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Abstract

This dissertation uses discourse analysis and ethnographically informed qualitative research methods in order to answer these research questions: What happens when teachers and students from different neighborhoods and communities in Central County participate in literacy and language events and practices in an alternative humanities class? When, where and under what conditions do spaces/places become engaging and/or community generative learning environments? The study examines a half-day humanities program for high school juniors and seniors, which is known as Connect. Applying trialectical spatial theories (Lefebvre, 1974/1992) and Holland et al’s (1998) theory of figured worlds, the researcher analyzed classroom data in the form of field notes of classroom observations, audio and/or video recordings of classroom observations, classroom artifacts, Facebook postings to the Connect group page, and interviews with both teachers and 5 focal students. Findings include greater understanding into the ways that teachers’ and/or students’ conceptions and perceptions interact with one another across spaces in ways that co-construct not only classroom spaces but also the collective figured world of Connect, the ways that fields of privilege, such as those involving race, class, gender, sexuality, religion, and/or schooling, interact in classroom spaces, and the ways in which Connect spaces were (or not) community generative and/or engaging.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

As I began to think about choosing a research site for my dissertation, I wanted to find a learning space where students were integral decision makers in their own learning and there was an emphasis on building and sustaining relationships with one another. Through my years as a social studies teacher, I had placed emphasis on co-creating and maintaining a classroom space where students worked together but they could also be individuals with different learning styles and interests. I understood from my classroom experiences that students knew when things either worked well or failed, and they often were quite astute in offering ways to make things work better in the future if I only asked for their thoughts and suggestions. When I left the social studies classroom to complete a doctorate, my coursework provided support to my personal understandings of the importance of relationships (i.e. hooks, 1999; Noddings, 1992), learners' voices (i.e. Freire, 1970/2000; Howard, 2001), and community building in learning spaces (i.e. Sergiovanni, 2000; Smith, 1993). Coursework in culturally relevant pedagogy as well as supervising student teachers in urban and suburban schools provided further support to my understandings of the importance of relationships, learners’ voices, and building a learning community. After a few visits to Connect¹ in the fall of 2010, I believed I had found a learning space that included all of these important characteristics in ways that

¹ All names are pseudonyms.
may add greater details to the corpus of educational research already available on these topics.

**Introduction to Connect**

Connect, which can be found in MidwestCity, MidwestState, began as the Explorer Program in 1991 under the auspices of School Partnership. The School Partnership began in 1986 as a non-profit organization that "foster[s] cross-district programming and improve[s] education through a confederation" of the sixteen public school districts in Central County of MidwestState (School Partnership Webpage). These programs include: after school programs, family intervention programs, cross district classes, middle school enrichment programs, Cosmo, and Connect. While the Explorer Program focused on discovery learning, its administrators and teachers later changed the name to Connect to emphasize and celebrate the coming together and learning from diverse identities and perspectives. In the early 1990s, the program employed three teachers: two for the first year class, which is referred to as CO1, and one for the second year class, which is referred to as CO2. Both CO1 and CO2 were taught in the afternoons, while the teachers spent their mornings recruiting students and collaborating with one another and community members. When the state ceased to fund the program, the local school districts that comprise the School Partnership funded their students’ tuition and the program restructuring. In the restructuring, Connect employed only two teachers. One teacher taught CO2 in the morning, while both teachers co-taught CO1 in the afternoon, which is the focus of this study. Funding continued to change the structure of the Connect program during my time with them, as parents began to have the option to pay for their child’s tuition even if their local school district was outside the School Partnership.
Partnership and the School Partnership placed the Connect program in a subordinate position within Cosmo, which is a STEM high school supported by School Partnership. Specifically, Connect is a half-day humanities program to which students apply that uses inquiry and project-based learning. Selected juniors and/or seniors receive 1 social studies credit, 1 English credit, ½ cultural studies credit, and ½ fine arts credit for their successful completion of program requirements over the course of the school year. Throughout this study, I have chosen to use the term alternative to describe Connect because: (1) the classroom is not held within a school building, (2) students apply and are selected to attend the program, and (3) the students are not grouped by age nor are the subjects taught in isolation. Connect offers an alternative to students who are attending public high schools, which I refer to as their Schools of Primary Enrollment (SPEs). Students’ SPEs are what I have termed traditional because schools in the United States since the early twentieth century have largely had the following characteristics: learning occurs within a building called a school, the students are required by law to attend their classes until the age of 16, the students are largely grouped by age, and individual teachers most often teach their particular subjects, such as English, social studies, and art as a distinct discipline without integration across the curriculum. At Connect, however, social studies, language arts, cultural studies, and fine arts are interconnected through project-based learning with multi-aged high school students by two co-facilitators, David and Erma. David maintains relationships with participating schools of the School Partnership in order to recruit students in grades eleven and twelve to the program. He and Erma then provide the required grades to each student’s SPE to ensure students receive their one high school credit in both social studies and English as well as half
credits for both cultural studies and art appreciation, depending on their class attendance and completed work on each unit's projects. While students are receiving high school credits in particular content areas at their SPEs, Connect is a "mobile campus," which is not held within the walls of a school building (Connect Webpage). During my observations, Connect met in a church building most days, but David, Erma, and the students used various other community spaces, such as religious places, markets, libraries, and theaters, as meeting sites for learning.

Students’ SPEs can be found across the 16 school districts that comprise the School Partnership as well as recently a potential for beyond MidwestCounty as students may pay their own tuitions. The 16 districts of School Partnership along with their statistical descriptions of their student populations from their online report cards can be found in Table 1.
Table 1.
School Districts of School Partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Average Daily Enrollment</th>
<th>Students Enrolled In CO1²</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian or Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Multi-Racial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-Burb</td>
<td>2130</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW-Burb</td>
<td>3446</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Burb</td>
<td>13614</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-Burb</td>
<td>7028</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GranBurb</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GroBurb</td>
<td>5746</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HallBurb</td>
<td>3005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-Burb</td>
<td>14945</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest City</td>
<td>49616</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NewBurb</td>
<td>4191</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Burb</td>
<td>5811</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RedBurb</td>
<td>2818</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SouthBurb</td>
<td>19336</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UpBurb</td>
<td>5542</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-Burb</td>
<td>9098</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WestBurb</td>
<td>14105</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² This number does not include students who are attending Cosmo from these districts as their SPE will be listed as Cosmo not the local district in which they live.
Table 1 (continued)

*School Districts of School Partnership with Statistical Descriptions of Population*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Economically Disadvantaged</th>
<th>Limited English Proficiency</th>
<th>Students with Disabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-Burb</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW-Burb</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Burb</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-Burb</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GranBurb</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GroBurb</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HallBurb</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-Burb</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest City</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NewBurb</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Burb</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RedBurb</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SouthBurb</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UpBurb</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-Burb</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WestBurb</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 provides general descriptions of the 16 local school districts that comprise School Partnership. It also provides general descriptions of the student populations that attend each of the district’s schools. The diversity of the Connect program differs across school years as it depends upon which students apply and are selected as well as the local districts that agree to pay students’ tuitions. As shown in Table 1, 7 local school districts did not send anyone to Connect during the 2011-2012 school year. G-Burb sent 3 students to Connect, but these students had to pay part of their own tuitions, while one student from W-Burb came to Connect by paying her own full tuition. Funding, thus, greatly influences the ways in which Connect spaces are constructed.

**Research Questions**

In this study, I provide details about how teachers and students at CO1 participated in literacy and language events and practices throughout the 2011-2012 school year. These details help answer my research questions, which are: What happens when teachers and students from different neighborhoods/communities in Central County participate in literacy and language events and practices in an alternative humanities class? When, where and under what conditions do spaces/places become engaging and/or community generative learning environments?

I entered Connect as a participant observer, and to answer my research questions, I drew data from a variety of classroom sources, such as audio and/or video-recordings of class lessons, field notes from classroom observations, and collection of classroom artifacts (i.e. instructions, worksheets, rubrics) as well as interviews with 5 focal students and 2 teachers. While I collected data throughout the 2011-2012 school year, this
dissertation largely focuses on the first two learning units, which were topically concentrated on perspectives and world religions.

Statement of Purpose

Connect is an in-school space that regularly includes community places/spaces as well as literacy practices found in more out-of-school spaces, which thus makes it a rich research site for understanding how teachers and students from different places/spaces create class spaces and/or participate in literacy and language events and practices. According to Heath and Street (2008), “classrooms have become the most frequently researched site of ethnographers” (p. 17). Most of these classroom studies involve classrooms that take place in traditional public schools, where age-grouped students move through the content areas of English, mathematics, science, and social studies. This research study, however, occurred in an alternative public school classroom, where social studies, language arts, cultural studies, and fine arts were interconnected through project-based learning with multi-aged high school students. While there seems to be a wealth of research in traditional classrooms and schools, there has been much less research published about non-traditional classrooms and schools. Research into adolescent literacy in hybrid spaces provides one area of educational research in which research outside of traditional classrooms has occurred (Hull & Schultz, 2002; Kinloch, 2009, 2010; Leander & Sheehy, 2004). This dissertation adds to this corpus of research on adolescent literacy by providing even greater nuanced understandings of adolescents’ literacies in Connect as an alternative classroom that operates within the traditional public school system but which offers teachers and students an alternative way of meeting content area requirements required by state and federal educational laws in the United States.
States. The nuanced understandings provided by this dissertation might help educators and researchers rethink and re-orchestrate how adolescents participate in literacy events and practices across learning spaces in ways that are engaging and/or community generative in the figured world of school.

While this study offers the opportunity for educators and educational researchers to rethink and re-orchestrate adolescent literacy and language events and practices, it also fills gaps in educational research by including students’ voices on engagement as well as community generation in classrooms. Student engagement is a multidimensional process, and educational researchers have used a variety of methods and studies to understand this complex part of learning. Some researchers have chosen to examine the affective, cognitive, and behavioral factors of student engagement in learning through correlational studies (Archambault, Janosz, Fallu, & Pagani, 2009; Lewis, Huebner, Malone, & Valois, 2011), while others have used qualitative methods to offer implications for teachers’ classroom practices (Caraway, Tucker, Reinke, & Hall, 2003; Kelly, 2007; Schussler, 2009). Largely absent in these studies are the voices of the students they are examining in order to understand how they are engaging in learning. My research, however, uses qualitative methods to examine how, when, and under what conditions spaces become engaging learning environments by examining how the teachers and students co-construct spaces. Student voices about community generation and/or sustainment in classrooms are also largely absent from the educational research on community, perhaps because of the emphasis on correlational studies in this area of research. Much of the educational research on community building in classrooms involves correlational studies which examine how factors, such as violence (Chen, 2008; Gottfredson and DiPietro 2011) or
motivation and academic achievement (Battistich, Solomon, Kim, Watson, & Schaps, 1995; Goodenow, 1993; Stewart, 2008) affect feelings of community among students. In an effort to include students’ voices on community generation and sustainment in classrooms, my research examines how Connect members create community generative spaces over the 2011-2012 school year. Students, who represent the largest group of participants in classrooms, have much to offer educators and educational researchers who want to more deeply understanding how classroom participants create and sustain community spaces.

This research study, which includes teachers’ and students’ voices on literacy and language events and practices, student engagement in learning, and community generation/sustaining across spaces, provides implications for classroom practices that are deeply theoretically informed by trialectical theories of space (Lefebvre, 1974/1992) and Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner, and Cain’s (1998) theory of figured worlds. As an example of how these theories might help teachers and educational researchers re-think and re-conceptualize classroom spaces in ways that foster student engagement and/or generate/sustain feelings of community I provide as an example the ways in which Connect teachers and students participated in and made sense of literacy and language events and practices across Connect spaces. Throughout this study, teachers and students co-constructed Connect spaces using their collective and individual conceptions and perceptions of spaces. These conceptions and perceptions, both collective and individual, are important in understanding more fully how teachers and students can come together and co-construct classroom spaces.
Understanding the Researcher

The reasons I have chosen to pursue a study at Connect using the research questions I listed above are multiple and interconnected, much like the spaces I describe throughout this dissertation. I will quickly explain a few of the most cogent reasons I am pursuing this work. As a child growing up in West Virginia, my parents wanted my brother and me to travel and learn, and from a young age, I believed travel and learning were intertwined. My mom had grown up without ever leaving the state, and she was adamant that my brother and I would not have the same experience. Each year, my family packed up the truck and tent-camper and headed to a campground for at least a week, where we would attend all the learning programs the naturalist at the campground offered. I loved learning about the plants, the critters, and the history of the place all while being so close to them all. My grandmother, mom, and I would attend all the craft making sessions, where we learned how to make baskets, stained glass windows with wax paper, and jewelry. In addition to our time among the woods, we often travelled by car, and later by airplane, to historical sites. We walked the hallowed grounds of battlefields, visited the homes of important historical figures, and even got to perform some of the daily tasks those who lived long ago performed. I loved each and every experience with the history of a place, and I valued those experiences as influential in how and what I learned. My love of experiential learning influenced my chosen career path as I entered college.

After great thought, I chose social studies education as my undergraduate major, because I could integrate my love of reading and writing with history, economics, and the study of people and places. In my educational course work, I began to create lesson plans...
that involved my imaginary students in experiencing social studies. In West Virginia, transportation made field trips difficult, so I began looking for ways to create experiences in my future classroom. As I approached graduation, a professor suggested I pursue a graduate degree in hopes of making myself more marketable. I took his advice, and, after student teaching 11th grade history and 8th grade state history/civics, I went to The Ohio State University to complete a master’s degree in reading education. In addition to my parents supporting learning through traveling to places, they also valued reading. I grew up surrounded by books along with weekly trips to the small county library about 15 minutes from our house; my dad sat my brother and me on his knees to read us the Sunday comics until I protested I was too old for that. I entered the work force with degrees that made me a humanities teachers, but humanities classrooms were not often found in West Virginia’s schools. My educational background and passion for learning, history, and literacies greatly affected my choice in dissertation research.

I entered my classrooms in West Virginia with certifications as a reading specialist for grades K-12 and a social studies teacher for grades 7-12. I spent 7 years teaching social studies to high school students in the small town of Winfield, West Virginia, where I had grown up and attended the same high school. What I learned there with my students and colleagues directly influenced my conceptualizations of teaching and learning and ultimately this dissertation. As a high school social studies teacher, I built upon sociocultural learning theories and conceptualized the interconnected process of teaching and learning in the following way. Teaching, at its core, involved caring about my students, providing them with planned instruction involving a variety of activities, which were based on learning goals, and assessing their learning of those goals
through informal and formal assessments. Teaching required me to make all of the above
decisions based upon knowledge of the content and my students as well as local, state,
and national educational policies. As a social studies teacher, teaching was more about
“doing” history together (Wineburg, 2001), which occurred as we explored topics as
individuals, small groups, and whole group using a variety of activities. Teaching helps
humans to learn. Learning, at its core, involves acquiring and using new knowledge,
skills, values, and/or attitudes. As humans interact with texts, artifacts, contexts, and
other humans, they are involved in the process of learning. Everyone learns in different
ways, and each person has different strengths and interests, which affect his or her
motivation and engagement in the learning process.

After 7 years of teaching high school students in Winfield, WV, I decided to
pursue my lifelong dream of earning my doctoral degree. My husband and I both quit our
jobs to begin new ones in our new place of residence in D-Burb, MidwestState. As an
Appalachian who moved away from home to pursue my graduate degree, I missed home
and noticed that those around me did not necessarily feel the attachment to place that I
did. I was very interested in understanding more about this particular phenomenon. I
began to notice how place was taken up differently in different spaces in my life. For
example, as a doctoral student, I was often asked what I was going to do after I
completed my degree, but my family and friends in West Virginia often asked me,
“Where are you going to go after you finish your degree?” Place was a re-occurring topic
of discussion with my grandparents. I remember one particular conversation in which my
grandfather wanted to talk about my future plans after graduate school. With what
sounded like a hint of regret to me, he told me to find the perfect job for me wherever it
may be. He reminded me home would always be in West Virginia, which I could always visit, but he also acknowledged the constraints the area might put on opportunities for me and my family. That conversation with my grandfather solidified my desire to explore the importance of place in human interactions in my research.

I entered my doctoral program with a focus on social studies education, but during the first year of coursework, I believed a better fit for my research interests would be a focus in adolescent, post-secondary, and community literacies. Through literacy coursework, I was able to explore how students were using literacy practices and/or texts to make meaning across their lived spaces. Literacy frameworks seemed to bring together my many passions and my socioculturally-founded conceptualizations of learning as integrated, experiential, and individualized. I began to look for classrooms in which teachers were taking up similar conceptualizations of learning, and I was introduced to the Connect program in September 2010, when my adviser asked for volunteers to join her at Connect for a guest speaker panel on privilege.

As a guest speaker, I shared with the 2010-2011 CO1 students my experiences as a White, middle class woman who grew up and taught in Appalachia. While spending the day there, I kept thinking about how I might get to spend more days with the program members. With intent eye gazes and probing questions, the students seemed engaged in our discussion about privilege, which was a topic I had not observed being even mentioned in the local schools where we had placed students teachers I had been employed to observe once a week. I learned the program had many of the qualities I had sought to provide my own students in my classroom back in West Virginia as well as new pieces I had learned about while in graduate school. These qualities included project-
based learning, experiential learning, building relationships and communities, learning outside the school walls, integrating subjects (i.e. social studies, English, and art), creating lifelong learners, and learners' choices. After talking with my adviser, I took the initiative and emailed David and Erma asking if I might observe the program for a preliminary investigation for my dissertational work. They agreed, and I began spending afternoons with Connect.

Over the 2010-2011 school year, my infrequent visits helped me get a “sense of the flow of social activity itself” (Dyson & Genishi, 2005, p. 29). The visits offered me opportunities to more completely understand how the teacher and students spent their time together, which informed my decisions on the foci and methods for this dissertation. During these visits in 2010-2011, I took part in the class, and I often talked with students and teachers before, during, and after class. I took field notes during and/or after my visits. These observations provided me opportunities to understand and experience the process of building and analyzing relationships in Connect places/spaces before I began a longer, more in-depth ethnographically-informed study.

During Summer 2011, I obtained IRB permission to enter Connect as my dissertational research site, and I chose to focus on the first year experience, which members referred to as CO1. In July, David emailed me asking if I would be willing to lead a book discussion during the first week of school, and I chose Nation (Pratchett, 2008) as the book I would read and discuss with students. I also emailed David and Erma about my IRB approval, and they asked me to meet them before school started to sign the consent forms. My first meeting with students and parents did not occur until CO1 orientation night on August 22, 2011. I then spent 54 days from August 23, 2011 until
December 15, 2011 observing CO1 class lessons, which were recorded in field notes as well as audio and/or video recordings. From January 2012 until May 2012, I spent time transcribing audio and/or video recordings of classroom observations, completing and transcribing seven (2 teachers and 5 students) interviews, and observing and audio and/or video recording 9 class lessons, such as presentations and writing workshops. This dissertation provides some of the rich events I experienced through my year-long research study with the Connect community.

**Overview of the Dissertation**

Chapter Two details the literature that informs this dissertation. It is broken into two sections: theoretical framework and literature review of empirical research. My theoretical framework comprises the first section. In it, I explore the theories that inform my understandings of teaching and learning, literacy, place/space, and figured worlds. This section ends with a description on how I am blending trialectical theories of space (Lefebvre 1974/1992) with Holland et al.’s (1998) theory of figured worlds, which significantly influences the ways in which I present and analyze my research data in Chapters Four and Five. My literature review makes up the second section. In it, I examine the empirical studies that inform my understandings of four main areas of my research questions: centrality of language in classrooms, adolescents' literacies in hybrid spaces, student engagement in learning, and building community in schools/classrooms.

Chapter Three discusses my methodology as well as the contextual understandings necessary for understanding Connect spaces. The chapter begins with descriptions of the global spaces and then the more local spaces involved in this research study. After I describe these more local spaces, I turn to briefly describing each of the
participants. Moving on from these contextual descriptions, I then discuss the methods I used during data collection and data analysis. The chapter concludes with acknowledgements of the study’s limitations as well as the ethical considerations I thought about both before and during the study.

Chapter Four provides the findings of this study. The findings describe the interconnections I noticed among the fields of power, such as race, gender, sexuality, religion, and/or schooling, and teachers’ and students’ conceived, perceived, and lived spaces, which could be both individual and collective in nature. Chapter Four is comprised of three sections. Section One discusses how participants conceived their figured worlds of Connect. Section Two describes the lived spaces of Connect using five artifacts of its literacy and/or language practices. These five artifacts are CO Circle, Field Trips, Guest Speakers, Outside Learning Projects, and the group's Facebook wall. Using evidence from Section Two as well as interview data, Section Three examines how the lived spaces of Connect created (or not) engaging and/or community generative spaces.

