these constraints on including student gender, racial, and ethnic diversities. For example,
participants offered responses such as: “I don’t really understand all of that;” “I also don’t really know how world languages is dealing with gender identity;” “It is uncomfortable to talk about for many reasons;” “It’s extremely easy to misconstrue what you are saying;” “And it’s just something that I don’t really want to bring up really;” “I don’t feel that it’s 100% my place to dive deep into things;” “That’s a tough question;” and “No, I haven’t encountered anything like that at all.”

Sub-theme: Teachers’ knowledge of different forms of diversity in Bridgefield community (historical/present)

This theme is defined as teachers’ direct references to various community events and organizations that celebrate the transnational history of the community in which they work.47 I designate this theme as a sub-theme due to its relatively fewer examples when compared to other themes and due to its overall limited integration within teachers’ pedagogies. As teachers described their knowledge of the Bridgefield community, they articulated little incorporation of the community’s history and limited engagement with the community in their pedagogies. Thus, this theme offers evidence of teachers’ awareness of linguistic and cultural diversity in the community, which I accentuate in juxtaposition with teachers’ limited integration of communities in their curricula. Teachers’ examples of their knowledge of the community include socioeconomic differences between Bridgefield High School’s community and neighboring towns, the various historical and present linguistic influences on the population in the community, references to specific racial and ethnic community organizations in which faculty have participated, local events and parades celebrating the racial and indigenous diversity of the community, and sporting events that include students with disabilities.

47 Some participants also reside in the Bridgefield community.
Critical Discourse Analysis

Generally, CDA can be used to raise awareness about how subjectivities are shaped, influenced, and constrained by institutional social structures in their demonstration of how and the extent to which texts construct or position the participants and readers. These social structures then determine the roles that one acts out in social contexts, the constructed identities we perform in interpersonal relationships, and the representation of the world through interactions with others.

Following Fairclough (2010), CDA has three essential properties: “it is relational, it is dialectical, and it is transdisciplinary” (p. 3). Recognizing that social relations are highly complex, CDA is relational in that it does not focus entirely on individuals but also on the relations themselves; it is dialectical in the analyses of relations between objects that differ; and it is transdisciplinary as it entails “dialogues between disciplines, theories, and frameworks” (Fairclough, 2010, p. 4).

Regarding the “C,” or how this analysis is critical, I ground this analysis of discourse in the critique of “what exists, what might exist, and what should exist based on a coherent set of values” (Fairclough, 2010, p. 7). Recognizing that there are discordant elements across societies and no generally accepted coherence to claims that posit democracy, fairness, justice, and freedom, among other values, my critique thus offers a limited analysis of how world language pedagogies appear to be equitable and just, how teachers’ pedagogies may or may not be oriented towards its students and communities, and my reflections on how they should offer equitable opportunities and address social wrongs in discursive aspects, including the consideration of “possible ways of righting or mitigating them” (Fairclough, 2010, p. 11).
Thus, the purpose my engagement with CDA is not to make general commentary on discourse but to engage with a systematic analysis of texts to identify discourses that emerge, the relation between dialogues, and the operationalization of discourse. These analyses intend to identify how world language teachers incorporate student diversity and are inclusive in their pedagogies, how there are systemic constraints on teachers’ engagement with students’ diversity and inclusivity, and the identification of possible changes that can be made to overcome these limits.

**CDA Analytic Framework and Methodology**

Throughout these analyses, it is not my aim to criticize teachers’ pedagogies. Specifically, I investigate teachers’ discourses in contexts where they have been asked to offer examples of how their pedagogies are inclusive of a range of factors in students’ identities and how they draw upon student and community diversities in their practices. My use of CDA also aims to include, when possible, instances where teachers were both intellectually and emotionally engaged in the recognition of barriers that students encounter in their academic pursuits. I consider how the use of language is constructed within social practices that “have implications for inherently political things, like status, solidarity, the distribution of social goods, and power” (Gee, 2014a, p. 87).

Epistemologically, CDA recognizes that individual agency and social factors contribute to the production of language. Thus, my methodological analysis of excerpts from teachers’ interviews begins with a social issue as it is presented in a linguistic or other semiotic component. The primary analysis proceeds with the analysis of the text and the sociocultural contexts surrounding the event from which the text is extracted, including documenting the discourse and other aspects of social practices. As I analyze samples of discourse, this process
includes the identification of where there are gaps, ambiguity, or contradiction that open possibilities for “change in the social process” (Fairclough, 2010, p. 366).

To connect Gee’s (2014a) approach to CDA with Fairclough (2010), Gee (2014a) describes “Big D” and “little d” D/discourse (p. 24). Regarding “little d” discourse, he refers to the use of language in social contexts and how it is structured to convey a particular meaning or meanings. On the other hand, “Big D Discourse” distinguishes social identities and the goals of articulated language within specific social contexts, which then align with a particular set of values. Linking “Big D Discourse” to Fairclough (2010), an articulated alignment with a set of values then opens space to identify that which exists, what may exist, and where there is room to address social change.

My engagement with CDA began with the formatting of my interview responses. I examined and analyzed each participant’s transcript individually to review my codes and resulting themes from the coding process. I then searched for areas that related to my primary research questions, rereading interview transcripts for language specific to each. Foci in the application and refinement of codes became areas where teachers discuss their integration of student diversity in experiences, abilities, and identities, how their pedagogies are inclusive, and considerations that relate to my theoretical analyses.

Next, I extracted excerpts from each transcript that related to my guiding questions and themes, implementing Gee’s (2014a; 2014b) theoretical and building tools to ask questions in the data and build my analyses. Although Gee (2014a; 2014b) describes the use of 28 tools to guide CDA, I found that not all 28 tools were relevant to each transcript. Specifically, these tools guided my exploration of how meaning is constructed, social language is used, and identities can be socially positioned. I looked for evidence indicating that ideological assumptions are made,
how “difference” is or is not treated, and in which ways students’ voices are elevated, suppressed, and/or ignored, including how social events are described and values are represented. To clearly depict this process, I have included my full analytic engagement with Excerpt 4 (pp. 20-21) in Appendix F.

Additionally, I draw analytic and interpretive support from communication accommodation theory (CAT; Coupland & Giles, 1988; Giles et al., 1991) to substantiate my empirical findings and analyses of communicative strategies in different contexts. Briefly, CAT can be defined as an analytic theory to explore how “linguistic choices are not made in isolation but relationally, as for example vis à vis interlocuters own choices” (Coupland & Giles, 1988, p. 175). Interlocuters, or communicators, often adjust their communication style and content, dependent upon their communicative and social goals within a particular context (Gasiorek & Giles, 2015). CAT provides a framework for exploring the phenomena of adjustment, or accommodation, and non-adjustment, or non-accommodation in social interactions, including their motivations and social consequences (Giles et al., 1991).

Essentially, this theory assumes the premise that communication moderates interpersonal and intergroup communication (Galois & Giles, 1998). It hypothesizes that participants adjust, or accommodate, their communication based upon two underlying principles. First, speakers adjust communication to maintain a particular personal and social identities, and second, they accommodate according to “their perception of their interlocutors’ communicative characteristics (e.g., language proficiency, social group membership, level of content-related knowledge)” (Gasiorek & Giles, 2015, p. 457). Following this hypothesis, accommodation can be motivated by the desire to gain social approval and affiliate, whereas non-accommodation is often grounded in a desire to heighten social distance between communicators (Gasiorek & Giles, 2015).
According to the theory, is most common for participants to accommodate the structure of a communicator’s speech in interpersonal and intergroup interactions. When speakers do not accommodate, it often stems from a desire to “disaffiliate with a speaker, increase social distance, and/or hinder comprehension” (Gasiorek & Giles, 2015, p. 457). In instances where communication is perceived as not adequately adjusted for conversational recipients, non-accommodation is often perceived as dissatisfying or troublesome by participants (Gasiorek, 2013).

Across divergent applications of CAT, there have been varied empirical and conceptual interpretations of accommodation and the phenomena to which it refers. Within these analyses, I note that my use of the theory represents one of many possible linguistic interpretations of accommodation and non-accommodation in support of my methodological analyses. As I tease out structural accommodation and non-accommodation across my participants’ linguistic styles, I accentuate how specific instances of participant non-accommodation appear to intensify their social distancing from topics of race, gender, ethnicity, and sexual identities and support my methodological use of Gee’s (2014a, 2014b) tools.

In this chapter, I present selected excerpts accompanied with a discussion of each in my textual analyses below. As I began my exploration of each excerpt, I first formed a hypothesis for each text based upon what each speaker was doing, saying, and building in each narrative. In my presentation of excerpts below, every line introduces a new piece of information or idea, what Gee (2014a) refers to as an “idea unit” (p. 154), after which there was often a pause or break in rhythm. While I have numbered each sentence separately, I note that each line or new information is also accompanied with letters (i.e., 2a, 2b, and so forth). Unlike written texts, it is
not always clear in these excerpts where a sentence ends, and in these cases, I have measured approximately one sentence.

In each of these sentences, I have capitalized the subjects/topics that were spoken with emphatic stress in each line, often indicating the most prominent topics in a line of communication. I refer to each grouping of lines in my narrative as a stanza; a double-space represents a shift in topic, represented by a new stanza. When included, the initial “I” in a transcript stands for interviewer. In addition, each of the five excerpts presented below connect with the three primary interview themes that resulted from the coding process: Excerpts 1 (Julie), 2 (Robert), and 3 (Lisa) involve teachers’ experiences with multilingual student identities; Excerpt 4 (Lisa) draws upon inclusivity of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual identities; and Excerpt 5 (John) involves teachers’ adaptations to school-level change. Following each excerpt, I present a discussion of my engagement with CDA.

**Excerpt 1 – The Throw Away Kid**

Excerpt 1 focuses on a memorable experience Julie had with one of her multilingual students.

**Interviewer:** *Do you have a particularly memorable experience with a multilingual student or students in your classes that comes to mind?*

**Julie:**

1. Yeah, there are SO MANY of them.
2. One comes to mind, he graduated last year, was kind of THE THROW AWAY KID,
   2a. family from Mexico,
   2b. he was goofy, acting out, whatever else,
   2c. but I always got along fine with him.
3. He was a COMPLETE BACKSIDE to a lot of teachers just
   3a. because he was very energetic and goofed off a lot.
4. I would go in his face, tell him in Spanish YOU NEED TO DO THIS,
   4a. perfectly bilingual, there was not a linguistic issue or any of that sort,
   4b. but he just didn’t behave sometimes.
5. But I NEVER HAD ANY PROBLEM with him at all
5a. and he would talk to me.

6. I finally PULLED HIM ASIDE and said,
6a. “Look, you’re not even behaving for ME, you’re being an idiot, what’s going on?”

7. He came to see me,
7a. sat in that chair,
7b. CRIED HIS EYES OUT.
8. HIS MOTHER had been pulled over,
8a. ran a stop sign,
8b. undocumented,
8c. she was detained. [J: cries]

9. So they said SHE’D HOLD ON for a period of a couple of weeks
9a. and then trying to figure out how to get her out,
9b. was she going to be deported,
9c. where is he going to end up.
9d. He wasn’t sure where he was going to be the rest of the year.
10. HE DIDN’T KNOW if he would be in Mexico, he just didn’t know.

11. HE DOESN’T HAVE A DAD.
12. He visited family in Mexico
12a. but DOESN’T HAVE ANY CONNECTION to them,
12b. The typical thing you see on TV.

13. So we talked a little bit about these are SOME THINGS HE COULD DO
13a. and keep me posted and all that,
13b. and right then there was this INSTANT CONNECTION.

To begin, I analyzed this excerpt theoretically, using the Big D Discourse (#27) and the Big C Conversation (#28) tools. The Discourse tool is used to identify “socially recognizable identities” (Gee, 2014b, p. 183) and the Conversation tool asks what issues, debates, and claims the communication assumes readers know, including their relation to historical and social issues (Gee, 2014b). The use of these tools suggests that Julie was taking on the identity of a professional who has the knowledge and skills to support multilingual students who experience social uncertainties. Working with this initial hypothesis, I drew upon Gee’s remaining relevant
tools to ask questions of the data. In this process, Julie’s identity as a professional was verified, and I was able to offer more nuanced descriptions.

In line 2, Julie’s describes this student as a “throw away kid.” To explore the use of this term, I draw upon the Social Languages Tool (#24) to ask how these words “can signal and enact a social language” (Gee, 2014b, p. 167). This particular language, in terms of word choice, is in Julie’s vernacular English. Reflecting upon how Julie speaks five languages and how the way in which she uses these words is distinctive, I found myself asking, “What does it mean to be a throw away kid?” As a verb “to throw away,” it would mean, “to get rid of” or possibly “discard.” In this sense, the function of this language seems to be the teacher’s articulation of this student as one that others would overlook, not give a second thought to, just as one would “throw away” or discard items that are no longer needed, including those that are no longer of use. Reflecting on how I would characterize the identity Julie is enacting through this social language, this language affirms the characterization of her identity as professional who has the skills to assist multilingual students yet functions to imply that she is willing to adapt these skills for situations that others may be inclined to “throw away.”

In lines 2b-5a, Julie also describes her student as “a complete backside,” his behavior as “goofy,” and “acting out,” she also uses the words “energetic” and “just didn’t behave sometimes.” She then identifies a tension between the student’s “acting out” and being a “backside” to other teachers, whereas in her words, she “always got along fine with him” and “never had a problem with him.” She recognizes his linguistic skills as “perfectly bilingual.” In these lines, Julie is building an identity for herself (#16 The Identities Building Tool) as tolerant of student behavior such as “acting out,” positions herself as she builds her identity as a professional who is not dissuaded by a student acting “goofy” as separate from teachers for
whom this student was a “backside,” and an educator who recognizes linguistic skill and establishes and “instant connection” (line 13b) with the student.

Turning attention to the significance of this communication (#14 Significance Building Tool), I focus on an area where Julie’s enactment of her professional identity in this excerpt appears to build significance in lines 6-6a. With the exception of lines 9a and 9c in the discourse that follows, each of the lines from 6-10 are main clauses. In fact, Julie uses very few dependent clauses throughout this entire dialogue (i.e., fewer instances of discourse in the background). Grammatically, her limited use of subordinate clauses foregrounds and asserts the significance of the suite of events that occur and those that her student shares with her. Although assertion alone in a main clause does not make it significant, it offers the main action(s) the listener or reader is engaged in and the focus of the dialogue, which is an aspect of significance. There are other items, such as the preceding use of adverbs never (line 5) and finally (line 6), that heightens the significance of her engagement with this student. Put differently, there is very little dialogue in this story that Julie downplays; each aspect of this discourse is offered as a significant activity.

To extend the Identities Building Tool (#16) referenced above, Julie’s language in this excerpt also describes how she establishes a relationship with this student (#17 The Relationship Building Tool). Through her engagement with his “acting out” and her communication with him in his native Spanish, she experiences a pivotal moment, during which she also demonstrates how she has a different relationship with this student, one that is more akin to the relationship, and identity, of a friend. This is illustrated in lines 6-10, where she “pulls him aside” (line 6) and the suite of detailed, personal information the student shares with her. This analysis extends her professional identity, as we often think of teachers as helping students with areas that fall into a range of teachers’ professional skills, and here, Julie’s professional identity seems to fall more
into a “helping profession,” a role in which she diligently engages. Although her student did not directly say that he needed help, she builds upon her relationship with him through the risk of pulling him aside.

In line 9a, the Fill in Tool (#2) assumes knowledge that has to be filled in to achieve clarity in this context of “get her out,” meaning that the mother in this story is in prison after being detained after being pulled over and discovered as “undocumented.” In lines 9-12a, each new line introduces new information, and it is important to note that not only is the student emotionally engaged in this story, but Julie is also intellectually and emotionally engaged in this story. She cries and simultaneously whispers as she tells this story. Thus, the way that she speaks, quietly and with emotion, helps shape the way the listener views the context as one that conveys information very directly. She builds language that is quite different than language one might assume to sound “school-like” from a teacher. Conversely, this is communication that reveals social contexts in this student’s life and the relationship she has with this student.

In the same two stanzas (lines 9-12b), Julie constructs what counts as social goods (#18 The Politics Building Tool). One may view how the teacher positions herself to the student, and to the interviewer, when she switches to “the typical thing you see on TV” (line 12b). You in this sentence does not mean “interviewer” or “reader” per se, but it seems to implicate a broader TV viewership and the type of tragedy one might “typically” view as fictional or fabricated in a story. This represents one way that she construes reality through language that depicts the conflicting needs, inequities, and disadvantages of her student in this story. For example, the student was burdened with wondering if he would be “deported” (line 9b), “where he was going to be” lines 9c-10), “he doesn’t have a dad” (line 11), and “doesn’t have a connection” (line 12)
with his family in Mexico. These lines build significance in the contexts of challenges in this student’s life.

Extending this analysis, Julie’s enactment of an identity as a “helpful professional” through her interactions with multilingual, immigrant students supports my findings across other forms of collected data. Linguistically, Julie accommodates the linguistic structure of the interviewer’s communication through the reproduction of pronouns and structure. In her accommodation of the linguistic structure of my speech, Julie minimizes the social distance between us and from my recipient’s perception, makes appropriate adjustments to facilitate comprehension (Gasiorek & Giles, 2015). In addition, Julie seems to recognize this student’s challenges yet is not dissuaded by the behavioral and interpersonal ways in which they manifest in her students’ daily lives. Importantly, this excerpt reveals how teachers enact nuanced roles in support of multilingual, immigrant students who experience inequities and disadvantages and who are, metaphorically, on a playing field that is never level.

Excerpt 2 – Can You Write in Bosnian?

Excerpt 2 presents a striking story from Robert about how he and his multilingual students interact with staff at the school.

Interviewer: Do you have one particular student or a couple of students that come to mind who were multilingual?

Robert:
1. Actually, a story from our CLEANING PEOPLE
   1a. who only spoke Bosnian.

2. And so we would write notes on the board,
   2a. and because THEY DIDN’T SPEAK ENGLISH
   2b. or COULDN’T READ ENGLISH very well,
   2c. they had no idea what the notes said.
3. So we'd be like, “PLEASE DON’T CLEAN THIS,”
   3a. and it would get cleaned. [I: the board]
4. And so ONE OF MY STUDENTS,
4a. this happened in my Spanish class,
4b. I'm like, "You speak Bosnian at home, right?
4c. Can you write in Bosnian?"
5. And SHE WROTE IN BOSNIAN,
5a. “Please don't erase it.”
6. We tried to write it in as many languages as we could,
6a. and THE CLEANING PEOPLE CORRECTED HER BOSNIAN. [I: I like that.]
7. And I think THE CORRECTION was just more like,
7a. "You didn’t have to use the polite command,"
7b. or something.
8. It was an indirect command
8a. or something like that,
8b. but THEY ACTUALLY CORRECTED IT.

To begin the analysis of this excerpt, I used the big D Discourse tool (Gee, 2014b) to ask how language in this context describes Robert’s interactions with students and the use of messages on the board, questioning how he enacts a socially recognizable identity and engages in socially recognizable activities. In other words, I asked what Discourse this language is a part of, and what identity Robert is seeking to enact. This analysis led me to hypothesize that Robert is enacting the professional identity of being a teacher, drawn from his interactions with students, his use of writing on a board, asking students to write on a board (i.e., the manipulation of tools), and his interest in communicating a message about what is written on the board.

Next, I proceeded to analyze these data with the use of Gee’s (2014a; 2014b) additional tools to refine my hypothesis. In line 1, I draw upon the use of the Figured Worlds tool (#26) with reference to the “cleaning people.” In this line, Robert assumes that I have knowledge of the “cleaning people,” and this reference is taken to be typical or normal according to this social
context. The Figured Worlds tool will be useful again later in this analysis, and I return to it again in the final paragraph of this excerpt.

I note that within this entire excerpt (#4 Subject Tool), Robert uses “I” infrequently, just twice; he uses a socially constructed “we” four times to indicate he and the students together. In the use of “we,” he positions himself and his students as active users of tools and users who are autonomously capable of writing in many languages. Further, the use of language in this social context also positions the Bosnian staff as users of tools and capable of writing in Bosnian. In the sense that the “cleaning people” are manipulating tools, communicating with students in Bosnian, students are communicating with the staff in Bosnian, and the staff corrects the student’s written Bosnian. Thus, this analysis also positions “the cleaning people” as “teachers” who enact socially recognizable identities and engage with socially recognizable activities.

However, “the cleaning people” are not referenced as “teachers” in this context, despite the fact that they are engaging in socially recognizable activities. In the first line, Robert uses the term “the cleaning people,” although these “people” are not named and grouped together as a whole. With the support of tools (#21) Signs and Systems Knowledge and the closely related tool (#18) The Politics Building Tool, I ask how this text describing how the Bosnian staff “didn’t speak English” and “could not read English” is being used to privilege/de-privilege English vs. Bosnian. This text communicates a message that knowledge of English in spoken and written language, here as forms of social goods, is a distinctive way to know the world. Here, these utterances appear to privilege English over Bosnian, including the support of the word “only” in line 1a.

Looking at how the words and grammatical devices construct what counts as a social good, I focus on “didn’t speak” and “couldn’t read” specifically in these contexts, and how the
grammatical function of this language is being used to build a viewpoint about these social goods. First, the past tense of “to speak” is used in “didn’t speak,” and “could read” is in a conditional tense, both are coupled with the repetitive negation “not.” In this language and the repetition of “not,” Robert is communicating that the social goods that the Bosnian “cleaning people” lack is the ability to communicate in English. Not only “did” they lack the skills, but they also “couldn’t,” extended to “could not,” indicating that the condition of “being able to” read in English is not possible. Thus, the social goods of speaking and writing English are not available to the “cleaning people.”

Moving to the message students wrote to students, they wrote in “as many languages” as they could, including Bosnian. Here one can observe a portion of the range in linguistic diversity among students at Bridgefield High School. Although “many” is not numbered, it is indicative of more than two. In line 6-6a, the “ah-ha” moment of the story occurs: “The cleaning people corrected her Bosnian.” In line 8, Robert added emphasis to “actually” corrected it. “Actually” functions grammatically as an adverb in this sentence and relates again to the Figured Worlds Tool (#26). The use of this tool presented above presents a picture of a simplified world that captures the Bosnian “cleaning people” as typical or normal. What is typical in this simplified world is their manipulation of tools to erase and clean the board.

According to Gee (2014b), there is an aspect of this world that is often taken for granted; the nature of the figured world “often stands in the way of change” (p. 176). In this example, it is not normal for the cleaning people to teach the instructor and students something; this violates the “typical” story or figured world. In this sense, the figured world of the relationship between teachers and students versus “the cleaning people” has been destabilized. “The cleaning people” are teaching, and the students and teachers are learning from them. Through the experience and
articulation of this story, the figured world and conflict therein rises to consciousness. This differs, however, from a typical figured world that is often either unconscious or taken for granted. Thus, I consider this excerpt to be exemplary of how overt manipulation of tools using multilingual communication can create a fissure in one’s figured world.

**Excerpt 3 – His Responsibilities Outside the Classroom are Really, Really Huge**

In Excerpt 3, Lisa describes her experiences with a multilingual student who has a high level of responsibility, including caring for his one-year old sibling through the night while his dad works.

**Interviewer:** Do you have an example of a specific student that was multilingual who particularly had a lot of success or maybe struggled?

**Lisa:**

1. I find a lot of our students,
   1a. a lot of our MULTILINGUAL STUDENTS,
   1b. come from more of a poverty level.
2. It’s JUST THE NATURE.

3. A LOT OF THEM have been settling,
   3a. and a lot of them have just settled in
   3b. and then just have COMMITMENTS
   3c. that they have to do
   3d. to get their family TO SURVIVE.

4. So I think SCHOOL CAN’T GO TO THE TOP of the priority list.
5. They have OTHER THINGS they have to put first.
6. And I find that tends to be more
   6a. with DUAL LANGUAGE
   6b. or DIFFERENT BACKGROUNDS.