Chapter Five concludes this research study with a discussion of my findings. My findings have implications for classroom practices that are deeply theoretically informed, and I begin the chapter by explaining how trialectical spatial theories (Lefebvre, 1974/1992) and Holland et al.’s (1998) theory of figured world might help teachers and educational researchers re-think learning in classroom spaces. I then move to discussing more particular implications for classroom practices by examining what we can learn about literacy and language events and practices as well as co-constructing spaces through the example of Connect. The chapter ends with a brief discussion of further questions I now have after completing this study.
Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

The purpose of this study is to describe what happens when teachers and students from various communities in MidwestCity participate in literacy and language events and practices in an alternative humanities classroom. In order to more richly describe these happenings, I draw upon theoretical and empirical scholarship in the fields of teaching, learning, literacy, and language. This chapter has two main sections: a theoretical framework and a literature review. In the first section, I provide the theoretical foundations upon which I based this study. I begin the first section, which is focused on my theoretical framework, with a discussion of the theories of teaching and learning which seem to undergird the Connect program. From these more general theories of teaching and learning, I move to defining and explaining how I take up literacy as it involves events, practices, and texts in this study. Teaching, learning, and literacy events, practices, and texts are situated in particular places and spaces, so I then turn to examining the social constructions of place/space. As this research study evolved, I began to look for a more robust way of explaining the identity and/or agentive opportunities I was noticing at Connect, so I also include a review of Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner, and Cain's (1998) theory of figured worlds, which involve identity, agency, and power. I conclude my theoretical framework section with a section which describes how I blend
spatial theories and figured worlds in order to more fully understand literacy and language events and practice in Connect spaces.

In the second section of this chapter, I provide a literature review focused on empirical studies around the four main areas of my research questions: the centrality of language in classrooms, adolescents' literacies in hybrid spaces, student engagement in learning, and building community in schools/classrooms. In the first part of my literature review, I will examine how discourse has been studied in classrooms across places/spaces over time. In the second part, I will review studies which examine adolescents participating in literacy events and practices in hybrid spaces. In the third part, I will discuss educational research studies focused on how students engage in classroom activities. In the final part, I will explore how community has been taken up in educational research.

**Theoretical Framework: Theories that Inform My Study**

In this first section of chapter 2, I provide a theoretical framework for this research study. This framework shapes the ways in which I entered, participated in, and analyzed the Connect spaces. In the first part of this section, I discuss the general theories of learning, which seem foundational to the Connect program. These theories include sociocultural theories of learning, experiential learning, situated learning, "funds of knowledge," and culturally sensitive pedagogy. In the second part of this section, I define literacy as situated social practices, where humans make meaning from and/or with various types of texts. I further explain how the literacy theories of New Literacy Studies, Multiliteracies, and critical literacies inform my understandings of literacy events, practices, and texts. In the third part of this section, I explicate my understandings of
placeospace, which are founded upon theories from across academic disciplines. In the fourth part of this section, I review Holland et al.'s (1998) theory of figured worlds as I found it to be a useful way in which to think about my data as I analyzed what was happening as teachers and students participated in literacy and language events and practices across Connect spaces. In the final part of this section, I detail how I blend the spatial theories I described in the third part and the theory of figured worlds I described in the fourth part of this section in ways that afford me the opportunities to more robustly describe how Connect members participate in literacy and language events and practices.

**Teaching and Learning**

Several learning theories, including sociocultural theories of education (Rogoff, 2003; Vygotsky, 1978), experiential learning (Dewey, 1938/1997), situated learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991), "funds of knowledge" (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992), and culturally relevant pedagogy (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995, 2009), seem to have influenced the ways in which the School Partnership and the co-facilitators created and/or enacted the Connect program. Sociocultural theories of education, particularly as espoused by Vygotsky (1978) and Rogoff (2003), seem to be key foundational pieces of how learning is conceived and/or lived in the participants’ figured worlds of Connect. Vygotsky and other sociocultural theorists posit that humans use “physical tools and socioculturally—and sociohistorically—constructed symbolic artifacts, of which languages is the most important, to control and master nature and themselves” (Swain & Deters, 2007, p. 821). This process of mediation helps humans’ minds develop higher-level cognitive functions. Vygotsky’s theory gave importance to not only the human mind but also the social context as well as the use of language in the learning process. Specifically,
Vygotsky (1978) defined learning as “...more than the acquisition of the ability to think; it is the acquisition of many specialized abilities for thinking about a variety of things” (p. 83). Vygotsky believed children could learn the abilities for thinking through interactions with adults in the children’s zones of proximal development. Vygotsky (1978) defined the zone of proximal development as "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers." (p. 86). Adults should teach children by providing scaffolding so children might take what they already know, link it to new knowledge and/or skills, and then move to higher cognitive functions. Expanding on Vygotsky's theories of learning, Rogoff describes how humans “...develop as participants in cultural communities. Their development can be understood only in light of the cultural practices and circumstances of their communities – which also change” (Rogoff, 2003, p. 3-4). Rogoff includes the importance of the learner's culture in the learning process, and she acknowledges the mutability of all social practices. Sociocultural theories of learning, thus, suggest teaching involves planning and implementing instruction that builds upon the learner's backgrounds and identities to help the learner acquire and use new knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes across various contexts.

Sociocultural theories are not the only learning theories that undergird the foundations of Connect. Experiential learning theories also seem to be of great importance to the ways in which the School Partnership and the co-facilitators have created and/or enacted the Connect program. John Dewey (1938/1997), who was an educational reformer, might have been describing Connect when he describes the goals of
progressive schools in *Experience and Education*: "expression and cultivation of individuality;...free activity;...learning through experience; ...acquisition of them [skills and techniques] as means of attaining ends which make direct vital appeal; ...making the most of the opportunities of present life; ...acquaintance with a changing world." (p. 5-6).

Dewey cautions against learning by simply doing any experience, and he provides guidance on the careful planning and implementation of experiential learning in the field of schooling. He also details some of the problems one might encounter as he or she implements experiential learning. For example, he worries about the quality of the educational experiences as each individual experiences them differently. Experiences might be enjoyable yet promote "a slack and careless attitude" or they "may be so disconnected from one another...a person becomes scatter-brained." (Dewey, 1938/1997, p. 14). While Dewey's specific examples might be dated in their word choice, his theories of experiential learning seemed to influence the ways in which School Partnership created Connect in the 1990s and the ways in which David and/or Erma planned and implemented the learning experiences for Connect students during my preliminary observations during the 2010-2011 school year.

Building upon the foundations of both sociocultural theories of learning and experiential learning, the theory of situated learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991) seemed to provide the Connect program with a pedagogical model based in my previous experiences with the program. Lave and Wenger (1991) believe learning occurs through a process they call "legitimate peripheral participation." This process occurs as "learners inevitably participate in communities of practitioners...." (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 29). As they participate in these communities of practice, they begin to master knowledge and
skills essential to their participation in the community. Teachers often help students to join a school and/or classroom community of practice by providing guidance through direct instruction, expectations, and practice through repeated activities. How David and/or Erma apprenticed students into the Connect community of practice was of interest to me as I began this study.

The School Partnership designed Connect as an educational program in which it seemed students’ diverse identities and backgrounds could be celebrated and used as a learning tool. Though not cited specifically in the texts about the program, theories of learning which suggest building upon students' identities and/or background knowledge and skills seem to be a part of the conceptualizations of learning in the participants’ figured worlds of Connect. One such theory that posits building upon students' identities and background knowledge and skills is referred to as "funds of knowledge" (Moll, Amanti, Neff, and Gonzalez, 1992). Moll et al. (1992) define "funds of knowledge" as "historically accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household or individual functioning and well-being" (p. 133). By considering and building upon students' knowledge and skills learned at home, teachers can help students to learn academic content knowledge and skills. "Funds of knowledge" was influenced by the work being done in what Moll et al. (1992) call "culturally sensitive curriculum" (p. 139), but "funds of knowledge" shifted the focus from students' cultures to the more local contexts in which they lived.

With a close association to "funds of knowledge," culturally sensitive teaching models also seem to inform the conceptualizations and teaching practices at Connect. Specific models, such as Ladson-Billings’ (1995, 2009) culturally relevant pedagogy and
Gay’s (2000) culturally responsive teaching, provide guidance on how urban teachers might more effectively teach Black students. Drawing upon her work with classroom teachers, Ladson-Billings (1995, 2009) suggests culturally relevant pedagogy has three goals for students: (1) academic success, (2) cultural competence, and (3) critical consciousness. Teachers need to believe and take up these goals in order to help African-American students learn in classroom spaces. Gay (2000) also provides teachers with guidance on how to help students with diverse identities learn in classroom spaces. Culturally responsive teaching has many components, including integration across content fields, lessons, and pedagogical practices, consistency in use, perceptions of academic success and community among students, believing in and building upon the strengths of each student, and helping students to become agents of change (Gay, 2000, p. 213-214). Less specific models based on cultural congruencies became labeled as culturally sensitive pedagogy (Banks, 2000; Howard, 2001). Culturally sensitive pedagogy models are more inclusive in their definitions of diversity. While culturally relevant and/or responsive pedagogy tends to focus on Black/White identities, culturally sensitive pedagogy provides guidance to teachers on how to teach students with diverse linguistic identities (Nieto, 2000) as well as Latino/a students (Ochoa, 2007). Each of these models for building upon students' backgrounds and identities provide suggestions for teachers on selecting and implementing content knowledge and/or pedagogical practices that include students' cultural identities.

Teaching and learning are interconnected sociocultural processes that occur across spaces and involve language, identities, and power structures/relations. Teaching and learning are thus dependent upon the people involved in the process, which can make
the processes “rife with tension” (Baquedano-López, Solís, & Kattan, 2005, p. 2). At Connect, with its foundations in sociocultural learning theories, experiential learning, situated learning, "funds of knowledge," and culturally sensitive teaching theories, tensions do arise as teachers and students participate in literacy and language events and practices. Connect offers a unique space in which to research such tensions as teachers and students orchestrate and/or improvise what teaching and learning mean in their figured worlds of Connect.

**Literacy: Events, Practices, and Texts**

Educational researchers focus much of their work on the teaching and learning that occurs in the places/spaces of schools and classrooms. Among these educational researchers, literacy researchers have also examined how participants took up literacy in schools and/or classrooms. Historically, researchers examined literacy as an autonomous set of skills, which in and of itself affected “other social and cognitive practices” (Street, 2005a, p. 417). At present, there are those who still support this model of literacy believing literacy will lead to progress and success, as it leads to critical thinking, economic success, and even creates greater equality (Graff, 1995; Scribner & Cole, 1981). Over the last 30 years, literacy researchers have questioned this autonomous view of literacy, and they have suggested the ideological model of literacy, which emphasizes literacy as “a social practice…that is always embedded in socially constructed epistemological principles” (Street, 2005a, p. 418). Specifically, the ideological model of literacy “view[s] literacy practices as inextricably linked to cultural and power structures in society and…recognise[s] the variety of cultural practices associated with reading and writing in different contexts” (Street, 1993/2001, pp. 433-434). With the shifting literacy
practices across contexts, there is not a literacy but multiple literacies that individuals use (Barton & Hamilton, 2000; Hull & Schultz, 2002; Street 1998). Moving away from the autonomous model’s view of literacy as a set of practices residing in a person, the ideological model’s view supports more fully understanding literacy as multiple practices that reside “in the relations between people, within groups and communities” (Barton & Hamilton, 2000, p. 8). Researchers who view literacy as multiple can examine the multiplicity of literacy as social practices across modalities as well as social practices across social spaces/places (Barton & Hamilton, 2000; Cope & Kalantzis, 2000).

The autonomous model of literacy tended to privilege literacy research in school settings, but over the last 20 years many researchers have taken up the ideological model of literacy to understand literacy in-school and out-of-school. As early as the 1980s, Shirley Brice Heath (1983) worked to draw attention to literacy as a social practice as well as its use in and across particular places/spaces in her ethnography of literacy among community members in Trackton, Roadville and Maintown. Much like Heath, New Literacy Studies (NLS) scholars focus on literacy practices in use across multiple places/spaces (Barton & Hamilton, 2000; Gee, 1986; Hull & Schultz, 2002; Street, 1984, 1998, 2003, 2005a, 2005b). NLS scholars focus on the social aspects of literacy rather than its power as an autonomous process in humans’ lives.

In order to understand literacy practices in various places/spaces, researchers have observed literacy events (Heath, 1982/2001). A literacy event is “any occasion in which a piece of writing is integral to the nature of the participants’ interactions and their interpretative processes” (Heath, 1982/2001, p. 445). Literacy events provide insight into the literacy practices of the particular group being studied, but the NLS researcher must
conceptualize the literacy practices present in the events he or she observes. Research that “abstract[s] or decontextualize[s] ‘literacy bits’ from the larger practices in which they are embedded” removes the “real life” meaning involved in these literacy practices (Rowan, Knobel, Bigum, & Lankshear, 2002, p. 92). NLS researchers therefore use literacy events in order to better understand the larger literacy practices of the individual[s] with whom they are working (Street, 2005b). Drawing upon “…a social practice approach to literacy in use pushes us [NLS researchers] towards recognizing the considerable overlap across [these] boundaries as people, texts, and practices track through different settings and scenes…” (Street, 2005b, p. 2). NLS scholars tend to define literacy as social practices involving reading and/or writing of alphabetical texts.

In 1994, scholars from Australia, Great Britain, and the United States met in New London, New Hampshire to discuss teaching literacy in the future, which they believed involved “the changing word and the new demands being placed upon people as makers of meaning in changing workplaces, as citizens in changing public spaces and in the changing dimensions of our community lives – our lifeworlds” (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000, p. 4). The New London Group (NLG), as this scholarly group became known, created a framework for conceptualizing literacy and literacy teaching which included the increasing existence of multimodal texts. Their theory, termed Multiliteracies, would include two arguments: “the multiplicity of communication channels and media” and “the increasing salience of cultural and linguistic diversity” (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000, p. 5). The theory of Multiliteracies examines not only what humans do during literacy events but also how teachers might help students use literacy in their everyday lives.
The Multiliteracies framework involves six design elements of meaning-making and four components of pedagogy (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000). In order to make meaning, the NLG believes humans rely on six elements, which are “Linguistic Meaning, Visual Meaning, Audio Meaning, Gestural Meaning, Spatial Meaning, and the Multimodal patterns of meaning that relate the first five modes of meaning to each other” (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000, p. 7). These six elements of Multiliteracies focuses on the types of texts and types of processes involved in making meaning from those texts. “…[P]edagogy is a complex integration of four factors: Situated Practice…Overt Instruction…Critical Framing…and Transformed Practice…” (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000, p. 31). These four components of pedagogy provide teachers with a theoretical model for teaching and learning through which they might help students be more effective meaning makers across contexts. While Multiliteracies acknowledges the social and cultural diversity in literacy teaching and learning, its focus seems to be on the changing nature of literacy and literacy teaching.

Literacy practices involve power relations as all social activities do. Critical literacies, which examine power relations in literacy practices, involve reading the word and the world (Freire & Macedo, 1987). In reading the word and the world, humans evaluate the ideologies present in social practices and language. Many who support and use this theory believe literacies can be used to transform the inequities they see in various social relationships and structures (Freire, 1970/2000; Freire & Macedo, 1987; Rowan et al, 2002; Shor, 1999; Young, 2009). In particular, Shor (1999) believes critical literacy begins in “questioning power relations, discourses, and identities in a world not yet finished, just or humane” (p. 2). From this beginning, one can “discover alternative
paths for self and social development” (Shor, 1999, p. 2). Critical literacies thus encompasses not only understanding literacy practices in contexts but also critiquing and possibly changing the inequities found in these practices and contexts.

As a literacy researcher, my conceptualization of literacy draws upon New Literacy Studies (NLS), Multiliteracies, and critical literacies. In this study, I define literacy as situated social practices, where humans make meaning from and/or with various types of texts. I define texts as inscribed, material, and meaningful representations of ideas, which readers and writers/performers can construct in a variety of modes depending upon the resources and social contexts present (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000; Pahl & Rowsell, 2010). Inscribed means the author wrote, drew, collaged, carved, and/or engraved symbols in or on a physical object to meaningfully represent an idea or ideas. Texts include alphabetic texts, audio-visual texts, and pieces of visual art and music. Other physical objects, which Pahl and Rowsell (2010) refer to as artifacts, might be analyzed in similar ways to texts, but these physical objects do not meaningfully represent ideas. Instead, their creators constructed these objects for other purposes, such as providing shelter (i.e. house, place of worship, library) or tool(s) (i.e. pen, dishes, hammer). By including various types of modal representations in my definition of texts, I am afforded opportunities to more fully understand how participants understand, critique, and/or transform themselves and their world through meaningful representations (see, e.g. Kinloch, 2010).

**Social Constructions of Space**

Places and spaces are social constructions for understanding locations (de Certeau, 1984; Entrikin, 1991; Soja, 1996). The operational definitions of these terms,
however, differ across academic disciplines as well as between scholars within those disciplines. For example, cultural geographers, with scientific frameworks, use space as the term for understanding specific geographical locations, or locations that can be located using lines of latitude and longitude. These cultural geographers use scientific approaches and models to gain greater understanding of those spaces (Jordan-Bychkov & Domosh, 1999; Entrikin, 1991). Humanistic cultural geographers use place as the term for understanding locations, which includes the geographical location and also the social constructions around that location (Jordan-Bychkov & Domosh, 1999; Entrikin, 1991). The sense of place that humanistic cultural geographers try to explore is taken up by other disciplines, such as cultural anthropology (see, e.g. Basso, 1996). Including the social aspects of places allows researchers to “partake of cultures, of shared bodies of “local knowledge” (the phrase is Clifford Geertz’s) with which persons and whole communities render their places meaningful and endow them with social importance” (Basso, 1996, p. xiv).

Inside the field of geography, Harvey has spent much of his scholarly career trying to more fully articulate and understand the concepts of place, space, and time. Harvey (2006) believes space is absolute, relative, and relational, depending upon the human practices involved in a particular bounded area. While he seems to include the social practices of interest to humanistic cultural geographers, he chooses to use the term space to describe the social practices as well as the particular location that might be placed on a map. He (2006) acknowledges the complexities and issues involving the term “space” in the following way:
But space turns out to be an extraordinarily complicated keyword. It functions as a compound word and has multiple determinations such that no one of its particular meanings can properly be understood in isolation from all the others. But that is precisely what makes the term, particularly joined with time, so rich in possibilities. (p. 293)

The possibilities of space have led other theorists in social, literary, and cultural disciplines to take up the term in their academic areas and theories.

Building upon the sense of place of humanistic cultural geography, some social and cultural theorists have offered more defined ways of understanding place and space. Like cultural anthropologists, such as Basso (1996), de Certeau (1984) acknowledges the stories and memories tied to places but he defines places and spaces more specifically than anthropologists. He defines place as a relationship of positions. Place refers to “the order…with which elements are distributed in relationships of coexistence” (de Certeau, 1984, p. 116). For example, “here” and “there” have meaning based on their relationships to other locations. Place is more stable than space in de Certeau’s theory, because by his definition, place does not include multiple variables like time or movement. Spaces, unlike places, involve the intersections of time, processes, and power, thus making them less stable than places. Spaces are socially and politically constructed locales which involve the practices of places (de Certeau, 1984; Foucault 1982/2010; Leander, 2004). In order to more succinctly describe and understand the complexities of space, with its many social practices of places, some theorists have offered trialectical theories of space, which work to describe three interconnected levels of spaces.
Lefebvre (1974/1992) provided a trialectical theory of space which focused on how humans used and/or understood spaces. In Lefebvre’s theory, space could be labeled as perceived, conceived, or lived. Soja (1996) builds upon Lefebvre’s spatial categories to provide further theoretical details on how humans construct these spaces in particular places. Soja labels perceived space as Firstspace, which is where spatial practices occur. In Firstspace, space is “materialized, socially produced, [and] empirical” (Soja, 1996, p. 66). Firstspace is observable. Soja labels conceived space as Secondspace, which is where one finds representations of space. In Secondspace, “utopian thought and vision” comprise the space (Soja, 1996, p. 67). Soja (1996) labels lived space as Thirdspace, which is the “spaces of representation” (p. 65). In Thirdspace, “inhabitants” and “users” can generate counterspaces, which resist the dominance of Firstspace and/or Secondspace perceptions and conceptions (Soja, 1996, pp. 67-68). Soja (1996) admits “Trialectical thinking is difficult…. It is disorderly, unruly, constantly evolving, unfixed, never presentable in permanent constructions” (p. 70). Due to these issues, his conceptions of space have been difficult to use and apply in classroom spaces (see, e.g. Sheehy, 2010), especially in classrooms spaces such as those constructed by Connect members. In my efforts to more fully understand what I noticed occurring in my initial investigation among Connect members as they participated in language and literacy practices in Connect places/spaces, I turned to other theorists, and I found Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner, and Cain’s (1998) theory of figured worlds, with its focus on identities and power relations, seemed a complementary theory to trialectical theories of spaces.
Figured Worlds: Identity, Agency, and Power

Identity, agency, and power are key components in Holland et al.’s (1998) theory of figured worlds, but I would like to begin with a brief definition of the term “figured world.” A figured world is “...a socially and culturally constructed realm of interpretation in which particular characters and actors are recognized, significance is assigned to certain acts, and particular outcomes are valued over others.” (Holland et al., 1998, p. 52). Humans co-construct figured worlds based on their conceptions of how they should act and how they actually act in particular contexts. “Figured worlds take shape within and grant shape to the coproduction of activities, discourses, performances, and artifacts.” (Holland et al., 1998, p. 51). A researcher, thus, can describe a figured world by examining the “activities, discourses, performances, and artifacts” co-produced by members of the figured world. The figured world, however, is more than just a description of day-to-day happenings. As humans co-construct figured worlds, they must abstract “...significant regularities from everyday life into expectations about how particular types of events unfold...” while also using “distillations of past experiences” to interpret the day-to-day happenings (Holland et al., 1998, p. 53). Figured worlds involve identity, agency, and power as humans act in particular ways within the figured world to co-produce artifacts, which I believe may take the form of discourses, performances, activities, or texts.

Identity involves a process of self-understandings based upon a myriad of individual and social factors. Holland et al. (1998) define identity as “...the way a person understands and views himself, and is often viewed by others, at least in certain situations—a perception of self that can be fairly constantly achieved. These forms of
self-understanding are always construed relative to a figured world of social life.” (p. 68).

At its core, identity is how one views himself or herself, but identity is a complex, dialogic process. To more fully understand this complex process, Holland et al. (1998) suggest focusing on identity in practice, which involves examining identity through four interrelated contexts of activity (p. 271). The first context of activity is the figured world. The second context of activity involves “positionality” in which humans evaluate one another’s identities based on power, status, and rank often linked to social and cultural capital (Holland et al., 1998, p. 271). The third context of activity is the “space of authoring,” where “[t]he world must be answered—authorship is not a choice—but the form of the answer is not predetermined” (Holland et al., 1998, p. 272). The answer usually involves orchestration of inner and social voices, but the individual has agency in this context to compose that orchestration. The final context of activity is “making worlds: through ‘serious play,’ new figured worlds may come about...” (Holland et al., 1998, p. 272). The final context may become the first context as humans create imaginary worlds and play within them. While Holland et al. (1998) describe these contexts as separate spaces for identity in practice, they are often interconnected and allow individuals to move “back and forth from intimate to public spaces” (p. 272).

Drawing upon Holland et al.’s (1998) work on identity, I believe identities are how a human understands himself or herself. These understandings occur through a process of orchestration, where someone must make sense of all the information about one’s self, which has been stored in his or her brain over his or her lifespan. Holland et al. (1998) provide the concept of “person-in-history” to explain how previous life experiences help inform present and future identities. Based upon one's sense of self and
the figured worlds he or she believes are present, individuals choose and use particular words and behaviors to interact with others. Words and behaviors are practices/performances of his or her identities (Holland et al., 1998, p. 31). While the actual process of orchestration may occur internally, a person’s identities can be seen in their practices/performances of these self-understandings in social interactions. Identities can change over time, and humans often base their identities upon contextual factors. Identities may also take the form of “positional identities,” which involve “…the day-to-day and on-the-ground relations of power, deference and entitlement, social affiliation and distance...” or “narrativized or figurative identities,” which involve “…the stories, acts, and characters that make the world a cultural world” (Holland et al., 1998, p. 127). Identities vary across time, space, and others present.

Figured worlds and identities, especially positional identities within figured worlds, interconnect with issues of agency and power in complex ways. Humans do not co-construct figured worlds in a vacuum; figured worlds are connected to other figured worlds as well as larger fields (Holland et al. 1998). For example, the participants’ figured worlds of Connect were connected to the figured worlds of the students’ Schools of Primary Enrollment (SPEs) as well as the fields of schooling, race, gender, social class, sexuality, and/or religion. Humans also construct and perform their identities in the day-to-day events occurring within the figured world, and these identities are based upon the figured worlds and fields in which participants believe they are participating as well as their own senses of agency in these figured worlds and fields. Figured worlds are “a landscape of objectified (materially and perceptibly expressed) meanings, joint activities, and structures of privilege and influence—all partly contingent upon and partly
independent of other figured worlds, the interconnections among figured worlds, and larger societal and trans-societal forces.” (Holland et al. 1998, p. 60). Agency and power are complexly interconnected in the everyday events and construction of figured worlds in ways that involve both local and global influences.

I believe identity, agency, and power are important to understanding what happens when the teachers and students from various neighborhoods and life experiences come together to learn at Connect. Their personal identities as well as their understandings of the figured worlds of SPEs and Connect as well as fields of schooling, race, gender, social class, sexuality, and religion matter in how they participate in Connect spaces. They choose how they will participate in the collective figured world of Connect and also orchestrate and perform their identities in this figured world. Their words and behaviors, which I noted and/or captured on my audio/video equipment, are performances of their understandings of self as well as the many figured worlds and fields that intersect in Connect spaces. While this study examines identities, agency, and power in the participants’ figured worlds of Connect, it provides understandings into processes that occur in any human learning space as humans are always negotiating their identities, their agency and power, and their social contexts.

**Blending Theories: Bringing Together Spatial Theories and Figured Worlds**

Places/spaces matter to me, and I believe they are an important part of this dissertation. As I began to conceptualize place and space early in my doctoral program, I considered place to be a geographic location, but now, after reading the above theoretical works, I believe place is more complicated than this. At the present moment, de Certeau’s (1984) conceptualizations of place and space are influencing my own conceptualizations
of place and space. Place as a relationship of positions (e.g. here/there) offers the stability as well as the acknowledgement of the social construction of locations for which I had been looking. Places have more stability than spaces, but both terms involve imagined boundaries (Harvey, 2006; Sheehy, 2010). While places are socially constructed, I believe places are comprised of some sort of materiality which informs the social constructions around it (Harvey, 2006). For example, places are often comprised of physical items such as walls, houses, roads, trees, and/or mountains. Places include spaces.

Spaces, which are often located in places, are socio-political constructions. Spaces involve the practices of places, which include the intersections of time, processes, and power (de Certeau, 1984; Foucault 1982/2010; Leander, 2004). Spaces are thus less stable than places, and often do not have the materiality I understand to be in places. For example, at Connect, the teachers and students created a learning space in a place that has been labeled a church, which people often use as a religious space. Connect members did not consider the church their school yet they were participating in school practices in the church. While I have tried to present my understandings of place and space as succinct conceptualizations through this tangible example from Connect, I acknowledge “space is so abstract and intangible” that it can never be fully captured (Reynolds, 2004, p. 13).

Spaces are also comprised of three interconnected entities, which make them even more difficult to describe. Lefebvre’s (1974/1992) trialectical spatial theory labeled these three spatial entities as conceived, perceived, and lived spaces. Conceived spaces are based upon how people believe a space should be. Perceived spaces are how people felt or experienced a space. Lived spaces are how people act in a space, and this is the
observable entity of space. While Lefebvre’s (1974/1992) trialectical theory provides structure to spaces, there are still many social practices and processes that could not be fully described by the theory. Connect spaces involve not only co-construction of spaces but also power relations, identities, and content knowledge and skills.

My definitions of space are important in understanding my data, but they provide a broad understanding of the data, which is inadequate for more fully understanding the literacy and language practices of Connect members. I needed to find a way to foreground the members of Connect and their actions in creating particular spaces through the use of social practices. While not spatial theorists, Holland et al.'s (1998) theory of figured worlds seems to provide a helpful frame for analyzing Connect social practices. Holland et al. (1998) focus on how humans figure the spaces in which they live through orchestrations of conceptions about themselves and the spaces as well as improvisations as they live in the spaces. In this way, Holland et al. (1998) seemed to provide a method for applying Lefebvre’s (1974/1992) trialectical spatial theory to Connect spaces by affording me the opportunity to examine Connect members’ conceived, perceived, and lived spaces. Lefebvre’s (1974/1992) theory, however, seemed to be lacking the further connections to other fields, identities, and figured worlds that Holland et al. (1998) describe in their figured world model. Diagram 1 shows how I am conceiving the blending of these two theories.
Figure 1.
*Blending Trialectical Spatial Theories (Lefebvre, 1974/1992) and Holland et al.’s (1998) Theory of Figured World*
As shown in Figure 1, it is important to understand Connect participants’ conceptions about themselves, learning, and school as they lived in different communities which had different social practices. David and Erma plan certain practices in Connect based on their conceptions of learning and school, which are also dictated by other people, such as School Partnership, Cosmo, parents, and lawmakers. They figure the Connect community in a particular way, and they provide students with direct instruction on how to be members of David’s and/or Erma’s figured world of Connect. Students, however, have the agency to take up, change, and/or resist these figurings of the Connect community and their own identities, which may or may not match David and Erma's figurings of Connect community members' identities. Throughout this dissertation, I will be working to describe the orchestrations I noticed among teachers' and students' conceptions of themselves and the Connect spaces, the observed social practices, and the teachers' and students' experiences in Connect spaces through their participation in literacy and language events and practices.

**Literature Review: Empirical Studies that Inform My Study**

Building upon my theoretical framework as described above, in this section of chapter 2 I provide a literature review focused on empirical studies that inform my understandings of four main areas of my research questions: centrality of language in classrooms, adolescents' literacies in hybrid spaces, student engagement in learning, and building community in schools/classrooms. In the first part of my literature review, I will examine how discourse has been studied in classrooms across places/spaces over the last 40 years. In the second part, I will review studies which examine adolescents participating in literacy events and practices in hybrid spaces. In the third part, I will
discuss educational research studies focused on how students engage in classroom activities. In the final part, I will explore how community has been taken up in educational research. While I discuss these four areas in separate sections, all four are interconnected in the everyday happenings of classrooms and schools.

**The Centrality of Language in Classrooms**

In American classrooms, language is the central tool used by teachers and students to teach and/or learn. Educational researchers, thus, turned their focus on classroom discourse over the last 40 years. Educational researchers began with looking at the structure of teacher talk. Later, educational researchers, building upon sociocultural and/or critical theories, shifted the focus to how teachers and students used language in ways that showed the participants’ identity work, power relations, and/or other social and/or cultural practices. This dissertation, which focuses on language and literacy events and practices, builds upon these previous studies of classroom discourse. It provides further nuanced understandings of how teachers and students use language in their everyday interactions in class spaces, especially in the largely unexamined ways of how they use language to create spaces that are engaging and/or community generative.

Teacher talk was an early focus for educational researchers interested in classroom discourse. Mehan (1979) found classroom discourse seemed to follow particular routines, such as an Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) sequence, which he often observed in his constitutive ethnographic study of an elementary classroom. During initiation, a teacher asks for a response from students often by asking a question. Students then respond to the teacher's request by providing a response, which often takes the form of a statement. As a follow-up to a student's response, the teacher replies with an
evaluative comment, such as "Very good" or "That's incorrect." Teachers also seemed more concerned about maintaining social control than academic knowledge. Mehan (1979) also found that it looked like students were greatly adding to classroom lessons if one looked at it quantitatively; class members, however, often did not take up the utterances of the student speakers (p. 150). Lemke (1990) describes the triadic notion of classroom discourse, which provides an expansion of Mehan’s IRE sequencing to include a more inclusive ending, which he suggests as feedback (IRF sequence). In this way, teacher responses that build upon the student's response to move the lesson along, provide greater details, or connect to the next part of the lesson can also be explained by this particular teacher talk sequencing. Not all classroom discourse, however, follows the sequences noted by Mehan (1979) and Lemke (1990).

Cazden (1988) acknowledged the presence of the IRE sequences in her classroom discourse, which was the site for Mehan’s work in 1979, but she became particularly interested in examining the language events that did not follow the teacher initiation-student response-teacher evaluation/feedback sequence. She (1988) found classroom language varied in structures, styles, and purposes, depending upon many factors including the individuals participating in the event as well as the many contexts in which the event took place and/or referenced. Other educational researchers have also pointed out how classroom discourse cannot be fully described by routines, such as IRE or IRF. For example, Wells and Aruaz (2006) worked with teacher researchers to more fully understand how teachers created dialogic communicative spaces in their classrooms across disciplines. They found that while IRF sequences did occur in great quantities, teachers moved more towards dialogical spaces when they adopted “…an inquiry
orientation to curriculum...” (Wells & Aruaz, 2006, p. 414). Due to the limited understandings furnished by examining classroom language events and practices for IRE and IRF sequences, educational researchers have provided a more complete description of classroom discourse by examining it through sociocultural and/or critical frameworks.

Sociocultural researchers examine the social and/or cultural processes, including identity work and power relations, involved in participants’ participation in language events (Bloome & Clark, 2006; Heath, 1983; Michaels, 1981). Sociocultural researchers, such as Heath (1983), describe how humans use language in various contexts to learn and make meaning with one another. Heath (1983) followed people of Trackton, Roadville, and Maintown to learn how they used language to create and maintain their social, cultural, and community identities as well as teach their children. Other sociocultural researchers, such as Bloome and Clark (2006) and Michaels (1981), have focused on how teachers and students use language in classroom spaces. Bloome and Clark (2006), using examples from a seventh grade language arts classroom, provided details on how to use discourse-in-use to discuss classroom language events and practices. Discourse-in-use provides educational researchers with a way for examining classroom interactions, which include the people, the tools used, the social and historical contexts, and the outcomes (Bloome & Clark, 2006, p. 209). Examining how first grade students and their teachers used discourse during "sharing time," Michaels (1981) noticed students’ cultural identities and ways of using language could “...provide or deny access to key literacy-related experiences...” (p. 423), depending upon their synchronicity with the teacher’s expectations for narrative styles and structures. While Michaels' (1981) study focused on cultural identities and language usage, I believe the synchronicity of teachers'
expectations and other identities and/or ways of using language are also important to students' access to literacy events and practices. Sociocultural researchers, such as Heath (1983), Bloome and Clark (2006), and Michaels (1981), informed my understandings of the use of language by teachers and students across places/spaces as well as provided guidance on how to approach analysis of the classroom transcripts of this study. Sociocultural researchers, however, did not seem to include enough of a focus on the ways in which power and language were interconnected, especially in classrooms, which was important to a more robust description of what was happening when teachers and students from different communities in MidwestCity were participating in literacy and/or language events and practices in Connect spaces.

Like sociocultural researchers, critical researchers examine social processes in language events and practices, but they focus more specifically on how power relations influence language in social spaces (Fairclough, 1989; Gee, 1989; Rogers, 2004). Fairclough (1989) in *Language and Power* provides a basis for understanding the relationships between language and power relations through examples drawn from different areas of life, such as advertisements and schools. His purpose in writing the book was to “help correct a widespread underestimation of the significance of language in the production, maintenance, and hang of social relations of power” (Fairclough, 1989, p. 1). Gee (1989) also worked to provide a basis for understanding the connections among language and power but he shifted the focus away from language by suggesting researchers examine social practices. He (1989) suggested looking at "Discourses," which he defined as "ways of being in the world; they are forms of life which integrate words, acts, values, beliefs, attitudes, and social identities as well as gestures, glances,
body positions, and clothes.” (p. 7). Certain Discourses are privileged in certain places/spaces, and by examining the social practices of individuals and/or groups, one can begin to more deeply understand how language, power, identity, and literacy are interconnected across places/spaces.

Drawing upon these earlier critical discourse analysts’ works, some educational researchers entered classrooms and began focusing on how classroom language events and practices were interconnected with power relations. For example, in Rogers’ (2004) edited volume *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education*, she and nine other contributors examined how teachers and students’ language practices produced, maintained, and changed power relations in various classrooms across grade levels and content areas. Each contributor took up critical discourse analysis in different ways across school settings, and while each contributor informed my understandings of critical discourse analysis, not all of the chapters were empirical studies of language use in institutionalized learning settings. Rogers (2004, p. 51-78) and Young (2004, p. 147-171) both examine how language and power were connected in institutionalized learning spaces in ways that offered deeper understandings of how language and power were interconnected in Connect spaces and the participants’ figured worlds of Connect. Rogers (2004), in chapter 3 of her edited volume, examined how literate identities are aligned and/or in conflict across contexts. Through her case study of one illiterate adult in St. Louis, Rogers (2004) showed the importance of aligning institutions, such as schools, with the literacies and identities people bring with them into these institutional spaces. At Connect, I noticed similar tensions among alignment/conflict among the institutional spaces and the participants' identities and literacies. Young (2004), in chapter 7, also
traced the alignment and/or conflict among a student, his mother, and his teacher. Using cultural models, which are "...the beliefs, values, and attitudes held that inform what we say and how we act, read, and interact" (p. 152), Young (2004) found Chavo, his mother, and his teacher had different conceptions and perceptions about his literacy practices and identities based on what Holland et al. (1998) would call their own figurings of the world.

Educational researchers who use discourse analysis methods have largely examined classroom discourse that occurs in traditional classrooms. This research study will add greater details to the growing research in classroom discourse, but it will focus on an under-represented group of teachers and students who learn with one another in an alternative classroom context, where 11th and 12th grade students apply and are selected to study a curriculum based on integrated content areas with the aid of 2 co-facilitators. Language remains a central tool in teaching and learning in an alternative classroom, such as Connect, and it is important to understand how teachers and students use language in an alternative classroom in order to consider new orchestrations and/or improvisations for its use in the co-constructions of classroom spaces and the field of schooling. Language is a key piece in how humans co-construct their spaces, such as those found across classrooms, which then influences how humans create figured worlds, which are “...socially and culturally constructed realm[s] of interpretation in which particular characters and actors are recognized, significance is assigned to certain acts, and particular outcomes are valued over others.” (Holland et al., 1998, p. 52). This study also provides a focused examination of how teachers and students use language to create spaces that are engaging and/or community generative. Many of the above discourse studies examine language and how it is used to accomplish certain social work depending
on the context. In classrooms, language often is used as the foundational way in which humans learn academically, which includes content knowledge and skills. In this study, I focus particularly on how teachers and/or students use language to orchestrate and/or improvise their identities, agency, and spaces in their figured world(s) of Connect, which is intricately connected to the field of schooling, in ways that are engaging and/or community generative.

**Adolescents' Participation in Literacy Events and Practices in Hybrid Spaces**

This dissertation focuses on student participants, who most educators would classify as adolescents. Adolescence is a figured world in which adults conceive other humans, usually between the ages of 12 and 18, to be not children yet not quite adults. Adults, thus, position adolescents and conceive how they should act and behave in this position. Lesko (2001) argues that adolescence is a characterization based upon 4 assumptions about this particular group of people. These four underlying assumptions of adolescence are: adolescents will “come of age’ into adulthood: they are controlled by raging hormones; they are peer-oriented; and they are represented by age” (Lesko, 2001, p. 2). Adolescence has a biological foundation through its connection to genetic maturation as well as a sociocultural foundation since it is largely a socially constructed category which influences sociocultural practices. For this dissertation, while acknowledging both foundations of adolescence, I chose to focus on the more biological meaning of adolescence and included reviews of studies about literacy in/out of schools that included participants that were between the ages of 12 and 18, or were in grades 6-12.
Adolescent literacy is a large area of educational research, and I acknowledge I cannot review all the studies that have been written. When considering how to narrow adolescent literacy to spaces that were similar to Connect, I struggled to find appropriate terms as Connect is a classroom in the way it has been positioned by the field of schooling, yet it is also co-constructed by the co-facilitators and the students in ways that they perceive it to not be a classroom. While I have defined Connect as an alternative humanities program, the term alternative often has different meanings in the field of schooling than the one I have given. The students at Connect seemed to be participating in literacy events and practices which occurred in hybrid spaces. By hybrid spaces, I mean spaces that seem to be a blending of classroom and out-of-classroom spaces. The hybridity of Connect spaces offered me as a researcher an opportunity to examine how adolescents participate in literacy practices while co-constructing spaces that had familiar and unfamiliar qualities for the participants. While Connect spaces opened opportunities for me as a researcher, I needed to ground my study in the educational research. I chose to narrow this part of my literature review to adolescent literacy in hybrid spaces by examining studies that explored how adolescents participated in literacy events and practices across school and community spaces and included acknowledgement of the importance of social construction of space in the analyses of the data. I will begin by discussing studies which take place in alternative or elective classrooms as defined by the researchers. Then I will turn to studies that included spaces that occurred in regular classrooms as well as community spaces after school. Finally, I will conclude with a discussion on adolescent literacies in community literacy programs.
I have defined Connect as an alternative classroom because it is a multi-aged, integrated content program in which students apply and are accepted to attend in place of their typical afternoon coursework at their Schools of Primary Enrollment (SPE). This type of alternative program is uncommon among the studies on adolescent literacy, but some research studies have taken place in classrooms also labeled alternative. For example, in a study very similar to this one, Leander (2002) completed an ethnographic study of an alternative American Studies classroom, in which an English and a History teacher co-taught integrated content to high school juniors. In his study, the classroom was alternative because it occurred as a part of the Kempton Technological Academy (KTA), which was a "school-within-a-school" (Leander, 2002, p. 205). With funding from school funds as well as grants and other outside sources, KTA taught students core subjects while they attended their elective classes in the "regular school" (Leander, 2002, p. 205). Leander (2002) found artifacts, especially material more than semiotic, were important components to stabilizing identity in the case of Latanya and her classmates. He (2002) posited educators "need to consider how classroom practices of interaction are open to the identities of diverse learners" (p. 244), while also considering the ways in which social worlds are embedded in and reproduced in classroom spaces.

In another study on adolescent literacy in an alternative program, Vasudevan (2009) examined how adolescents in New York City's Alternative to Incarceration Program (ATIP) participated in literacy events and practices across classroom spaces, including regular field trips to various community places/spaces. While this particular study defined “alternative" as a place/space of last resort, there are similarities between ATIP and Connect in the ways in which the teachers and the students participated in
literacy events and practices. Vasudevan (2009) found Tony, the teacher, made use of various places/spaces with his small number of students, and he made learning relevant and multimodal. Vasudevan's (2009) study traced the ways in which Tony and his students created hybrid spaces in which "...the production and representation of knowledge...was varied--individual as well as collective, formative and also summative, linguistic and multimodal." (p. 372). At ATIP, adolescents were engaged in literacy practices in multiple ways that helped them understand themselves as agents in their own learning while making sense of themselves and the worlds in which they lived.