7. I have one student this year,
   7a. and HIS RESPONSIBILITIES OUTSIDE THE CLASSROOM
   7b. are really, really huge
8. And that’s just HIS FAMILY,
   8a. that’s their culture.

9. He has a ONE-YEAR OLD SIBLING.
   9a. He’s a SOPHOMORE.
10. When he gets home,
10a. HIS DAD goes to his job.
11. He’s in charge of the ONE-YEAR OLD
11a. through some time in the middle of the night
12b. where dad comes home again.

This story offers insight into how Lisa describes her knowledge of a student who bears tremendous familial responsibilities for his one-year old sibling. I offer that this story builds upon Excerpt 1, offering support to underlying, influential student-level factors that are often positioned as impediments or barriers to academic pursuits and simultaneously recognizing teachers’ experiences with and understandings of students’ “really, really huge” commitments outside of school. In addition, this excerpt builds upon Excerpt 2 in that they both describe inequities that immigrant students experience in social and educational contexts and how unequal power dynamics can disproportionately affect students in schools.

Theoretically, my analysis of this excerpt asked how Lisa is enacting a social identity and what issues and debates she assumes listeners have knowledge of to understand the communication in wider social contexts (#27 Discourse, #28 Conversation). I found that Lisa enacts the identity of a teacher who attributes inequities and responsibilities that impact students of lower socioeconomic status to societal factors. Additionally, Lisa implies her awareness of the instrumental role(s) that her students sustain in their families.

In the first stanza, Lisa makes a claim that “it’s just the nature” of multilingual students to “come from more of a poverty level.” In this shift, “it’s” is employed as a subject, suggests that “the nature” of this situation is accepted to be true. With a momentary hesitation on the word “just” that functions as an adverb in this sentence, “just” means “exactly,” which by definition implies “totally.” Here, she creates a connection between the intersection of student multilingualism and low socioeconomic status (#26 Figured World Tool), asking the listener to
accept “the nature” as reality (#19 The Connections Building Tool). However, I note that “nature” in this context is not clearly stated and am critical of Lisa’s figurative link, as it presents a world that assumes or perhaps normalizes a link between multilingualism and poverty. For example, “the nature” can be taken as a collective phenomenon of the natural world or to mean the fundamental features inherent to students with the unique combination of multilingualism and poverty (#3 The Making Strange Tool).

Assuming the latter, with the support of the word “just” referenced above, Lisa uses discourse that seeks to recognize multiple, compounding external factors that influence her students’ academic pursuits. In lines 3b-3d, she makes the claim that her students have “commitments that they have to do to get their family to survive.” She supports this claim and builds significance with the evidence that her sophomore student cares for his one-year-old sibling through the night while his single father is working. In lines 1-5, she uses “they” and “them” to refer to multilingual students from a “poverty level,” making assumptions about the knowledge and experiences of the listener to situate the meanings of these words (#23 Situated Meaning Tool). The meaning of these words, taken to conflate multilingual students of lower socioeconomic status as a whole, however, are specific to Lisa’s worldview. This conflation of student characteristics has led her to make these assumptions based upon her professional experiences in the United States.

Moreover, Lisa’s linguistic shifts to “a lot of students” and “they” in lines 1-6 depict how she consistently does not accommodate the interviewer’s linguistic structure. In the linguistic adjustment to “they” (i.e., students), Lisa shifts from the interviewer’s question that asks about her experiences with individual students to the struggles that students have in their family, social, and academic lives. Lisa also adopts a linguistic frame that homogenizes multilingual students
and attempts to revise the intersubjective meaning between interlocuters. This structural shift
distinguishes social attributes to individuals, i.e., multilingual students who “come from more of
a poverty level” (line 1b). As a recipient, this instance of non-accommodation appears to
distinguish social consequences to individuals in an applied setting and establishes a tension
between individual perspectives and the extent to which they may apply to intergroup dynamics
in this educational context (Gasiorek & Giles, 2012).

In lines 7-7b, she shares evidence that supports her claim, adding emphasis with the
repetition of the word “really.” In line 8, she references the student’s family, although prior to
and after this reference, she does not build upon this communication. Grammatically, in her use
of the main clauses “his responsibilities outside of school are really, really huge (7a-7b);” “He’s
in charge of the one-year old” (9a); and “He’s a sophomore” (line 11), she builds the significance
of the student’s responsibilities, foregrounding this information. Different from Julie in excerpt
1, Lisa does not articulate whether she engages in a “helping” role, although her knowledge of
the student’s home responsibilities suggests a level of ease in this relationship that is similarly
akin to friendship.

Although I have chosen to illustrate this particular excerpt to build the significance of
inequities across the student population at Bridgefield, I note that the articulation of
socioeconomic factors and social uncertainties for students and their families became a
somewhat consistent narrative in my observations and pre- and post-observation conversations
with teachers. For instance, one of Robert’s students frequently cut his last period gym class to
commute to work to support his family. I chose to present this passage in its direct support of
how inequities arise, are sustained, and may persist. When viewed as intersectional, this passage
offers evidence of compounded factors in students’ identities that demonstrate inequities across world language pedagogies.

**Excerpt 4 – Definitely Don’t Talk About Their Sexual Identities**

Excerpt 4 is also from Lisa’s transcript; the full illustration of this excerpt’s CDA is included in the Appendices, see Appendix F. This excerpt responds to the second module of identity, incorporative of race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities.

Interviewer: *We'll move to module two: inclusive classrooms. A few topics that some students are interested in is discussing race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities. Do these topics come up in your classes?*

Lisa:

1. Sometimes some I AVOID.
2. I just don’t want to get into some of those things
   2a. and definitely don’t talk about their SEXUAL IDENTITIES.
3. If they want to be categorized by the “he” or the “she” pronoun or whatever,
   3a. I’LL DO WHATEVER THEY LIKE
   3b. but I don’t get too involved in that because I just…
4. One, I DON’T FEEL COMFORTABLE enough.
   4a. I DON’T REALLY UNDERSTAND what
   4b. some of what is going through some of their heads
   4c. and to be fair, I’M OLD. I’m 50.
5. It’s different, I think, with some of THE YOUNGER TEACHERS.
6. They are MORE EXPOSED.
7. I learned things from my own children
   7a. that they explained to me
   7b. because I JUST DON’T KNOW ALL OF THAT.
8. We had A WORKSHOP in the fall working with gender identity
   8a. and that was FANTASTIC
   8b. because it’s stuff you just really don’t know.
9. When you go “BI”
9a. and you go “TRANS”
9b. and you start doing ALL THE TERMS.
10. I DON’T KNOW all of that.

11. I don’t want to get into UNCOMFORTABLE TERRITORY in my classes,
11a. so I tend to avoid some of that.

12. We will talk about different culture, stuff like that,
12a. but THE SAFE TOPICS.

In response to my question asking how race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities come up in her classes, Lisa makes a claim and continues to provide specific examples that support her claim. She describes how she lacks knowledge about these topics and generally avoids them, and then provides evidence that she is “old” (line 4c), she “doesn’t want to get into uncomfortable territory” (line 11), and instead prefers the “safe topics” (line 12a). In this excerpt, Lisa also expresses her openness to being inclusive, yet reinforces her stance that she does not possess the knowledge to do so. In this process, she establishes the social identity of a teacher who distances herself from the topic of inclusivity of gender and sexual identities. She also implies that younger teachers are more likely to be inclusive of gender and sexual identities through their “exposure” (line 6).

Throughout this passage, Lisa describes a high level of unfamiliarity and discomfort with this topic. She also expresses ownership of her stance and uses “I” in almost every line of this transcript (#4 Subject Tool). She builds significance to her claim with evidence (i.e., “because” (lines 3b, 7b, 8b), “I don’t understand” (line 4), “I don’t feel comfortable” (line 4a), and the repeated use of “I don’t know” (lines 7b, 10). At the same time, she expresses openness to the topic in two instances (big D Discourse #27) with “I’ll do whatever they like” (line 3a) and her description of a gender identity workshop as “fantastic” (line 8a). This establishes that she values
teacher communication and interactions with students that are inclusive, and she welcomes thinking and learning about gender and sexual identities in professional settings.

In addition, Lisa’s discourse favors a figured world (#26) that expresses how her age somehow contributes to a lack of understanding (“I’m old,” line 4c), whereas youth is positioned as more likely to have knowledge of gender and sexual identities (“It’s different, I think, with the younger teachers,” line 5). She supports the claim that youth is privileged with this knowledge from her experiences with her own children (line 7-7a). Lisa supports her lack of knowledge and understanding of these topics (#20 The Cohesion Tool), with the use of words that articulate little content such as “some” (line 4b) and “stuff” (line 12), deictics with the words “that” (line 7b, 11a) and “things” (line 2), and her disconnect from ownership with the switch to the subject “It’s” (line 5, #4 Subject Tool). These examples appear throughout the passage and support Lisa’s inarticulation of the specific information beyond her references to “bi” and “trans” (lines 9-9a).

Drawing upon CAT, I note that at the beginning of this passage (e.g., “some I avoid”), Lisa begins with behavior that communicates an assertive response, defined as a proactive, direct expression of a participant’s feelings that asserts one’s competence and autonomy (Gasiorek, 2013). As Lisa continues, she communicates an inferred motive, in other words, the motive that I subjectively attribute to her as a recipient and perceive as purposeful (Gasiorek & Giles, 2012), that centers upon creating social distance from her instructional practices and topics of race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities.

As examples, Lisa demonstrates non-accommodative adjustments in the displacement of her linguistic frame with lexical shifts to others, such as “the younger teachers” and “my own children.” Each linguistic adjustment represents Lisa’s frequent non-accommodation of the
speech pattern from the interviewer’s guide. Rather than respond by positioning her knowledge and practices as central to the communication, Lisa moves away from the conversational recipient’s communication (Giles et al., 1991) and places an emphasis on the knowledge of others. In line 4c, Lisa adjusts her discourse to communicate a social identity in her linguistic shift to “I’m old.” In this particularly salient linguistic adjustment, Lisa appears to reveal a tension between the maintenance of her social identity and the negotiation of metaphorical boundaries in her practices. If one were to imagine a figurative line drawn in the sand, “I’m old” appears to not only maximize the social distance from gender, race, and ethnicity in her communication but also appears to implicate socio-structural relations between her social identity and the instructional choices she makes in her practices (Petronio et al., 1998).

Overall, this passage supports my observations of world language pedagogies that were relatively devoid of direct references to students’ gender and sexual identities. On the other hand, I did not observe Lisa’s classes, which is a clear limiting factor in this analysis. Although I did not observe her classes, I interacted with her daily during my data collection period, and I feel that her response to my question was truthful and demonstrates her willingness to articulate her inexperience with and lack of knowledge of differences in gender and sexual identities. However, Lisa is amenable to including students’ preferences and describes her limited experiences with learning about gender and sexual identities as “fantastic.” Thus, this communication may also suggest that Lisa acknowledges that there are differences across gender and sexual identities and that this knowledge simultaneously does not interfere with her attitude toward her students.
**Excerpt 5 - We’re Way Behind**

Excerpt 5 has been extracted from John’s interview. In response to my question that asked him what he found challenging about his classes, he described how the school-level switch to a block schedule format and transition to remote learning has impacted teachers’ classes.

*Interviewer*: What do you think is challenging about your classes?

*John*: [Sways from left to right as he answers]

1. Well, now we have BLOCK SCHEDULING.
2. It's like we’re MISSING ALMOST 55 MINUTES of instruction a week
2a. when you do that.

3. So WE’RE WAY BEHIND.
4. I mean WE’RE BEHIND.

4a. What we did in January,
4b. WE SHOULD HAVE BEEN DOING in November.

5. We are at least TWO MONTHS BEHIND.
6. And now with REMOTE LEARNING,
6a. let's see how far we can get.
7. We're not going to get to
7a. where we should have been covering,
7b. but EVERYBODY’S IN THE SAME BOAT, I guess.

With this excerpt, John uses language to enact a social identity of a teacher who distances himself from the block scheduling format. In line 1, John assumes my knowledge of “block scheduling” (#26 Figured Worlds Tool) and understanding of how a typical or normal block schedule week functions. This establishes an activity in John’s life that is organized externally and throughout which there are other people involved (“we”). I note that in this figured world, time is organized according to a particular schedule, and in line 2, he establishes that his academic instruction has been altered according to the organization implemented in this figured world. He states, “It’s like we’re missing almost 55 minutes of instruction a week.” This line initiates the establishment of a “we,” or collective group of teachers, who value staying on track
or perhaps not falling “behind” (lines 3-4, 5). Although figured worlds are generally oversimplified, this institutional setting features teachers who are “behind” due to block scheduling and remote learning (line 6). John also communicates how this is not how the curriculum has functioned prior to the implementation of this schedule.

One item that struck me was how his response to my question was not representative of his individual classes (#9 Why This Way and Not That Way Tool). He made different choices about words with grammar, responding with the collective, “we.” I note that throughout this excerpt, John refers to “we” most frequently (#4 Subject Tool) in this discourse to indicate “I” plus “we” of the other teachers, although my knowledge of who “we” is, is not overtly referenced and was filled in to achieve clarity (#2 The Fill Tool). Although John could use “I” in his response, he chooses to organize this information with the use of “we,” offering his response at a teacher/group level. In the use of “we,” this topic flows, or is “chained” (#22 Topic Flow/Topic Chaining) to the remainder of his response to create the overall topic of teachers who are “all in the same boat,” which refers to “block scheduling” in this social context, and that teachers, when taken as a collective unit, are “way behind” (line 3).

Linguistically, the shift to “we” can also be perceived as a non-accommodating linguistic structure of the interviewer’s question. Rather than draw upon particular instructional strategies in his classes, John establishes a social identity of “we,” with the inferred meaning teachers at Bridgefield collectively, and articulates what he perceives as shared challenges to teaching in this applied educational setting. In this shift, John communicates adjustments such as “we’re way behind” (line 3) and “everybody’s in the same boat” (line 7b), disaffiliating with the interlocuter’s speech and establishing a social intergroup identity with his colleagues (Gasiorek & Vincze, 2016).
To continue with line 7b, the metaphor “we’re all in the same boat” reinforces John’s use of “we” in that it compounds the togetherness in a different way. This phrase bolsters his use of “we” in that it fills what John has left unsaid in this social context with different language. In addition, if one were an outsider or unfamiliar with the idiomatic English expression (#3 The Making Strange Tool), the underlying meaning of this expression may appear strange or may be questioned, perhaps alluding to the risk passengers may share on a small vessel at sea.

Moreover, John shapes how the listener views the context as a tension between teacher conceptions of how their pedagogies should function and the structural operations of the school (#13 The Context is Reflexive Tool). This passage illustrates a constraint to John’s practices; he does not express ownership of this change. His discomfort with the impact this change has had on his curriculum is evident, although he refers to his situation as more of a bystander, or metaphorically as a passenger floating, or being hauled away, with his colleagues in unison across a block-scheduled sea. Thus, this excerpt illustrates constraints to his practices; constraints over which teachers appear to have no control.

**Presentation: Student Work and Course Syllabi**

Following the descriptions of course syllabi and student work, I present the results of three rounds of coding these texts accompanied with examples from each category. Given that my interview and observational data are robust and that there are relatively few items in the course syllabus and student work categories, these sources are drawn upon to support and nuance the other forms of collected data. After the discussion of each resulting theme in these data, I offer examples of the types of work students are asked to complete and explain how teachers describe course topics in their syllabi.
Further, these data sources were different in structure, genre, language, and content. For instance, the examples of student work include written worksheets, quizzes, vocabulary pages, and grammar review packets. The course syllabi presented a variety of structural and thematic information and were relatively short. Having stated these differences, I note that the purpose of including these two forms of data was to examine them for patterns of agreement and inconsistencies across my findings and inferences. Taken as a whole, these differences across sources did not appear to be an impediment to their impact on my findings.

**Descriptions of Course Syllabi**

Three course syllabi were collected from Julie and Robert. Each prospectus is from the spring 2020 semester. Teachers did not provide all of their syllabi during the data collection period, and thus, I note that my analysis is limited. The length of each document ranges from four pages of Spanish I and II syllabi in Robert’s classes to seven pages in Spanish for Native Speakers in Julie’s class. Robert’s Spanish I and II syllabi are written in outline form, in text only, and there are no images on these documents. There are sections on each devoted to “My schedule,” “Materials – What to bring,” “Other,” a brief list of topics covered in Spanish I that are subject to change, “Formative Assessments,” “Summative Assessments,” “Make-up Due to Absences Procedures,” “Course Competencies,” “Plagiarism, Cheating, & Academic Honesty Policy” for the school district, and “Teacher Responsibilities.” Spanish I and II differ only in the “brief list of topics” that are covered in each course.

In the section entitled, “Other,” there are 22 sentences with additional procedural and grading-related policies. Four of these phrases are boldface and underlined, one of the four is also capitalized, underlined, in boldface, and is punctuated with four exclamation marks:

“PLEASE NO CELL PHONES OR PORTABLE MUSIC DEVICES WITHOUT
PERMISSION!!!!” One phrase is only in boldface but not underlined, and two are capitalized, but not boldface: “STUDY EVERY NIGHT!” and “TRY AND ENJOY CLASS!”

Formative assessments are worth 10% of the quarter grade; students are offered eight examples such as note checks, vocab lists, worksheets, and quizzes to practice endings of verbs or verb forms. Summative assessments are 90% of students’ quarterly grades. They “demonstrate what students know and are able to do,” comprised of written, oral, and performance assessments, quizzes, projects, presentations, homework, and enrichment activities, described as “supplemental activities that support standards or competencies.” Homework is “designed as preparation for learning, translations, and readings,” after which is written in all capital letters and two exclamation marks: “NOT ALL HOMEWORK IS SUMMATIVE!!”

The Spanish for Native Speakers syllabus is divided into sections, with each section’s title in boldface followed by a colon. Sections are titled: “Course Description,” “Major Goals,” “Competencies,” “Placement test,” “Textbook,” “SEMESTER 1” and “SEMESTER 2”. Semesters 1 and 2 describe each book unit’s content in outline form. When Spanish accents are needed, they are written in black ink. During one of our post-observational conversations, Julie told me that she requested special permission to write this syllabus during a professional development day. That permission was granted by the principal.

The “Major Goals” section of this document contains five goal areas:

1) Language maintenance, defined as “establishing or re-establishing some connections to the language and the culture of the home.”

2) Transfer of literacy skills: “Students who are literate in their first language learn other languages more quickly and easily, thus promoting bilingualism and biliteracy as well as encouraging academic achievement.”
3) Cultural awareness: “Students compare their use of language with that of others to increase understanding of those cultures and make connections with other cultures in the Spanish speaking world. Introduce a diversity of cultural information based upon the students’ heritage.”

4) Respect students’ language varieties: “All parties accept and validate the diversity of students’ language varieties and do not denigrate those varieties or impose one Spanish as the ‘correct’ one. Very often students have acquired an informal language necessary for communicating with family and friends but have not yet developed the ‘standard’ or ‘prestige’ variety necessary for academic success.”

5) Prepare students for further language study: “Students who successfully complete this course should be prepared to continue their study of Spanish in either the third or fourth year Spanish as a foreign language course.”

The competencies section of the Spanish for Native Speakers’ course syllabus aligns the content of the course with national standards established by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL, 2016). The “placement test” section describes the use of the placement test as a determinant of “who is a heritage speaker and whether a student would be better served in a tradition(al) Spanish as a foreign language class or a Spanish for Native Speaker(s).” The textbook that Julie uses for the course is *El español para Nosotros, Nivel 1* (McGraw Hill, 2006). As Julie and one of her world language colleagues were organizing a closet before the academic term began, she found these materials in their original boxes. They had been ordered for the course over a decade ago, but Spanish for Native Speakers experienced a hiatus between 2008 and 2019.
Course Syllabi: Results of Coding

Table 5.2 below presents the results of coding across Robert’s Spanish II syllabus and Julie’s Spanish for Native Speakers syllabus. With the course syllabi, I engaged in a line-by-line analysis of teachers’ content. Each document was coded three times. Following Table 5.2, descriptions of each code are offered. I note that the differences between the two syllabi are in part revelatory of teachers’ different styles. To illustrate these differences, I offer that Julie’s syllabus presented an outline of eight units that described the course contents for the entire year in several pages, and Robert’s syllabus described his course content with bulleted single words or phrases in approximately one half-page in length.

Table 5.2. Results of coding course syllabi from Julie’s and Robert’s classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Julie</th>
<th>Robert</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policies &amp; Assessment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar &amp; Vocabulary</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Culture</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Multilingual Identities and Interests</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policies and Assessment: Textual language that describes how teachers grade student work or offers details about course policies and the nature and frequency of assessments. This category includes but is not limited to course expectations, student work, student behavior, electronic use, homework and make-up assessments, absences, and tardiness.

Course Content: Grammar and Vocabulary: This theme involves language that describes all grammatical and vocabulary-related course content in each instructor’s syllabus.
Course Content: History and Culture: This theme predominantly describes the section “History and Culture” of Julie’s Spanish for Native Speakers’ syllabi across eight course units (i.e., the outline of the entire year’s curriculum). Each unit features two items that relate to this category.

Student Multilingual Identities and Interests: This category describes the items in the Spanish for Native Speakers’ course that directly incorporate students’ identities and interests. Items in this theme include writing projects about students’ countries (“Mi país”); writing a paper about different indigenous groups of students’ choice; readings about and discussion of groups in students’ ancestral countries; and students’ drafting their autobiographies (“Mi vida”), a project that asks students to focus on celebrations in countries of students’ ancestral origins, and students’ choice of reading from newspapers, magazines, or internet articles.

Descriptions of Student Work

I collected photocopied de-identified student work from teacher participants in the forms of classwork, homework, worksheets, and assessments. The content of this work in Spanish classes is predominantly grammatical. From Robert’s classes, I collected 17 documents of student work. Fourteen of these documents are question-and-answer activities copied from textbooks, with which students engaged in pair work in class. Thirteen of the 14 activities feature pictures of people engaging in activities, buildings, shops, maps, travel activities, food items, geography, and expressions of feelings. One of these documents has 13 questions for students to answer “sí” or “no” in response. One blue page has approximately 50 words on the front and 50 words printed on the back, all Spanish vocabulary words for their textbook’s Unit 4 by category. A smaller white page for Spanish II was a homework assignment for students; it has the numbers 1 through 24 written on it followed by blank spaces. Students were asked to write in Spanish verbs that they needed to practice conjugating in the past tense. Finally, I have a packet of
Spanish I’s “Unidad 4,” including 10 pages of homework for students in this unit that have been photocopied from a textbook. Examples of these activities include two crossword puzzles, an activity that asks students to practice question formation, and four pages featuring images of people in various situations that students are asked to identify.

In Julie’s classes, I collected 18 examples of student work. Among different types of assessments and worksheets, I collected the following:

- Nine 2-page quizzes entirely in Spanish with accents written in black ink that Julie graded
- A sheet of questions that students completed partially in Spanish for Native Speakers class for the book they were reading, Los Piratas del Caribe – El Triángulo
- Two workbook activities that review verb conjugations and ask students to respond to questions. These activities also include a dictation activity, which requires students to write the auditory input they hear directly on the worksheet to practice auditory and written skills. This sheet also features an activity that asks students to listen and repeat: “escucha y repite.”
- An article from Julie’s advisory that was passed out about the proposal of a bill in Vermont banning cell phone use under the age of 21.
- A history and culture worksheet copied from a textbook
- An example of “Conexión con el inglés” worksheet from a unit in the Spanish for Native Speakers book.
- A vocabulary review worksheet
- A blank copy of a grammar quiz
Also from the Spanish for Native Speakers course, students completed a worksheet titled, “Historia y cultura.” Questions on this worksheet ask students about their family life, how they spend the day with their families, where members of their families eat lunch, if they have dinner together every day, what they used to do in Latin American countries and Spain during lunch, how customs have changed today and what is behind these changes, where people eat lunch today, and to contrast an area in the United States with an area in Latin America or Spain. This worksheet concludes with vocabulary words, such as “un bocadillo” (a sandwich, in this context), “los suburbios” (suburbs), and “una autopista” (a freeway). In class, when these vocabulary words were discussed, Julie touched on how “suburban life” in Latin American and European countries vastly differ from that in the United States.