Elective courses, while not considered "alternative" classes but rather optional or student-choice classes, also offer empirical understandings to the literacy events and practices in which adolescents may participate during their time at school. Drawing upon her work with the Sistahs, which began as an after school program and turned into a three-trimester credit-bearing, elective course, Wissman (2007; 2008) explored the conception of photography as a social practice that the young women in her study took up and used in agentive ways. While Wissman's study was not focused on the social constructions of space, she does suggest the importance of space in the analysis of Sistahs' literacy practices. She believed "we can move out of the binary between in-school and out-of-school literacy research and practice" by creating spaces which have "permeable boundaries" where students can move between school, home, and community spaces (Wissman, 2007, p. 348). By co-constructing these learning spaces with students in school, educators can create relationships and/or senses of community, build and/or understand one's own as well as others' identities, and support social change (Wissman, 2008). Wissman's study showed the different ways in which adolescent females
participated in multimodal literacy practices in a course they chose to take within their school setting.

Some educational researchers have examined how adolescents participate in literacy events and practices in classrooms as well as in community spaces. Instead of focusing on one particular space, these studies tend to show the different ways in which adolescents participate in literacy events and practices across school and community spaces. Through her work in Ms. L's English classes at Harlem High School, Kinloch (2010) met Khaleeq and Phillip who worked with her to more deeply understand themselves, one another, and their Harlem community through various literacy practices. She (2010) discussed how she, Khaleeq, Philip, Ms. L, and other participants took up literacy practices in classrooms, at home, in Harlem, and other places/spaces over and across time. Kinloch (2010) focused on the ways in which Harlem as a place/space influenced the lives of adolescents, such as Khaleeq and Phillip. She (2010) urges educators and educational researchers to (re)conceptualize place/space as a text, which like other texts requires critical examination by its readers. Kinloch (2010) also suggested rethinking the "traditional definitions of literacy" as literacy includes "issues of identity, culture, community practices, funds of knowledge, access, and agency" (p. 191-192). Kinloch provided a detailed description of the interconnections among adolescents' literacy practices, place/space, identity, and agency across hybrid spaces.

Like Kinloch, who met her participants through her work in their English class, Sheehy (2010) studied adolescent literacy practices through her work at Sanders Middle School (SMS), where she worked with the students and their science/social studies teacher, Jade. Unlike Kinloch, Sheehy's (2010) study focused on the literacy events and
practices that occurred in the adolescents' class during "The Building Project," which she and Jade had designed to engage students in finding out what SMS community members would like to have in a new middle school that was being built to replace SMS. Students then designed buildings to meet the SMS community's desires and were supposed to present them to the school board. Using trialectical theories of space to analyze her experiences with Jade and her students, Sheehy (2010) found the ways in which she and Jade conceived the classroom space influenced the ways in which students co-constructed and lived "The Building Project" spaces, which in turn influenced the adolescents' perceptions of what school literacy practices were. This co-construction of space was extremely messy, and at times, the adolescents, Jade, and even Sheehy perceived the spaces as tense. She (2010) also found her adolescent participants used literacy practices in ways that supported their identity and agency, yet adults, such as the school board and the school's administration, ignored and/or dismissed the adolescents' voices and perspectives.

Adolescents in classrooms such as those described by Kinloch (2010) and Sheehy (2010) also participated in literacy practices across community spaces. Some educational researchers explore how adolescents participate in literacy events and practices in particular community literacy programs, which may or may not be connected to their classroom spaces at school. For example, Hall and Katz (2006) describe how Dara, a thirteen year old, participated in literacy events and practices at "a community technology center called "DUSTY" (Digital Underground Storytelling for Youth)," which welcomed adolescents and adults to participate in digital storytelling practices together (p. 44). Hall and Katz (2006), while not specifically focused on social constructions of space,
discussed how Dara took up literacy practices at DUSTY in ways that she seemed to be a “confident author and active community participant” yet they learned from a program visit/presentation at her school that these identities were not the ones she performed in her school/classroom spaces. Hall and Katz (2006) concluded the importance of composing practices that take place in “an atmosphere,” or a space, where adolescents were supported, actively listened to, and viewed as knowledgeable members of the community (p. 70). Flower (2003) also gave an example of how a community literacy program provided adolescents and adults with spaces in which to participate in literacy events and practices together in ways that were agentive and/or supported identity work.

At the Community Literacy Center (CLC) located in Pittsburgh’s Community House, a youth coordinator, the Community House director, a university professor, a graduate student, 8 college mentors, and 9 adolescents came together to participate in literacy practices rooted in the local community and its issues. While Flower (2003) described how the adolescents constructed a written analysis text called “Raising the Curtain on Curfew,” her findings focused on the ways in which community spaces provided opportunities for adolescents and adults to “participate in a deliberate mix of literate practices.” (p. 59). She admitted social change does not happen after one particular event, such as the writing and discussing of “Raising the Curtain on Curfew,” but she illustrated how such events can influence participants’ understandings of themselves, others, and/or their community.

Adolescents are participating in literacy events and practices across their lived spaces, including alternative classrooms, elective classrooms, classrooms and community spaces, and community literacy programs. Empirical research into each of these
particular spaces provides deeper understandings to the hybrid spaces of Connect. At Connect, spaces are in some ways classroom spaces in the ways they have been positioned by the field of schooling, yet they are also co-constructed by the co-facilitators and the students in ways that they perceive them to not be a classroom. This dissertation adds to a larger corpus of research of adolescent literacy by providing even greater nuanced understandings of adolescent students’ literacies in a hybrid space, which has qualities similar to the spaces described above yet also differs from each of the hybrid spaces researched by other educational researchers. Connect is an in-school space that regularly includes community places/spaces as well as literacy practices found in more out-of-school spaces. The nuanced understandings provided by this dissertation might help educators and researchers rethink and re-orchestrate how adolescents participate in literacy events and practices across learning spaces in ways that are engaging and/or community generative in the field of schooling.

**Student Engagement in Learning**

Literacy and language events and practices occur in a classroom, but students might not necessarily participate in these happenings. Examining student engagement in learning is important to more fully understanding how they participate in literacy and language events and practices. Educational research into student engagement in classrooms has identified the affective, cognitive, and/or behavioral factors, which affect student engagement. Archambault, Janosz, Fallu, and Pagani (2009) explored the affective, cognitive, and behavioral factors of engagement as indicators of dropout potentiality in a longitudinal study of French-Canadian high school students. Their (2009) findings supported the importance of examining each factor individually and as it
connected with other factors in order to more fully understand student engagement and the potentiality of dropping out of high school. Lewis, Huebner, Malone, and Valois (2011) examined the correlation between life satisfaction and student engagement by asking middle school students to complete a questionnaire both in Fall 2008 and Spring 2009. The questionnaire included questions dealing with emotional, cognitive, and behavioral engagement. They (2011) found a bi-directional relationship between life satisfaction and student engagement, but they also found differential associations between life satisfaction and the individual types of engagement, which suggests the importance of the multidimensionality of student engagement. Adding further complexity to the affective, cognitive, and behavioral factors of engagement, educational researchers who use sociocultural frameworks also include contextual factors, such as pedagogy, peer groups, and identities, in their studies of student engagement across classrooms and/or schools (Fredericks, Blumenfeld, & Paris, 2004; Newmann, 1992). Student engagement is a complex process involving students’ and teachers’ emotions, thoughts, and behaviors as well as contextual factors, such as instructional strategies, relationships, and identities.

Some educational researchers have added to the complexity of the multidimensionality of the factors involved in student engagement by also investigating the interconnections among engagement and motivation, achievement, and/or attachment/bonding to class/school communities. Two studies provided insights into thinking about the interconnections among engagement and motivation. Using quantitative methods with classroom observations, Skinner, Kindermann, and Furrer (2009) worked with teachers and students in third through sixth grade classrooms in order to understand engagement as a form of motivation as well as to distinguish engagement
behaviors and emotions. While this particular study was focused on the validity and reliability of two particular quantitative assessment tools, Skinner, Kindermann, and Furrer (2009) acknowledged the multidimensionality of student engagement and the need for conceptualizing engagement as including behaviors and emotions, which is important to this study of student engagement at Connect. Looking more specifically at how constructing portfolios might affect high school students' motivation and engagement in literacy learning, Clark, Chow-Hoy, Herter, and Moss (2001) found students' motivations and engagement were "triggered" by shifts among three key conceptual categories: "self, task, and fit" (p. 219). Their (2001) findings suggest that "motivation and engagement are best understood as social rather than individual phenomena, realized when students become fully participating members in communities of practice." (p. 234). This study seemed to provide support for the ways in which Connect members participate in literacy events and practices in the Connect community of practice.

Other educational researchers have examined the relationships between student engagement and student achievement. Applebee, Langer, Nystrand, and Gamoran (2003) examined the relationship between discussion-based pedagogies and student performances on an essay test by comparing test results of middle and high school students in 64 English classrooms. While not focused particularly on student engagement, Applebee et al. (2003) found when they disaggregated the data using the students' tracked identities (honors English student, average English student, remedial English student) that the lower-track students "have less engagement in all aspects of effective English instruction" (p. 719). What students are engaging in is important to their achievement as measured by standardized tests. In a study of college students, Carini, Kuh, and Klein
(2006) also found correlations among student engagement as reported on surveys and student performances on particular standardized tests, such as the SAT and/or GRE. They concluded the students with the lowest test scores seemed to benefit most from teachers who used pedagogies that were considered engaging and their findings varied across schools. What students are engaging in as well as how and where they are engaging in it matters to their achievement as measured by standardized tests.

In addition to motivation and/or student achievement, some educational researchers have explored the interconnections among student engagement and students’ feelings of attachment/bonding. Using data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, Johnson, Crosnoe, and Elder (2001) looked at the ways in which students in grades 7-12 engaged in academic learning tasks and/or felt attached, or a part of, their school community. They concluded that African-American students were more engaged than Whites and Latino/as based on their measures of engagement, but they acknowledged that a more inclusive understanding of engagement might be helpful in more deeply understanding student engagement. Much like Carini, Kuh, and Klein (2006), Johnson, Crosnoe, and Elder (2001) found the school and/or classroom context influenced the ways in which students engaged in academic learning tasks. What students are engaging in as well as how, where, and with whom they are engaging in it matters in understanding the process of student engagement in academic learning tasks.

Drawing upon the research into the cognitive, behavioral, and emotional factors of student engagement as well as the interconnections among engagement, motivation, achievement, and attachment/bonding, much of the educational research into student engagement provides educators with how to plan and implement pedagogical practices
that will help students become more engaged. In particular, this type of research seems to focus on understanding student engagement in order to help “at-risk” students, who are likely failing and/or dropping out of school. Caraway, Tucker, Reinke, and Hall (2003) discussed how educators can help high school students engage in classroom and/or school spaces. Using data collected through a questionnaire distributed during study hall at one urban high school, Caraway et al. (2003) found a positive relationship between self-confidence, goal orientation, and engagement in school-related tasks. Based on their findings, they (2003) suggested more positive feedback, increasing the frequency of feedback, and providing multiple opportunities for success in school-related tasks. Some educational researchers have used qualitative methods such as classroom observations in order to more closely examine what and how teachers should teach in order to engage students who are disengaged and often "at-risk" for failure and/or dropping out. In his study of 120 7th and/or 8th grade English/Language Arts classrooms in 23 schools, Kelly (2007) found “...in classrooms where teachers engaged in dialogic instruction, by asking authentic questions, utilizing uptake, and focusing on analysis and generalizations rather than quizzing students, levels of student effort on classroom tasks were more evenly distributed.” (p. 350). He (2007) believed this type of teaching "...set the stage for widespread student engagement..." (p. 350). In a study of an alternative school for "at-risk" students, Schussler (2009) looked to more fully understand why such alternative schools engage students who were disengaged in more traditional schools. He (2009) found academic challenge, academic support, instruction, and relevance were key components in how this particular alternative school engaged high school students in learning tasks. Schussler (2009) suggested “…teachers purposefully balance offering an
academic challenge with support, use instructional techniques that convey excitement for the content, and make learning relevant. Managing a classroom within these pedagogical parameters means moving beyond thinking primarily about content and into thinking about knowing students as individuals” (p. 120). While these research studies add more details to our understanding of student engagement and provide teachers with suggestions for engaging more students, many of these studies position students as either engaged or disengaged with little or no inclusion of the students' own voices.

Researchers, such as McMahon and Zyngier (2009) and Fielding (2006), discuss the importance of student voice and empowerment as it relates to engaging students in classroom events. McMahon and Zyngier (2009) compared not only student engagement through the voices of teachers and/or students in Australia and Canada but also what they call the three conceptions of engagement: instrumentalist, socio-constructivist or individualist, and critical transformative. They found most teachers and students conceived engagement as instrumental, which involved a more objectivist perspective that understood engagement as particular behaviors, or socio-constructivist or individualist, which is based in a "more student-centred [sic] pedagogy" but does not involve engaging critically into epistemological inquiries (McMahon & Zyngier, 2009, p. 166). In a more theoretical piece about the relationship between student engagement and person-centered education, Fielding (2006) suggested schools should be “places that involve young people in that reflection and dialogue [about challenges, such as social justice], places where our humanity emerges from and guides our learning together” (p. 312). The humanness involved in student engagement is important to understanding the process, yet many educational researchers have focused on the teachers and their agency
in engaging students in the learning spaces. Even further removed from the humanness of student engagement are research studies that have relied on quantitative methods of inquiry, which provide statistical evidence for student engagement in particular behaviors and/or emotions. This study, however, will use qualitative methods to examine how, when, and under what conditions spaces become engaging learning environments. By examining how the teachers and students co-construct spaces in ways that are engaging, we can begin to understand how the teachers and the students became and/or were engaged in the literacy and language events and practices across Connect spaces.

**Building Community in Schools/Classrooms**

The term community has many different meanings, and Marcia Pelly Effrat (1974) compares studying community to "trying to scoop up jell-o with your fingers. You can get hold of some, but there's always more slipping away from you" (p. 1). Empirical educational research into community building in schools and classrooms is scant. Many educational researchers, who examine community in their studies, do not often explicitly identify their concept of community, and most of this research into community building focuses on elementary and/or middle school students. Some of this educational research analyzes the correlation among feelings of community with other factors. Two correlation studies examine the relationship between feelings of community and violence. Using data from the 2000 U.S. School Survey on Crime and Safety, Chen (2008) suggested smaller schools in which students have a positive social culture and opportunities to bond with one another in meaningful ways could result in less crime. In another study, based on the data from teachers’ and students’ survey answers in the National Study of Delinquency Prevention in Schools, Gottfredson and DiPietro (2011) found smaller schools, lower
student-to-teacher ratios, and less diverse populations positively correlated to lower physical and/or property victimization among students.

Three other correlation studies also examined how feelings of community relate to motivation and achievement. Battistich, Solomon, Kim, Watson, and Schaps (1995) explored multiple variables and relationships among elementary school students’ senses of community, poverty levels, attitudes, beliefs, motives, and behaviors. They (1995) analyzed the data from four questionnaires and found students who felt a stronger sense of community were more motivated to take up what they were learning in school, which in turn influenced their achievement on learning outcomes. In another study, Goodenow (1993) investigated students’ sense of community in their academic classes in relation to their achievement and motivation by surveying 353 middle school students. Goodenow (1993) found middle school students tend to find motivation to complete academic learning through the support they feel among their peers and/or teachers. In a correlation study of 10th grade students, Stewart (2008) used the data from the National Educational Longitudinal Study database to ascertain the relationship among student achievement, peer relationships, parent support, and school climate. Stewart (2008) found positive attachments to peers and one’s school community positively correlated to student achievement. These correlation studies used quantitative methods in the forms of surveys/questionnaires to show the positive effects of students feeling like members of a school/classroom community. While feeling like a community member is part of my conceptualization of community, building community among members of schools and/or classrooms is deeper than creating and/or sustaining affective relationships.
Qualitative educational research on community building seems to be less numerous than quantitative studies. Based on a multi-database search for books and journal articles using the keywords “community,” “community building,” “humanities,” and/or “classroom,” I located three books and one peer-reviewed journal article that explore community building in educational settings using qualitative or mixed methods. Using personal experiences in schools and/or classrooms, two of the sources were books (Noddings, 1992; Sergiovanni, 2000) that theoretically explain how teachers and administrators might build effective communities in their schools and classrooms.

Noddings (1992) proposed the use of a pedagogy of care in schools and classrooms, which focuses on the affective relationships and senses of community often taken up in the qualitative educational research studies. Sergiovanni (2000) explained “…how we can craft a school system based on layered loyalties and shared accountability that builds on local initiatives and concerns without compromising the legitimate concerns and interests of the state and other stakeholders” (p. xii). Sergiovanni’s community was more territorial, but his proposed school system relies upon effective relationships among all stakeholders. The third qualitative book on community building in schools was an edited volume, where each chapter provided details on a particular school or classroom where participants created feelings of community (Smith, 1993). For example, in chapter 2, Peterson detailed the creation of La Escuela Fratney, where teachers, community members, and students fought to create a school that represented themselves, while in chapter 3, Hastrom described the Denali Project where school became an extended family for students, teachers, and parents.
Educational research on community building was largely absent in the peer-reviewed journals in the online databases. In the only article about community building found during the multi-database search, Solomon, Battistich, Kim, and Watson (1996) observed and surveyed elementary classrooms to examine the relationship between teachers’ practices and students’ senses of the classrooms as communities. They (1996) concluded:

it is important for teachers to create classrooms that encourage students’ active participation, collaboration, and interpersonal support, and indicate that teachers can accomplish this by displaying interpersonal concern, by providing and encouraging interpersonal support and collaboration, student autonomy and self-direction, and by emphasizing and encouraging student thinking and intellectual exploration. (p. 259).

This study provided deeper understanding into practices that help build communities in schools/classrooms, yet their focus was on how teachers create a community space rather than the co-constructions of such community generative spaces. Teachers are not the only participants in the classroom who create community in classrooms, though students and their agency as community builders and sustainers seem to be absent in educational research about community.

Qualitative educational research on community building and sustaining in classrooms is scarce. My dissertation fills part of this general gap in the educational research by examining how Connect members create community generative spaces over the 2011-2012 school year. More specifically, I include student voices in my detailing of how Connect members create and sustain community spaces. Students, who represent the
largest group of participants in classrooms, have much to offer education researchers who want to more deeply understanding how classroom participants create and sustain community spaces.

The theoretical and empirical scholarship I have reviewed in this chapter provide a foundation to this study. From general theories of teaching and learning to defining terms such as literacy, place, and space to an improvised blending of Holland’s et al. (1998) theory of figured worlds with trialectical spatial theories (Lefebvre, 1974/1992), I have detailed my conceptualizations of key components throughout this study. In addition to this theoretical framework, I also drew upon the empirical work of other educational researchers as they examined classroom discourse, adolescent literacy in hybrid spaces, student engagement, and building community in schools/classrooms. Building upon these theoretical and/or empirical foundations, the following chapters will detail what happens when teachers and students from various communities in MidwestCity participate in literacy and language events and practices in an alternative humanities classroom. In chapter 3, I will describe Connect and its multi-layered, interconnected spaces as well as the methods I employed in this study.
Chapter 3: Methodology

To more deeply understand what happens when teachers and students from various communities in MidwestCity participate in literacy and language events and practices in an alternative humanities classroom, one must understand the local and/or global spaces which influence these happenings as well as the ways in which I collected the data to describe these happenings. This chapter has 5 sections. In the first section, I thickly describe some of the multiple spaces which influence Connect members and their participation in literacy and language events and practices in this context. This description begins with more global spaces and then moves into the local spaces, which includes details about the identities of the individual participants. In the second section, I discuss the methods I used during the data collection phase, and in the third section, I explain the methods I employed to analyze the data. In the fourth section, I acknowledge the limitations of this study both in its design and execution. In the final section, I discuss the ethical considerations I thought about both before and during this study.

Thick Description of Spaces

As a researcher working from a ethnographically-informed methodology, I acknowledge that any description I provide in my work will always be incomplete as it is impossible to fully explain any person, space, place, and/or situation exactly how it
was experienced and understood by even one person. Words cannot express all experiences and understandings. In this section, I work to provide some general descriptions of the spaces I believe are important to understanding Connect. These spaces are interconnected in many and, oftentimes, messy ways though, for purposes of clarity, I have chosen to examine them separately, which makes them appear more neat than they truly are in the day-to-day operating of human lives and endeavors. First, I will begin by discussing Connect’s interconnections with more global spaces in the form of policies and structures from the field of schooling, which influenced the ways in which participants conceived their figured world(s) of Connect and lived in its spaces during the school year. Second, I will turn to the more local spaces of Connect and how participants lived in and perceived these spaces throughout the school year.

Global Spaces: Policies and Structures from the Field of Schooling

School Partnership. The School Partnership began in 1986 as a non-profit organization that "foster[s] cross-district programming and improve[s] education through a confederation" of the sixteen public school districts in Central County of MidwestState (School Partnership Webpage). According to the School Partnership webpage, the School Partnership believes "[c]losing the achievement gap, increasing system flexibility, broadening choice, and standards driven accountability mandates are pushing us toward a greater and deeper personalization of educational services" which they believe changes the "education script to put the learner at the heart of the system." In an effort to put the learner at the heart of the system, the School Partnership at the time of this study offered six types of programs to members of the confederation. These programs included: after
school programs, family intervention programs, cross district classes, middle school enrichment programs, Cosmo, and Connect.