Accompanied in the same unit with these questions in Spanish, the end of each unit in their text, El español para nosotros, Nivel 1 (McGraw Hill, 2006) features a section with connections in English (conexión con el inglés). The first activity directs students to “write a sentence in Spanish with the indicated subject” (escribe la oración de nuevo con el sujeto indicado). Following these directions, four phrases are written: 1. I speak Spanish. She_________. 2. We live in El Paso. He _________. 3. They always push. He _____________. 4. We always finish on time. He__________. The remainder of the three-page section asks students to conjugate different present-tense verbs in English. One section is dedicated to the verb, “to do.” Another asks students to answer questions such as, “What language is she speaking now?” and “What book are you reading now?” Next, an activity alternates questions between the present and present progressive tenses with questions such as: “Who prepares dinner at your house?” “Is he/she preparing dinner now?” “Do you work a lot?” “Are you working
now?” The final activity asks students to practice contractions with questions: “Where’s her boyfriend?” “Where is their house?” “How’s your Spanish teacher?” “What’s your sister doing?”

**Student Work: Results of Coding**

The first and second rounds of student work coding include grouping work type, content, and frequency of topics. In the third round of coding, I conducted a section-level analysis of each student work document. This process resulted in two major themes across participants and is presented in Table 5.3 below. I have also included two codes that are specific to Julie, yet provide helpful information about her courses as I consider the types of claims I can make and how these findings relate to each case as a whole. Below the description of each theme, I offer two examples of student work from Julie’s and Robert’s classes.

**Table 5.3. Results of coding student work across Julie’s and Robert’s classes (n = 35)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Julie</th>
<th>Robert</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar Activities</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary Activities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/Culture Activities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature and Current Events</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Work: Examples**

*Student work examples from Julie’s classes*

Figures 5.2 and 5.3 below are examples of an assessment from Julie’s classes. These two images show a grammar assessment of the preterite versus the imperfect tenses. Its content includes fill-in-the blank, written, and multiple choice answers. This assessment asks students in Part 1 to write the best answer, either letter A or B, in the blank. In Parts II and III, students...
decide whether the verbs should be in imperfect or preterite form, and then conjugate the verb accordingly. Part IV features a vocabulary assessment of crime vocabulary. The definition for each term is written in Spanish, and students are to select the correct term and write the corresponding letter for the term in the blank.

In her student feedback, Julie’s written corrections are consistent across assessments. At the bottom of each individual section, she writes how many points were removed. When an answer is incorrect, she places a slash through the response. If an answer has the incorrect verb ending, she circles the ending but does not correct it. If a section is entirely correct, she writes a large “C” through the section. A calculated total of incorrect points is written at the top of the first page, and the student’s numerical grade is written on each assessment.

Recognizing that Julie’s graded work includes three graded copies of one quiz, this particular assessment was coded just once. However, the additional copies provide data that supports my observations about the consistency of Julie’s grading techniques.
Figures 5.2 and 5.3. Assessments of the preterite and imperfect tenses in Spanish.

Student work example from Robert’s classes

Figure 5.4 below features an example of student work from Robert’s Spanish classes. This image features pictures of people, situations, and objects that students are asked to identify and discuss in pair work and answer questions about on assessments. In my classroom observations of these activities, students produced a high frequency of Spanish utterances in pair work, were allowed to work with partners of their choice, and often smiled while working with their partners. Figure 5.4 offers images of the following: a cartoon image falling backward off a skateboard, a woman reading, a woman walking her dog, a man sipping an iced drink that is approximately half his size from a straw, a cartoon person pointing one finger in the air with a lightbulb over his head, two young boys with backpacks shaking hands, a pool with a diving board, a person squirting mustard onto a hot dog, two bubbles that say Hello! and Bonjour!, a
person with a megaphone shouting to a woman who is hunched over a walking cane, a bag of money, a weight-related reference, Pinocchio with a very long nose, a cartoon worker standing on a piece of machinery that has eyes, a house being destroyed, a person putting on a sweater, a person lying on his back with his hands on his stomach, mouth open, eyes closed and “ha ha” above him, and a girl holding her foot straight out before her, pointing to her injured toe.

**Figure 5.4. Paired worksheet activity from Spanish classes**

![Image of worksheet activity]

**Conclusion**

Across sources, the themes described in this chapter will be conceptually analyzed and discussed in detail in Chapters 7 and 8 of the dissertation. Following the presentation of findings from observations in Chapter 6, I consider how these data are interrelated and how they vary across sources. Self-reflexively, I offer that the analyses of each of the sources referenced above transformed the inferences and claims I considered making. Thus, collating sources was instrumental to my purported understanding of these data, and in Chapter 7, I build upon these analyses with my consideration of how the data is nuanced across sources.
CHAPTER VI: CLASSROOM OBSERVATION FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION

I conducted classroom observations during the course of the entire month of February and through the first week of March 2020. I worked first with Julie and then Robert, observing their classes daily. This chapter begins with a description of both teachers and their classrooms; I then proceed with a discussion of salient themes that emerged from these observations after three rounds of coding. Findings emerged from three forms of data:

1) Fieldnotes

During my observations and innumerable pre- and post-observational conversations with teacher participants, I wrote informal jottings in a notebook each day. I transformed the jottings into approximately 100 pages of fieldnotes, supported with Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 2011) as a guide. I wrote notes by hand and worked electronically with my fieldnotes during the coding process. More specific information about the coding process can be found in my findings presented later in this chapter.

2) Observation protocols

I implemented the use of the informal protocol tool to place an intentional focus on the three themes from my research questions and how my observations relate to these themes. One protocol was used for each classroom observation. Thereafter, two Excel spreadsheets were created to track modality and episodes from each class. Thus, this form of data collection served as a support to the study’s emergent themes that resulted from the coding process and their relation to my guiding questions. The development and piloting of the informal observation protocol tool are presented in the dissertation’s
methodology; see Chapter 4. In addition, a more detailed discussion of the interrelation of observational findings to the research questions will be presented in Chapter 7.

3) *Audio-recorded and written memos*. Each day, I either wrote or audio recorded informal memos in reflection on the day’s observations. I often recorded these reflections while commuting home or to the University of New Hampshire before teaching and office hours. I revisited these memos during the second and third phases of coding as an additional resource to assist with positioning my themes.

After a discussion of the coding process, I present a table depicting major themes and modalities. These themes are based on the three phases of the coding process: in vivo, focused, and axial coding. There are limitations to these findings, however, in that a relatively simplistic categorization of classroom utterings and occurrences tends to obscure the complexities of teaching world languages. Other limitations exist in these data as I am the primary instrument in the documentation and interpretation, and that which I choose to notice, record, and interpret is not representative of a comprehensive depiction of any particular class. Thus, I consider these observational data and the coding it represents to be a springboard from which one may begin to understand some of the dominant themes in this study.

Following this discussion, I present a series of vignettes from each classroom to demonstrate the major themes. Recognizing that my interpretive lens is never distended, it is my aim to present these vignettes as descriptive. The conceptual intersectional analysis and inferences from these data will be reserved for Chapter 7’s reflection on the findings and their relation to the research questions. In addition, it is often the case that more than one theme is present in the vignettes. I offer these anecdotes to provide a general sense of how pedagogical practices are enacted in Julie’s and Robert’s classes.
Given that I observed two classrooms, I also note that each classroom and each teacher’s style was markedly different. It was challenging to avoid drawing comparisons between their different approaches to teaching and how they engaged with their students. During the coding process, I noticed that despite these disparities, there were also consistencies across observations and themes that overlapped. However, not all themes were consistent, and I make an effort to point out areas where the expression of each theme varied across participants or were mediated by circumstantial differences. Rather than adopt the unique view of two different classrooms as a limitation, I consider that this comparison can simultaneously function as a benefit. Put differently, differences between the two pedagogical approaches and styles can posit important ideas and questions, not only about difference but also about inclusivity.

As an additional stipulation and to offer an example, as I was taking notes in Robert’s class, I documented how some students were engaged at times in other tasks, such as using their cell phones or chatting in pairs. His classroom was spacious, and there were certain times in some classes when I could not distinguish whether students were working on group activities, if they were conversing socially while working, or if they were ignoring instructional tasks. Discordantly, the groups who were seated next to me, relatively unaware of why I was present each day, were overall on-task with classroom activities and even invited me on occasion to sit with them and participate.

On the other hand, in Julie’s classes, she took students’ phones away from them if they tried to use them during her class lessons and placed them on her desk. Similarly, she spoke directly with her students by approaching them individually if they were not engaged in class activities. These differences between the two classrooms offer insight into how I began to notice other ways that students characteristically distract themselves and others and how other
disruptions occurred in these classrooms. Thus, in each of the vignettes I offer, I also consider that in Julie’s and Robert’s classrooms, a certain level of distraction was always present in some forms, presented as unavoidable on a certain level:

- Students wearing earbuds and listening to music. Students at Bridgefield High School are allowed to have (only) one earbud in their ears.
- Students entirely absent from class due to English Language day-long testing.
- Students eating and drinking various consumable items.
- Students asking permission to leave class to go to the restroom or drink water.
- Students being called down to the office, leaving early, or arriving tardy.
- Students doing work for another class.
- Teachers occasionally stepping out of the classroom for various reasons.
- Students absent for field trips.

These differences accentuate how, despite the magnitude of what has been documented, there is much that has not been recorded in these observations. While not unique to this study, I mention this as an aspect to keep in mind while one reads the descriptions of each classroom and the lived experiences of teachers’ world language pedagogies at Bridgefield High school.

**Julie**

Julie’s shoulder-length brown hair is starting to grey. She has glasses and often wears khakis with a turtleneck or sweater, occasionally paired with a zip-up vest or light fleece. She adds details to accent her attire, such as chunky beaded necklaces and artful earrings, yet avoids any items that are too distracting. She is ambidextrous and a polyglot. In addition to her Spanish linguistic talents, she studied French and German in high school and picked up Italian in college.
On my first day working with Julie, I observe that she, as I wrote three times in my notes that day, is “no funny business.”

She has been teaching Spanish for 36 years, 23 of which have been at Bridgefield High School. During her tenure at Bridgefield High, she has served as department chair, which was designated both as “multi-level instructional coordinator” and “building level instructional leader.” Julie’s first official duty each day consists of hallway monitoring at 7:00 am. After hallway duty, her instructional schedule is fast-paced, alternating either three or four 78-minute classes in row of a block schedule format. She is accustomed to this routine and enjoys having the last block free each day.

Julie is respected by her colleagues and the administration and is quick to vocalize missteps among both students and administrators. She regularly enforces dress code among students and the one-ear bud rule, and generally does not allow student to use cell phones during instructional time. Consistently, she vocalizes her critiques of procedures, the advisory curriculum, and other areas of Bridgefield life. For example, the morning after students in black hoods were videotaped on the fourth floor after school, she went straight to the principal before school to discuss how more leadership was needed in hallway areas. She rejects the school-purchased curriculum book *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective Teens* (Covey, 1995/2011), refusing to teach her advisory with a text that she describes as “cultish.” She has communicated this opinion to Bridgefield High School’s administration, who supports her decision.

She establishes herself as an ally to multilingual students and is sensitive to their differences in instructional needs and abilities. When she notices a student who is either not on-task or not engaging in the day’s activities, she discreetly walks to their desks during student paired or group activity time and engages them in rapid-fire Spanish, most often on a topic of
their interest. For instance, she approached one student and explained to him that baseball tryouts were next week. She told him who the coach was, that he was a science teacher, and encouraged him to go ask the teacher about tryouts. His eyebrows raised, and he began to smile. He then practiced repeating the question he would ask the coach in English several times, careful to make sure it was correctly stated.

Her sensitivities toward students and their challenges are not only interpersonal; they are occasionally structural. For example, in her words, there was “no vetting” or exam to enroll in the Spanish for Native Speakers course. This means that there are vastly different skills present in one classroom, both in Spanish and in English. While different linguistic abilities are not uncommon in world language classrooms, Julie organized a very adaptable solution for her students by dividing them into two pods within one class. At the front of the class, there are five students who are fluent in Spanish yet have limited proficiencies in English. In the middle of the class, four students have comparatively passive Spanish speaking skills, comprehend Spanish auditory input, and have either limited or introductory proficiencies in English. In her assessments, Julie uses a differentiated approach, grading students in this class slightly on different scale, such as with forgiveness for missing or incorrect accents for multilingual students. Recognizing that her students are not on an equal level, she demonstrates her intent, which is to help her Spanish speaking students in multiple ways, including through her instruction of English in this class.

She offers advice to her students about study skills in the Spanish for Native Speakers class, encouraging them to share their notes in her class and in other classes. In her past leadership roles at the school, she fought over two decades ago to have world language classes

---

49 Pods is my designation, not hers.
de-leveled. Leveling, sometimes referred to as tracking, is a controversial educational practice that places students in classes based on past performance. Critics (Brindley, 2015) suggest that, in particular for low-income and minority student populations, this practice represents a form of academic segregation.

Julie is generous with her free time and welcomes students into her classroom throughout the school day. During her 30-minute lunch period, she often reviews material with students individually. This is true for not only immigrant and multilingual students, but also for all of her students. She remains in contact with students many years after they have graduated. During my third observation week, a former student in his senior year of college came to visit to speak with students about his post-secondary experiences. She is approaching the end of her career, her husband retired, and Julie occasionally states, “I will not be here forever” during our time together.

**Julie’s Classroom Description**

As we take the elevator to Julie’s fourth floor classroom, I notice that the Bridgefield High School building is located operates on a European design. That is, the fourth floor is indicated as the third, and the first floor is zero. Thus, the fourth floor, designated as the third, is home to the World Language, Art, and Music Departments. 50 I notice there is a student in the hallway working one-on-one with a teacher. Julie mentions that approximately 25%-30% of the student population at Bridgefield High qualifies for special educational needs. Students working in this capacity with an individual teacher are frequent occurrences that I observe during hallway

---

50 These three departments are housed in one instructional unit at Bridgefield High School, and Robert is their “building level instructional leader” (i.e., department chair).
duty and during my trips to and from World Language classes, although this insight did not
directly impact my observations in World Language classrooms.

As we enter Julie’s classroom, I notice there are 15 different flags above the chalkboard,
each representing countries whose official languages include Spanish. Four large maps hang on
the walls: Central America and the Caribbean, South America, Europe, and the world. Cold air
blows through the vents on this New England winter day and thereafter. A student will
occasionally comment, “It’s chilly in here” upon entering the room. In one instance, Julie replies,
“At least no one will sleep.” The hands on Julie’s classroom clock no longer turn. When students
ask her if the clock can be fixed, she explains the challenges to orchestrating the simultaneous
arrival of a ladder and batteries to the fourth floor.

Figures 6.1 and 6.2. A map of Central America and the Caribbean and a cabinet filled with
textbooks in Julie’s classroom

Julie is organized, justifiably so. She aims to arrive at her classrooms around 6:00 am
each day to prepare, and her daily hallway duty begins at 7:00 am until 7:45 am. She is one of

51 In fact, one day the air conditioner was set to 29 degrees, although the actual temperature was
much warmer.
three assigned teachers who greets students as they walk through the doors each morning and oversees their activities in the cafeteria. She has two large teacher desks in her classroom; one is positioned sideways with a desktop computer, and another faces student desks. On Fridays, she prints out worksheets and assessments for the following week that are stored in four filing cabinets, each filled to the brim with instructional materials in manila folders.

Her classroom has two fans and a red telephone attached to the wall that is most often used to field calls from the main office. A boombox with C.D. and cassette options sits atop a desk co-located with the filing cabinets, and on the other side of the room near the front chalkboard, a built-in cabinet with painted white French doors house her Spanish textbooks that are often retrieved by students when they forget their own. A large flatscreen television is mounted above her two teacher desks. The television arrived just three months prior as part of the curriculum reform. A large flag of Spain hangs from the walls, as do four small, laminated travel-oriented posters and seven images of art, including Picasso’s (1937) Guernica, an image of Roberto Clemente, Puerto Rican Major League baseball player and first Latin American Hall of Fame inductee, a poster highlighting a bullfight in Madrid, and a migrant girl.

Figures 6.3 and 6.4. Image of Roberto Clemente and unnamed migrant girl in Julie’s classroom.
There are four different schedules on the front top right-hand corner of Julie’s chalkboard. Three are designated by colors (Navy, Carmine, and Gold). Two (Navy and Carmine days) indicate alternating block-schedule days, one schedule (Gold) is for a day when all classes meet, and the fourth details the class alterations during a two-hour delay for winter weather. Next to the door, a poster categorizes and offers explanations for “21st century skills.” A second poster on the opposing wall designates Bridgefield’s civic and social school-wide rubric. The floor is composed of steel blue tiles interspersed with gray tiles. A few tiles are missing or have cracked.

Robert

Wearing khakis, a polo shirt, tennis shoes, and a lanyard replete with buttons, pins, and ribbons, Robert takes a sip from his large, iced coffee and places it on his desk. By lunch, he will refill his cup with water. On his lanyard, he has a LGBTQ+ Pride rainbow heart, a yellow ribbon, a red ribbon, a yellow button featuring half a clock face, an X-men pin, and his school picture identification with his name. During my first day working with him, he tells me that the liveliness of some of his classes can be exhausting. He is the department chair, or “building level instructional leader,” of the Art, Music, and World Language Departments. In college, he double-majored in Spanish and Latin, and at Bridgefield, he teaches three sections of Spanish I and one section of Latin 3/4. Prior to the construction of a neighboring town’s high school, he taught only Latin. He has been teaching languages for 22 years, 15 at Bridgefield High School. Each day, he wakes up at 4:30 am to arrive at Bridgefield High School by 6:00 am.

In his pedagogical methodology, he relies upon a timer for each student activity, and to select partners, he uses a website that selects pairs at random. He invites his students to volunteer to assist with flash card pack creation during study halls. This involves cutting out new vocabulary words and organizing them into bundles. He creates new flash card packs for every
unit he instructs. When his students sleep, use their cell phones, or have both ear buds in their ears in his class, he often does not disturb them. When asked about each of these policies, he offered, “I don’t want to be cursed at.” On the other hand, when Robert needs to use his cell phone, he announces it to the class and often explains why: “Guys, I am taking out my phone to look at the flashcard activity.”

Although he tends to avoid direct conflict with his students, each day he types notes at his desk during class as he marks attendance. He records when students are not paying attention, if they are having off-topic or side conversations, and what these conversations entail. His notes are available to the school counselors and administration; their documentation tends to slightly distract him from students’ conversations, although he chimes in while typing. For example, one day a male Nepalese student engages with a female Chinese student in a rich culturally diverse conversation about food, the origin of last names, what they represent in each student’s birth country, and how each student prefers to prepare their favorite dish. Sparked by the Nepalese student’s curiosity, this conversation occurred spontaneously during unstructured time in advisory. By the end of the conversation, Robert was working to organize substitute teachers across the departments for the week.

His approach to teaching world languages is grammar and vocabulary-intensive. He supports the vocabulary and grammar reviews with the use of an overhead projector, photocopies of words and phrases that he creates, flash cards packets, and worksheets. He has uploaded content to the newly-arrived Chromebooks for each class, selecting different websites for them to use during class time. He mentions that they have used the Chromebooks infrequently, perhaps once per quarter. He creates his own review activities; one Spanish I irregular activity took him the majority of one weekend to create. The activities he designs for in-class practice often
involved paired activities featuring pictures of vocabulary words and grammatical structures. For many of these activities, students create or read questions and respond to their partner in Spanish according to the prompts.

During our informal conversations, he tells me about the frequent disturbances at Bridgefield, such as bomb threats or students bringing guns to school. In fact, a student was arrested for possession of a gun the week before my observations began. “The threats blend together,” Robert says. There are enough incidents so that no particular threat to the safety and security of the educational community particularly stands out in his mind.

Robert expresses concern about his students and makes adaptations to nurture their academic progress. “Students do not often turn in their work,” he says. He continues, explaining that he had a Spanish I student who worked his way from an F to a B in the fall term, yet did not turn in his final review packet in January. Offering extra opportunities to turn in the review work, Robert spoke directly with the student, wrote the student a note to turn it in, allowed extra time to turn in the packet, and wrote a second note to the student on an assessment. Finally, the student turned in the packet several days late. Robert stated, “I broke my own rule and gave him a 50% on the packet,” which resulted in a B- (79.6%) on the student’s report card.

In his advisory, he differs from Julie in that he engages with the curriculum book to generate discussion twice weekly. In addition to their twice-weekly discussions, he has organized a lottery activity during this 40-minute time as a quarterly reward system for student grades. Within the prize lottery, students can choose to enter a ticket with their name on it into different categories, and the prize choices vary based on categorization. For every A that students earn each quarter, they can fill out three tickets; a B will earn two tickets; and a C is worth one ticket.
Robert’s rationale behind this system is based upon his experiences with a researcher at the school several years prior who was interested in motivating students through rewards.

**Robert’s Classroom Description**

On the front door entering his classroom, Robert has an LGBTQ+ pride sticker adjacent to an “ally week” message that states: “Change lives. Be an ally. Be the change.” On the other side of the classroom door’s window, there is another message: “Safe Space” with a Pride Rainbow Pencil. Each of these messages was retrieved from the Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network (GLSEN, 2019). GLSEN is an organization that was created by teachers to promote LBGTV+ safe spaces in education and to foster affirming learning environments for LGBTV+ youth.

**Figures 6.5 and 6.6. Robert’s front door to his classroom**

Robert’s classroom presents the opportunity to study a wealth of tangible artifacts in American teacher life. Precisely, there are 99 items with words written on them hanging on four walls in Robert’s classroom: handwritten, printed, laminated, and chalk messages in various sizes. Not far from Robert’s teacher desk, which is almost entirely covered with various items, a collection of 33 dolls and action figures are displayed on three shelves: Yoda, Lisa Simpson, Frida, the Flash, and other superheroes. There are handwritten, printed, laminated, and chalk messages for students on the board and walls. Several corners of these messages curl inward
from age. In plastic bins on the floor and on two different desks, there are board games, sets of flash cards, and workbooks that are not used. On the tiled floor, there is a milk crate of white boards with erasers. On one small, unused student desk pushed against the dry erase board, there are two Sharpies, a pencil, a marker, an overhead projector sheet, two loose-leaf pieces of paper, an old quiz, a review sheet, packing tape, a binder clip, a crumpled notecard, 12 Spanish-English dictionaries, and a piece of tape with the classroom number written on top.

**Figures 6.7 and 6.8. Robert’s chalkboard and an unused student desk**

Baskets are scattered around the room: an Easter basket, a Halloween basket with candy in it, a Roman shield with a sword, and a sombrero. On the board during the length of my observations in February and March, “Merry Christmas Ho! Ho! Ho!” is written in yellow chalk. There are 14 cardboard boxes that line the left-hand wall that contain books, notebooks, disheveled pieces of paper with handwriting on them, and candy. Some papers in the cardboard boxes have begun to yellow. On the door that connects his classroom to another world language teacher’s room, he has innumerable photocopies of handouts for students. He does not use a text in his classes; instead he hands out loose pages of paper for students to use during each unit. In one of the 14 boxes referenced above, there are also textbooks available for use, although he has chosen to not distribute them to students this year. They have not yet been stamped with the
school stamp. The copied pages he hands out to students have no less than 50 new vocabulary words on each side.

**Figures 6.9 and 6.10. Robert’s teacher space, including two desks**

On the 99 items that hang on the walls, there are several different messages for students. One poster states, “If you have an electronic device out in our classroom, please put it away.” Two other messages state that students should ask before using electronics or cell phones. Handwritten on one large post-it sheet, the message reads, “Start studying day 1! If you do nothing, we won’t know what to fix.” Typed on a laminated 8 ½ x 11 sheet of paper, “I want to hire employees who are always late, said no boss ever.” “Mistakes are proof that you are trying,” and “Don’t be upset with the results you get with the work you didn’t do” hang at the back of the room alongside a clock that accurately tells time. Spanish question words, several iterations of the daily schedule, questions in Spanish, Robert’s availability for extra help, the curricular objectives for this month’s lessons, and a laminated image of Salvador Dali’s (1931) *The
Persistence of Memory are among the innumerable other visuals on display in Robert’s classroom.