During the 2011-2012 school year, the School Partnership changed some of the structures and policies involving Connect’s position in its educational programming and structure. The School Partnership, like many of its member districts as well as districts across the United States, had to become more fiscally frugal due to budget constraints, which was the result of a more global economic recession. Some confederation districts, who in the past had sent students to Connect, had stopped sending students to the program before the 2010-2011 year, and thus the School Partnership was not collecting tuition from these districts. As a result of the need for operating monies, during the 2010-2011 school year, the School Partnership allowed out-of-confederation students as well as confederation students whose districts would not pay the tuition to attend Connect by paying their own tuitions.

Beginning with the 2011-2012 school year, the School Partnership also changed the structure of Connect in two ways. First, the morning course, which had traditionally been only returning seniors, accepted first year students in order to increase the total number of students in both programs (CO1 and CO2). By including first years that were seniors in the morning, more first year slots were available for students to fill in the afternoon. Overall, this increased the amount of money Connect collected by increasing the number of students paying the tuition. Second, Connect became one of the Learning Pods for Cosmo students. According to Becky, a Cosmo student, every Cosmo student must choose a Learning Pod to attend during their eleventh and twelfth grade years (Becky's Interview, April 18, 2012). Learning Pods operate as learning internships that
occur beyond the brick and mortar school building but include high school, and
sometimes college, credits for certain subjects (Cosmo Webpage). Before the 2011-2012
school year, Connect and Cosmo had been connected with one another in intricate ways
(David's Interview, March 14, 2012; Erma's Interview, April 5, 2012), but the 2011-2012
connections, specifically the one in which Connect became a Learning Pod of Cosmo, in
ways subordinated Connect to Cosmo's policies. In the 2011-2012 school year, Connect
had to accept the twelve Cosmo students who applied for the program, since it was a
Learning Pod of Cosmo. Connect also had to create a capstone experience so these
Cosmo students might meet the capstone requirements mandated by Cosmo or allow
Cosmo students to return to Cosmo after the fall semester in order to complete capstone
experiences in the spring as required for graduation from Cosmo (Erma's Interview, April
5, 2012).

**MidwestState.** Connect and the School Partnership are ultimately responsible for
meeting the educational requirements mandated by law in MidwestState. Based on the
online checklist for graduation for graduating classes through 2013, MidwestState
requires students to pass the MidwestState Graduation Test, which they are first given in
the spring of their tenth grade years. In order to graduate with a MidwestState diploma
[without honors], they must also attain four English units, a one-half health unit, three
mathematics units, a one-half physical education unit, three science units, three social
studies units, and six elective units, which include one (or two one-half) unit(s) of
business, technology, foreign language, or fine arts during their high school careers.
Connect, who reports grades to the students' Schools of Primary Enrollment (SPEs),
gives one social studies unit, one English unit, one-half of an art appreciation unit, and
one-half of a cultural studies unit to those students who satisfactorily complete the
Connect assignments. At Connect, juniors and seniors receive units for different types of
English and social studies even though they are studying the same content in CO1
(Erma's Interview, April 5, 2012). For example, junior Connect students receive a social
studies unit of a course offered in their schools (there is no required junior level social
studies in MidwestState), while senior Connect students receive a social studies unit that
includes American government.

United States. Schools in MidwestState are accountable to the state, and in turn
MidwestState must then provide accountability to the federal government. In the United
States, schools are local systems that operate under the guidance and structure provided
to them from the state and federal policy levels. Most educational decisions occur on the
state and local levels due to the Tenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.
Federal educational policies, however, have been established in order to ensure quality
education for all students. The federal policies affecting K-12 schools in the United
States include mandates for non-discriminatory practices, such as Title VI of the Civil
Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Section 504 of the
Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990,
as well as laws governing educational standards and accountability, such as The No Child
Left Behind Act of 2001. It would take a large amount of space to discuss how each of
these policies affects MidwestState, the School Partnership, and Connect, and that is not
the purpose of this study. I provide this glimpse into federal policies as it is important to
recognize that each entity is making decisions in a system where multiple decision-
makers are involved in trying to provide quality education to all students.
Local Spaces: Connect’s Lived Spaces

Physical configuration of Connect spaces. The class did not meet in a traditional brick and mortar school building. The primary meeting location for the class was inside a Congregationalist Church in the downtown area of Midwest City. Connect members did not use the sanctuary space inside this exterior; the program rented space in the Parish Hall of the church. For whole class meetings, Connect met in the large auditorium area below the sanctuary, where a few days a week CO1 members could hear organ music in the background as afternoon class took place at the same time as the organist’s practice times. In the middle of its northern wall, the auditorium area featured a raised, wooden stage with heavy velvet curtains and a projector screen that could fill the entire stage. The floor of the auditorium area was wooden throughout, which at times students enjoyed sliding across with their stocking feet. One entered the room through a set of double doors on the eastern side of the room as the weekday entry doors were on the eastern side of the building. Wooden stairs in the southern part of the auditorium area led to smaller rooms, such as the Youth Room, and stairs to the sanctuary could be found beyond these smaller rooms. There were two small sets of these wooden stairs leading to the smaller rooms and sanctuary; the first set of four stairs led to a raised area overlooking the floor of the auditorium area, which CO members referred to as the veranda. On the western side of the auditorium, there were doors leading into the kitchen area as well as a small area CO used as a sort of holding space for things, such as art supplies or personal items that needed locking up if CO headed over to the Midwest City Art Museum for the day. Between these two rooms on the western side of the auditorium area sat 6 long white tables with chairs around them. Students used these tables and
chairs to hold backpacks, purses, notebooks, books, and other articles they brought with them to class. A piano sat near the stairs in the southwestern corner of the auditorium area, but students rarely touched and/or made use of the musical instrument. In the opposing southeastern corner of the auditorium area, there were metal racks holding folding chairs, which students used during class periods in which they sat facing the stage to watch a video or listen to guest speakers.

For smaller class meetings, each teacher could make use of the youth room and/or Sunday school classrooms in a more recent addition to the church building. CO1 students would sometimes race to the youth room for smaller class meetings as they enjoyed lounging on its couch, arm chairs, floor cushions, and carpeted floors while talking about their content for the day. They also used the Sunday school classrooms, which were located down two hallways and up two sets of stairs from the auditorium. These rooms were made up of five long white tables, often placed in a U-shape, with folding chairs around them. While the eastern walls of both of these classrooms were filled with windows, the glass was very fragile and students had to be extremely careful around them. For group projects, such as small group presentations and literature discussions, students could also use the long but narrow area near the stairs to the sanctuary to meet as it offered students carpeted floors, a couch, and three pews not far from the auditorium area. Of the 54 classes I observed during the fall semester, which included two full units, the class worked in small groups 36 times (see Appendix A). I noted 12 days included use of the youth room and 16 days included use of the Sunday School classrooms.

Entering the Congregationalist Church during a weekday required more than simply opening a door. First, since the church is located in the downtown area of
MidwestCity, parking could be an issue for those who drove to the program. Students could park their cars in a fenced-in parking lot about two blocks from the church. They then had to walk across a major downtown street to arrive at the church, but there was a crossing guard at the stoplight where they should have crossed. Bus stops for several lines could be found near the church for those students who used the public transportation system. Drivers, such as parents, could also drop off/pick up students at the eastern doors of the church as the doors faced a two-car wide, one way street that was not frequently congested. Teachers and guests could park their cars in the small lot behind the church though on occasions when this lot was full teachers and guests had to find metered parking along the streets. Second, once one had parked his or her car, he or she had to walk to the eastern side doors of the church and press a button by the doors. The doorbell system rang into different areas of the church, and each button was labeled with the area in which it would ring. The Parish Hall had its own button, and it rang to a phone in the auditorium area. David showed students how to operate the phone and the door on the first day of class, and students usually answered the door buzzer though less frequently the co-facilitators, student teachers, or I did so. David explained on the first day of class the importance of this security feature (Classroom Transcript, August 29, 2011).

**Bodily configurations in Connect spaces.** The members of the program used the physical space they rented in a variety ways depending on what they were doing during class. As students entered, they congregated in various spots, but most often they were sitting at the tables set up on the western side of the auditorium. If there were whole group activities scheduled, a co-facilitator, often David, asked student to circle up or sit facing the stage. On the first day of class, David and Erma shared with students how to
create both seated configurations. To begin class on the first day, David rang a hand bell he got while on a trip in southeast Asia in 2010, and he talked to the students about how to sit facing the stage.

1. **David:** now it's true when we gather in front of the stage somebody's gotta be in the back because you know it's like if we're all facing that direction there has to be a back
2. we really want to create a culture here where we're all like the people that want to sit in the front because we are excited to be here or happy to be here so there's no like race to the back
3. or like somebody sits in the back and then someone sits even further behind them and then someone sits even further behind them or something like that
4. **(Students laugh)**
5. so today I want to practice for our first time ever of sitting in front of the stage to begin class (Classroom Transcript, August 29, 2011)

Shifting the topic of discussion to what students should bring with them, David gave students time to move and sit facing the front of the stage. On this first day, most students sat on the floor, but as the year continued some students chose to sit in seats when facing the stage no matter the activity occurring. Most students would sit in seats in front of the stage if there was a video and/or guest speaker(s) as the main activity for the day, but there were a few students who sat on the floor even on those days. On the first day, after David and Erma went over a variety of procedural items with students seated facing the stage and students explored through writing in their Connect notebooks (or CoNo's as the members called them) why they joined Connect, they formed a CO circle for the first time. Erma started to explain the "tradition" of the CO circle.

1. **Erma:** so we're going to move into the Connect circle
2. now a circle is a circle
3. that means everybody is included no it's not a square where someone's at the top and someone's at the bottom
4. but
5. we have a big group
6. so we want to make sure that everyone is sitting in the circle and nobody's sitting behind somebody else you know
7. that or what not so+ if it's too small we're going to have to push out to make sure everybody's included
8. we will only get together in this huge circle every now and then because
9. it's just huge+
10. so
11. your notebooks and pen
12. try to make a circle
13. David: make a nice tight so you're right in the middle (Classroom Transcript, August 29, 2011)

The students made their first CO circle in the minute that followed these directions, and they successfully created a circle big enough to include all members’ bodies in a single-file spherical shape (throughout the year sometimes students noted their circle looked more like an egg). The CO circle was the most common configuration to discuss all sorts of topics as a whole group; I observed it occurring 32 times in the 47 days where large groups discussions occurred (see Appendix A). Often days began in a CO circle, and the co-facilitators would open the floor for sharing details of experiences from the night or weekend before or of events/opportunities to attend in the near future.

Participants in Connect spaces. This research study includes myself as participant-observer, the two Connect co-facilitators, two student teachers, twenty-one students, and three guest speakers. I acknowledge that lists often start with the most important items, but I have listed and will describe the participants in the order in which they agreed to work with me to try to provide an understanding of the chronology of the study. I do not believe that any of my participants should be considered more important than any of the others. While it is impossible to provide complete biographies of all of the participants, I will work in this section to provide some general understandings of each.
For all participants, except the guest speakers, I have created a table (see Appendix B) of certain identities, which I deemed important to understanding each of them more fully, but these identities might not be the ones the participants would have deemed as most important to understanding themselves. For example, through my interview with Becky (April 18, 2012), I learned she believed her four most important identities at the time of our interview were daughter, student, Christian, and artist. Thus, I do not believe I have fully captured each participant as an individual through an identities table, and I hope the reader will be able to more fully understand them through their own words in the transcripts and artifacts throughout this dissertation.

As a participant-observer, I believe it is important that I include myself as a participant in Connect spaces. While I am more comfortable behind the camera and computer, my identities are important to my Connect experiences as well as my analysis and writing about those experiences. I am a certified social studies and reading teacher in the state of West Virginia, where I taught high school social studies for seven years before coming to Ohio State University for a doctoral degree in Adolescent, Post-Secondary, and Community Literacies. I am a White, Appalachian, heterosexual woman from a middle class family, though I have to come understand the relativity of class labels since moving from Charleston, WV. My identity as a doctoral student working on her dissertation was brought up by participants at times, and it was an identity that I struggled to own. I felt very unsure of myself as a competent researcher as I navigated through this research study.

The co-facilitators of Connect are David and Erma. A twenty-three year veteran teacher, David has been teaching with the program for eleven years. He worked in R-
Burb Schools as a social studies teacher before he received a letter inviting him to apply to teach at Connect. When I asked about his important identities during our interview (March 14, 2012), David shared the importance of growing up in a Jewish upper middle class family in northeastern MidwestState as well as his roles as a husband and a father of three teenage children (two girls in high school and one boy in middle school). He has been working with Erma for the last six years. Erma came to teaching as a second career after spending her twenties working as a journalist. Erma taught in MidwestCity Public Schools for "a while" and then went to Northeast University in Massachusetts to work on her Master's degree in Creative Arts and Learning with a specialization in multicultural education. When she returned to MidwestCity, she applied for a job at Cosmo, which led to the job at Connect. She believes her multiple identities, which include middle-aged, divorced, heterosexual, woman, dancer, and former rebellious teenager, affect the advice she gives students as well as the way she navigates her relationships.

During the 2011-2012 school year, two student teachers, Stephen and Stephanie, completed their field work in social studies education with Connect. Both student teachers wanted to be placed at Connect, and they both taught at MidwestCity High School in the morning before teaching at Connect in the afternoon. During the fall, Stephen and Stephanie were mostly observers in the class, but during January and February, they took over the co-facilitator duties as full-time student teachers. Stephen is a white, middle class man who moved to MidwestState from North Carolina in order to pursue his master's degree in social studies education at Midwest State University (MSU). Stephen's marriage and wife were sometimes topics of discussion in class. For example, he talked with the students about his wedding that occurred over the Labor Day
weekend (Classroom Transcript, September 6, 2011). Stephen’s wife Miriam attended class a few times, including our field trips to the Central Market and the Islamic Center. Stephanie is a white, middle class, heterosexual woman who lived in northeastern Midwest State before attending MSU for her undergraduate and graduate degrees. She, too, was seeking a master's degree in social studies education, but she seemed to have a real passion for reading and writing. I shared young adult literature titles with her throughout our time together, and I noticed she carried home nearly twenty books on writing from Erma as she began to prepare for the creative writing unit she and Stephen co-taught. Both student teachers successfully completed the field experiences at Connect, and they began their final field observations of other sites in March 2012.

Twenty-one students assented and their parents/guardians consented to be a part of my study though not all students assented and/or parents consented to full participation. During the first four weeks of my data collection, I observed students in whole group and small group discussions as well as interactions on Connect's Facebook page. I was looking for four focal students who would each represent one of the following identities: engaged, disengaged, community generator, and community degenerator. While this was my original plan, I noticed that there were no students who were actively working to destroy the community building efforts of teachers and students in Connect, which I believe the term "community degenerator" seems to denote. I instead chose a participant who I termed a community sustainer, or someone who seemed to participate in the community yet was not actively engaged in building the Connect community through either creating community events, inviting others to attend events with him/her, or leaving Facebook comments on the group wall.
Based on my four weeks of observations and selecting from participants who agreed to fully participate, I selected five students who I decided would become my focal students for the remainder of my time at Connect. I chose five rather than four because Amy and Chelsey both seemed to be engaged in literacy and language events across Connect spaces in ways that intrigued me, such as offering interesting perspectives in CO Circle discussions or on Facebook. Based on my initial observation, I thus included both Amy and Chelsey as good representatives of engaged students. Callie was a community builder based on her Facebook posts, which included creating events and inviting others to join her, as well as her involvement in poetry slams. Allison was representative of disengaged students as I noted her tendency to sleep during class periods, though most disengaged students never returned their assent/consent forms to even be included in the study. Crystal was not one to build community though she did not actively work to destroy community efforts by others in the group. While these five students were the ones I followed in small group discussions and then interviewed in the spring, I still continued to observe and take note of all student participants when they spoke in whole and small group discussions. About eight weeks into my observations, I made the decision to include a sixth focal student, Becky, who seemed to be consistently engaged in literacy and language events unlike Amy whose engagement was sporadic as the school year progressed. In the spring, I interviewed five of the focal students (Amy, Chelsey, Callie, Crystal, and Becky), but Allison was unavailable for an interview. While collecting work samples from the participants, Allison also stated she had "actually accidentally deleted" her research papers from the first two units of the year (Facebook Communication, April 27, 2012). My data for Allison is thus sparse.
This study also includes people who were not present in Connect spaces every day. Three guest speakers consented to inclusion in the research project. Richard and Holly, who were members of the White privilege panel, quickly agreed and signed the consent forms before class began that day. Richard talked with students about his experiences as a Mexican-American who works in various ways for human equality with a focus on national and local immigrant rights. Holly talked with students about her experiences as a Black woman and mother who works for equality through her personal life, which includes raising children, and her work with the NAACP. Matthew, a Druid priest, shared with Connect members his life's spiritual experiences and the religion of Druidry, which he had chosen as his spiritual path while in college. Matthew also quickly consented to be a part of the study as he was interested in reading what I would find from my time with this alternative educational program. Also, while not physically present in class and not included through consent forms, the Congregationalist Church offered continued human support to the participants through its staff, including the pastor, organist, and janitor, who each had relationships with the co-facilitators and students.

Data Collection

I was a participant observer at Connect throughout the 2011-2012 school year. I collected data in the forms of class observations (field notes, audio-recordings, and/or video-recordings), interviews of both teachers and 5 students (audio and with permission video-recordings), collection of in-class artifacts, such as unit plans, assignment sheets, and student work, student work records (i.e. Did the student complete the project?), and screenshots of postings to the Connect Facebook group page. Data collection occurred in
two phases over the course of the 2011-2012 school year. These phases were interconnected, and phase I informed the decisions I made in phase II.

Phase I was the more intensive data collection phase. It took place during the fall semester, which involved two unit plans, and I collected data nearly every school day in the form of audio- and/or video-recordings of whole class discussions, field notes of discussions across places/spaces, in-class artifacts (i.e. unit plans, assignment sheets), student work records, and Facebook postings. During the fall, I took field notes and audio- and/or video-recorded whole class discussions nearly every day during class time, which usually lasted about 2-2.5 hours each afternoon. I, thus, collected about 100 hours of audio-recordings, 42 hours of video-recordings, and 106 hours captured in field notes. Class time, and thus my observation time, was also spent on “field trips,” which occurred when the participants met at another place for afternoon class time. On field trips, I did not often obtain consent of the presenter/guide to be a part of my study, so I documented most field trips in the form of field notes only. Audio-recordings of field trips, such as the ones to the Central County Conservatory or the MidwestCity Art Museum, occurred when only co-facilitators and students were present for the discussions. My field notes also included information I observed and/or heard during informal discussions with David, Erma, Stephen, Stephanie, and the students before and after class. This intensive data collection phase included collection of in-class artifacts, such as lesson plans and work samples, student work records, and Facebook postings as a way of triangulating data.

In January 2012, I moved into Phase II of data collection, which was a less intensive data collection phase comprised of weekly class time visits. This phase
continued until the Connect school year ended on May 18, 2012. I chose which class days to visit during Phase II based on my focus of capturing focal language and literacy events, which I selected based on my fall observations as well as discussions with the co-facilitators and students. These focal events included presentations, writing workshops, and art shows, and this phase added 8 hours of audio-recordings, 6 hours of video-recordings, and 16 hours captured in field notes. In March and April, with much of the critical incidences from the fall observations transcribed along with content analysis of the other data begun, I interviewed the 2 co-facilitators and 5 of the 6 focal students about their understandings of literacy, teaching and learning, engagement, and community building. These 7 interviews amounted to another 5 hours of recordings. I spent the remainder of my time during Phase II analyzing data and collecting focal event observations. By the end of May 2012, the program ended, and I moved to the data analysis phase of my dissertation with IRB approval to re-enter the site until December 2012 for member checking.

**Data Analysis**

Throughout the fall semester, I looked over my field notes from the past few weeks for rich moments that seemed to help me understand how Connect members were engaging in learning and literacy practices and generating community. My “noticings” reports helped me see patterns across Connect spaces in the course of the semester as I added new data to the original list of events/phrases each time and tracked those additions over the semester with different colors. I returned to this lengthy report in January when I began to make decisions on which particular class observations to transcribe in detail, but
I first turned my analysis to the Facebook postings of which I had been taking screenshots throughout my observations.

In early January, before I began to transcribe the rich moments I had tracked in my "noticings" reports, I analyzed the 212 pages of screenshots I had collected from the Connect Facebook page. In order to make sense of the Facebook data, I created a chart in which I tracked the date, who wrote the post, the number of likes, the number of replies, who replied, type of post (text, picture, weblink, videolink, and/or Facebook document), the text of the post (if any), and what I thought was the purpose of the post. The purposes of posts fell into the following categories: content knowledge/skills (such as sharing links to other information or grammar rules), event notices for MidwestCity (i.e., things happening in MidwestCity that Connect members might want to attend), planning get-togethers, cheer (such as posts about loving or missing CO), class procedural instructions, pleas for help, pictures/videos from class, and random (i.e. posts that seemed out of place like Naomi's "Pandas are so CUTE!"). Since not all of the Connect members consented/assented to participate in my study, I only included posts that were originally written and posted by participants for a total of 315 analyzed posts. This data helped me to confirm and/or reconsider what I had been noticing during my observations of Connect spaces in regards to how participants created learning spaces that were engaging and/or community generative.

In late January, I returned to my "noticings" reports and field notes to choose the rich moments I should transcribe in order to better answer my research questions about how Connect teachers and students participated in language and literacy events and practices and how they created spaces that were engaging and/or community generative.
While I largely used content analysis methods in my overall analysis of the data, I used discourse analysis methods on the transcripts I created from the audio- and video-recordings of the selected rich moments from class as well as the interviews (Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, & Shuart-Faris, 2005; Bloome, Carter, Christian, Madrid, Otto, Shuart-Faris & Smith, 2008). I drew upon Bloome and Clark’s (2006) discourse-in-use methods to more fully understand how the participant created Connect learning spaces that could have been engaging and/or community generative through their everyday language with one another. Discourse-in-use involves answering the questions of “who is using language…to do what, with whom, to whom, when, where, and how?” (Bloome & Clark, 2006, p. 209). I transcribed the class observations and interviews by parsing the discourse into utterances and interactional units. I decided how to parse the conversations based on mostly verbal cues, such as pausing, inflection, and interruptions, though I did use non-verbal cues, such as facial expressions, hand gestures, and body position, when they were available.

My transcripts foreground verbal behaviors because I wanted to understand how participants used language to create engaging and/or community generative spaces in this alternative humanities program. I did not transcribe participants’ use of ums, ahs, or other such utterances, but I did include their false starts and any partial words as I believed they indicated changes in thoughts. I included the absence of words in parenthesis with the number of seconds for which the pause occurred. I did not include punctuation or capitalization as the mechanics are part of written not spoken verbal behaviors, and I wanted the transcript to represent how the participants heard one another. I chose to include nonverbal behaviors in the transcript by sharing them in parenthesis and italics,
and I included these behaviors when I believed they would be helpful to the reader in understanding the interactions I was representing in the transcript. Table 2 shows the transcription symbols I chose to use while transcribing both the classroom observations and the seven interviews. The following transcription symbols appear throughout my transcripts in order to represent tone, prosody, and other pieces involved in the participants’ use of interacting practices.

Table 2.  
Transcription symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbols</th>
<th>Representations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Rising intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ line 1 line 2</td>
<td>Overlapping speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Elongated sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word (Students laugh)</td>
<td>Emphasis by speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than one participant verbalizes at the same time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(actions)</td>
<td>Non-verbal behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[details]</td>
<td>Explanation of speaker’s words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to more fully understand how participants were using discourse to create spaces that were engaging and/or community generative, I mapped the selected critical incident discussions to discover how participants were interacting with one another and how their topics of discussion connected over the course of the discussion as well as across class periods. Mapping the discussions provided details on how Connect members exercised power among themselves during discussions. Table 3 provides an example of my mapping process for one segment of classroom discourse (September 12, 2011).
Table 3.
Classroom Discourse Map: An Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Spoken Words</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Number of Lines</th>
<th>Floor Positioning (s)</th>
<th>Uptake of Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Noah take us buddy</td>
<td>David had previously asked students to comment on McIntosh's article, so he called on Noah to respond</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gives floor to Noah</td>
<td>Noah answers David's question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>so the way I was reading this like I recognize a lot of these to be true but at the same a lot of them are just kind of circumstantial so a lot of these just depend on factors that go into them (1 second pause)</td>
<td>Noah is answering David's question with a claim about the importance of context to McIntosh's list</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Took floor from David</td>
<td>Chelsey and Amy try to support Noah's claims; David offers counter-examples to disprove Noah's claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Like give an example</td>
<td>David is telling Noah to support his claim with support such as an example</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Took the floor from Noah after he paused; returned the floor to Noah</td>
<td>Noah tries to answer David's request in the next 5 lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>like &quot;I can avoid spending time with people who I was trained to mistrust and who have learned to mistrust my kind or me.&quot; [number 2] it just kind of depends on the way you were brought up and what kind of person you are and how you can pretty much be towards other races not necessarily that's a white privilege</td>
<td>Noah is answering David's request by providing an example from McIntosh's list in the article and how context might affect it</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>but you but I'm a white guy right↑ I can pretty well know that I'm not ever going to have put myself in a situation where I'm around people who don't like white people</td>
<td>David counters Noah's argument with a question involving a real life example from his perspective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Took floor from Noah</td>
<td>Chelsey immediately tried to counter; Amy questioned David's argument later on (lines 35, 38)</td>
<td>Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chelsey</th>
<th>that's not true that's not true</th>
<th>Chelsey counters David's claims</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Interrupted David</th>
<th>David immediately replied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>when do I have to be in a situation where I have to be around people who don't like white people</td>
<td>David asked Chelsey to provide an example</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Interrupted Chelsey</td>
<td>Chelsey tried to reply to his request; Amy questioned his argument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While mapping the classroom discourse as indicated in Table 3 does not necessarily provide an explanation for why members did or did not have power, I could see by mapping the discussion who created, gained, and maintained the floor, how long he or she was able to do so, and whose topics were taken up by other participants on the discussion floor (Goffman, 1981). Mapping the discussions thus helped me to answer the questions posed by discourse-in-use, which was helpful in explaining how members were creating learning spaces through their everyday language. By focusing on how Connect members were talking with one another, from one interactional unit to the next interactional unit, I was able to examine in detail how Connect members participated in language and literacy events and practices in ways that creating learning spaces, which were engaging and/or community generative.

In May, using content analysis methods to examine my field notes, interview and observation transcripts, in-class artifacts, student work records, and Facebook postings, I created a chart that included 6 key themes I believed were important to understanding the participants’ figured worlds of Connect. These themes were then each a focus of a
conceptual memo that I discussed with my advisor as well as selected peer doctoral students. The memo topics included “Checking In,” “Living a CO Life,” “Getting Together,” “Weekend Updates,” “Learning from Experiences,” and “Text-Based Discussion.” I acknowledge these conceptual memos were at times longer than 50 pages, but they provided me with a space to think and write about the many rich moments I observed and needed to understand in order to more fully understand the figured world(s) of Connect. As my adviser and I discussed these memos over the summer, we began to notice teachers and students participated in language and literacy events and practices in intricately interconnected ways across my 6 key themes, and I tried to reconsider how these interconnected ways might help to answer my research questions, which were: What happens when teachers and students from different neighborhoods/communities in MidwestCounty participate in literacy and language events and practices in an alternative humanities class? When, where and under what conditions do spaces/places become engaging and/or community generative learning environments? My original memo topics did not robustly show the intricately interconnected ways in which Connect participants were participating in literacy and language events and practices in and across Connect spaces as I had focused each original conceptual memo on one particular activity, such as “text based discussions.” In late August 2012, I, thus, began reshaping the analysis categories, which eventually became those found in chapter 4, to better represent the ways in which Connect members participated in literacy and language events and practices in Connect spaces, which were greatly influenced by each of their own conceptions and perceptions of Connect spaces and the figured world(s) of Connect as
well as the myriad of other figured worlds and fields of power that influence human interactions on a more global scale.

**Limitations**

While I planned and implemented research methods that would help me to better understand how Connect members came together and used literacy and language events and practices in Connect spaces, my research study was limited in several key ways. My first limitation involves simply the number of participants who consented and/or assented to be a part of the study. The members of CO1 for the 2011-2012 school year numbered about 50 students, though some students left the program as the year progressed due to moving and/or desire to return to their SPEs. Only 21 of the 50 students consented and/or assented to participate; of these 21, not all of them and/or their guardians fully consented/assented to all of the parts of the study. In order to provide participants with the greatest amount of comfort, I allowed those who consented/assented to do so with each of the following tasks by asking them to check each of the tasks with which they agreed. The tasks included being audio- and video-recorded during classroom instruction, providing copies of classroom work to the researcher, allowing the researcher to talk to David and Erma about his or her work records, allowing the researcher to collect his or her postings to the program's Facebook page, and/or completing an interview with the researcher. I believed by providing students and their parents/guardians with options on how they would be involved in the study I was providing them with more control over their participation and my study as a whole.

I would have liked to have interviewed all of the student participants, but I did not have the time or the ability to analyze such large amounts of deep data for this study. In
order to gain deeper understandings into how students were conceiving, perceiving, and participating in literacy and language events and practices across Connect spaces, I planned to choose four focal students that each represented a particular identity as either engaged, disengaged, community generator, and community degenerator, which I described above as a word I eventually modified to community sustainer. After I observed Connect members for four weeks, I chose 5 focal participants as both Amy and Chelsey showed engaged behaviors in interesting and different ways, so I chose to include them both to represent engaged learners. While I believe in the importance of understanding the participants from their own perspectives, I acknowledge that I placed the engagement and/or community generative identities onto the students. When I chose the focal students, I did not talk with them in order to understand how they might self-identify in the areas of engagement and/or community generation, which I believe I should have done. I also noticed a flaw I had made in thinking of identities as crystallized rather than fluid. Students' engagement and/or community generation changed over time and space for many different reasons throughout my observations, and this is why I included Becky as a sixth focal student about eight weeks into my observations. While I acknowledge that these identities varied across time and spaces, I had to narrow my focus to a smaller group of focal students in order to more deeply examine my research questions. I not only acknowledge the flaw in my planning around focal student selection but I also acknowledge that the focal students I did choose created another limitation to my research study. I chose six focal students all of whom were females. In the CO1 class, about 40 out of the 50 students were female students, and in my research study, only one male consented/assented to full participation in my study. My identity as a female as well
as my focal students' identities as females might have created a stronger relationship and particular discourses based on our shared identities. Our shared identity as females might have also influenced how we interacted with David and/or Erma. While we might have had similar understandings and participatory behaviors in our literacy and language practices in Connect spaces, we also each conceived, perceived, and experienced the Connect spaces and the figured world of Connect in our own ways.

Another limitation of the study is of a more personal nature. I could not attend every class meeting nor any outside functions in which members interacted and/or participated in literacy and language events with one another. These missed opportunities might have provided me further insights into the lives of my participants, but I also had demands from my own life that made it difficult to be with my participants every day and/or after Connect hours. Even during classes in which I was present, I at times did not obtain the consent of the guest speakers as they or I arrived late and the forms could not be filled out before the class began. In those instances, I turned on the recording devices after the guest speakers finished their presentations though I continued to take field notes of questions, comments, and behaviors students made/performed while the presentation was occurring. I also missed opportunities to collect copies of students' written work beyond their research papers. During my data collection phase, I was so focused on how Connect members were co-constructing Connect spaces that I did not consider how collecting copies of their CoNos, artist statements, or literature discussion prep sheets might help me more fully understand their language and literacy practices. My research study could have been richer if I had been able to observe, collect, and/or record more during my intensive data collection phase.
As a beginning researcher, I also felt I was unable to complete my research study in the way I had learned I should do so. As a result, my research study is not as solidly built on my participants' perspectives as I would like for it to have been. For example, I did not perform member checks frequently after collecting classroom observations. As I struggled to collect my data in readable field notes, scan copies of classroom artifacts, download the audio and visual files from the recording devices, organize all the data, and then attend the next class meeting at least four days a week, I felt like I had little time to do daily analysis of the data. Since I did not have my data analyzed each day before the next class began, I did not regularly ask my participants about their perceptions of class events and practices right after they occurred. Most of my member checking discussions occurred before or after Connect class time among David, Erma, Stephen, and/or Stephanie. I do not think I included my student participants enough in the member checking process, which is a limitation I hope to change in my next research study. Many of the interviews with the focal students provided me with deeper understandings of their conceptions and perceptions of Connect, but more regular member checks would have improved my study.

**Ethical Considerations**

As a researcher, I was concerned about ethical issues that might be involved in my study. I am grateful to the IRB process for helping me surmise the ethics of my research plan before I entered the site. While the study occurred in a classroom, which is a normal instructional setting, I took several precautions to ensure the identities of non-participants and participants would be kept secure. Based on the consent/assent forms, I did not ask students for interviews, work samples, and/or work records unless they had
agreed to do so. I told students where I would set up the video camera, and I tried to place it so non-participants were not included in the camera's field of vision. Students' posting to the Connect Facebook page were not included in my analysis without their and/or their guardians' consent/assent. I did not seek any potentially damaging information in this research study, though I did acknowledge that participants might become embarrassed, upset, or uncomfortable by something they said or did that was then recorded on the audio- and video-recording. I had asked the participants to talk with me if they ever felt discomfort in this way, and I had tried to make the importance of doing so during the assent and/or consent process I describe below. No one ever discussed these types of feelings with me. During the interviews, I tried to minimize discomfort over the interview questions and/or the recordings by giving participants the option to skip a particular question, though no one did so. Participants could also refuse to complete an interview at any time without any penalty.

The assent and consent process occurred in the following way, which IRB agreed was fair and ethical to my participants. I shared a letter describing the research study as well as the participation commitments, risks, and benefits with the interested teachers, along with a consent form. Once the teachers agreed to the study, I informed parents and students of the study through a formal letter as well as an oral introduction during Connect's orientation night before school began. This letter and oral introduction described the research study, making clear the participation commitments, risks, and benefits. I provided the letters to students during the second day of class. I also distributed and collected assent materials during regular class time, and this process took about 30 minutes as students asked questions at David's request about the research,
college and doctoral degrees in general, and my personal life. The assent forms gave students space to indicate their assent with various parts of the study. They could choose to be audio- and video-recorded, participate in an interview, provide his or her work record and samples, and/or include his or her online postings to the program’s Facebook page. Students had 2 weeks to ask me questions and return the assent forms, and I answered questions from participants and non-participants throughout the study as they asked them of me. I also gave students letters of information and consent forms to share with their parents/guardians, and they were responsible for returning the parental/guardian consent forms to me. Like the students' assent forms above, parents'/guardians' consent forms provided space to indicate their consent with various parts of the study. They could choose to allow their child to be audio- and video-recorded, participate in an interview, provide his or her work record and samples, and/or include his or her online postings to the program’s Facebook page. They were given 2 weeks to ask any questions and return the consent form, though I received no formal questions from parents throughout the study. I also asked the adult guest speakers and field trip leaders to consent to their inclusion on the audio- and video-recordings through a letter and consent form on an occasion-by-occasion basis as they took part in the instructional time. There was almost no possibility for coercion or undue influence in this consent process. The teachers decided whether to participate or not, and there were no negative repercussions for that decision. Parents and students then were told clearly that students’ grades and/or standing in the classroom/school would not affected by their decision to participate or not participate in the study, and this remained true throughout the study.
To minimize harm and secure the data, all names throughout my field notes, transcripts, and this paper have been changed to pseudonyms. The data is stored on a password-protected computer, and backup copies of the data have been saved at an online, encrypted backup utility site. I will store all of the data, including the copies of the audio- and video-recordings, indefinitely at this utility site. Students’ work records and samples have been stored with names and other identifiers removed. I removed program identifiers from classroom artifacts, such as class assignments, as they were being stored electronically.

The IRB process provided me with guidance on how to enter the field ethically, but as a researcher, there were times during data collection that I struggled with my own ethical considerations. Throughout my research study, I have agonized over how to present my data and analysis in ways that present my participants as people who care and want the best for one another while at the same time being true to what my critical eyes noticed occurring throughout the data. I want to provide a story of hopeful possibility, and I did not want to shine a light of negativity on Connect members who are coming together from across local geographic neighborhoods and diverse identities to participate in literacy and language events and practices in ways that interest and excite some students in ways I have not observed in more "traditional" classrooms. At the same time, I could not ignore the ways in which fields of power, such as those involving race, gender, sexuality, social class, and religion, and the field of schooling, with its values and positionings, influenced how Connect members unequally participated in literacy and language events and practices. I have tried hard in the next two chapters to balance my
hope for and love of Connect and its members with the critical analysis of the fields of power in which they and their actions were inescapably intertwined.

Connect is comprised of multi-layered, multi-connected spaces, which influence the ways in which Connect members participate in literacy and language events and practices. Building upon methods informed from ethnography and discourse analysis, I spent a year gathering data among Connect members. While there are limitations to this study, it seeks to provide answers to the questions: What happens when teachers and students from various communities in Midwest City participate in literacy and language events and practices in an alternative humanities classroom? When, where, and under what conditions do spaces becoming engaging and/or community generative learning spaces? In chapter 4, these questions guide my descriptions of the orchestrations I noticed among teachers' and students' conceptions, perceptions, and/or experiences of themselves and the Connect spaces through examination of their material and discursive artifacts, which provide evidence of their literacy and language practices across Connect spaces. In addition, the descriptions of these orchestrations among conceived, perceived, and lived spaces also include the ways in which they were influenced by Connect members' figured worlds of Connect, other figured worlds, such as those of the students' Schools of Primary Enrollment (SPEs) or particular religions, and fields of power, such as those involving privileges based upon race, gender, sexuality, social class, and/or religion.
Chapter 4: Findings

Places and spaces are social constructions of locations that have imagined boundaries (Harvey, 2006; Sheehy, 2010). Place involves a relationship of positions (e.g. here/there) (de Certeau, 1984), though I believe places are comprised of some sort of materiality which informs the social constructions around it (Harvey, 2006). For example, places are often comprised of physical items such as walls, houses, roads, trees, and/or mountains. Places include spaces. Spaces, which are often located in places, involve the practices of places, which include the intersections of time, processes, and power (de Certeau, 1984; Foucault 1982/2010; Leander, 2004). Spaces are thus less stable than places, and often do not have the materiality I understand to be in places. Spaces are also comprised of three interconnected entities, which make them even more difficult to describe. Lefebvre’s (1974/1992) trialectical spatial theory labeled these three spatial entities as conceived, perceived, and lived spaces. Conceived spaces are based upon how people believe a space should be. Perceived spaces are how people felt or experienced a space. Lived spaces are how people act in a space, and this is the observable entity of space. While Lefebvre’s (1974/1992) trialectical theory provides structure to spaces, there are still many social practices and processes that could not be fully described by the
theory. Connect spaces involved not only co-construction of spaces but also power relations, identities, and content knowledge and skills.

In order to more fully understand how Connect members participated in literacy and language events and practices across Connect spaces, I needed a framework that helped me include the many interconnections among people, processes, and structures involved in the social practices that created the Connect spaces. While not spatial theorists, Holland et al.’s (1998) theory of figured worlds provided a helpful frame for analyzing how Connect participants co-constructed activities and artifacts in ways that created the social practices associated with Connect places/spaces. Holland et al. (1998) focus on how humans figure and construct the spaces in which they live through orchestrations of conceptions about themselves and the spaces as well as improvisations as they live in the spaces. In this way, Holland et al. (1998) seemed to provide a method for applying Lefebvre’s (1974/1992) trialectical spatial theory to Connect spaces by affording me the opportunity to examine Connect members’ conceived, perceived, and lived spaces through their actions in Connect spaces, which were sedimented in material and/or discursive artifacts. Lefebvre’s (1974/1992) theory also seemed to lack the further connections to other fields, identities, and figured worlds that Holland et al. (1998) describe in their figured world model. As previously shown in Chapter 2, Figure 2 visually represents how I blended these theories.
Figure 2.
*Blending Trialectical Spatial Theories (Lefebvre, 1974/1992) and Holland et al. ’s (1998) Theory of Figured World*
As represented in Figure 2, the interconnections among spaces, figured worlds, and fields create abundant possibilities in human interactions. Connect offers an interesting example of how people can come together and participate in literacy and language events and practices through the plethora of opportunities created among the many multilayered, multiconnected spaces, figured worlds, and fields that influence their daily interactions. David and Erma tried to create a Connect space where everyone was equal, but no one could completely remove the identities, agency, and power relations taken up and/or given during the events and practices occurring in this alternative humanities class. Artifacts, both material and discursive, provided tangible evidence of the co-construction of spaces and figured worlds, but these co-constructions were always changing as different artifacts and experiences created new and different constructions of spaces and eventually figured worlds. As educators, we need to become more aware of how we co-construct class spaces with our students as well as the many fields and other figured worlds that influence these constructed spaces. With these understandings, we might be able to better create engaging and community generative spaces in the figured world of our school/classroom and the field of schooling.

Throughout this chapter, I will be working to describe the orchestrations I noticed among teachers' and students' conceptions, perceptions, and/or experiences of themselves and the Connect spaces through examination of their material and discursive artifacts, which provide evidence of their literacy and language practices across Connect spaces. These orchestrations among conceived, perceived, and lived spaces are also influenced by Connect members' figured worlds of Connect, other figured worlds, such as those of the students' Schools of Primary Enrollment (SPEs) or particular religions, and fields of
power, such as those involving privileges based upon race, gender, sexuality, class, and/or religion. This chapter is broken into three sections. Section One will examine how participants conceived the figured world of Connect. Section Two will describe the lived spaces of Connect using five artifacts of literacy and/or language events and practices: (1) CO Circle, (2) Field Trips, (3) Guest Speakers, (4) Outside Learning Projects, and (5) the group's Facebook wall. Section Three will explore how the lived spaces of Connect created (or not) engaging and/or community generative spaces based on evidence from the artifacts from Section 2 as well as interviews with the participants.