Figures 6.11 and 6.12. Action figures and dolls and a desk in Robert’s classroom

Findings

The first round of in vivo coding resulted in 52 different codes. Second and third rounds of coding focused on answering my research questions, specifying themes, and identifying commonalities and disparities in these data. Specifically, in the second round of focused coding, I conducted a line-by-line analysis, searching for the most frequent codes in order to develop salient categories in the data corpus (Saldaña, 2016). This second round’s focus was on developing major categories that did not distract from their properties or dimensions (Saldaña, 2016). I also noted where categories in this phase include different elements or features to assist with defining each theme. My second round of coding resulted in 22 categories.

In the third round, I narrowed my focus to create “categories of categories” (Saldaña, 2016, p. 278) or meta categories. I implemented a hierarchical strategy in my creation of matrices which indicated frequency, linguistic feature, and impact of relationships and connections between categories. Oftentimes, I thought about how inserting a word or phrase
between categories could establish their connection and also drew upon my analytic memos. This process resulted in the creation of four themes, as depicted in Table 6.1, Figure 6.13, and Figure 6.14 (below). Following these visuals, I offer definitions and examples of each theme and a subsequent commentary on race, ethnicity, and gender as constructs that were seldom directly positioned in teachers’ world language pedagogies.

In my self-reflection on the consolidation of these theme during coding rounds two and three, I recognize the struggle I experienced in my interpretation of these data. I found it challenging to remove my professional identity, opinions, and experiences from teachers’ language and pedagogical practices. As each theme is defined by teachers’ language and pedagogical practices that vary in frequency, linguistic features, contexts, and type, I engaged in several iterations of self-interrogation throughout this process to reflect upon how my language and interpretation could be biased. Specifically, I considered how the consolidation of codes was verbally and conceptually challenging, and recognizing this struggle, I worked to remove my opinion and biases in the resulting themes.

Table 6.1. Results from observational data after three rounds of coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Julie</th>
<th>Robert</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ use of grammatically-based instructional practices</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ instructional techniques that are sensitive to multilingual students &amp; differences in abilities</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ adaptations to school-level change</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figures 6.13 and 6.14. Stacked area charts of observation themes by observation number

**JULIE**

- Frequency
- Observation #
- Grammatical Practices
- Multilingual Identities
- Adaptations

**ROBERT**

- Frequency
- Observation #
- Grammatical Practices
- Multilingual Identities
- Adaptations

*Teachers’ use of grammatically-based instructional practices*

During the course of my observations, teachers’ grammatically-oriented practices were pervasive in their pedagogies. A striking component of teachers’ practices includes how few occasions students were asked to draw upon their abilities, experiences, and identities in their participation in world language classes, although a more detailed description of this inference and its relation to RQ1 will be presented in Chapter 7. Specifically, both participants’ classes were roughly 85% structured around grammatical content; their assessments were designed to
test students’ reproduction of verb conjugations, sentence structure, and accurate placement and
gender agreement with nouns and adjectives.

These practices include coded items such as teachers’ presentation of grammatical
material, class practice with grammatical structures and content, and grammatical review for
assessments, all of which centered on structural reproduction and accuracy in Spanish, Latin, and
English. Items coded in this category include teachers’ presentation of grammatical structures,
grammar drills, grammar activities, paired partner work, teachers’ review of grammatical
concepts using a chalkboard, whiteboard, an overhead projector, and worksheets, preparation for
grammatical assessments, group-level chorally rehearsed verbs conjugation, the use of flash
cards, verb charts and pictures, and other grammatically-oriented activities.

*Teachers’ instructional techniques that are sensitive to multilingual students and differences in abilities*

Supported with episodes from each participant’s classes, this category is defined as
episodes in which teachers’ instructional practices are sensitive to multilingual students and
differences in ability in world language classes. Although the types of strategies and techniques
that teachers draw upon are varied, items coded in this theme include instances where the two
participants incorporate student multilingualism and differences in abilities to foster an
environment that recognizes and/or supports variance in learning styles, abilities, and levels of
proficiency in English and Spanish. Examples of items coded in this category include the
presentation of a concept in English first followed by a translation into Spanish,\(^{52}\) written notes
provided to students that detail the auditory content that is delivered in class, and differentiated
approaches to grading for students who are non-native speakers of English, among other

\(^{52}\) And vice versa.
examples. In the documentation of this theme, I recognize that Julie’s classes and advisory, on average, had higher percentages of students who were multilingual.

*Teachers’ adaptations to school-level change*

This category represents episodes of participants’ language and instructional practices that are responsive to Bridgefield High School’s implementation of new policies for students, teacher duties, schedules, curriculum requirements, and staffing changes. During the course of observations, items that were coded in this category include how teachers have implemented different strategies based upon curricular and policy-related school-level change. Examples of items in this category include teachers’ creation of an alternate advisory curriculum, their use of multiple grading policies that are flexible to support students’ achievement, and pedagogical and curricular adjustments that were made in response to the block schedule format.

*Commentary: Teachers’ awareness of school-level socioeconomic factors*

An additional component that emerged in these data, in particular in pre- and post-observation conversations, was teachers’ verbal references to socio-economic factors (e.g., lack of resources, costs of funding, a need of available funds for certain resources) and the unavailability of certain resources or roles due to a variety of factors. While the considered year’s curriculum grant provided some assistance in particular on a technological level, other socio-economic factors, such the persistent lack of certain resources or inaccessibility of curricular opportunities, were present in these data, yet they were not a prominent theme in teachers’ pedagogies themselves.
Commentary: race, ethnicity, and gender in teachers’ pedagogies

Given that the percentages of students in classes I observed were a majority non-White, that the gender ratios in these classes were skewed to females, and the intent and purpose of my study, I found it notable how rarely race, ethnicity, and gender status were directly positioned in world language pedagogy in the two classrooms. Throughout my observations, these constructs were featured in teachers’ pedagogies a combined total of five times. Although they seldom surfaced explicitly in my observations of world language pedagogies, the impact of their influences on pedagogy was present and will be discussed in my final chapters. Considered differently, it is also interesting to observe instances where these constructs surfaced and the contexts in which they arise.

Presentation of Vignettes

In the presentation of vignettes, I emphasize that no singular vignette is intended to define or offer evidence of one particular theme or themes. I have chosen to describe four vignettes from each teacher’s classes and suggest that one might keep the themes in mind while reading each vignette. The scenes were selected for the purposes of envisioning life in two different world language classrooms at Bridgefield High and represent the most salient themes described above. The vignettes are presented chronologically, beginning with my work in Julie’s classes. In each classroom, the first vignette is recounted with the most detail, to furnish a sense of routines, structure, and social milieu of the classroom. I will revisit these vignettes interpretively in Chapter 7.

53 These statistics are estimates based upon the information teachers provided me and from my observations.
Vignettes from Julie’s Classes

Spanish II

A female student walks into Spanish II first period class wearing a midriff shirt. Julie remarks, “Cover up your shirt. There is way too much real estate there.” She offers a sweatshirt to cover up and then walks over to another student and removes the earbuds from his ears. Other students enter her classroom wearing puffy winter coats with hoods, hooded sweatshirts, hijabs, jeans with holes in the knees, sweatpants, t-shirts, and sneakers. Julie asks them to take out their homework as they get settled. As she walks around the class checking their homework, four students are eating breakfast, and another student bursts out, “I watched the Super Bowl just for Shakira.” Julie responds, “Where is Shakira from?” “Columbia,” some students reply.

Julie tells her students to take out their flash cards. The majority of students produce a set of flash cards, and Julie walks around the room to verify that students completed them correctly. In today’s class, they review the preterite (past tense) and imperfect tenses; students will have a quiz on this material tomorrow. The review begins with students placing their hands on their desk at Julie’s request. They begin to recite preterite verb conjugations, drumming their hands on the desks, striking the desk once with each new preterite conjugation: “ser and ir: fui fuista fue fuimos fueron; dar: di diste dio dimos dieron; ver: vi viste vio vimos vieron.”

She calls on students directly as they practice identifying the differences between the preterite and imperfect tenses. If the tense is imperfect (e.g., if the action is continuous in the past or “used to” happen), Julie asks her students to “wave” their arms on each side of their bodies in continual motion. Julie’s students are paying attention, and they each read from a notes page that Julie passed out at the beginning of class.
Julie: “Here is another example: When we were in high school, we went to Spanish in the morning.”

(Calls on a female student directly; student taps her foot as she answers)

Julie: “Did something happen?”

Student: “In the morning.”

Julie: “In the morning is not a verb. Look at your notes.”

(A few students joke about how they will be sick for tomorrow’s quiz.)

Julie states, “If you are sick, the makeup is harder, and there will be no multiple choice.”

**Spanish for Native Speakers**

At the beginning of Spanish for Native Speakers class, each of the eight students are facing different directions. A student politely says in Spanish that he forgot to eat breakfast this morning. Julie walks over to a cabinet filing drawer, pulls out a granola bar, and drops it on his desk. He eats it immediately. She states, “Now, who remembered his book today?” Two students forgot their books, stand up, and walk over to a well-organized cabinet replete with textbooks.

The class proceeds to review irregular present-tense Spanish verbs coupled with a verb review in English. The majority of teacher-modeled examples are in English with followed by rapid explanations in Spanish. This week at Bridgefield High School is one of two weeks during which students take their spring semester English Language day-long examinations on a staggered schedule. Three students are testing today and missing from Spanish class, and two will take the test tomorrow. Julie wishes students good luck on their exam and explains that they will have makeup opportunity for the quiz they will miss.

Julie continues working with her students on the present tense irregular verbs in Spanish, and then they practice conjugating them in English. Their textbooks have a section in each
chapter, “Conexiones en inglés,” and students practice conjugating verbs such as to live, to talk, and to speak, and to carry. Julie corrects her students, “He lives.” Next, they review a textbook exercise and then are told they can work with a partner on a worksheet. As she walks around the room while they are working, Julie explains to one group that Maryland is a state in the United States that is located near Washington, D.C. They also briefly touch on the Bermuda Triangle. One student asks, “You die?” Julie answers, “It’s a mystery!” They wrap up that activity and review present-tense verbs in Spanish and then in English, chorally conjugating verbs.

Toward the end of the class with a few extra minutes remaining, a student walks up to the board and erases it. Noticing that his eraser and the others are full of chalk, he asks Julie if he can take them and clean them for her. With the erasers in hand, he walks to the large windows at the back of the room, opens the windows, and starts to clean the erasers, clapping them against the brick building walls directly exterior the windows.54

After class ends, a student approaches Julie with a question. He found out in the fall semester that he received a 69.7% in one of his classes. He explains to her that he does not understand percentages and is not sure if he passed the course. She explains it to him in three different ways, and he answers that he still not sure if he understands.

**Julie’s Advisory**

Julie’s advisory class is comprised of seniors. Five of 14 are designated by the school as English Language Learners (ELLs), eight of 14 are multilingual, and there are 11 students

---

54 This was the third of five students in as many days who exhibited helpfulness and collaboration in the Spanish for Native Speakers class. During this third day, the cleaning of the erasers fully drew my attention to this series of events. Prior to this occurrence, I had only documented this phenomenon in my jottings as part of the class “goings on” each day. In addition, in subsequent classes after the erasers were clean, Julie vocalized to a different class and to me how well he had cleaned the erasers.
present today. Two students enter the class chattering in Spanish. A separate student enters and asks Julie if the school election is today. Julie engages them in U.S. politics, and the class discusses: who is running for president, if anyone knows who the candidates are and their stance on a variety of issues. Some students volunteer the candidates with whom they are familiar: Joe Biden, Bernie Sanders, Andrew Yang. Julie points out that they mention several men but no women and volunteers female candidates: Elizabeth Warren, Amy Klobuchar, and Kamala Harris.

Julie leads the class through a discussion of students’ personal stances versus the relation of the candidates’ issues to the United States, broadly considered. A theoretical economic discussion ensues; they discuss wages, cost, inflation, supply and demand, and how these issues are quite complex in economic functioning. She holds this discussion in both Spanish and English. One student jokes, “I learn so much about Spanish from my job and in advisory.”

She takes the economic discussion to a personal level. She says, “A lot of you work, and money disappears from each of your paychecks.” She asks, “Does Amazon pay taxes? Should they?” One student responds, “I don’t care.” “You should care,” Julie replies, “because it matters.” A student holds up a scrap piece of paper and asks her to throw it away. “Throw it away yourself,” she replies, “you have legs.”

Next, she asks students to research at least one fact about each candidate. “Do research on your magical cellular devices,” she instructs. As they conduct research, she speaks to the two students who are 18 and eligible to vote, indicating where they should go to register to vote. After this information is conveyed in English, she switches back to Spanish, and the discussion about the election continues. As students work on this activity collaboratively, several student conversations are in Spanish; fewer are in English. A student who recently joined Julie’s
advisory due to conflicts in another advisory mentions he did not sleep at all last night and requests to leave class. Julie refuses. She says he has to stay in order to graduate.

**Spanish 3/4**

Julie asks her students to arrange their desks in a circle. As students rearrange their desks, instead of asking the student to pull the hood off his head as she did the day before, Julie pulls the hood off of one student’s head herself. A female student is applying lip gloss from a plastic egg. As she plays with the egg, Julie takes it away from her and places it on top of a filing cabinet. The student cries in defiance, “I’m going to forget it!” Another student asks if he can sign out and borrow the key to use the restroom. He is absent for several minutes. A student walks over to the built-in bookcase to retrieve a textbook, *Galería de arte y vida* (Albini & Adey, 2004).

They begin to review a poem, “El gato de Sèvres” (Almazán, 1972), that was assigned for homework. This poem is described in their books as a cultural unit. Julie selects a desk seated among them and leads them through a poem about a collector, inquiring about certain words and their meaning. Together, they translate the phrase, “The sergeant got upset when the soldier saluted him disdainfully.” “Tell me what that sentence means,” Julie calmly asks. A long silence ensues. “How many of you got to the reading part [in your homework]?” A few hands raise. She pivots, “Who is the principal or main character?” “El coleccionista” (the collector), students reply. “¿Qué tipo de coleccionista?” (What type of collector?), she asks. “De cerámica” (ceramic), a few students reply. That’s right, a ceramic collector, “especialmente en porcelana” (especially in porcelain), Julie asks her students what it means to collect something; students express their incomprehension of what it means to collect items as a profession. Julie offers that
some people, perhaps their grandparents, may collect spoons. One student volunteers, “My grandmother used to collect Beanie Babies.”

In the poem, a cat drinks milk from a very valuable porcelain bowl that would complete the collector’s collection. “I would love to have that cat in my house,” one student says. The collector cannot believe the antique owner would have an animal drinking from that plate, and he feigns interest in the cat as one strategy for acquiring the rare porcelain piece. The collector offers to buy the cat, a process which Julie compares to bartering with a car salesman. In the end, it is the collector who is duped and pays 40 pesos for the cat that he does not take with him. The shop owner, well aware that his rare 1150s plate is worth 10,000 pesos, has duped the collector.

Vignettes from Robert’s Classroom

Spanish I

Robert passes back quizzes in Spanish I and reviews them with his class in Spanish and English. Three girls sitting in front of and around me invite me to join their group and participate in the review activity with them. On their quizzes, several students incorrectly identified “pool” as a “water tank.” Robert laughs. He briefly touches upon false cognates of library (“la biblioteca”) and bookstore (“la librería”) in Spanish. He tells his students, “There are five states whose names originate in Spanish: Montana, Florida, Arizona, Colorado, and Nevada.” A student asks about Arizona; he claims that it originates from the Spanish term “zona árida” (arid zone). He pretends to put on Arid dry deodorant.

Following this review, he asks them to take out their vocabulary sheets, which depict no fewer than 50-60 words on each side of a blue sheet of paper. They begin the vocabulary sheet

55 This, however, is a misconception of the origin of Arizona’s name. Upon investigation, scholars appear to disagree about the name’s origin and derivation. Retrieved from https://azlibrary.gov/collections/digital-arizona-library-dazl/arizona-almanac/meaning-arizona
with a discussion of cultural differences in the concept of time in Latin American countries. To illustrate, he offers that the “la hora Latina” (Latin American time) generally means that people will be around 30 minutes late. As the review proceeds, the class discusses “ser” versus “estar,” different verb forms of “to be” in Spanish. During the examples of these differences, no less than 10 American pop culture references are made: Star Wars, Adam Sandler, Dora, Chevy Novas, Lisa Simpson, the Beatles, and Buzz Lightyear, and others.

At one point during the review, one student makes a connection between Spanish and French, one of her native languages, in the idiomatic expression with estar “to be in agreement” (“estar de acuerdo/être en accord”). Robert jokingly replies, “El francés es estupido,” (French is stupid), and pretends to spit on the ground. Whereas French is stupid, he proceeds to compare the Spanish idiomatic expressions with estar to two Latin correlated usages.

The class then breaks into paired work during which each student has either sheet “A” or sheet “B,” featuring different sets of pictures about which students ask and answer questions. Students, all freshman, participate and work to clarify meanings with each other in their smaller groups. “Guys,” Robert says, “we have just two minutes remaining.” One female student asks a question, and he responds, “I’ll be right there, sweetheart.” A timer goes off. He resets it. They switch partners.

**Latin 3/4**

It’s 8:00 am, and class is about to start. One student sits in front, eating from one of two bags of Doritos on his desk. A female student next to him sips from a 20-ounce Dr Pepper bottle; another student is eating a Hidden Valley granola bar. As the few remaining students enter the room, they place their academic books either on or under their desks. Among these books, psychology, chemistry, and finite math books are stacked high. The class is comprised of only
six seniors. This is the last year Latin courses will be offered at Bridgefield; the administration, however, remained committed the completion of their Latin studies in this academic year (2019-20).

The class begins a review of Latin vocabulary: “Delectable, femur, tibia, all of these words come from Latin,” Robert says. “Tendon is a term which means stretching the muscles. ‘Osteo’ means bones. Ostentatious means showy, if you have a big ring on your finger.” A student replies, “Or that you are just rich.” Robert continues, “‘Ostendo’ means to show; ‘quotidie’ means daily, ‘die’ such as ‘carpe diem’.” The class proceeds with a discussion of verb cases, of which there are six in Latin, and five different noun declensions.

They proceed with a literary discussion of the story of Aulus and Publius, who were flute makers in Ancient Rome. Students take notes and participate during this discussion. Robert asks, “What is the 9th hour?” They discuss how the 9th hour is the first hour when the sun rose, how ancient bath houses were social experiences, and the various foci on hygiene in different rooms in the bath houses, such as those dedicated to bathing and waxing. Aulus and Publius visited the bath houses during the 9th hour. “Why, Robert asks, was this not the right time?” He writes on the board, “Salus populi suprema lex esto.” One student translates, “The health of the people is the supreme law.”

Romans, he explains, understood that personal hygiene made life better for people for many reasons, including less disease and sickness. “The Romans,” he explains, “built a sewer system with lead pipes, which caused some problems later on. The Latin word for lead is plumbus, and today, we have plumbers. Pb is the element for lead.” One student chimes in, “I love Chemistry class.” This brings the class to another tangent: “Iron,” Robert states, “is Femus in Latin.” “Fe,” two students chime in. Robert continues, “Why would we take Magnesium
(students: “Mg”) tablets? To lower heart disease and other diseases, to keep your body functioning.”

The class returns to the reading and their discussion of the social experience of Roman bathhouses. They briefly touch in passing on slavery and misogyny in Ancient Rome, discussing how women and slaves did not have equal rights and the abundant presence of slavery during this time. Women, for example, had to pay nearly twice as much to enter the bathhouses and were allocated the less desirable morning times to bathe. Slaves were not often allowed to bathe in the public bathhouses, and if they were, they were segregated and had different entrances. Instead, they attended to the needs of the free-born Roman owners as they participated in the various bathhouse experiences.

**Spanish I**

Today is a late start day, a two-hour delay for winter weather, and over half of Robert’s Spanish I class is missing. Robert tells me that one student who is challenging for him to manage will be absent today. Another female student who failed the first semester and tended to be “combative” in class dropped the course yesterday. Due to multiple behavior challenges for certain members of this class, Robert has assigned seats to his students. As the class’s homework review begins, one male student is trying to distract another female student; they are chatting in the far corner of the room.

One student asks Robert, “What is Eduardo doing?” As Robert is explaining to the student that Eduardo is going to the Post Office located in the “nice to know” vocabulary section, his timer goes off. He resets it. Robert then leads his students through a grammar and vocabulary review. He acts out people watching and then lifting weights. He asks the students, “¿Quién tiene una bicicleta?” Students write the name of the person with the bicycle on their white boards with
dry-erase markers and then hold up their answers for Robert to see. “¿Quién quiera una siesta? ¿Quién va a pie? ¿Quién está en las montañas? Qué mira Juan? Quién va a los Estados Unidos?” During this process, every single student is participating, and I write in my notes that Robert seems almost joyful as he continues the review.

Next, students break into a partnered activity where they ask and answer questions in Spanish. The same student again starts to chat with the female student behind him before they start this activity. Unprompted, Robert walks over to the male student and scolds him. I hear Robert say, “You deserve whatever you get. If you want to keep laughing at me, it’s going to hurt you. This is affecting your participation grade. I have done a lot for you, but I will do no more.” I learn after class that this student is the one Robert “broke his own rule for” to assign a B- in the first semester (see “Robert,” pp. 9-11).

**Robert’s Advisory**

As the students are walking into their advisory block this morning, several students are wearing hooded sweatshirts, shirts, jeans with holes in the knees, Skechers tennis shoes, Doc Maarten boots, winter beanie hats, and ballcaps. A student walks over to talk to me. He wants to talk about yesterday’s mock presidential election. He tells me he didn’t vote and explains his reasoning, “I see people equally, so I don’t want to choose one person. So I didn’t.” In the school’s election the day before, Vermont Senator Bernie Sanders swept the election. Some discussion ensues about the Electoral College and its differences from the popular vote. Unrelated, and unprompted, a different student loudly asks, “Do you think you should be judged by your past?” One student is creating “streaks” in Snapchat, a social media sharing application,
to share with his social network. Holding his phone in front of me, he asks if I want to be in his streak by saying hello. I participate.

In today’s advisory block, there are six female and three male students. They plan to explore the curriculum book, *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective Teens* (Covey, 2011), during this block, and this week’s unit is about identity. Robert hands out the curriculum book to each student and asks them to turn to page 37. Robert begins, “How would you describe how you are different now than when you were a freshman?” He offers the example of a politician with a long career. “We can all change,” he states.

Today’s lesson is entitled, “Signs of a Healthy Relationship.” The school has sent out a handout to all students to complement today’s lesson. Robert asks them to review page 37 and the handout provided by the school before completing the review activity. During this time, many students are on their phones, and one student is sleeping. Provided that they participate and pass advisory block each semester, students earn a quarter credit towards graduation. After delivering these directions, Robert returns to his desk to document participation and absences.

Following this discussion, Robert distributes “tickets” for students to fill out for the prize lottery, based upon their first semester grades. Students choose their preferred category for each ticket from the following categories:

1) A card for unlimited Wendy’s free drinks for a year

2) Dunkin Donut’s free drink coupon

3) A Star-Wars themed mystery prize (the top choice among students)

4) Candy

---

56 Streaks represent the number of consecutive days a Snapchat user has recorded short video clips that are shared with that account’s followers.
5) Comic book-themed prize (another top choice)

The tickets go into a large box and are drawn for each category. The student who wins the Wendy’s prize turns to another student, “I’ll take you on a date, bro.” Robert walks across the hall to retrieve the other prizes: “the Flash” socks go to a female senior Latin student, another student wins a pencil sharpener shaped as a shark, a different student wins a Yoda Christmas ornament. During the prize distribution, two female students are singing together; a handful of students are looking at their cell phone screens. Although Robert chooses not to infringe upon those who do not complete the approximately three-minute curriculum activity, he documents who has and who has not completed the activity. He communicates that it is their choice and responsibility to decide whether to do the activity or not.
CHAPTER VII: CONNECTING FINDINGS: RESEARCH QUESTIONS, REPRISE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter returns to the three research questions articulated in Chapter 4 and discusses each in relation to the findings presented in Chapters 5 and 6. To begin, I present visual displays of triangulated data and discuss each theme’s connection to my findings. Following this discussion, I restate my guiding questions and articulate my inferential claims. I examine each of my research questions in relation to these claims, reflecting first upon the three research questions individually and then collectively.