"To Live a CO Life\textsuperscript{3}": Conceptions about Identities and Spaces in the Figured World(s) of Connect

For Connect participants, it is important to understand their conceptions about themselves, learning, school, and Connect because their sociohistorical experiences, which occurred in different communities throughout MidwestCounty, provided different ways of seeing and participating in multiple spaces at Connect. As co-facilitators, David and Erma’s conceptions of the field of learning as well as their figured worlds of Connect were influenced by their own positions and identities as well as the voices of other people, such as members of the School Partnership, administrators of Cosmo, parents, and lawmakers. As the program’s director and lead CO1 co-facilitator, David planned and discussed certain practices in which he wanted Connect members to participate based on his conceptions of Connect as a culture and identity. Erma, as the CO1 co-facilitator, planned and discussed certain practices in Connect spaces based on her conceptions of

\footnote{David used this phrase on August 29, 2011 around minute 54.10 in his directions on how to complete the CO2 Cultural Artifacts activity on the first day of class.}
Connect as a school and classroom, though she did not do so as a rejection of David's conceptions of Connect as a culture and an identity. David and Erma negotiated their conceptions throughout my observations. They both figured the world of Connect and its spaces in particular ways, which often had to be negotiated among themselves before they provided students with direct instruction on how to be members of their figured worlds of Connect. Students, however, had the agency to take up, change, and/or resist these figurings of Connect, its spaces, and their own identities, which may or may not match David and Erma's figurings of Connect community members' identities.

In this first section of chapter 4, I will provide a rich description of how David, Erma, and the student participants conceived the figured world(s) of Connect as well as the identity of a CO person. This section will begin with a description focused on David’s conception of Connect as a culture and identity that all students should embrace throughout their lived spaces. Then, the section will focus on Erma’s conceptions of the figured world of Connect as a school/classroom, which is congruent with its positioning by the School Partnership, but her conceptions were often subordinated to David’s leadership as the Program Director and lead afternoon teacher. Finally, I will provide a description focused on how students conceived themselves as CO persons and the figured world of Connect.

**David’s Conceptions of the Figured World of Connect**

As the program director and lead CO1 co-facilitator, with eleven years of experience with the program, David seems to be the leader in the collective conception of the figured world of Connect. His conceptions about the figured world of Connect, its spaces, and the Connect identity are influenced by the other teachers of Connect and the
earlier Explorer Program (EP), whose conceptions guide the present co-constructions of
the participants’ figured worlds of Connect and its spaces. As described in Chapter 3,
Connect operates within a variety of interconnected, multilayered contexts, which also
influence the ways in which David, as well as Erma and the students, understand their
figured world of Connect. During David's interview, he situated Connect historically by
describing how it was first created and formed, but he believes the program today is
"kind of an alternative space for districts' most kind of creative or in some cases non-
traditional learners or kids who are looking for different education than schools are
providing" (David's interview, March 14, 2012). This evolution into "an alternative
space" occurred over the last twenty years, and the Connect space is founded upon a set
of guidelines. These guidelines have emerged and become solidified into a material
artifact, called "The 17 Guiding Principles" (see Appendix C). During his interview,
David explained students received several written items about the program, which
included “The 17 Guiding Principles” and a list of guest speakers, during the recruitment
meetings at the SPEs in the winter and spring before they apply for the program. He
believes students "see the seventeen guiding principles and they're like that sounds like a
cool place to be. I'd like to be either a part of that kind of community or having those
kinds of learning experiences" (David's interview, March 14, 2012).

David, as the lead CO1 co-facilitator of Connect, has expectations for how the
program would and will continue to function, which in turn influences the decisions he
makes in how to construct and run the program. “The 17 Guiding Principles” seemed to
guide his decisions, and the principles themselves focused not only on the educational
nature of Connect but also the creation of a Connect culture and identity. According to
the 17th guiding principle, Connect teachers believe "learning is a way of life...", or culture. Connect culture thus involves learning in a particular way "both within and outside school" (Guiding Principle 17, Appendix C), and Connect teachers believe the "best" way for students to learn is from "an integrated, project-based curriculum that incorporates choice, active learning, and outside audiences." (Guiding Principle 1, Appendix C). Other valued components of Connect culture include diverse and multiple perspectives (Guiding Principles 3, 8, 16, Appendix C), caring and trusting relationships (Guiding Principles 2, 4, 10, Appendix C), and support from the facilitators (Guiding Principles 2, 11, 14, Appendix C), "parents" (Guiding Principle 15, Appendix C), and one another (Guiding Principles 2, 4, 8, 12, 16, Appendix C). A Connect identity involves many different characteristics that assist one as he or she makes learning a way of life in the Connect fashion outlined in “The 17 Guiding Principles.” According to “The 17 Guiding Principles,” a CO person is responsible, self-aware, intrinsically motivated to learn, "takes on personal challenges" (Guiding Principle 14, Appendix C), voices one's thoughts and opinions, "value[s] the program" (Guiding Principle 10, Appendix C), cares about others and their perspectives, and learns across spaces. Connect culture and identity as described by “The 17 Guiding Principles” was taken up by David throughout my observations.

The 17 Guiding Principles provided a foundation for David's figured world of Connect, and he had particular conceptions about his roles and identities in this particular figured world where learning was a way of life. David had taught as a co-facilitator with Connect for eleven years, and prior to Connect, he had taught for twelve years as a high school social studies teacher for R-Burb Schools. Through his work in R-Burb Schools,
he had participated in "interdisciplinary teaming for a number of years" and designed innovative programs, such as a "community action program where students were designing service projects and a thesis program where students were doing like a semester long research study" (David's interview, March 14, 2012). At Connect, the School Partnership had positioned him as the Program Director as well as a co-facilitator. He and Erma further positioned one another when they decided to split the co-facilitator duties in such a way that David was the CO1 lead co-facilitator while Erma was the CO2 lead co-facilitator. This splitting of facilitator roles allowed David time in the morning to work on administrative tasks. When I asked David about his roles at Connect, he described his roles in the following way:

DA-1 first of all I mean Erma and I are co-facilitators so part of my job is that I'm just a teacher in the program
DA-2 then I'm also the program director which means that I'm kind of overseeing or
DA-3 managing the program you know the administrative side of it
DA-4 which Erma does some of that too
DA-5 I mean Erma deals with parents or different issues but in general when things like budgets things like recruiting and admissions
DA-6 reporting to the superintendent about the program
DA-7 anything you know that involves kind of management or
DA-8 kind of long term
DA-9 stewardship of the program I do
DA-10 and so you know for example the
DA-11 the recruiting and admissions thing is huge
DA-12 huge if we didn't
DA-13 if we didn't do that effectively there would be no program
DA-14 (2 seconds pause)
DA-15 so for me that's probably I would say my most significant responsibility I have

DA-16 Christy: is recruitment
DA-17 David: besides teaching
DA-18 is recruitment yeah
DA-19 because you know it's like doing a good job in teaching is like obviously job one but you can't do that if we don't have kids  (David’s Interview, March 14, 2012)
Table 4. 
*Transcription symbols*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbols</th>
<th>Representations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Rising intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ line 1 line 2</td>
<td>Overlapping speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>＋</td>
<td>Elongated sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word (Students laugh)</td>
<td>Emphasis by speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(actions)</td>
<td>More than one participant verbalizes at the same time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[details]</td>
<td>Non-verbal behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of speaker’s words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I then asked David to tell me more about the recruitment process, which resulted in a change of topic away from his roles in Connect. David began his description of his roles by naming himself and Erma as co-facilitators (line DA-1), which he later listed as "job one" among his roles (line DA-20). After his role of co-facilitator, he then detailed his role as program director (lines DA-2 through line DA-15). Despite his designation as the program director, which involves "the administrative side of it [Connect]" (line DA-3), he stated in lines DA-4 and DA-5 that Erma also completed administrative tasks, like "deals with parents or different issues"(line DA-5), in her role as co-facilitator. While David believed "doing a good job in teaching is like obviously job one" (lines DA-18 & DA-19), he believed his role of teacher depended heavily upon his ability as program manager, specifically being able to recruit and admit students. As the program manager, David seemed to place great importance in his position as the "long term steward[ship] of the program" (DA-8 & DA-9), and this position and identity seemed to provide David...

---

4 As I stated earlier in chapter 3, I make use of these transcription symbols in my transcripts throughout chapter 4.
with a strong sense of purpose and communal responsibility as evidenced in his switch from the use of the pronoun "I" to "we" in lines DA-12 and DA-13. In David’s figured world of Connect, David's positions and identities, which changed over time and spaces but had deep historical roots in his 11 years of experiences with the program, influenced the ways in which he planned and participated in Connect spaces.

As long term steward of the program, David also had conceptions about the roles and identities students had as actors/participants in his figured world of Connect. On the first day of class, David instructed students about his conceptions of how Connect people performed a CO identity. The first class lesson involved David inviting students to become members of the Connect "culture" by examining artifacts from the CO2 culture. Around the church auditorium on tables, CO2 students had displayed their summer project artifacts, which ranged from sheets of paper with lists of books read and places visited to poster boards and scrapbooks filled with pictures. As a part of CO2's first assignment, Erma had asked students to complete four lists over the summer break, and then they brought in the lists along with supporting artifacts to share with one another on the first day of CO2. According to my field notes for that day, Erma had titled these four lists: Outside Learning Experiences Record, Summer Reading Record, First Time Ever Record, and Creating Community Record. The CO2 students agreed to leave their projects for the CO1 students to see. This particular in-class lesson seemed focused on the 17th guiding principle, which is "learning is a way of life and therefore [we] expect students to take advantage of the wide range of unique learning opportunities both within and outside school." David invited CO1 students into the Connect culture in the following way:
1. so
2. you have around you artifacts
3. surrounded by them
4. in this room
5. each of us is going to take a moment
6. think about 25 moments
7. 25 minutes if you were
8. to study the artifacts in an effort to understand what it means to live a CO life
9. these are all artifacts
10. of another culture
11. and that culture is the CO2 student world
12. these are all CO2 students who have spent their summer trying to live CO
   when we don't meet every day
13. right↑
14. so like we go to CO and we're here its two hours of class every day and then
   we leave and we go home
15. but one of the things that the kids who really really transform their lives
   because of CO I mean everybody has a good experience for the most part
   every once in a while maybe not but almost everybody has a great experience
   but the people who have a transformational experience
16. so like real life changer are the people who understand that CO isn't just a two
   hour a day experience but it's a whole way of living
17. do you know what I mean↑
18. and so
19. when the year ended on CO1 the twenty plus students who were coming back
20. asked the question well I'm not in CO for the next three months
21. so what does that mean↑
22. like am I shutting it down until like the school year starts up and Erma and
   David starts telling me what to do to be CO again or can I take the ball and
   run with it by myself↑
23. so what you'll see on the table is artifacts of what CO2 kids did in the summer
   to try to live in a CO way
24. and what we want you to do is we want you to take a look around at those
   artifacts and see what you can learn about what living a CO life means from
   these artifacts
25. does that make sense↑
26. (2 seconds pause)
27. at the end of the twenty at the end of the twenty-five minutes we'll come back
   together and see what conclusions we can draw about what it means to be CO
   in the way you live your life (Classroom Transcript, August 29, 2011, minute
   53.40)

This segment ended as David changed the topic on the floor to focus on the steps for
completing this activity, which he did for another 2 minutes before Erma took the floor to
offer advice on how to complete the task with such a large group of students present. David's invitation allowed students to explore his and CO2 students’ conceptions of the collective figured world of Connect by examining other Connect members' artifacts, drawing conclusions, and then explaining in their own words how one "lives CO" (lines 8, 12, 16, 23, 24, & 27). David's lecture set out certain conceptions he had about his figured world of Connect and how actors should behave within it, which is an identity David assumes students will want to take up as they have chosen to apply for the program. David believed Connect could be a "real life changer" (line 16) if students recognized and acted like Connect was not simply the "two hours of class every day" (line 14) "but it's a whole way of living" (line 16). David positioned the CO2 members as exemplars for how Connect members should act (line 12). According to David, CO2 students knew how to "take the ball and run with it" (line 22) without David and Erma directing them on what to do (line 22) though most of these students had been taught about CO culture and identity in similar ways the year before as they also entered the program as CO1 students. David positioned Connect members as students who are learners always seeking learning opportunities from which they have "good," "great," or even "transformational experiences" (line 15) both in and out of school.

After students completed David's assigned task of examining the CO2 summer artifacts silently, they shared their thoughts, which they had written in the Connect Notebooks (CoNos), with the whole group during a CO Circle Discussion, which I describe in further detail in Section 2 of this chapter. David ended the whole group discussion with his conceptions of an interesting person, which seemed to be a strongly valued identity for an actor in his figured world of Connect.
1. you know in a way it's like inspiring to look and see like we can be more interesting people
2. do you know what I mean↑
3. like in a way like I you look at that and you think like
4. people are interesting they do interesting things I want to be an interesting person
5. and one of the ways you can be an interesting person is by going out into interesting spaces and trying new things and being in different you know
6. that you know it's fun being interesting
7. you get to be around other people who are interesting
8. I don't know it just makes life richer in some way (Classroom Transcript, August 29, 2011, minute 1.46.30)

Erma then took the floor after David's last word to ask students whether anyone had attended weekend events, which David and Erma had suggested at the picnic that occurred the Friday before this first day of class. This opportunity given by Erma provided students with an opportunity to show David and Erma they were interesting people "going out into interesting spaces and trying new things" (line 5). In the first line of the segment, David positioned himself with his audience by using the pronoun "we," but he used the pronoun "you" throughout the remaining seven lines to tell students how they should have responded to the CO2 cultural artifacts. David's use of pronouns seemed to shift the agency of becoming "interesting" from a cultural identity he shared with students to an individual identity he wanted students to take up to become CO people. "Interesting" was also a re-occurring word in the segment. David used the word "interesting" 8 times in his 8-line conclusion to the CO2 cultural artifacts lesson. With such emphasis on this word, it seemed David strongly valued a personal identity as "interesting," which he defined as someone who "do[es] interesting things...by going out into interesting spaces and trying new things" (lines 4-5). While David did not provide examples of these "interesting things" and "spaces" in this segment, he had provided
these examples in the form of cultural artifacts, which students had been examining for 25 minutes before the discussion and this conclusion occurred. In this way, an "interesting" person was one who was living a CO life by reading books, attending outside learning experiences, trying new things for the first time, and creating community. In his figured world of Connect, David conceived Connect members performed a CO identity by being "interesting people" (line 1) who did "interesting things" (line 4) in "interesting spaces" (line 5), like those found among the many examples of cultural artifacts from CO2 members.

**Erma’s Conceptions of the Figured World of Connect**

The School Partnership hired Erma as the second co-facilitator six years ago, and according to their website, she is labeled as the Program Specialist. She and David had positioned one another to be the lead co-facilitators in one of the classes, and she had taken the lead for the CO2 class during the 2011-2012 school year. Due to the larger size of the CO1 class and her position as the second co-facilitator, Erma was almost always present during CO1 class time as a subordinate co-facilitator, which was unlike David who could use the time in which he was not lead co-facilitator to work on other Connect duties. As the CO2 lead co-facilitator and her positioning by the School Partnership, Erma seemed to have less power than David in the collective figured world of Connect. She conceived Connect more as a classroom that operated in the field of schooling than David, who conceived of Connect as a culture and identity. David and Erma, thus, often had to negotiate their plans for activities, artifacts, and expected behaviors for Connect members, but as the subordinate CO1 co-facilitator, she often followed David's lead.
Erma had begun her career as a journalist for a small publication in Midwest City, but in her thirties decided she wanted to move into teaching. She had previously taught in Midwest City Schools as an English/Language Arts teacher, before attaining a Master's degree in Creative Arts and Learning from Northeast University in Northeast City, MA. She returned to Midwest City without a job, and she applied for a job opening at Cosmo, where the principal told her she should apply for the job at Connect instead as it would be a better fit. After several rounds of interviews, including those with Connect students, the School Partnership offered Erma the job, which she accepted. Erma's varied background and education helped position her as the co-facilitator knowledgeable in English/Language Arts and Fine Arts. Oftentimes, on days involving art or creative writing activities, David deferred his role as lead co-facilitator to Erma.

Erma's conceptions of Connect and her identities and roles within it seemed to focus on Connect as a class that was a part of the field of schooling. These conceptions were particularly apparent when I asked Erma to "tell me a little bit about the program and your roles in it" during our one-on-one interview. Erma agreed with David's classification of their roles in their figured world of Connect, but her description of Connect focused more upon its roles in the field of schooling.

ER-1 you know the short version of the program is Connect is a half-day humanities program that focuses on project learning
ER-2 and uses the city as it's campus
ER-3 and I think
ER-4 you know I think if my husband hears me describe Connect one more time he's going to
ER-5 (laughs) jump off a bridge
ER-6 but I think that is what it is
ER-7 it's a half day humanities program
ER-8 we do to our+ best ability use the community as our campus and as our library so to speak
I then took the floor from Erma to discuss her roles as the lead co-facilitator for CO2, which shifted the topic to the changes she had helped this small group of students navigate this year with the inclusion of "new students into the morning group" (Erma's interview, April 5, 2012). Erma's description of Connect as well as her roles within it seemed filled with references, such as "project learning" (line ER-1), "campus" (lines ER-2 & ER-8), and "curriculum" (line ER-15), to the field of schooling. In her conception of Connect, she emphasized her role as "the facilitator" (line ER-17) while David had different responsibilities that Erma did not "want to have anything to do with" (line ER-14). Erma stated she was "happy" and "fine" (line ER-14) with her position in their figured world of Connect as she could focus her energies and time to being "just the facilitator" (line ER-17). Erma's descriptions of Connect as well as her facilitating role within it seemed influenced by Connect's position within the field of schooling.

Her conceptions of Connect, like David's, were based upon “The 17 Guiding Principles.” While I believe Erma conceived Connect as a classroom in the field of schooling, she did not reject David's conceptions of Connect as a culture and identity. For example, she believed Connect's ultimate goals could be found in the 17th guiding principle's value on lifelong learning. During our interview, when I asked Erma about the
goals of the program, she seemed to provide support to Connect's guiding principles as well as some of David's conceptions of Connect as a culture. She, however, did not seem to label this way of living as "CO" like David seemed to do. In response to my interview question about the program goals, Erma stated:

ER-1 I think the goals of the program are to create lifelong learners
ER-2 to really emphasize that learning isn't that
ER-3 I don't want to say that learning isn't education but learning isn't an edifice
ER-4 that learning is something that can permeate your life if you find passions
ER-5 I think also one of the goals is to get students engaged in the community
ER-6 and whether it's through going to poetry slams or just getting out of your neighborhood
ER-7 that's what I think the main goals are
ER-8 (1 second pause)
ER-9 of the program
ER-10 I guess I could say we're also trying to get help the students grow up a little bit
ER-11 so when they go out in the world and they are forced to
ER-12 interact with adults or interact with job interviews or college interviews
ER-13 we're trying to get them comfortable in the world
ER-14 so yeah (Erma's Interview, April 5, 2012)

I then asked Erma to discuss why students choose to join Connect, which shifted the focus away from her beliefs about the program's goals. Erma's conceived goals of Connect seemed to be influenced by “The 17 Guiding Principles” as well as the field of schooling. In lines ER-1 through ER-8, she seemed to be rephrasing the 17th principle, which stated "learning is a way of life and therefore [we] expect students to take advantage of the wide range of unique learning opportunities both within and outside school" (Appendix C). While Erma seemed to conceive Connect as occurring in the field of schooling, she acknowledged in lines ER-2 through ER-4 that Connect tries to emphasize learning is more than what students often experienced in the field of schooling, which she terms "education" (line ER-4). After describing the primary goals of
lifelong learning across places/spaces, Erma included another goal that seemed more aligned with those found in the field of schooling. In lines ER-11 through ER-14, she stated Connect is preparing adolescents to "grow up" (line ER-11) and "interact with adults" (line ER-13), which are commonly held conceptions about high schools preparing adolescents to live in the “real world.” Erma, thus, seemed to orchestrate her figured world of Connect with not only her conceptions of the field of schooling but also with the Connect material artifact of "The 17 Guiding Principles," and her orchestrations created different conceptions of Connect than David's conceptions, which seemed to view Connect as a culture and identity.

**Students' Conceptions of the Figured World of Connect**

At the same time as David and Erma were trying to negotiate and co-construct activities, performances, and artifacts that matched their own individual conceptions of the figured world of Connect, they were entering the Connect spaces with 50 students who each had their own conceptions about the figured world of Connect, the other interconnected figured worlds and/or fields, and their own identities and senses of agency. Much of the students' conceptions about the figured world of Connect were influenced by their experiences in the figured worlds of their SPEs as well as the field of schooling, the conceptions presented by David during recruitment, and the information they might have gathered through online research. In addition to these sources, some students entered the program with conceptions they had learned through talking with people associated with Connect in some way.
Some of the students had conceptions of Connect based upon limited knowledge they learned from talking with former Connect students. For example, Amy shared how Jessica and Katy got her interested in applying for the program:

AM-1 like last year and
AM-2 the year before and last year they [Jessica and Katy] would talk about Connect and they loved it
AM-3 and I remember the one defining thing the one thing I was like
AM-4 I need to look into this was over winter break
AM-5 one of them had posted a status ugh school but I can't wait to go back to Connect and I was like
AM-6 you can't wait
AM-7 why why are you so excited to go back to school†
AM-8 and so I looked into it and
AM-9 I mean I didn't really understand what Connect was even after I signed up for it and stuff
AM-10 but I just kind of did cause I was like you know
AM-11 why not
AM-12 it apparently looks good on scholarship or college stuff
AM-13 so why not
AM-14 so I did (Amy’s Interview, April 4, 2012)

I then asked Amy how she felt about her decision to apply, which changed her topic of discussion to focus on why she believed applying to Connect was a good decision. Amy had learned that Jessica and Katy enjoyed Connect in ways that she did not enjoy school at her SPE in G-Burb, which made her curious enough to research and apply for Connect. She admitted, however, she still did not "really understand what Connect was even after I signed up for it" (Line AM-9). Former students, either relatives or school mates, were not the only ones who provided conceptions to CO1 students about their figured world(s) of Connect.