Through this process, I identify areas that are nuanced or may conflict. Taken as a whole, my data was rather consistent across sources although highly complex, and I demonstrate both consistencies and disparities when appropriate. While empirical and theoretical bodies of literature are woven into this chapter, a more in-depth discussion of the relation of my findings and claims to existing literature is presented in Chapter 8.

Presentation of Data Across Sources

To view my data across sources, Figure 7.1 below depicts the major themes between and within combined sources by intensity of each data source, including individual themes by observation, interview, syllabi, and student work modalities for all four participants.

The process of connecting these data revealed two important absences between data sources, including 1) limited evidence of grammatically-oriented pedagogies in interview data and 2) very little evidence of gender, race, ethnicity, and sexual identities across all data sources. I emphasize the absence of each as relevant findings in themselves for two reasons. First, it may suggest that instructional practices that rely heavily upon grammatical structures may not be perceived by teachers as linked with students’ abilities, experiences, and identities. Next, it may
also suggest that a heavily grammatically-oriented high school curriculum may be not well-suited to integrate student characteristics of the students it is designed to instruct, and the argument can also be made that its use with secondary student bodies who are impacted by multiple inequities, such as the substantial percentages of non-White, multilingual, and low SES students at Bridgefield, is not suitable.

Although practical implications will be more expansively considered in Chapter 9, I note that this finding has important implications for language teachers and teacher educators of all student bodies, as the lack of integrating student characteristics in language pedagogies seems to serve as a basis for perpetuating inequities, invisibility, and exclusion of student race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities. Put differently, a relative paucity of these forms of student characteristics in teachers’ instructional practices seems to reinforce a stereotyped, White, Western curriculum. These practices may have more pronounced, deleterious effects on students who experience multiple inequities and who may fail to connect with a curriculum that is consistently presented through a heterosexual, White, middle class American lens.

Further, my connection of these data sources advances two vital themes that are holistically not present within these data. Similar to my between-findings discussion above, I consider these absences within my data to also represent crucial findings: 1) the lack of engagement with (student) race, gender, ethnicity, and sexual identities in teachers’ performances of world language pedagogies and 2) a lack of connection of world language pedagogies with local communities. Examined across data sources, the former is further supported in interview data during which teachers articulated constraints to the integration of student race, ethnicity, gender, and ethnicity. This finding resonates with my study’s aim, purpose, and broader empirical body of research that calls for the integration of student diversity
in world language pedagogies (Baggett, 2018; Banks, 2015; Possi & Milinga, 2017; Stein-Smith, 2019; Wedin, 2020) and their connection with communities (Al-Amir, 2017; Byram & Wagner, 2018; Mills & Moulton, 2017).

Below, I describe major themes across all participants and data sources. Following the descriptions of themes across sources, Figure 7.1 presents heatmaps depicting each data source’s intensity for the four themes.

*Teachers’ use of grammatically-oriented pedagogies*

Teachers’ use of grammatically-oriented pedagogies represents the highest frequency of resulting themes across sources. With the exception of its absence in interview data described above, this theme was widely represented in observation data, course syllabi, and student work. As depicted in Figure 7.1, sources with substantial impact on this theme include Julie’s and Robert’s observations, syllabi, and student work.

*Teachers’ sensitivities to multilingual student abilities and identities*

 Teachers’ sensitivities to multilingual student abilities and identities are sustained across several collected sources of data. In addition, I note that this theme has relatively moderate intensity across seven different data sources and that Julie’s observations represent the highest intensity within this theme.

*Structural adaptations to school-level change*

This theme is a result of a structurally unusual academic year that is described by teachers through the school’s adoption of seven entirely new daily schedules in the transition to block scheduling. According to teacher participants, these new scheduling formats have resulted in a deceleration of teachers’ curricular pacing and consistently appeared in my data across teachers’ pedagogical practices, interviews, and pre- and post-observation discussions. Among
data sources, I note that all four participants’ interviews and Julie and Robert’s observations contributed to this theme.

*Constraints to student diversity in race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities by source*

Figure 7.1 below depicts the intensity of constraints to student diversity in race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities by data source. This theme is defined by teachers’ articulations of constraints to the incorporation of student race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities in world language pedagogies. As discussed in Chapter 5, each participant articulated constraints to the inclusion of these characteristics during their interviews, such as a lack of knowledge and a limited awareness of how these topics are treated in world language education. This finding is consistent with my observations of classroom practices, during which teachers’ pedagogies minimally incorporates student diversity in race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities.
Research Questions, Reprise

In the practical interests of facility and structure, I have restated my research questions below.

RQ1. In what ways are student diversities such as experiences, abilities, and identities a resource in world language pedagogies?

RQ2. In what ways are world language pedagogies inclusive of multilingualism, race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities?
RQ3. What does intersectionality reveal about how world language teachers take up student and community diversities in their classrooms?

Inferential Claims Across Findings

Across findings, I make four inferential claims about these data. After stating my claims, I support each through my direct engagement with responses to each of my guiding questions.

My first claim responds to RQ1 and RQ2. Teachers position themselves as sensitive to multilingual student identities in their practices, yet there are constraints to the operationalization of student race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities in world language pedagogies.

My second claim answers the first portion of RQ3. Intersectionality reveals a) how teachers are sensitive to social inequities that arise in multilingual student lives in ways that disrupt structural and cultural domains of power (Collins & Bilge, 2016) and b) how teachers’ avoidance of other (student) characteristics of gender, sexual identities, race, and ethnicity tends to position White, heterosexual students as advantaged in world language pedagogies.

My third claim draws from the latter half of RQ3. Teachers express knowledge of the diversity in the Bridgefield community, yet they report limited connection of their curricula to communities in their instructional practices. Asserted as a form of disavowal, teachers show limited evidence of the transnational history of the community in their curricula.

My final claim impacts my guiding questions as a whole, framing teachers’ pedagogies through the lens of unique factors that have influenced their teaching during the considered academic year. Teachers’ pedagogies have been disproportionately impacted by external forces over which they have no control and require continual adaptations to their pedagogical practices.
RQ1. In what ways are student diversities such as experiences, abilities and identities a resource in world language pedagogies?

There is evidence in my data that world language teachers in this study are sensitive to their students’ multilingual identities, abilities, and experiences. Evidence of this finding is perceived between and within sources in Chapters 5 and 6. For example, in my interview data (Table 5.1), teachers’ integration of student multilingual identities represents the second-highest frequency (n = 74). This finding is also demonstrated through my engagement with CDA (Chapter 5, Excerpts 1, 2, and 3) and specific examples in observational vignettes (Chapter 6, Spanish for Native Speakers, Julie’s advisory, Robert’s Spanish 1).

Thus, this theme combines teachers’ instructional practices and narrations that include students’ multilingualism, birth origins, and nationalities in their curricula. In my observational findings (Chapter 6), teachers’ instructional techniques that are sensitive to multilingual students and differences in students’ linguistic abilities represents the theme with the second highest frequency (n = 63). Julie’s Spanish for Native Speakers course syllabus supports this finding, demonstrating 18 instances of how student multilingual identities and interests are integrated into the course structure and student assignments throughout the academic year.

To layer these matrices with additional evidence, I begin with examples drawn from my observations and pre- and post-observation conversations. For example, Julie operationalizes student multilingualism in her pedagogy in the Spanish for Native Speakers’ course through several types of activities and assignments. These components take on various forms, such as: systematic writing, presentations, projects, and activities that directly draw upon student experiences, abilities, and identities, including: a paper about the Indigenous group(s) of students’ choice; a project and presentation entitled, “Mi país” (my country); the drafting of an
autobiography and presentation, “Mi vida” (my life); two essays, “Los cambios en el Mundo Hispano” (Changes in the Hispanic World) and “Los Cambios en las Familias Hispanas” (Changes in Hispanic Families); a paper “Mi futuro” (My Future); and other writing assignments and projects. To add context to the relevance of these assignments, I note that every member of this class has a birth origin other than the United States. Importantly, I recognize that many of these activities may correspond with factors that operationalize students’ race and ethnicity, incorporate their individual experiences, and relate to correlated aspects of students’ identities. However, I defend my designation of these activities with student multilingual identities, abilities, and experiences as they function to demonstrate and assess linguistic skills.

To address difference in multilingual student abilities, Julie demonstrates instructional practices that recognize varying levels of linguistic proficiencies in Spanish and English. In her practices and methodology, Julie attends to difference in student ability with various strategies: (1) individual and group-level modifications to grading assessments, (2) instructional approaches to teaching during which communication is consistently constructed in two languages (English and Spanish), and (3) detailed information about each lesson provided to students in different medias (written on the board, spoken, and supplied to students as handouts). Regarding her third strategy, Julie creates typed notes for each lesson, clearly visually depicts explanations on the board, and communicates this information verbally.
RQ2. In what ways are world language pedagogies inclusive of multilingualism, race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities?

Whereas teachers are inclusive of student multilingual identities as described above, findings also suggest that there are constraints to teachers’ inclusion of student race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities in world language pedagogies. As stated above, the latter portion of my first claim states that there is little evidence of the integration of students’ race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities. This claim is consistent across all forms of data. This finding is supported with teachers’ language through which they articulate constraints to their operationalization of these aspects (see Chapter 5, Excerpt 4, “Definitely Don’t Talk About Their Sexual Identities,” for example).

Although there is an overall lack of representation of these student characteristics in observation data, I acknowledge that teachers reported some instructional instances where race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities appear during their interviews. Examples of how these characteristics were described in interview data include: disparate views of slavery among the Romans that were not tied to race and ethnicity and discussions of Spanish colonialism and indigenous populations in Julie’s classes. Non-binary gender and sexual identities are represented in Greek mythology with the stories of Achilles on Skyros and Apollo and through LGBTQ+ symbols on Robert’s classroom doors and lanyard.

---

57 Noting that these examples are relatively few and solely appear in interview data.
58 This myth describes how Achilles disguises himself and lives as a woman rather than die at Troy as prophesized. The most elaborate version of this Roman poem is *Achillied* (Statius, 2015).
59 In Greek and Roman mythologies, Apollo is one of the 12 Olympian deities, living on Mount Olympus. Apollo adopted a very open stance toward gender and sexual identities, what some scholars describe as “polymorphous” (Agard, 1935, p. 99).
Another factor in teachers’ constraints to inclusive practices include the overall White, heteronormative materials they use. For example, Robert and Lisa communicated their liberal use of cartoon images depicting people in various scenarios to conduct listening and speaking comprehension checks. An example of this scenario can be found in Figure 7.2 below, illustrated by White or cartoon people engaging in middle-class, mostly American, and heteronormative scenes for Spanish I classes. Regarding middle-class, there are images of shopping at Staples, attending concerts, leisure at the beach, dining in a restaurant, and airplane travel, all of which assume and impose monetary wealth as a cultural value. To the point of “American,” a quite flagrant example is a map of the United States; other examples include a pool, a man lifting weights, ostensible references to money in a bank and earning money, and skyscraper buildings. With respect to heteronormative, a man and a woman are apparently dancing socially; textbooks portray “family life” as a man and woman with children. Gendered stereotypes are also present with a woman teaching at a chalkboard and a man lifting weights. I note that there are also two women dining at a restaurant, representing an example of a homosocial friendship being normalized.

---

60 I present this information as visually relevant to my findings, while noting that there are institutional constraints to inclusive pedagogies in the school’s ability to acquire training, materials, and services in this contemporary environment (e.g., textbook replacement has not been available to teachers for over 15 years).
One example, however, breaks from this trend. In Lisa’s instructional practices, she adjusts textbook images when she creates flash cards for her students to present images of people who are non-White. Lisa’s alterations of stock textbook images were in this sense an outlier among other materials I documented and observed. An excerpt describing this move is included below.

[I]: *Is there anything you look for when you select materials that may give your students voices?*  
Lisa: I do a lot of art and make sure that I have all different pictures of different types of kids. It can't all be just a typical White kid. It can't just be the White American, or whatever. You know what I mean? I try to make sure that in every flash card there's different characters (March 11, 2020).

Having presented these efforts to integrate non-White visual examples as discontinuous with other collected visual materials in available data, it is equally important to consider that a flash card activity neither naturally assumes unique student characteristics nor represents areas in which students can build a critical consciousness (Baggett, 2018) and combine the aims of intercultural citizenship (Byram, 2013) in language pedagogy.
Related to the topic of normalizing heterosexuality and the invisibility of queer people in language materials and curricula (Cashman & Trujillo, 2018), there was little evidence of diversity in gender and sexual identities in my observations of language materials and texts during my classroom observations. In teachers’ materials, examples and images are presented as heterosexual and gender binary. To offer concrete examples, a worksheet asks, “Where’s her boyfriend,” male-female and gender neutral social scenarios, and “family life” depicted in textbook images as solely a man and woman with children. In interviews, teachers articulated constraints to inclusivity of LGBTQ+ communities as lack of knowledge, background, training, and concerns about bringing up gender and sexual identities as topics. Moreover, the invisibility of LGBTQ+ presence in world language materials may not only negatively impact students in language classrooms (Cashman, 2017; Nelson, 2009), but also materials that assert heterosexual perspectives and identities “may feel overly hostile to LGBTQ+ students and faculty” (Cashman & Trujillo, 2018, p. 135).

On the other hand, Robert and Lisa position themselves as open to building their knowledge of gender and sexual identities. It has been established that Robert positions himself as an LGBTQ+ ally. In their interviews, Robert and Lisa reference the professional training they had in the fall regarding gender and sexual identities. Regarding this day-long professional development about gender and sexual identities, Lisa refers to this workshop as “fantastic” (March 11, 2020). Robert echoes Lisa’s sentiments and adds more information about the session: “Well, the morning session was all about LGBT-type things. We had a mother who had a transgendered son who ended up committing suicide as part of this. Not here [at Bridgefield]. But they talked about the struggle, about the legal name change” (March 4, 2020). Concerning this glimpse into teachers’ training with the understanding that all teachers attended, knowledge
of this tragedy and the institutional training with LGBTQ+ identities may represent a start to building an awareness of inclusivity, and yet at the same time, one, day-long training falls short of supporting students, families, and teachers in their adoption of practices that are inclusive.

To touch on gender neutrality in non-English languages, I note that that the widespread shift in gender neutral pronoun sensitivities in 21st century American society has yet to be fully articulated and translated into other languages and societies. In the French language, ongoing efforts are being made to create gender neutral pronouns, yet modifications in French have yet to gain widespread acceptance. In my data, Robert relates that he “don't really know how the romance languages are dealing with gender identity” (March 4, 2020); this response was consistent across all four participants.

RQ3. What does an intersectional lens reveal about how world language teachers take up student and community diversities in their classrooms?

I begin my response to this question by reflecting upon intersectionality’s relation to my findings and engaging with recent critiques. Following this deliberation, I proceed to directly respond to my third research question.

First, the use of intersectionality examines how social inequities arise for multilingual students of lower socioeconomic status in academic contexts. Intersectionality considers how these factors function in different and mutually influential ways (Collins & Bilge, 2016), and it

---

61 This is also reminiscent of diversity trainings in institutional settings presented in Chapter 1.
62 It is my understanding that Spanish gender neutral pronouns have been more widely accepted (Cashman, 2017) than French, and with this in mind, I offer that languages are continually adapting.
63 This introduces additional complications specific to the French language, which is governed by l’Académie Française, the French council for matters pertaining to the French language. For example, in October 2017, the Academy wrote a critique of gender inclusivity (Kosnick, 2019), and the French Prime Minister has banned the use of gender-neutral French in all official documents (Muguet, 2017).
promotes understandings of how social factors in immigrant, multilingual students’ lives are manifest and often compounded in academic settings.

I acknowledge that this application of intersectionality adopts an interpretive stance that does not center on Black women, a critique of intersectionality’s use (Alexander-Floyd, 2012), and diverges from Crenshaw’s (1989, 1991) multidimensionality in Black female experiences. However, I defend this interpretation and my adaptation of intersectionality’s groundings across discursive elements (Cho et al., 2013), as my work explicitly aligns with Collins’s (1990) articulation of intersectionality as an analysis of multifaceted inequities and oppression that are influenced by systems of race, gender, class, and ethnicity. In addition, although my work does not center on Black females, it is alternatively not devoid of Black female experiences. This is evident in a Bridgefield student body that is 53% female and over 40% non-White, and this academic institution has the most diverse, lowest SES student body in the state.64

Further, I draw upon intersectionality’s frameworks (Collins & Bilge, 2016) in this analysis to strengthen my ability to think through my findings. Of the six frameworks, I examine four of the six more intently: social inequities, social context, relationality, and domains of power. Connecting intersectional frameworks to an American, world language educational setting, certain aspects of these frameworks are reflected in the literature (Al-Amir, 2017; Baggett, 2018; Baggett, 2020; Mills & Moulton, 2017) that calls for the examination of how multiple forms of student diversity are integrated in world language pedagogies and reflects upon recent examples of oppression, prejudice, racism, classism, and marginalization experienced by students in education, broadly.

---

64 Recognizing that individual student characteristics in world languages were not collected in this study
To circle back to my second claim stated above, intersectionality offers a language and a conceptual basis with which to further analyze social inequities and power dynamics in teachers’ pedagogies. Importantly, it reveals how teachers in this study are sensitive to social inequities that arise in multilingual student lives and disrupt, or perhaps subvert, structural and cultural domains of power (Collins & Bilge, 2016). To contextualize these inferences, I accentuate the use of an etic approach to my analysis. An etic approach is defined as observations provided by outsiders in a community who can offer broader understandings of a particular issue or community (Gaber, 2017). Thus, while my participants may understand student inequities through an intersectional lens, I point out that they do not articulate it in this way, and these interpretations are based upon my analytic categorizations as a researcher.

Addressing the structural domain of power, teachers’ sensitivities toward multilingualism represent a break from the “English-only” policies and economic barriers that govern the majority of public schools in the United States. Julie and Robert do not assume student fluency in English in their language pedagogies and have organized their practices to be sensitive to communication in Spanish and English. Teachers draw upon student fluency in multiple languages, such as written Bosnian (see Excerpt 2, Chapter 5) and fluency in Spanish (see Julie’s course syllabi, Chapter 5), to build and communicate meaning. At the same time, teachers appear to recognize the privilege associated with socioeconomic status and strive to afford their students educational experiences that do not de-privilege them based upon economic factors. Recognizing that there are limits to teachers’ abilities to overcome institutionalized social mechanisms, I maintain that these practices represent ways that teachers seem to disrupt privilege in formal schooling and enact multilingual practices in educational settings.
With regard to disruption in the cultural domain of power, this domain “shows how people both reproduce and legitimate the ideas that uphold social order” (Collins & Bilge, 2016, p. 179). Certainly, there are counterexamples to this point with the Spanish 3/4 poem referenced above, yet the majority of collected data in this study suggests that teachers’ practices legitimize multilingual student identities and strive for equitable educational experiences irrespective of economic factors in their practices. While there is a predominance of power and privilege associated with speaking the English language in American schools and in this community’s history (Hanlan, 1979), participants in this study demonstrate how teachers can draw upon multilingual student identities and celebrate in students’ cultural and linguistic diversity.

Next, intersectionality reveals how teachers’ avoidance of other student characteristics such as gender, sexual identities, race, and ethnicity in their pedagogies tends to position White, heterosexual students as advantaged in world language pedagogies. At the same time, it serves to de-privilege students who do not identify with these identities. To layer this claim with perspectives from poststructuralist theory, the ambiguity with which teachers treat these student characteristics in language practices may preclude, or at best, muddle an individual student’s relation to the language they aspire to learn (McNamara, 2011). This complication also serves as a way to reinforce the perceived dominance of Eurocentric, White perspectives as superior, rendering those that diverge from these views as de-privileged.

Moreover, I draw upon Marranci (2003, 2009, 2011) to consider how teachers’ language pedagogies may present a tension between students’ identities and the social environment. How “‘ethnic’ minorities are represented, discussed, and imagined” (Marranci, 2011, p. 818) and how individual students perceive themselves in relation to the social context of world language classrooms are important factors. In this study, an overall lack of representation conflicts with
dynamism inherent in student identities and may inhibit students’ abilities to negotiate their belonging within a community (Marranci, 2003).

My **third** claim suggests that teachers express knowledge of the diversity in the Bridgefield community, yet they report limited connection of their curricula to communities in their instructional practices. Asserted as a form of disavowal, teachers show limited evidence of the transnational history of the community in their curricula. Examples of teachers’ descriptions of students’ educational experiences that are affected by their family lives and communities include: student participation, homework completion, classroom attendance, tardiness, and behavior. In addition, teachers spoke about their participation in events and activities in the Bridgefield community that celebrate the diversity and the history of the community, although teachers do not connect these events with their pedagogies.

The initial implication of this finding is that it establishes teachers’ knowledge of the transnational historical influences in the Bridgefield community. Connected through Chapter 3’s theoretical discussion of disavowal (Freud, 1927, 1940) in educational psychoanalytic theory (Salvio & Taubman, 2021; Taubman, 2012), I maintain the argument that teachers have disavowed their knowledge of the community’s transnational history in their pedagogical practices. In their denial of responsibility of this connection, teachers’ knowledge of the transnational history of the community is articulated during interviews and pre- and post-observation conversations. Reminiscent of Freud’s (1927) work in which he describes two patients who had each disavowed the death of his father, two distinct currents seem to exist in opposition in participants’ pedagogies. While one current of their consciousness does not form a pedagogical link with the transnational history of the Bridgefield community, there is “another current that takes full account of the fact” (Freud, 1927, p. 156) that this history is essential
knowledge of the community. Thus, the attitude that exists with knowledge and interest in the Bridgefield community and its history and the attitude that fits with the pedagogical reality exist side by side.

Freud’s (1927, 1940) concept of disavowal is evident in the failure to acknowledge the significance of the transnational historical influences in the community, accompanied by the independent attitude that allows for a rejection of this perception and the acceptance of this reality in a split ego. Moreover, teachers’ recognition of this knowledge in the unconscious split ego accentuates how they are implicated in what they know and what they resist knowing (Taubman, 2012). Teachers’ knowledge exists “on the periphery of consciousness” (Salvio & Taubman, 2021, p. 6) yet impacts their pedagogies through absence. In this sense, the concept of disavowal has established a disconnect between teachers’ knowledge and their pedagogical practices, thus propelling a rationale for reconceptualizing world language pedagogies that more intently link with communities and their histories, including those that are denied.

**Teachers’ Adaptations**

Regarding my **final** claim, teachers’ pedagogies have been disproportionately impacted by external forces over which they have no control and require continual adaptations. Asserted as adaptations, new schedules, teacher and student school policies, and staffing decisions affected teachers’ daily lives and instructional practices. For example, John’s CDA Excerpt 5, “We’re way behind,” articulates his views of block scheduling as a challenge. An excerpt from Lisa’s interview describes her experiences with the new format below.

[I] *What is a typical day like in this school?*

Lisa: With block scheduling, I think it's not working out for the majority of my classes, especially the beginner years, the first two years. It's too long to go without. Even if it's

---

65 Teachers’ articulations of perceived challenges with the new schedule were consistent across all four participants.
two days, and if it's one that goes over the weekends. Thursday to Monday, it's just too long. So reinforcement when we did the traditional schedule here, the eight periods a day, you saw them every day, and it was reinforced every single day, and there's no reinforcement and they don't touch it. A few times a week is not enough, and then you have the block of time, it's not enough because you have to review. You're trying to do new and trying to keep them going and I don't think it works. I think it would be better if we did a full semester for level one.

Many of these and similar frustrations were articulated by each participant. Another example of adaptations is the isolation teachers described due to fewer and fewer full-time world language instructors at the school. When each of the four participants was hired, there were approximately 15 full-time language instructors at the school. In the examined academic year, there were just three. In addition, teachers rarely have a common period free to collaborate, have little free time to do any additional work, and have difficulty obtaining school permission to take students out of the building. Students in each class I observed are frequently absent; no class I observed had full student attendance during my observational period. When students returned to class, either two or three days had passed in a block-scheduled format, and students missed extensive instructional time as they sat for makeup assessments. In Julie’s case, she had more makeup assessments left to be taken than completed during the first week I observed her classes.

The new advisory curriculum is an additional example of an adaptation imparted upon teachers alongside the new schedule, a responsibility of engaging with and delivering a new curriculum 40 minutes each day.

**Conclusion**

Reflecting upon my findings and their relation to my guiding questions as a whole, I consider how my identification of constraints to teachers’ practices may be perceived as overly simplistic. While a prioritization of inclusivity in student race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities may seem an appropriate treatment to the findings I advance, I believe that the term “inclusion,” defined as the act or practice of including those who have historically been excluded
(Inclusion, n.d.), is a starting point, and yet not sufficient as an institutional orientation in education. Broadly, “inclusion,” interpreted as a universal human right, assumes more than representation in materials, in instructional practices, and in assessment. Inclusion signifies particular, local sociocultural value systems, equal access, the eradication of discrimination, and the removal of structural barriers.

To this point, it is not my aim to identify fault with teachers’ practices but to advance a need for more inclusive educational practices and societies. Inclusion involves integration across political systems, educational priorities, and democratic societies. Regarding sanctuary cities and refugee communities such as Bridgefield, Barton and Tan (2020) punctuate the academic limitations of equity frameworks in education and advance a critical justice framework for “rightful presence” (p. 434). Rightful presence contends that “legitimately belonging in a place (. . .) centers making present the political struggles guests embody and experience” (Barton & Tan, 2020, p. 434), including the political and historical struggles and inequities experiences by newcomers in host communities. Thus, this framework may be a useful consideration that can orient educators and teacher educators toward justice-oriented pedagogies that legitimate both presence of political struggles in sanctuary communities in addition to variance in student experiences and identities.
CHAPTER VIII: DISCUSSION

The lives that you admire, the attitudes that seem noble to you, have not been shaped by a paterfamilias or a schoolmaster, they have sprung from very different beginnings.

-Marcel Proust, 1919, À la Recherche du Temps Perdu: Pt. 2, p. 924

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, I reflect upon my findings and their relation with the literature presented in Chapter 2. I then grapple with theoretical complexity and further contemplate intersectionality and disavowal. I proceed with a discussion of how findings presented in Chapters 5, 6, and 7 may seed new directions for research, such as prospective opportunities for service learning and collaboration with communities in world languages. Finally, the discussion concludes with a brief summary of my findings as a segue to practical implications for future research that are articulated in Chapter 9.

Diversity and Inclusion in World Language Pedagogies

Findings from my coding strategies and critical discourse analysis (CDA) suggest that world language teachers demonstrate sensitivities towards multilingual students. To engage with prospective critiques of this finding, I interrogate its promises and pitfalls through an alternate viewpoint, framed as challenges to teachers’ instructional practices. While the term “challenge” in noun form has multiple interpretations, relevant usage of the term can be defined as a stimulating task or problem (“Challenge,” n.d.). Regarding the latter, I consider “problem” imprecise, given that teachers in this study design their curricula and have the autonomy to choose their instructional practices and methods. At the same time, teachers have some but not full autonomy over their curricula (Gerrard & Farrell, 2014), as resources at this school are limited in the area of textbooks and technology. Further, the world language pedagogies I observed advance a rather fossilized (Osborn, 2016) view of world languages that is reliant upon
grammatical structures and vocabulary. On the other hand, teachers demonstrate inclusion of student multilingual identities and cultures in their methodologies (Glynn & Wassell, 2018), in particular within Julie’s Spanish for Native Speakers.

   Engaging with the former, I concede that the integration of student identities may be a stimulating task, however, I object to a holistic application of this interpretation, as it attributes a sort of triviality or perhaps frivolity to the integration of multilingual identities. Put differently, integrating student multilingual identities is a far-reaching affair that can assume consequences for social, academic, economic, and political factors. Thus, I maintain my stance that the practices teachers adopt reflect advances in scholarly literature (Martí, 2018; Yamat, 2012) and appear to be inclusive of multilingual student identities. This inclusivity is demonstrated in teachers’ development of auditory and written communication that does not assume fluency in English and practices that aim to afford equitable opportunities to all students.

   Moreover, this finding appears to counter exclusionary policies and linguistic discrimination across U.S. monolingual-dominant educational settings. It may also suggest that teachers in this study have developed a sense of critical consciousness about the languages and cultures of the students they teach (Glynn, 2012). As one example, Robert demonstrates his critical consciousness when he employs students’ multilingual skills to communicate with the Bridgefield staff in written Bosnian. On the other hand, his socially constructed ideology was simultaneously challenged in this example through the initial failure to communicate with staff members in Spanish.

   In other areas of support, my CDA of this excerpt reveals a rift in the power and privilege that systematically advantages the English language over other linguistic talents.

   66 See Excerpt 2, Chapter 5, “Can You Write in Bosnian?”
Related to the complexities of pluricultural identities (NCSSFL-ACTFL, 2017), the Bosnian staff engage with the Bridgefield students in socially constructed and recognizable roles of teachers. This episode also reflects engagement with the school community beyond the classroom, an emphasis of ACTFL’s (2019) positionality statement. In addition, this episode reflects one way that world language class knowledge and use of student home languages and cultures appear to be valued at the micro-level of Bridgefield High School (Paris & Alim, 2017) and establish connections within the school community.

However, while this example certainly engages with the Bridgefield school staff, there remains a disconnect between teachers’ pedagogies and the diversity in the school community, broadly considered. To my knowledge, there was no follow-up or expansion upon the chalkboard communication in Bosnian. As one example, Robert might build a relationship with the Bridgefield staff that could advance other learning opportunities for his students and teachers in the school community. Clearly, this example “demonstrates the positive role diversity plays in language education” (ACTFL, 2019, para. 3), and yet this story, although rather remarkable, appears distended and rather undeveloped vis-à-vis (a) wider curricular role(s).

As an implication for world language teacher education, Wedin (2020) suggests that the strategies teachers adopt ought to affirm multilingual identities and offer a range of linguistic resources to their students. To this point, teachers position themselves as supportive of multilingual student identities through the linguistic resources in their instructional practices. Assignments in the Spanish for Native Speakers course suggest that spaces for identity negotiation (Possi & Milinga, 2017; Wedin, 2020) are offered through student sharing of personal items, discussion topics incorporative of students’ families and countries of birth origin,
assignments that involve personal narrative writing, and vocabulary exploration based upon students’ birth origin and ancestry.

Moreover, topics such as those presented in the Spanish for Native Speakers course may promote discussions of critical cultural awareness (CCA, Byram, 1997) through student preparation to enter into discussions of “perspectives, products, and practices” (p. 53) in their own and other cultures. Concrete evidence of the development of CCA appeared across world language teachers’ pedagogies. For example, cultural awareness is one of the five goal areas in Julie’s Spanish for Native Speakers Course. Julie also positions CCA within two other areas in her syllabi through connections with (1) Spanish courses and the culture of students’ homes and (2) her course goal of respecting and affirming diversity in student language varieties. Through the establishment of these goals and her instructional practices which demonstrate her sensitivities to student multilingual identities, Julie’s positions her pedagogy as inclusive of linguistic diversity in ways that reflect the aims of the recent literature (Conway & Richards, 2017; Glynn & Wassell, 2018; Jovés et al., 2015; Krulatz et al., 2018).

Byram and Wagner (2018) argue that world languages ought to be linked to other disciplines, thus supporting world language curricula and school communities. However, this study offered little evidence of coordination between world language teachers and teachers of other disciplines. While teachers reported knowledge of racial and ethnic organizations and

67 She describes this goal in her syllabus: “Students compare their use of language with that of others to increase understanding of those cultures and make connections with other cultures in the Spanish speaking world. Introduce a diversity of cultural information based upon the students’ heritage” (Spanish for Native Speakers [course syllabus], 2020, p. 1).
68 As described: “All parties accept and validate the diversity of students’ language varieties and do not denigrate those varieties or impose one Spanish as the ‘correct’ one” (Spanish for Native Speakers [course syllabus], 2020, p. 1). More detailed information about course syllabi is included in Chapter 5.
linguistic services within the local community, these resources appear neither linked with interdepartmental curricular programming nor extended through collaborative efforts between Bridgefield High School world language teacher participants and the local Bridgefield community. As cross-curricular engagement can support student reflection, the ability to think critically about local and global contexts, and social responsibility within communities, collaboration among teachers that integrates linguistic and cultural diversity is a recommended area of future exploration.

Whereas teachers exhibit sensitivities toward student multilingual identities, findings suggest that there are constraints to the operationalization of student race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities in teachers’ pedagogies. In Chapters 5 and 6, several constraints, defined as limitations or restrictions on something (Constraint, n.d.) are articulated, inclusive of economic, temporal, and technological constraints to teachers’ pedagogies. A lack of knowledge and awareness of how to approach these topics were repeatedly articulated by each participant. This particular finding has important implications for teacher education,69 as teacher education programs have instrumental roles in disrupting the status quo (Austin, 2009) and fostering inclusive classroom environments that affirm all student identities (Glynn & Wassell, 2018).

In addition, support to this finding of teachers’ lack of knowledge and familiarity is also illustrated through my engagement with CDA in Excerpt 4 (“Definitely Don’t Talk About Their Sexual Identities,” see Chapter 5). The results of CDA suggest that Lisa is a professional who distances herself from diversity in gender and sexual identities and communicates high levels of unfamiliarity and discomfort with each topic. This finding reflects recent studies (Cashman & Trujillo, 2018; Prieto-Bay, 2007) that advance the need to establish more inclusive pedagogies in

---

69 Practical implications for teacher education will be discussed more expansively in Chapter 9.
teaching practices. In addition, the professional distancing from gender and sexual identities has implications for teacher and ongoing education and future research in inclusive pedagogies.

Furthermore, world language teachers’ methodologies, practices, and materials often position White, heterosexual students as advantaged in world language pedagogies and place an emphasis on grammatical constructs that appear to avoid diversity in gender and sexual identities. As inclusive pedagogies in world languages are found to be positively associated with a student sense of belonging, willingness to participate, and capacities to learn independently (Freeman & Li, 2019; Glass et al., 2015), this finding supports a call to reconceptualize, and to my mind, repurpose the goals of world language pedagogies in ways that directly align the goals of world languages with diverse student characteristics and the communities in which students reside.

I use the term avoid above to describe how many examples in world language classrooms that I observed seem to turn on scenarios that intentionally aim to avoid difference in race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities, thus representing pedagogies of exclusion and pain (Ennser-Kananen, 2016). For example, conversation topics on one of Robert’s student worksheets exhibits a reliance upon the topic of school, travel, and the imposition of typified “American” leisure activities. Figure 8.1 (below) asks students to work with a partner and answer questions about their schoolwork; the figure depicts a boy at a bus stop with a backpack on his shoulders, a school, a highway, a desktop computer, a concert, a church, two unidentified
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70 As articulated in Chapter 7, it appears that participants do not conceptually link their grammatical practices with gender and sexual identities.

71 Recognizing no pedagogy “avoids” these characteristics. Conversely, I recognize that all pedagogies are shaped by a range of political, social, economic, and linguistic factors. Rather, I describe what I interpret as the “aim” of specific world language materials that center on grammatical practices.
depictions of travel by air, a train, a boat, a hot dog, a French fry and ketchup lunch on a tray, a U.S. map, and a skyscraper city scene. This worksheet, similar to many others, is exclusionary in that it assumes knowledge of travel and leisure activities, demonstrates little evidence of a rapport within communities, and tends to position Western, educated, and affluent American perspectives as advantaged. Perhaps metaphorically, more images are depicted as “traveling away” in this example, which is how distant this activity appears to be from the high proportions of immigrant, multilingual, and low SES students that compose world language classes at Bridgefield High.

Figure 8.1. Student paired activity in Spanish I

Returning to my second research question with regard to racial and ethnic diversity in teachers’ pedagogies, one of four participants offers a concrete example of her efforts to heighten representation of racial and ethnic diversity in her curricular depiction of people. As Lisa describes, “I have all different pictures of all types of kids. It can’t just be the typical White American” (March 11, 2020). This example was an outlier among other forms of collected data, which often present families as White women and men with children, and White, heterosexual
couples dancing, and dining socially. Thus, curricular materials in world language pedagogies, apart from Lisa’s description of her alterations, overwhelmingly appear to display little evidence of racial, ethnic, and gender diversity in world language curricula.

Echoing a need for the integration of critical issues such as sexual identities in world language pedagogies (Coda, 2017), techniques that deconstruct the use of heteronormative pedagogical practices and question the formation of sexual identities can serve forms of resistance to binary and oppositional thinking (Nelson, 1999). Moreover, there may be other unobserved barriers to inclusivity in world language pedagogies such as barriers to student access to materials (Scott & Edwards, 2019) and access to online materials and sources.

Although recent studies (Piller, 2016) raise concerns about the incompatibility of monolingual English academic and social settings with the linguistically diverse students and communities they serve, findings in this study suggest that world language teachers foster an academic environment where multilingual students are supported. Moreover, teachers in this study do not assume fluency in English and are attentive to varying levels of student fluency through auditory, written, and textual sources of information provided to students and information that is consistently delivered in two languages.

While this finding may be compelling, I recognize that there are conceptual weaknesses in this interpretation of teachers’ practices. For example, teachers in this study demonstrate a use of Standard English practices, defined as English that is uniform in spelling, grammar, and vocabulary, established in speech and writing by formal schooling (“Standard English,” 2021). Although some may consider Standard English practices “objective” within academic use, I argue that teachers may benefit from reflection upon how their instruction in English serves to reproduce linguistic practices viewed as normative by White privileged speakers. In addition,
future research might draw upon raciolinguistic ideologies (Rosa & Flores, 2017; Flores & Rosa, 2015) and debates surrounding additive approaches that claim to promote minoritized linguistic practices outside of normative White perspectives.

To be clear, I am suggesting that teachers’ ought to adopt practices, attitudes, and methodologies that are inclusive of linguistic varieties, including English, in schools. To contextualize this recommendation, I weigh the linguistic, social, and conceptual flaws in standard language ideologies. A standard language ideology can be defined is the belief that a hypothetical standard language is written and spoken “by persons with no regional accent; (…) with more than or superior education; (…) who not sloppy in terms of pronunciation and grammar; who are easily understood by all” (Lippi-Green, 2012, p. 60). In a North American educational setting, a Standard (American) English language ideology is often promoted, maintained, and systematized in language instruction, books, dictionaries, newspapers, and appropriate use manuals.

Milroy and Milroy (2012) suggest that within the maintenance and promotion of Standard English ideology, the “chief linguistic characterization is suppression of optional variation at all levels of language – in pronunciation (phonology), spelling, grammar (morphology and syntax), and lexicon” (p. 30). Thus, the effect of this promotion and maintenance is “to legitimize the norms of formal registers of Standard English rather than the norms of everyday spoken English” (Milroy & Milroy, 2012, p. 30). Prospective deviations from these norms may be viewed as errors, accented speech, or grammatically incorrect, and thus, the myth of a Standard English is perpetuated diligently with “almost universal success, so that language, the most fundamental of all human socialization tools, becomes a commodity” (Lippi-Green, 2012, p. 61).
Moreover, education in a North American context tends to be perceived as “the key to success of all kinds” (Lippi-Green, 2012, p. 78). Teachers in the U.S. are often charged with innumerable tasks and responsibilities, are viewed as authorities on their subject matter, and are often role models to students. At the same time, teachers communicate their own language ideologies and attitudes through interactions with students. Their beliefs, attitudes, and practices may (re)produce, challenge, or break from standard language ideologies.

Exemplified by the heavily grammatically-oriented materials, student work, and assessments in my available data, I contend that Bridgefield teachers are complicit in reproducing Standard English and a standardized form of Spanish in students’ written assessments and classwork. As examples, the linguistic and conceptual feedback teachers provided focuses on correcting students’ home language practices in Spanish and English to reproduce linguistic styles that maintain standard language ideologies. Additionally, the cartoon vocabulary images employed in Robert’s classwork and assessments lend themselves to further criticism in that they depict cultural-specific images that may be unfamiliar to non-speakers of Standard English. This clearly is the case with the image of the “pool” which was identified by students a “water tank,” representing a bias in curricular materials rather than a difference in students’ abilities (Milroy & Milroy, 2012).

As an opportunity for growth in written work, teachers might focus instead on nurturing students’ critical reflection on developing their own voices, allowing space to make use of a range in their linguistic skills and abilities and to celebrate in linguistic differences. In a different approach to engaging with linguistic differences, teachers may develop lessons on the history of English in the Bridgefield community, inclusive of the linguistic policies established in the textile factories in the 1900s, the night schools that were created, and the residents who fought
for the preservation of linguistic and cultural diversity in Bridgefield. Another project students and teachers might consider is writing about their own linguistic histories (Lippi-Green, 2012), experiences learning languages, and discussions of these experiences with classmates and fellow educators.

In contrast, there is evidence of the integration of students’ minoritized linguistic diversity in Julie’s and Robert’s instructional practices in Spanish courses. For example, Julie’s course goals listed on her Spanish for Native Speakers syllabus involve the development of student critical cultural awareness (CCA) that neither casts aspersion on students’ language varieties nor imposes one form of Spanish as “correct.” This finding speaks to a repositioning of Spanish linguistic practices that engages with linguistic minority students and does not implicate the reproduction of a particular form of Spanish deemed “appropriate” for academic use. In Robert’s classes, he encourages students to volunteer new terms for vocabulary words based upon their full linguistic repertoire and experiences, which he incorporates into class vocabulary units.

Regarding the adoption of intercultural approaches that may raise awareness of linguistic diversity present in the classroom, Bruen and Kelly (2016) suggest that activities ought to be developed and implemented into teachers’ curricula that engage with students’ linguistic diversity. Apart from course assignments in the Spanish for Native Speakers, there was little evidence of activities in other observed world language classrooms whose purpose was to elevate class-level awareness of students’ diverse linguistic skills. As activities that heighten understandings of linguistic diversity and affirm student identities may hold additional benefits in world language curricula (Gkaintartzi et al., 2015; Pauwels, 2014), the development of
activities designed to raise student awareness of the diverse linguistic skills present in language classrooms would benefit from future investigation.

**Findings vis-à-vis Theoretical Influences**

My use of an intersectional lens contributed theoretically to my analysis of Bridgefield’s history, my engagement with CDA, and the scrutiny of major themes across sources. In Bridgefield’s history, three turbulent eras of transformation in Bridgefield reveal how social, political, professional, and educational injustices contributed to linguistic policies and unequal power dynamics. In the present study, findings suggest that intersectionality positions teachers as sensitive to social inequities that arise in multilingual student lives in ways that disrupt structural and cultural domains of power (Collins & Bilge, 2016) and how teachers’ avoidance of other (student) characteristics of gender, sexual identities, race, and ethnicity tends to position White, heterosexual students as advantaged in world language pedagogies.

To further examine intersectionality’s domains of power (Collins & Bilge, 2016), I consider the promises and constraints of each domain in relation to my findings: cultural, disciplinary, structural, and interpersonal.

*Cultural domain of power*

As presented above, I advance teachers’ sensitivities toward multilingual factors as a form of disruption to cultural domains of power, yet these domains of power are more complex than this relatively simplistic response. Put differently, this study identifies a subtle disruption, perhaps an interstice, in cultural domains of power. Understood through an intersectional lens, my observations of collected data reveal mutually constructive and competing factors present in world language pedagogies (Collins & Bilge, 2016). Linguistically, teachers’ pedagogies privilege standardized English over other English linguistic varieties in world language
pedagogies. At the same time, I have made the earlier claim that the accepted “objective”
academic use of English conflicts with the identification of a cultural rift in power as it serves to
reproduce linguistic practices viewed as normative by White privileged speakers. There is an
additive layer to these findings, as Julie’s instruction of Spanish both acknowledges and defends
equitable value in Spanish language varieties. Moreover, this finding also demonstrates the
subversion of cultural domains through her account of immigrant, multilingual students and
ethos of equity in her teaching practices.

Disciplinary domain of power

The disciplinary domain of power involves how power can hold a disciplinary role by
privileging some who are afforded certain opportunities whereas for others certain options are
out of reach. During my observational period, this particular domain of power stood out in two
ways, each of which finds a common thread in segregation. First, during hallway observations, it
surprised me that certain groups of students were not permitted to socialize with peers before
school, excepting in some cases for a very limited amount of time. Teachers performing their
professional duties acknowledged this segregation, and I note that the regulation of these
procedures existed outside of the scope of mainstream teachers’ responsibilities. Second,
students in world language classes who had previously passed their English language exams and
those who are native English speakers were afforded the opportunity of considerably more
instructional time with their classroom teachers, whereas students who had not yet obtained this
qualification missed several days of instructional time with their teachers. In a reverberating echo
of early English-only policies and practices implemented in the mills in the 1900s, present
students at Bridgefield appear to be unfairly impacted by these policies and are academically and
socially segregated from their peers.
**Structural domain of power**

In addition to their relation to the cultural domain of power, findings in this study demonstrate an aperture in structural domains of power. The structural domain of power shows “how schooling institutionalizes sorting mechanisms” (Collins & Bilge, 2016, pp. 178-179). This includes school offerings in the curriculum, tracking policies, how resources are distributed, and how economic barriers are constructed. In response, I consider how certain practices within teachers’ approach to instruction disrupt this domain, yet others do not. To address disruption, teachers’ world language instructional practices that provide resources to students aim to deconstruct economic barriers to their pedagogies. Examples of structural barriers to access in world language pedagogies include tangible resources such as texts and access to online sources.

To offer concrete examples of economic barriers to world language access, teachers have textbooks, extra notebooks, writing utensils, and food and clothing items that are always available to students to either keep or borrow (textbooks) for the year, and there are Chromebooks for students who may not have access to cellular data during the school day for use during group research. On the other hand, there are limits to teachers’ resources and abilities to overcome other obstructions that persist, such as barriers to postsecondary access in the forms of scholarships and financial aid and study abroad opportunities.

To remark upon a different structural barrier, Julie spoke on multiple occasions of how she fought as instructional leader of the department to remove barriers to student access to world language education. In Chapter 6, I describe how she fought and succeeded in dismantling school policies that tracked and sorted students according to levels and English proficiency (i.e., the
controversial practice of “leveling” students on academic scales).\textsuperscript{72} As a result, students in world languages are no longer “leveled,” representing a break from inequitable structural policies.

\textit{Interpersonal domain of power}

The interpersonal domain of power refers to the lives of people and how they relate to each other, including the positioning of certain individuals as advantaged and disadvantaged within social interactions (Collins & Bilge, 2016). One example that illustrates this domain was witnessed during my observations of hallway duty. It came to my attention that students who have documented disabilities resulting in their segregation from mainstream academic classes are not permitted to socially interact with their peers before school in the cafeteria. However, there is one exception in that a few days per week, students may enter the cafeteria during the last 10 minutes before the first period bell rings.

Relationality, defined as thinking that adopts a both/and frame (Carbado & Crenshaw, 2019; Collins & Bilge, 2016), can be used to tease out other ways that interconnections in world language pedagogies can be analyzed for intellectual and political possibilities. World language teaching in the context of this study demonstrates a reliance upon grammatical practices that are most often not contextualized (Toth, 2004) within a Eurocentric curriculum presented through a White-dominant, heterosexual lens. These findings suggest that in order to incorporate more diverse student identities and perspectives, materials ought to be supplemented. Moreover, teachers’ dependance upon grammatical practices produces a curriculum that seems unmoored and abstract from an outsider (etic) perspective. Additionally, when minoritized and

\textsuperscript{72} To reiterate, leveling, sometimes referred to as tracking, is a controversial educational practice that places students in classes based on past performance. In particular for low-income and minority student populations, critics (Brindley, 2015) maintain that this practice represents a form of academic segregation.
multicultural students are present, they may find it challenging to connect with curricula that do not include diversity in perspectives.

In addition, the social context of world languages can pose challenges. As social contexts of different languages and cultures are not transposed into an American, public school setting, world languages appear to be understood through a set of established American cultural norms and practices. In this sense, language in United States education is a political project that positions Standard English as valued and necessary (Glynn & Wassell, 2018). In response, world language teachers and teacher educators ought to communicate the importance of linguistic varieties in all languages, including English, in particular with multilingual, immigrant students who have diverse linguistic talents and cultural identities. Findings suggest that while varieties in Spanish are recognized and incorporated into instructors’ practices, the acknowledgement of and appreciation of varieties in students’ languages is a recommended essential area for teachers’ pedagogies, teacher education programs, and future research.

Following my theoretical critical inquiry of the intersectional process, this research also advances critical praxis as a way to contribute to and learn from complexity. To address inequities and advance social justice, Collins and Bilge (2016) describe as how intersectional inquiry ought to be process-oriented, as it is not only a method for research but is also entwined with activism. Foundational writings in Crenshaw’s (1989, 1991) and Collin’s (1990) work describe an approach that intends to empower people who experience multiple injustices in their lives. Similarly, I view critical praxis as integral to this intersectional process and thus, consider how my research may be used to develop professional experiences for teachers, teacher

---

73 See also, Chapter 1.
educators, and schools, fostering opportunities that address and dismantle inequities and support academic and social change in educational settings.

Further, a commitment to critical praxis can be situated in contemporary activism that is evident in Crenshaw’s (1991, 2010) work, such as through her engagement with legal understandings of violence and discrimination, her advocacy of elevating Black female experiences with #SayHerName, and the podcast Intersectionality Matters (Crenshaw, 2020-present), among other examples. Collins and Bilge (2016) view “both scholarship and practice as intimately linked and mutually informing each other” (p. 42) and argue that pedagogy is a highly important aspect of critical praxis. College faculty, administrators, and staff are also crucial to an intersectional critical praxis, as their practices with students and future educators have pedagogical, methodological, and theoretical implications.

As an integral point in my critical engagement with teachers and teacher educators, Mignolo and Walsh (2018) advance decolonial praxis as “a perspective, a stance, a proposition of thought, analysis, sensing, making, doing, and feeling that is actional” (p. 100). There are multiple pedagogies through which I hope to continually expand my praxis with educators “to plant and grow an otherwise despite and in the borders, margins, and cracks of the modern/colonial/capitalist/heteropatriarchal order” (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018, p. 101). To this end, I intend to engage with critical praxis beyond the imagined projects I advance in Chapter 9 and adopt an activist vision of critical praxis and humanitarianism that includes engagement in local communities, with my students, and through scholarly pursuits.
Moving to cognitive linguistics, the weaker form\textsuperscript{74} of linguistic relativity in the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis holds that speakers of other languages may cognitively experience thinking differently (Evans & Green, 2006). That is, language influences how individuals perceive reality, and speakers of different languages engage in different forms of thinking about particular constructs (Evans & Green, 2006). Through the lens of teacher participants, it may be that there are other components related to grammatical structures that teachers conceptualize in English as inherently distinct from student identities that students may not understand in this way. As all four teachers in this study are native speakers of English and learned additional languages in northeastern U.S. schools, this component may further affect their understandings of student multilingual and multicultural identities.

Regarding teacher and student positioning within the sociocultural academic setting, students who have limited experiences with Standard English are disadvantaged in Bridgefield High School. In poststructuralist debates, McNamara (2011) maintains that an individual’s relationship to a language communicates a relation of power. While the discussion above suggests that Standard English ideology is reinforced in this study, I underscore how, although not documented in this study, future research may benefit from direct investigation of how immigrant students negotiate their identities in world language social contexts.

Drawing upon critical feminist poststructuralist debates, Weedon (1997) points to the inherently patriarchal social and educational functions of literary discourse that tends to depict women as passive cultural recipients, advancing and also prioritizing institutional strategies of marginalization and exclusion. As examples from my collected student work that was designed

\textsuperscript{74} The stronger version, or the interpretation that “language entirely determines thought,” is generally perceived by linguists as “untenable” (Evans & Green, 2006, p. 96).
by American educational textbook companies, critical feminist poststructuralism has helped me reflect upon how and why the women and female children in the student paired workbook activities presented earlier in this chapter are always presented in subservient roles where they help and serve others (e.g., handing out drinks, walking the dog, teaching) while their adult male counterparts are shown lifting weights, counting money, and winning first-place trophies.

To further consider student identity within the academic social milieu, I draw upon Marranci’s (2003; 2009; 2011) theory of self. Prior to their arrival in the United States and in Bridgefield High School, immigrant students may not have been taught about or have knowledge of American geography, cultural practices, academic life, and values. To speak to the tension Marranci (2011) articulates in regard to how “ethnic minorities are represented, discussed, and imagined, and how the single individuals (…) actually perceive themselves in relation to the environment” (p. 818), I offer that the Spanish for Native Speakers course positions itself constructively within student negotiation of identities during the observed year. Not only were assignments inclusive of student multilingual and multicultural identities, but Julie also drew from student experiences and interpretations of the world in her instruction of languages.

Given that there are presently no available empirical studies that apply an intersectional lens to world language settings, I examine these findings in relation to available studies in second language research. Related to the positioning of White, heterosexual students as advantaged, Qin and Li’s (2020) application of intersectionality revealed how immigrant students’ masculinities were shaped by racism, heteronormativity, and linguistic discrimination in language learning

75 For many students, their arrival in the United States was a few weeks or, in some cases, months prior to my data collection.
classrooms. Specifically, the intersection of gender ideologies with racialized masculinities showed how students were subject to marginalization, discrimination, and unique forms of harm and oppression (Qin & Li, 2020).

In addition, Schissel and Kangas (2018) point to existing assessment and educational policies that can be challenging for multilingual students who have disabilities, including institutional classifications as long-term English learners (LTELS) or special education. While the present study did not expressly investigate multilingual students’ language assessment in English, teacher participants often referenced English language assessments in world language classroom contexts throughout my observational period. During that time, students engaged in day-long English language proficiency assessment, resulting in numerable absences, makeup assessments, and lost instructional time in world languages. Viewed from my (etic) observer stance, these assessment practices echo the literature (Schissel & Kangas, 2018), standing out as rather exclusionary in the context of world language curriculum. Related to disciplinary domains of power, these assessment practices appear to be routinely privileging native speakers of English (Collins & Bilge, 2016) and perpetuating the academic and social segregation of multilingual students who miss instructional time that tends to be compounded by makeup assessments.

Given the complexity that exists within each social interaction, I embraced intersectionality’s core themes in theoretical deliberation with my interpretative lens (Collins & Bilge, 2016). Reflecting upon my findings and their rapport with existing intersectional research, I engaged with multiple strategies to mitigate my biases, such as analytic memoing (Saldaña, 2016), reflective journaling, member checks in person and electronically, and sharing excerpts of interviews with participants.
To engage with reflexivity and existing intersectional researcher positionality literature (Cho & Yi, 2019; Giampapa & Lamoreux, 2011; Moyorga-Gallo & Horge-Freeman, 2017), I acknowledge the values and experiences I bring to these data analyses. In my teaching, I consider schools as critical sites of inclusion and history a requisite link within language pedagogies. To counter this position, I accentuate how, in my efforts to investigate fluidity in teachers’ beliefs and practices, I provided teachers the opportunity to express their voices as language instructors, irrespective of a prospective alignment with my own beliefs and values.

Moreover, my interests and experiences have influenced my relationships with my participants. Cho and Yi (2019) discuss how their researcher identities held complex linguistic and cultural influences on relationships with their participants, and to this point, I found some similarities with that work. For example, as I negotiated my identities to gain and sustain access in the field, I found that sharing a common language with participants did not facilitate access to their classrooms, a methodological peculiarity supported in other recent studies (Giampapa & Lamoureux, 2011; Mayorga-Gallo & Hordge-Freeman, 2017).

**World Language Pedagogical Practices**

While teachers in this study articulated their knowledge of linguistic and cultural diversity in the Bridgefield community, teachers also reported limited connections of their world language curricula to communities in their instructional practices. Asserted as a form of disavowal, teachers articulated institutional and personal limitations to connecting their curricula with the Bridgefield community. This finding was somewhat surprising, given teachers’ knowledge of the community and their positioning as professionals who have the knowledge and skills to support students who face social and economic uncertainties (see Excerpts 1 and 3, Chapter 5) that was established during the CDA of teachers’ interview responses.
Moreover, there is evidence (Lindholm-Leary, 2012; Ramirez & Ross, 2019) of positive attributes that can be associated with links between students’ languages and communities. Considered an integral component in affirming student identities and maintaining sustainable practices, community engagement ought to be an imperative in language education. First, student-community engagement can communicate the value of linguistic skills and demonstrate their relevance to global contexts, and second, it can serve as a meaningful way for bilingual students to negotiate and affirm their identities. Lindholm-Leary (2012) maintains that the integration of communities is not only relevant but vital for communicating the value of multilingualism, affirming student identities, and connecting schools within local and global communities.

Reflecting upon my findings through disavowal in Bridgefield’s history, findings in this study position a rift in world language pedagogies from the linguistic disavowals in the pre-colonial era to the present. I use the word rift to describe how world language pedagogies exhibit a fissure in predominantly monolingual linguistic policies that are pervasive in U.S. schools. This finding is in-line with the development of multilingual policies in empirical research (Liao & Maddamsetti, 2019; Wedin, 2020), revealing that monolingual policies can be adapted to serve multilingual populations.

In the Spanish for Native Speakers course, there was evidence that students’ multilingual identities were resources, thus instructionally relevant material (Krulatz et al., 2018). Evidence that students engage with topics that are challenging and relate to their interests and identities (Krulatz et al., 2018) includes a writing project about an Indigenous group(s) of choice, a project and presentation about the students’ birth country, an autobiography and presentation about their
lives, essays about changes in the Hispanic world and Hispanic families, and a paper project where students describe their future.

The literature suggests that projects such as these, described as “funds of identity” (Jovés et al., 2015) may be expanded through the creation of personal artifacts (Esteban-Guitart, 2012), providing an opportunity for students to self-create definitions of their identities and highlight a particularly salient aspect of their identity that is important to them. Examples of how these activities could be expanded are varied, such as through geography, social, cultural, and political links or practically with class activities and music (Jovés et al., 2015). Such opportunities not only incorporate linguistic difference as an important aspect of diversity but also advance opportunities for students to negotiate their identities as language learners.

Importantly, research suggests that students express a heightened interest in cultural content in world languages and place a greater value on culture in instructional practices than instructors do in their goals (Al-Amir, 2017; Mills & Moulton, 2017). In my observation findings, I note that that my full participants differ across listed goals on their course syllabi. Whereas Robert’s course goals are relatively devoid of cultural content with just one reference to culture on a double-sided, single-spaced syllabus, four of the five course goals listed on Julie’s syllabus involve cultural implications. As Robert and Julie are the only two full-time Spanish instructors and teach nearly all Spanish courses at Bridgefield, this discrepancy suggests wide variation in the goals of Spanish instructional practices at Bridgefield.

An implication of this finding might be that at the lowest levels of Spanish (Spanish I and II), students may not perceive cultural diversity as a stakeholder in language education, in particular within a curriculum that relies heavily upon grammatical practices. In student work, course worksheets and handouts were predominantly grammatical in structure and nature,
although the “history and culture” worksheets in Julie’s courses portray cultural diversity in her Spanish for Native Speakers course. Student work from Robert’s courses depicted various images and scenarios, most of which appear to be either culturally devoid of difference or American, as discussed in more detail above.\(^7\)

Moreover, a more intentional focus on the interrogation of issues such as social inequities, poverty, and racism through the lens of teachers’ pedagogies may support the development of critical consciousness among students and educators. Observational data suggest that Julie’s self-created advisory curriculum supports this development, established through the exploration of films such as *Cinderella Man* (Howard, 2005), political discussion and debates, and the introduction of a cellphone law for residents under 18 years of age. In world language pedagogies, engagement with diversity in social, economic, political, and race-based issues in a present-day American climate can be useful to ethically ground students in work related to social injustice (Duffy et al., 2014).

As Bridgefield High School is set in a linguistically and culturally diverse community, it is well-positioned to develop collaborations and exchanges with the other local schools and businesses in the area. Martí (2018) offers a tangible example of how collaborations between schools and communities may be orchestrated to stimulate inclusivity and promote respect among citizens. Articulated as a form of service learning (McLeod, 2017), students can engage with opportunities to serve their communities, put classroom skills into practice, take on new responsibilities, and learn about the outcomes of their actions. Although the design, collaboration, and enactment of service learning activities tends to require teachers’ diligent

\(^7\) See also Chapters 5 and 7
planning, findings suggest that students experienced overwhelmingly positive outcomes, both socially and linguistically (Martí, 2018).

**World Language Perspectives and Preparation**

Observational findings in this study suggest that teachers draw heavily upon grammatical resources and that many examples in student work, syllabi, and observations were grammatical in nature. This finding presents a quite pronounced and stark contrast with more recent literature that advances a heightened awareness of diversity in various forms and places cultural diversity as a stakeholder in world language pedagogies. To circle back to Robert’s classes, in Spanish I and II, he does not use a text. Instead, he prints out worksheets and provides them to students each day. In fact, this particular example, in addition to being burdensome for instructors and students and detrimental to the environment, omits the contextualization of languages within a thematic unit and prospective readings, images, and other audio and visual resources that typically accompany a text.

One of the main assumptions of world language curricula is that cultural diversity assumes several forms, such as products, practices, and perspectives (ACTFL, 2016). However, as demonstrated through comparison of Robert’s and Julie’s cases, the ways that individual teachers interpret and make decisions about their curricula vary widely. As culturally diverse content is of great interest to developing engaging questions about issues in the world and developing critical consciousness (Tedick & Cammarado, 2012), I underscore how advancements in language teaching promote the organization of world language curriculum around real-life, problem-solving tasks and thematic literature (CB, 2013, 2019).

At the same time, findings in this study reflect recent studies that suggest that teachers struggle to integrate culturally diverse linguistic content in their curricula (Byrd et al., 2011;
Mills & Moulton, 2017), despite recent advancements in world language instruction. Through the lenses of cultural understandings and intercultural communicative competencies (ICC) as elements of global competence in world language curriculum (ACTFL, 2016; NCSSFL-ACTFL, 2017), preparing students to interact in intercultural settings is requisite in a standards-based world language curriculum.

Taken as a whole, my findings represent both strengths and weaknesses through the lens of ICC development. On one hand, Julie’s Spanish for Native Speakers’ class, in its design, nature of student work, and exploration of topics, appears to combine language skills with knowledge and attitudes that promote thinking about intercultural citizenship and support social change. In many instances, Julie’s enactment of her self-designed advisory curriculum with seniors also reflects the aims of intercultural citizenship, exemplified through a focus on action in the election process and economic inequities. While Robert’s Latin course reflects the aims of intercultural competencies through comparative analyses of cultures across historical and literary contexts, its curricular emphasis does not demonstrate intercultural citizenship’s action in the world. Finally, the Spanish I and II courses I observed did not appear to emphasize ICC per se, yet intercultural knowledge was presented intermittently in these classes in regard to customary behavior and differences in beliefs and attitudes across cultures.

Additionally, Julie’s promotion of student critical cultural awareness and ICC appear to be entwined with intercultural citizenship through her integration of autobiographical and culturally diverse assignments and practices. Nugent and Catalano (2015) suggest that the

---

77 Again, ICC in world languages can be defined as combining language skills with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes in ways that inspire students as intercultural citizens (Byram, 2008).

78 Intercultural citizenship blends the comparative analysis of cultures in language teaching with a focus on action in the world in citizenship education.
adoption of each is pivotal in world languages, as they communicate the importance of student preparation “with the attitudes, knowledge, and skills needed to participate in intercultural relationships of equality” (p. 75). In this sense, Julie’s world language practices are poised for critical thinking and reflect recent empirical aims in identity construction (Jovés et al., 2015; Krulatz et al., 2018).

The finding of teachers’ adaptations to school-level change is important through its consistent presence in participants’ professional lives. I articulate it as important because it represents a contributory factor in teachers’ curricula. Beyond this substantial school-level change, other new policies were adopted in the considered academic year, including the requirement of implementing and delivering a new advisory curriculum daily. That said, teachers did not articulate ways that their world language curricula had been substantively altered with the exception of their inability to progress with any momentum (i.e., their curricular pace had slowed dramatically).

Although no correlation can be made between this finding and diversity and inclusion, I offer that this component contributes to world language literature in the articulation of how external factors may serve as a structural impediment to curricular change. Over the course of five weeks of my observations, there was not a single day during which teachers proceeded without some form of tangible adaptation in response to the new schedule and the curriculum reform. For example, a day after school had been cancelled because of snow, the block schedule resulted in total chaos. Teachers, students, and staff did not know whether the snow day schedule would be made up, skipped, or passed over. Students arrived in classes that were scheduled for different days; teachers were prepared for opposing classes. Moreover, I consider how teachers had no control over this change, as revealed through my CDA of John’s Excerpt 5 (see Chapter
5). In this and other instances, my question did not directly ask teachers to provide details about
the new schedule, and yet, innumerable references in these data position requisite adaptations as
omnipresent.

Among other considerations for teacher and teacher educator perspectives and
preparation, I found the instances of student attentive helpfulness and sophisticated processes of
collaboration in the Spanish for Native Speakers class to stand out as unique in this study.
Briefly, the sophisticated process of collaboration, or the cohesive view of collaboration as a
fluid entity, can be defined as a process in which individuals make decisions together “under
flexible leadership, mutually building upon each other’s ideas” (Alcalá, Rogoff, & López, 2018,
p. 11377). Attentive helpfulness, or a cultural value system often observed from children of
Indigenous American and Mexican communities, involves student willingness to help and assist
others without being asked (Lopéz, Ruvalcała, & Rogoff, 2015, p. 76).

During my participant observations and also described in Julie’s vignette of the Spanish
for Native Speakers’ course (see Chapter 6), multiple students exhibited helpfulness and
collaboration with their teaching, engaging in the daily task of erasing the board. The tasks of
erasing the board were neither requested nor expected by Julie, and when I spoke with her during
a post-observation discussion, we discussed how it may be natural for these students to enact
helping roles, as these roles reflect those they may hold in their homes and may have held in
schools in other countries.

I, too, may have overlooked this discovery had it not represented such a stark difference
with other world language classes I observed. Spanish for Native Speakers, in which no student
was born in the United States and some students had arrived on American soil less than three
weeks prior, was a standout experience for me with regard to helpfulness and collaboration; it
was the only course that demonstrated this theme. Not only did the students volunteer to erase the board, on one occasion, a student noticed that the erasers were full of chalk and subsequently cleaned them for Julie, opening the large window at the back of the fourth floor classroom and clapping the erasers again the brick building wall outside.

As signs of the sophisticated process of collaboration (Alcalá et al., 2018) and attentive helpfulness (Lopéz et al., 2015), this observed pattern in the Spanish for Native Speakers course may be reflective of familial role(s) of children in other countries described in the literature. More recently, research (Coppens, Corwin, & Alcalá, 2020) with indigenous and indigenous-heritage families in Mexico and the United States shows how childhood participation in productive familial activities is particularly valued as a means to help children learn to collaborate. As an area of prospective ongoing exploration, world and second language research, particularly examinations of Spanish for Heritage and Native Speaker courses, may find collaboration and helpfulness of interest across European-American and non-European-American students in future studies.

**Conclusion: Summary of Key Findings**

This dissertation has shown how intersectionality offers a language and conceptual basis with which to examine world language pedagogies, how certain curricular practices and materials advantage some aspects of students’ identities and disadvantage others, and how social inequities and different domains of power can be examined in teachers’ pedagogies. Specifically, my use of intersectionality has shown that in some instances, teachers disrupt structural and cultural domains of power (Collins & Bilge, 2016) in their practices, yet in regard to variation in student gender, sexual identities, race, and ethnicity, their pedagogies seem to perpetuate
practices grounded in Western colonial modernity, de-privileging students who do not identify as White and heterosexual.

Turning to the concept of disavowal in educational psychoanalytic theory, my application of disavowal reveals how teachers deny the responsibility of connecting the transnational history of the community in their pedagogical practices. Impactful in their pedagogies through an absence, teachers’ recognition of this knowledge in the unconscious split ego accentuates the implications of what they know and what they resist knowing (Taubman, 2012). In the establishment of teachers’ denial of this important knowledge and a disconnect between knowledge and pedagogical practices, I proffer this evidence as a rationale for reconceptualizing world language pedagogies, linking them with communities’ histories.

Finally, this study reveals how teachers are disproportionately impacted by external forces over which they have no control and require continual adaptations. Teachers’ adaptations in the observed academic year arose throughout this study across multiple contexts. To reflect on this finding in relation to my guiding questions and the literature, this finding was articulated by teachers during their interviews, pre and post-observation discussions, and in their classroom practices. Put differently, the amount of energy and time teachers devoted to adapting their curricula and practices to new schedules, student absences, and makeup assessments permeated other aspects of their practices, thus representing an impediment of time and resources.
CHAPTER XIV: IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION

INTRODUCTION

The term, “différence” in French was articulated by the late Algerian-born French philosopher Jacques Derrida (1972), although it is neither a word nor a concept. In writing, he discerns it from “différence” by substituting the first letter of the alphabet. While those unaware of the term may desire to erase or correct this seeming oversight, others may pass over it in silence. In each of these cases, one may take an interest in it. This interest is “recognized and situated in advance as prescribed by the mute irony, the inaudible displacement, of this literal permutation” (Derrida, 1972, p. 4). One may act as if the letter makes no difference.

In spoken French, the difference between the e and the a are phonemes, meaning auditorily imperceptible. Thus, “différence” (with an a) holds no spoken nor written form in a typified sense. Situated in a peculiar space beyond familiarity, I consider how the mute e and a in “difference/différence” can metaphorically be used to signify the importance of that which may be invisible to, or overlooked by, the senses yet is nevertheless present. Différance (with an a), existing in a space that unites this volume, between that which has been written and that which has yet to be spoken, dismantles the illusion of invisibility as non-existence. Conversely, its graphic and inaudible intervention is present.

Reflecting further upon this singular alphabetic shift, critical feminist poststructuralists maintain that language constructs meaning, and thus meaning is never a neutral act (Weedon, 1997). Findings in this study reveal how imperceptible and muted characteristics contribute to the construction of meaning in world language classes that is influenced by teachers’ interests, knowledge, and power. In this sense, meaning is partial, both limited and self-interested, subject to unconscious and conscious dimensions, and “embodied in bodies that are both socially and
culturally produced and gendered” (Weedon, 1997, p. 173). Thus, constructed through teachers’ enactments of world language pedagogies that are expressed in different languages, I reiterate that this construction of meaning is specific to a unique Western social setting at a particular moment in time.

Further, these findings reflect advancements in the literature (Ennser-Kananen, 2016; Osborn, 2016; Glynn & Wassell, 2018) and suggest that world languages may benefit from a reconceptualization. To this point, I maintain that a reconceptualization is not to be considered an act that is achieved, but rather a process that struggles, continues, decolonizes, and reimagines (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018). As examples, this study exposes flawed views of linguistic diversity that tend to invalidate the rich immigrant and Indigenous histories of the community. It critiques educational policies and practices that are entrenched in political, punitive, exclusionary measures for immigrant, multilingual students. It advances a need for more inclusive U.S. language pedagogies. It is as important in what has been empirically perceived and documented as for that which was neither seen nor heard.

**Practical and Theoretical Implications**

In response, I note that my teacher participants were aware of gaps in their knowledge and their limited integration of student race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities in their pedagogies. World language teachers in this study were also in a relatively advantaged position when compared to other public school teachers in their freedom to choose curricula and pedagogies. However, this freedom was nonetheless constrained by outdated resources, such as textbooks, materials, and other tangible constraints that include the school’s adoption of different schedules and a new advisory curriculum.
From this study, I advance three implications for future research to the fields of world language education, teacher education, and education: (1) Professional opportunities for teachers and teacher educators ought to be offered to help educators conceptualize, articulate, and integrate student diversity in practices and build pedagogies that are inclusive; (2) Multilingual students’ sophisticated forms of collaboration ought to be further examined in educational settings as they may promote understandings and awareness of cultural differences among students, families, and communities; (3) Theoretically, schools should address the imperative of integrating the complex histories of their communities in school curricula.

First, teachers’ limited knowledge of and self-distancing from diversity in race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities in their pedagogies advance a need for more professional opportunities for teachers and teacher educators. Practically, these opportunities ought to be designed to help teachers develop strategies that incorporate student diversity, promote inclusivity, and are sensitive to difference in student identities, experiences, and abilities in their practices. As examples, schools and districts ought to provide resources to help teachers adapt curricula, design and select materials that affirm student identities, and offer ongoing professional support, such as workshops in virtual and in-person settings. In world language education, recent research has established the need for pedagogies that incorporate students’ languages and cultures in world language classrooms (Glynn & Wassell, 2018) and teaching through conversations of race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identities that “cultivate a critical, courageous, and compassionate” (Ennser-Kananen, 2016, p. 563) approach to pedagogy and education, broadly.

To consider how these professional opportunities may establish a link with intersectional critical praxis, I position the reciprocal elements I imagine as relevant not only to world language
education but also for K-12 teachers and teacher educators. Importantly, Sharkey (2018) notes that with greater migration in the 21st century, higher proportions of educators have become “de facto language teachers, asked to make their content and classrooms accessible and meaningful to newcomer students whose home language(s) and culture(s) differ from those taught in their new schools and communities” (p. 570). Moreover, the methodological design of this study expresses its interest in reciprocity with teachers and teacher educators who are interested in developing practices that incorporate different languages and cultures of individual students present in their classrooms.

To engage with critical praxis, I describe how my critical inquiry has informed the creation of future professional opportunities for teachers, teacher educators, and Bridgefield world language teachers.79 Specific to student diversity, I propose a professional workshop through which teachers and teacher educators can collaboratively discuss the integration of student diversity in identity, experiences, and abilities. Rather than a distended curricular piece, this workshop is designed as a process, developed through a series of lesson plans presented as case studies, to engage teachers on topics of instructional practices, materials, assessment and methodological approaches. As an extension of this study, I intend to adapt examples from my data and draw upon multiple resources to create differentiated lessons, presented as case studies, that will illustrate and spark discussions of how teachers might adapt their practices to integrate student diversity in language pedagogies and across disciplines.

Second, an aspect of this study that I found noteworthy during my observations of classroom practices were the traces of sophisticated collaboration (Alcalá et al., 2018) and

79 These professional opportunities have been offered to teacher participants for the fall 2021 semester.
helpfulness (Coppens et al., 2020; Lopéz, et al., 2015) exhibited by multilingual students in the Spanish for Native Speakers course. Research demonstrates that collaboration and thinking about collaboration differ for children in families of European-heritage versus families of non-European-heritage (Alcalá et al., 2018; Coppens et al., 2020). Moreover, these differences may manifest differently in educational settings that aim to foster collaboration among students of different linguistic abilities and ancestral countries. Socially and cognitively, learning to collaborate is complex, and knowledge of student development in collaborative work ought to “move beyond assumptions that the learning, development, and socialization practices of middle-class European heritage communities are the norm” (Alcalá et al., 2018, p. 11377). Thus, the investigation of broader understandings of collaboration in educational settings with European and non-European heritage families is recommended as prospective social, cognitive, and intercultural opportunities to students and for schools in their efforts to work with families and communities.

Finally, my examination of Bridgefield’s complex community history as a means to explore disavowal and enliven intersectionality extends an important theoretical implication. Teaching about local communities and their complex histories ought to be the responsibility of schools, and school curricula should provide students with knowledge of different forms of inequities in local communities within educational experiences. If present and future generations of students are not taught about the history of inequities in our communities, it is challenging to conceptualize how societies in our North American context might expect change and not the reproduction of the status quo.

Moreover, the integration of community knowledge in world language education is an imperative not only for affirming student identities but also for communicating value in
multilingualism, intercultural citizenship, and service to local communities. Thus, world languages must turn to engagement with communities, now and beyond the present isolating time. A call to connect world language pedagogies with communities is sustained as one of the five articulated goal areas in the field of world languages (ACTFL, 2016) and iterated in recent advancements in the literature (Byram & Wagner, 2018; Cutshall, 2012; Lindholm-Leary, 2012; Ramirez & Ross, 2019).

To critically engage with the rich linguistic, cultural, and natural history of local and global communities, I imagine three projects that teachers and teacher educators might adapt for their practices. While these projects have been designed for Bridgefield teachers, I offer examples of how they may be adapted for teachers and teacher educators in other educational settings. First, I suggest that teachers develop a community-based project in each semester of every course they teach. Community projects might be based upon student-centered interests, experiences, and identities, and in Bridgefield, teachers might develop partnerships with local community organizations through which language students can serve as mediators and interpreters for immigrant families, as one of many possibilities.

A second project I envision is the exploration of natural disasters within the history of a community and relates to social studies, history, and the natural sciences. In the study of Bridgefield’s devastating flood that accelerated the closing of the Naimkeak mills, students might begin an exploration of the community’s lack of preparation for this event. With the support of a short walk, students at Bridgefield would be able to see the damage of the flood on the mill buildings and roads; the flood’s highest points are clearly marked on several nearby buildings and structures. Initiated through this local perspective, the study of natural disasters
can develop into an examination of past events in other areas and cultures and extend to the future, in a discussion of how communities are, or are not, prepared for natural occurrences.

A third project draws upon communities’ close relationships with water sources. In Bridgefield, the Remmin river has historically been linked to its industrial success, and the various uses, and misuses, of the local river would be an excellent introduction to discussions of water conservation and water crises internationally. In world language classrooms, students might expand this discussion by choosing a country or countries in small groups and then creating products such as advertisements, commercials, video clips, and interactive media collaborations about the countries they are studying in the languages they are learning (Wagner et al., 2019). As this particular activity draws upon knowledge across disciplines, it holds several cross-curricular opportunities. In fact, with a certain consistent level of interest among language students, a project such as this may become one-semester language course in post-secondary settings invested in global sustainability, with each unit placing an emphasis on international comparisons of conservation efforts.

**Conclusion**

I acknowledge that these findings may raise feelings of discomfort among world language educators, teacher educators, and stakeholders in education. I recognize this potential as we are experiencing an international pandemic and a national reckoning about the ways that North American institutions and cultural norms benefit White citizens and disadvantage others. This study adds an additional layer of discomfort, and yet it represents one that I hope will drive academic and social change and serve as motivation to do so in positive, affirming ways.

Throughout my application of intersectionality across discursive elements in this study, I acknowledge how much I have learned from available literature on intersectionality. Without
question, the contribution an intersectional lens to the field of education represents a risk worth taking in its prospective benefit to world language students, teachers, and teacher educators. In this way, this application of intersectionality reflects my aim to elevate student representation and inclusivity in world language curricula in our present North American context.

Finally, I extend my appreciation to my dissertation advisor, Dr. Paula Salvio, for her insightful linking of my work with its conceptual lenses of intersectionality and disavowal. Through her recommendations, this work has benefited greatly. These recommendations, including other recent research (Salvio, 2020; Salvio & Taubman, 2021; Taubman, 2012), challenged, advanced, and contributed to my theoretical understandings of Freud’s (1927, 1940) concept of disavowal in educational theory. Regarding intersectionality, I recognize the pivotal scholarly contributions of Carastathis (2016), Collins (1990; 2019), Collins and Bilge (2016), Crenshaw (1989, 1991, 2010), and Hancock (2016) to this study. During a frazzling and exceptional time in our history coupled with the recognition of necessary discomfort within my findings, my hope is that they may serve as an impetus for academic and social change.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR TEACHER PARTICIPANTS

1. I have a few biographical questions to start:
   (a) Which languages do you teach (and speak)?
   (b) How did you learn this/these language(s)?
   (c) What is a typical day in this school?
   (d) Have you changed roles at the school since you started here?
   (e) Did you teach at other schools before this high school?

2. How does being a World Language teacher differ here than other schools where you have taught? (If teacher has taught at other schools)
   (a) Do you draw on activities in the community as resources in your teaching (e.g. events, families, churches, restaurants)

3. Now I have a few questions about your teaching experiences and insights:

   **Module 1: Multilingual Students**
   (a) Do you often teach multilingual students in your classes?
   (b) Does a particularly interesting student come to mind?
   (c) Tell me about your experiences with this student.
   (d) Where was this student from?
   (e) What were your struggles or successes with this student?
   (f) What was this student good at?

4. What do you think is challenging about your classes?
   (4a) Who are the students who are struggle with these challenges?

   **Module 2: Gender, Race, and Inclusive Classrooms**

5. A few topics that students seem interested in discussing is (a) race and ethnicity and (b) gender and sexual identities. Does this come up in your classes?
   (5a) What do your students seem to care most about?
   (5b) What do they struggle with?
   (5c) How do you respond?
   (5d) Are there any connections students make to media or literature that you discuss in your classes?
(5e) Are there examples of current or community events that relate to these questions?
(5f) None of us have the time to do all that we want to do. Is there anything you have thought about modifying in your teaching that would make your materials or practices inclusive of a range of race, ethnicity, and non-heteronormative views?

Module 3: Identity

6. Can you tell me about a time when a character in a book or film helped a student articulate who they were?
   a. Did it surprise you?

7. Is there anything you look for when selecting materials that may give students’ voices?
   a. Do you ever have students bring in an item from home and describe its relevance to their lives?

8. Participants are asked in advance to bring a curriculum artifact to interviews. This series directly addresses the artifact:
   a. What is the story of this artifact from a teaching perspective?
   b. What is the purpose of this artifact from a pedagogical standpoint?

9. I am going to wrap up with a final few questions:
   (a) How many years have you been teaching?
   (b) What is your highest level of education?
   (c) Do you have any teaching or professional certifications?
   (d) Are you from New England originally?
APPENDIX B: CLASSROOM OBSERVATION PROTOCOL

Classroom Observation # _____________  Date: ______________________________
Teacher: ___________________________  School: _____________________________

General information
Language course/level: ___________________________  Topic/Content: ______________________
Time of observation: ___________ to _____________  Total time: ______________________
Total number of students in the class: ______________
Students identify as (if known/self-identified):
Females: ______________  Males: ______________  Non-binary: ______________________

Classroom environment / set up:
___Rows with individual desks  ____Groups w/3 to 5 desks  ___Pairs w/2 desks
___Other (explain: ________________________________________________________________)

Types of organization
___ Whole class (approx. amount of time): __________
___ Pair work (approx. amount of time): __________
___ Small groups (approx. amount of time): __________

Languages spoken in class
Spanish__________________________________________
French___________________________________________
English___________________________________________
Latin____________________________________________
Other____________________________________________

Guiding questions and themes
Question 1. How is student diversity incorporated?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity in...</th>
<th>Description of evidence</th>
<th>Discussion and examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Question 2. How are world language pedagogies inclusive?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusive of…</th>
<th>Description of evidence</th>
<th>Discussion and examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

Question 3. How is identity incorporated in world languages?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity in…</th>
<th>Description of evidence</th>
<th>Discussion and examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

Question 4. Participants’ topic(s) of choice.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers’ items</th>
<th>Description of evidence</th>
<th>Discussion and examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post-observation follow-up discussions with teacher participants:  
1) What was discussed after the observation?
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APPENDIX D: INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR TEACHER PARTICIPANTS

Researcher and Title of Study:
My name is Sheri Dion, and I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Education at the University of New Hampshire. The title of this project is “Discourses of Diversity: A Qualitative Case Study of World Language Pedagogies through an Intersectional Lens.”

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS FORM?
This consent form describes the research study and helps you to decide if you want to participate. It provides important information about what you will be asked to do in the study, about the risks and benefits of participating in the study, and about your rights as a research participant. You should:
- Read the information in this document carefully, and ask me or the research personnel any questions, particularly if you do not understand something.
- Not agree to participate until all your questions have been answered, or until you are sure that you want to.
- Understand that your participation in this study involves you participating in an interview that will last about thirty minutes, two classroom observations for each class that you instruct, and offering examples of course syllabi and de-identified student work.
- Understand that the potential risks of participating in this study are anticipated to be minimal. You are not in danger of any physical or financial harm and your responses will be kept confidential.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY?
The purpose of this study is to explore the ways that an intersectional lens can be understood through complex manifestations diversity in world language pedagogies.

I anticipate approximately 5 participants in this study. World language teachers are the targeted group; therefore, all participants are adults and at least 18 years old.

WHAT DOES YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY INVOLVE?
This research involves your participation in one thirty-minute interview with the principal investigator and classroom observations of your language instruction during two classes per course that you teach. You will be also asked for copies of your syllabi and examples of student de-identified work. During interviews, you will be asked to talk about your biographical and teaching experiences and instructional insights about diversity in your teaching. I will also ask that you bring one curriculum artifact as an example that will be photographed. Observations will focus on the construction and function of discourse in world language pedagogies. Syllabi and student de-identified work will provide additional layers of data with which to conduct my analyses. The estimated length of time of your involvement in this study is approximately 10 total hours between January and June 2020.

WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE RISKS OF PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY?
This study is anticipated to present minimal risk for participation. You are not at risk for physical or economic harm. All data will remain confidential. In academic presentations and publication, pseudonyms will be employed for all participants and the academic institution, and the location of the school and subject(s) and levels taught will be disguised. Further, research findings will likely be shared with the school and administration. While participants will only be identified by pseudonyms, it is likely that the school administration will be aware of its participants in this study.

WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE BENEFITS OF PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY?
You may benefit from the opportunity to engage in self-reflection and conversation about diversity in world language teaching. This research also has the potential to benefit your academic community as you engage in your curriculum redesign. Additionally, you may benefit from knowledge of contributing to a greater understanding of world language instruction. More broadly, the knowledge gained from your participation in this study may add depth to the academic community and shape future research in the identification of how different forms of diversity intersect in world language pedagogies.

**WILL YOU RECEIVE ANY COMPENSATION FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY?**
One $200 Visa gift certificate be provided for your participation in this study. You will also be invited to a social gathering with food following this study to debrief and discuss these experiences.

**DO YOU HAVE TO TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?**
Taking part in this study is completely voluntary. You may choose not to take part at all. If you agree to participate, you may refuse to answer any question. If you decide not to participate, you will not be penalized or lose any benefits for which you would otherwise qualify.

**CAN YOU WITHDRAW FROM THIS STUDY?**
If you agree to participate in this study and you then change your mind, you may stop participating at any time. Any data collected as part of your participation will remain part of the study records. If you decide to stop participating at any time, you will not be penalized or lose any benefits for which you would otherwise qualify.

**HOW WILL THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF YOUR RECORDS BE PROTECTED?**
I plan to maintain the confidentiality of all data and records associated with your participation in this research.

There are, however, rare instances when we are required to share personally, identifiable information (e.g., according to policy, contract, or regulation). For example, in response to a complaint about the research, officials at the University of New Hampshire, designees of the sponsor(s), and/or regulatory and oversight government agencies may access research data. I am also required by law to report certain information:

- To government and/or law enforcement officials (for example, child abuse, threatened violence against self or others, or hazing). If I believe that such a report is required, I will follow the guidance of the UNH Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research (and of the University’s General Counsel) in making any such report, in order to provide as much protection for your privacy as possible while still complying with the law.

Every precaution will be taken to maintain confidentiality of the study data and records associated with your participation. However, with any audio and video recorded activity, the risk of breach of confidentiality is always possible. To help protect the confidentiality of your information, your interview will be transcribed and maintained under pseudonyms. In presentations and publications, I will report the results using pseudonyms for all participants, and additional identifying information will be disguised. Transcripts, recordings, notes, memos, and photographs will be stored in UNH box files on a password-protected computer. Only the primary investigator, her faculty advisor for this project, Professor Paula Salvio, the transcription service Rev.com, and Zoom will have access to this data. As data may be useful for later archival research and future studies, all data will be kept secure and de-identified indefinitely. Data will be used for academic presentations at professional conferences and will likely be shared with the school and administration. While pseudonyms will be maintained, it is likely that the school
administration will know who participated in the study. In addition, data will be used for publication in academic, peer-reviewed journals and future research.

WHOM TO CONTACT IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS STUDY
If you have any questions pertaining to the research you can contact Sheryl Dion, 603/303-3835 or sd1071@wildcats.unh.edu, or my advisor on this project, Professor Paula Salvio, 603/862-0024 or paula.salvio@unh.edu, to discuss them.

If you have questions about your rights as a research subject you can contact Melissa McGee in UNH Research Integrity Services, 603/862-2005 or melissa.mcgee@unh.edu to discuss them.

I have enclosed two copies of this letter. Please sign one indicating your choice and return in the enclosed envelope. The other copy is for your records.

Yes, I, __________________________consent/agree to participate in this research project.

No, I, __________________________do not consent/agree to participate in this research project.

___________________________  ________________
Signature                     Date
## APPENDIX E: TIMETABLE FOR COMPLETION OF DISSERTATION WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/01/2019 – 10/31/2019</td>
<td>Defend proposal (10/2); begin literature review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/01/2019 – 11/30/2019</td>
<td>Submit proposal revisions; submit IRB; write first draft of literature review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/01/2019 – 12/31/2019</td>
<td>Submit IRB revisions; obtain administrative school consent for IRB; write first draft of methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/01/2020 – 01/17/2020</td>
<td>Coordinate with teachers; set dates and times for interviews; begin data collection; pre-observation discussions write first draft of introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/18/2020-1/31/2020</td>
<td>Continue with teacher interviews; collect syllabi; post-interview discussions with teachers and member checks; continue with pre-observation discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/01/2020-2/14/2020</td>
<td>Complete teacher interviews; schedule initial classroom observation dates and times; revise and submit literature review to dissertation chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/15/2020-2/29/2020</td>
<td>Begin classroom observations; post-interview discussions with participants and member checks; revise and submit methodology to full committee; 2/15 presentation at NECTFL in NYC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/01/2020 – 03/15/2020</td>
<td>Continue classroom observations; first and second round of interview coding; revise and submit introduction to dissertation chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/16/2020-03/31/2020</td>
<td>Post-observation collaborative discussions with participants; submit introduction to full committee; memo writing and organization of observational data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/01/2020 – 04/15/2020</td>
<td>Continue classroom observations; third round of interview coding; resubmit amended Chapters 2-3 to committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/16/2020-04/30/2020</td>
<td>Continue with post-observation reflections with teachers; resubmit amended Ch 1 to committee; presentation at AERA in San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01/2020 – 05/15/2020</td>
<td>Continue with classroom observations; review fieldnotes, memos; finalize al three rounds of interview coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/16/2020-05/31/2020</td>
<td>Post-instructional discussions with participants; organize fieldnotes, memos, observation protocols; continue with member checks with participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2019-2020</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/01/2020 – 06/14/2020</td>
<td>Complete classroom observations; conduct remaining post-observational discussions with teacher participants; organize post-data collection social gathering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/15/2020-6/30/2020</td>
<td>Begin intersectional analyses (RQ1, RQ3) and conduct CDA (RQ1) of interview data; study teacher artifacts and course syllabi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Range</td>
<td>Task Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/2020 – 07/31/2020</td>
<td>Continue with intersectional analyses (RQ1, RQ3) and CDA (RQ 3) with interview data; re-examine artifacts and course syllabi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/01/2020 – 08/31/2020</td>
<td>Complete CDA with interview data; continue with and refine intersectional analyses (RQ1, RQ3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/01/2020 – 09/30/2020</td>
<td>Complete intersectional analyses with interview data (RQ 1, RQ3); begin first draft of interview data results; schedule final member check with each participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/15/2020-09/30/2020</td>
<td>Meet with participants for final member checks; begin CDA with observation data (RQ1, RQ2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/01/2020 – 10/31/2020</td>
<td>Continue CDA (RQ1-2) and begin intersectional analyses (RQ 1-2) of observation data; continue interpreting and writing interview data results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/01/2020 – 11/30/2020</td>
<td>Complete CDA with observation data; continue intersectional analyses (RQ 1-2); finalize interview results; apply for academic positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/01/2020 – 12/31/2020</td>
<td>Complete intersectional analyses with observation data; write initial draft of observation data results; write first draft of discussion and conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/01/2021 – 01/31/2021</td>
<td>Revise results, discussion, and conclusion chapters; submit first draft to committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/2021 – 02/28/2021</td>
<td>Schedule defense; revise full dissertation draft; write initial drafts of journal articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/01/2021 – 03/31/2021</td>
<td>Final draft of dissertation to committee; finalize journal articles and send out for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/01/2021 – 04/30/2021</td>
<td>Defend dissertation; present at AERA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01/2021 – 05/31/2021</td>
<td>Final revisions of dissertation to committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F: SAMPLE CRITICAL DISCOURSE

TOPIC: GENDER & SEXUAL IDENTITIES

Line 1: **Claim: Topic avoidance**
1. Sometimes some I AVOID.

Line 2: **Description of stance**
2. I just don’t want to get into **some of those things**
2a. and definitely **don’t talk** about their SEXUAL IDENTITIES.

Line 3: **Claim: Openness to Inclusivity**
3. If they want to be **categorized** by the “he” or the “she” pronoun or whatever,
3a. I’LL DO WHATEVER THEY LIKE
3b. but **I don’t get too involved** in that because I just...

Line 4: **Claim: I’m Old.**
4. One, I DON’T FEEL COMFORTABLE enough.
4a. I DON’T REALLY UNDERSTAND what
4b. some of what is **going through some of their heads**
4c. and to be fair, I’m **old**. I’m 50.

Line 5: **Aside – Younger teachers**
5. It’s different, I think, with some of THE YOUNGER TEACHERS.

Line 6: **Claim: Younger more exposed**
6. They are MORE EXPOSED.

Line 7: **Aside – Learning from her children**
7. I **learned** things from my own children
7a. that they explained to me
7b. because I JUST DON’T KNOW ALL OF THAT.

1. Uses “I,” articulates stance (**#4** Subject Tool); “some” is unclear (**#2** Fill In Tool)

2. Distances herself from topic (**#19** Connections Building Tool); assumes knowledge of “things” (**#1** Diexis Tool). Emphasis definitely (**#13** The Content is Reflective Tool); Why doesn’t she want to talk about topics? (**#9** The Why This Way and Not That Way Tool)

3. They/I (**#4** Subject Tool); lack of familiarity with topic (**#9** The Why This Way and Not That Way Tool); 3a. affirming openness to inclusivity of student’s preference (**#27** Big D Discourse Tool); 3b. “don’t get too involved” (**#15** Activities Building Tool)

4: Consistent use of I/switch to their (**#4** The Subject Tool); lack of familiarity/discomfort/how does this connect (**#20** Cohesion Tool); 4c. enacting an identity (**#16** Identity Building Tool)

5: “I/it’s” neutral/disconnect from the topic (**#4** Subject Tool); jump to other teachers/disconnect (**#20** Cohesion Tool); youth is privileged (**#19** Connections Building Tool); Asks the reader to assume that this is “typical” for younger teachers (**#26** Figured Worlds)

6. Uses exposure as a way to connect younger teachers with student identities (**#19** Connections Building Tool)

7: How does this text fail to connect with others in this excerpt? (**#20** Cohesion Tool); repeated use of because (**#14** Significance Building Tool); 7b. “things”/“that” assumes knowledge (**#1** Diexis Tool)
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