Parents of Connect students also provided CO1 parents and students with conceptions on the figured world(s) of Connect. Callie admitted she looked into the program because of what she referred to as "a freakish accident" that involved her mother.
and a mother of a CO2 student named Penelope (Callie's interview, April 4, 2011). Callie recounted how this chance encounter between her mother and Penelope’s mother led her to apply for the program:

CA-1 yeah her mom works at the same place and they bumped into each other and like
CA-2 Penelope's mom Lynn was like holding something and my mom was like ew what's that for and she's like oh Penelope made it in the art show at Connect
CA-3 and so+ then+ my mom's like oh I heard this thing that Connect has art shows and it's like a school+ and so I'm like ok I'll look it up
CA-4 and then+
CA-5 I looked it up and I applied when it turn++ed
CA-6 last year
CA-7 I heard about it when I was like in eighth grade
CA-8 no ninth grade
CA-9 wait
CA-10 yeah ninth grade (Callie’s Interview, April 4, 2011)

I then asked Callie if she heard about the program at school, and she admitted she had not as she was attending W-Burb Schools, who no longer pay for their students to attend Connect. This shifted our discussion to how her mother paid out-of-pocket for her to attend the program. Callie and her mother conceived Connect to be "a school" that "has art shows" (line CA-3), which was enough to influence Callie to apply and attend Connect even though it caused a financial strain for her mother.

Students, thus, entered Connect with particular conceptions about the program. Their conceptions were largely influenced by their previous experiences in the figured world of their SPEs and the field of schooling. David's conceptions, which he presented during the recruitment meetings at their SPEs in winter/spring of the previous school year, as well was the conceptions officially posted online by the program and School Partnership also might have influenced students' conceptions. In addition to these sources
of information, some students drew upon other students' and their parents' conceptions of the figured world(s) of Connect. As students entered Connect spaces, David and Erma both introduced their own conceptions of Connect, which students could then take up, change, and/or resist. David and/or Erma could not force members to act in particular ways, so each member, with his or her own conceptions, entered the spaces, experienced the planned activities, performances, and artifacts, and co-constructed the spaces into lived spaces that were all perceived differently by each of the members. This entire process was part of the Connect members’ co-construction of not only the lived spaces but also the more imagined figured world of Connect.

"Here's the Connect Thing\(^5\): Literacy and Language Practices as Artifacts of the Figured World of Connect

Connect members' conceptions of the figured world(s) of Connect, along with their conceptions of other figured worlds, such as their SPEs, and fields of power, such as race, gender, sexuality, social class, religion, and/or schooling, influenced the ways in which they participated in literacy and language events and practices within Connect spaces. I conceptualized the literacy and language events and practices I observed and/or recorded as artifacts (Holland et al., 1998) of the figured world(s) of Connect. These artifacts, in the form of written field notes and transcripts and audio and/or video-recordings, provided evidence of the ways in which Connect members co-constructed the spaces and figured world of Connect. These literacy and language events and practices, which became artifacts to Connect members and myself as a researcher, also provided

\(^5\) David used this phrase on September 22, 2011 around minute 33.50 to describe how writing workshops would occur that day in Connect.
evidence of the ways in which the spaces and figured world of Connect were interconnected and/or influenced by other figured worlds, such as the figured world of students' SPEs or churches, fields of power, such as race, gender, sexuality, or religion, and the field of schooling. The figured world of Connect, however, is more than just a description of Connect members’ creation of and/or experiences in the day-to-day literacy and language events and practices in the form of sedimented artifacts. The figured world(s) of Connect is an abstraction through which members made use of the "significant regularities" in Connect literacy and language events and practices to derive "...expectations about how particular types of events unfold...” while at the same time also using “distillations of past experiences” to interpret the day-to-day literacy and language events and practices (Holland et al., 1998, p. 53). The figured world(s) of Connect, thus, involves identity, agency, and power as humans act in particular ways within the figured world, which is itself interconnected with other figured worlds and fields, to co-construct spaces, which is evidenced in the co-produced artifacts of literacy and language events and practices.

In the collective figured world of Connect, there were five artifacts of literacy and language events and practices that operated as "significant regularities" in Connect spaces (Holland et al., 1998, p. 53). These artifacts, which are the focus of this section, include: CO Circle, Field Trips, Guest Speakers, Outside Learning Projects, and the group's Facebook wall. Each artifact was a regularly occurring literacy and/or language event in which Connect members participated and co-constructed the Connect spaces and its figured world as well as their own identities within those spaces. This section will work to describe how Connect members participated in these artifactual literacy and language
events and practices and how other figured worlds and fields of power influenced their orchestrations of lived spaces. While I discuss these literacy and language events and practices as distinct, individual artifacts, they blended and interconnected among each other in the lived spaces of Connect. For example, CO Circle was a particular type of language event, which involved the bodily configuration of Connect members as they discussed various topics. CO Circle discussions occurred around topics such as those found in the artifactual literacy and language practices of field trips and guest speakers, yet field trips and guest speakers were not comprised solely of CO Circles. Field trips involved going to another place in MidwestCity to learn for the afternoon class period, usually from talking with a guest speaker, though this guest speaker differed from the artifactual literacy and language practice of guest speakers. The artifactual literacy and language practice of guest speakers involved experts coming to the church to discuss particular topics with Connect members as they sat facing the stage area where the guest speakers stood to talk, and this artifact lacked the change in place offered by field trips. In order to provide greater clarity into these artifactual literacy and language events and practices, I will describe each artifact individually, but I acknowledge that each artifact might be blended and interconnected with one or more of the other artifacts.

**Artifact 1: CO Circle**

At Connect, discussion spaces often occurred in what David and Erma referred to as CO Circles. As I described in Chapter 3, a CO Circle was a single-file, spherical seating arrangement in which all Connect members sat on the wooden floor in front of the stage in the auditorium space of Parish Hall. While I, like David and Erma, refer to this seating configuration as a circle, students throughout my observations noted how
they actually made an oval instead of a circle because there were so many of them to fit in the rectangular floor area. This spherical seating arrangement allowed all Connect members to see one another, and, as Erma stated on the first day of class, it "means everybody is included [and] no it's not a square where someone's at the top and someone's at the bottom..." (Classroom Transcript, August 29, 2011). The CO Circle was the most common discussion configuration that I observed; it occurred 32 times in the 47 days in which large group discussions happened (see Appendix A). David or Erma opened the discussion floor in CO Circles, and they provided the topic Connect members should discuss. David or Erma would then call on the first person who wanted to respond, which he or she indicated by raising his or her hand. Both David and Erma tried to establish a turn-taking process where the respondent who had the floor called on the next respondent to take the floor. At times, this process broke down, and David or Erma would call on the next respondent.

By examining two examples of how Connect members participated in particular CO Circle discussions around race, we can begin to understand how CO Circle was an integral part of the figured world(s) of Connect as well as how other figured worlds and fields of power influenced the Connect members, Connect spaces, and the figured world(s) of Connect. I have chosen these two particular CO Circle discussions as examples to provide evidence from Connect artifacts of the ways in which Connect members co-constructed their identities, Connect spaces, and the figured world(s) of Connect as they were influenced by other figured worlds and fields of power in Connect discussion spaces. The co-construction process involved the identities Connect members performed as well as their positionings of one another; the process also involved the
conceptions and perceptions each of the members held. The particular focus of each of the CO Circle discussions I describe is the one David and/or Erma planned according to the unit calendar and his or her discourse in opening the floor. I acknowledge, at times, the proposed topic of the floor shifted based on details spoken by participants, but David and/or Erma tried to keep the discussion focused on the field of race. The first CO Circle discussion example occurred on September 12 and 13, 2011, as Connect members discussed race after reading Peggy McIntosh's (1989) "White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack." The second CO Circle discussion example occurred on October 3, 2011, as Connect members further discussed race after going to a local movie theater to watch *The Help* (Columbus, Barnathan, Green, & Taylor, 2011).

**CO circle example 1: "White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack."**

On September 12 and 13, 2011, Connect members read and discussed Peggy McIntosh's (1989) "White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack." David and Erma decided to have students read and discuss this article in smaller groups rather than as a whole class. As a result, David's research groups read the article on September 12, 2011, while Erma's group met at MidwestCity Public Library to work on research. On September 13, 2011, the groups switched, and Erma's research groups met in the church's auditorium to read and discuss the article. While this particular practice of splitting the students into two smaller groups occurred at times throughout my observations, this particular time is the only one in which I chose to follow both groups through the same activity. I made this decision because I believed this particular written text would be important to students' understanding of perspectives. I based this belief in my observations from the previous year's students' comments throughout my time with them as well as the use of this text
across university classes in which I have participated. As a result of this decision, I was afforded the opportunity to see how all the students read and discussed it and how the two co-facilitators individually mediated the reading and discussion of McIntosh's (1989) piece, which focused on the topic of race.

David and Erma seemed to follow the same general plan for the class time on their group’s reading and discussion day. They both began the discussion with a short pre-write in the students' CoNos, which students then discussed with one another. After this small discussion, David and Erma provided background information about Peggy McIntosh and they passed out the article for students to read silently on their own. Then, they formed a CO Circle for a discussion about race. David and Erma both concluded the discussion by referring to how it might help the Connect members understand the world as well as a reminder of the next day's plans. While the general plan was consistent, how each facilitator specifically implemented the plans differed. For example, the pre-write activities were different. According to my field notes (September 12, 2011), David asked students to rate in their CoNos on a scale of 1-10 how much race mattered in the year 2011 and why they believed that. After about 4 minutes of writing time, David asked students to stand in a line with people who had written the same number in their CoNos. David then helped the students break into four smaller groups based on their shared number ratings. The largest group occurred around the number 6 rating, so this group was split into two groups. Six students had written ratings between 1-4, and they became another group. Seven students comprised the final group, which represented the rating of 6.5-10. In comparison, Erma asked students to answer three questions in their CoNos. According to my field notes (September 13, 2011), the questions were: "What is race?
Does race matter? Write about some time in your life where race has made itself present.

In a CO Circle, after six minutes of writing time, Erma’s students discussed their answers.

The CO Circle discussions around the article differed as not only the teacher’s questions and directions differed but also the students present, which in turn affected the figured worlds and fields of power that members drew upon and referenced. In David’s group, after students finished reading the article and regrouped into a CO Circle in the floor area in front of the stage in the auditorium, David asked students in the CO Circle to give a fist to five on how much they agreed with the article and then how much they learned from the article. Their answers to these questions varied widely, and I unfortunately did not capture precisely how the students answered each question in my data. The majority of students held up 2-4 fingers for both questions. David then opened the floor for verbal comments:

1. okay
2. I want to start with people who would identify themselves as not white
3. okay
4. for people who identify themselves as not white
5. I wonder if you would be comfortable or open enough to talk about how you feel about the fact that we're talking about this
6. Non-Participant wanted to talk first, claiming she had been holding back all day. She shared some personal experiences around race for about 3 minutes.
7. David: other non-
8. people who consider themselves not white have any reaction to like how does how do you feel even talking about this
9. (3 seconds pause)
10. go ahead Callie

---

6 A fist to five was a practice David used to get a quick assessment on what students thought. A fist meant zero or no agreement, and all five fingers meant the strongest agreement.
11. **Callie:** oh
12. I agree with what Non-Participant1 said because I'm full black but I look white to like everyone
13. so like when I was little I got made fun of all the time
14. because I went to a predominantly black school
15. and they're like oh you're white and I'm like no I'm black and they're like no you're white and I'm like I think I know what color I am

**16. (Students laugh)**
17. maybe not all of them but even in like my family oh look at the little white girl doing art
18. I'm like what↑
19. and just shit like that all the time
20. it's weird being like full black and coming from a full black family and then like
21. how do people like see you as white
22. like I go to law classes with my brother sometimes and he's full black
23. like he looks it
24. and so like we're with a group of friends and then they're like
25. he didn't have money and so+
26. they're like oh look at the poor little black kid who doesn't have money but then I didn't have money and they're like okay
27. so you don't have money enjoy yourself it's fine and I'm like really+
28. we're related but no one can ever tell
29. so just
30. it's weird
31. like being like on the border though

**32. David:** others
33. (9 seconds pause)
34. you don't have to just creating the space
35. so one of the things that I
36. that I think is really interesting in this article
37. is I think one of the biggest white privileges is
38. that as a white person
39. I can just choose to not think about this if I don't want to

**40. (Someone says yeah)**
41. for me it's like
42. whatever
43. you know (throws papers with article printed on it into the air) ha ha silly article

**44. (Students laugh)**
45. okay I'm white
46. and like I could just walk right on like
47. I don't ever have to really think about it or deal with it
48. it's completely+
49. like
a privilege that I as a white guy have
you know
whereas
whereas a minority
like let's just keep it in the domain of race if you're not white you don't have a luxury of being able to say I'm just eh this stuff just not relevant to me because you know that it is
you know what I'm saying
in some way
what was in the article that was interesting to you challenging to you
that you like thought like wow I hadn't thought about it really resonated with you or you were like
you know
I don't think that's true (Classroom Transcript, September 12, 2011, minute 1.38.00)

A non-participant took the floor after line 60 to answer David's questions about what was "interesting" (line 57), "challenging" (line 57), or "really resonated" (line 58). At the beginning of the transcript, David opened the floor by asking non-White students to "talk about how you feel about the fact that we're talking about this [White privilege]" (line 5). David thus positioned the speakers who took the floor as non-Whites whose perspectives were important to be heard first, and these speakers represented not only their individual perspectives but also the non-White group perspectives. The first speaker, a non-participant, quickly took the floor and shared her personal experiences with White privilege. David then asked for other non-White students to share "how do you feel even talking about this [White privilege]" (line 8). He gave the floor to Callie, who also shared personal experiences with White privilege, though she did not really answer how she felt talking about this topic at Connect. In line 12, Callie took up David's positioning of her as non-White person by identifying herself as "full Black," but she acknowledged that others see and treat her as "White." Callie mentioned how others, like former classmates (lines 14-15), family members (line 17), and her brother's friends (line 26), positioned her
as White, and she strongly identified herself as Black. Callie later learned during the autobiography project in January the reason she appears White was because she was actually "quarter white!!!!! that explains so much. " (Facebook post, 1.15.2012) yet she continued to identify herself as Black during our interview on April 4, 2012. David did not take up the topics Callie and the non-participant shared even though he had privileged their perspectives as ones that should be heard first. He, instead, shifted the discussion to how his powerful position as a White man in the field of race gave him an opportunity to disregard what the article had to say (lines 39-50). In line 53, David used "minority" in contrast to his privilege as a "White guy" (line 50), but then in line 54, he returned the focus of the discussion from any "minority" to "let's just keep it in the domain of race."

David seemed to acknowledge the interconnections among identities in the multiple fields of power, but he chose to keep the discussion focused on race, which was the topic of McIntosh's (1989) article.

David’s CO Circle discussion continued as White students began to share things that they found "interesting," "challenging," and/or "really resonated." Chelsey shared her belief that number 49 on McIntosh's (1989) list was "weird," and she explained:

1. I think that's not 
2. exactly racism but I also think it's 
3. (1 second pause) 
4. class and sexism 
5. like I think it's a guy with two kids that are like 
6. oh his wife died something something something 
7. but if it's a woman and two kids it's like oh she's not responsible enough to keep a marriage together or not responsible enough to do this she's a single parent because she has to raise her kids by herself 
8. **David:** it's interesting that you use the word racism 
9. I want to read a line from the next to last page 
10. at the very bottom and I thought this was a really important line in the thing
11. because I think the word racism oh racism↑
12. like oh the r word
13. it's the neutron bomb of like conversation
14. she [McIntosh] says "I was taught to recognize racism only in individual acts of meanness by members of my group"
15. like racism means like calling someone the n word or like you know
16. spray painting something on their house or something like that
17. so she was taught that like that's what racism is but never to notice "invisible systems conferring unsought racial dominance on my group from birth"
18. she didn't notice that kind of racism
19. or she didn't notice a society that unfairly advantaged her
20. as racism (Classroom Transcript, September 12, 2011, minute 1.46.00)

After 20 more seconds of David expounding upon his point of the subtlety of racism, he then gave the floor to Melissa whose comment questioned our abilities to change things that are so invisible and engrained in our beings, which shifted the topic away from the interconnections among identities and privileges in the field of power Chelsey provided. Earlier in the CO Circle discussion, David had discussed the field of power as containing multiple privileges yet he tried to focus the discussion on race (line 54, Classroom Transcript, September 12, 2011), yet 2.5 minutes later Chelsey offered her own conceptions of the field of power involving interconnections among race, social class, gender, and sexuality (lines 2-3). In her conceptions and perceptions of the world, which included multiple fields of power based upon various privileges, identities could not be separated from one another as each were important to how people perceived and positioned one another. Based on her comments later in the CO Circle discussion, her above comments might also have been a show of resistance to believing in the operation of White privilege as McIntosh (1989) describes it, though I have no further evidence to provide support for this hypothesis. In line 7, David took up Chelsey's use of "racism," and then directed students back to McIntosh's (1989) article by quoting it twice (line 13
& 16). In his position as teacher, his shift in topic back to racism and McIntosh's (1989) article influenced others to take up the topics he supported rather than continuing to build on Chelsey's thoughts on the interconnections among the fields of race, social class, gender, and sexuality.

After about ten more minutes of CO Circle discussion among David’s group about McIntosh's (1989) article, there was a lull in the discussion as evidenced by an 8-second pause following David's comment to "hear from some other voices let's hear from some folks we have not heard from" (Classroom Transcript, September 12, 2011, minute 1.50.22). The discussion continued in the following way:

1. **David**: Noah take us buddy
2. **Noah**: so
3. the way I was reading this
4. like I recognize a lot of these to be true but at the same a lot of them are just kind of circumstantial
5. so a lot of these just depend on factors that go into them
6. (1 second pause)
7. **David**: like give an example
8. (4 seconds pause)
9. **Noah**: like "I can avoid spending time with people who I was trained to mistrust and who have learned to mistrust my kind or me." [number 2 on McIntosh’s list]
10. it just kind of depends on
11. the way you were brought up and what kind of person you are
12. and how you can
13. pretty much be towards other races not necessarily that's a white privilege
14. **David**: but you
15. but I'm a white guy right↑
16. I can pretty well know that I'm not ever going to have to put myself in a situation where I'm around people who don't like white people
17. **Chelsey**: that's not true
18. that's not true
19. **David**: when do I have to be in a situation where I have to be around people who don't like white people↑
20. **Chelsey**: like
21. *(Someone says "right now")*
22. **David:** well there could be some one person in this room that doesn't like white people
23. **Chelsey:** yeah yeah I know
24. **David:** (laughs) like Non-Participant2 doesn't
25. **Chelsey:** if you accidently walk into a random place and you're in the middle of like
26. (2 seconds pause)
27. er black panther
28. like you're in the middle of black panther
29. **David:** see the good news though for me is
30. I know where the places are that are predominantly black or whatever and I just chose not to go there
31. in fact most people around me tell other people like me not to go there because they are particularly places we want to avoid
32. as white people
33. *(Some students agree with "that's true" and "mmhh")*
34. but you know
35. **Amy:** it's the same way
36. **David:** we can do that
37. we're actually told to do it
38. **Amy:** but isn't it the same way for black people↑
39. **David:** no because if you're a black person you have to be in places where white people are because us white people are everywhere
40. like you know what I mean
41. *(Students talk and laugh)*
42. if you go to CityMall there's white people at the stores they run the stores
43. they run whatever
44. **Amy:** but there's black people at the stores as well
45. **David:** they're pretty much
46. one other thing there could be one individual here or there but I can stay out of places that are kind of
47. where I'm likely to be
48. not wanted respected or do you get it↑
49. does that make sense↑ *(Classroom Transcript, September 12, 2011, minute 1.51.00)*

This segment ended as a non-participant took the floor and shifted the topic to residential neighborhood segregation, which expanded the discussion around individual avoidance of people with certain racial identities to a more global avoidance of people with certain racial identities. David throughout the above transcript used the power given to him by the field of schooling in his position as teacher to control the floor as well as to offer
challenges to the students who seemed to be resisting belief in White privilege as detailed by McIntosh (1989). He offered counter-arguments directly after Noah's (lines 9-13), Chelsey's (lines 17-18 & 25-28), and Amy's (lines 35, 38, & 44) arguments/questions, though his counter-arguments might actually be directed to all three of them, as each of their arguments are related to one another's. In his position as teacher, David's words were directed towards everyone in the CO Circle as he instructed students on how the field of power involving race operates. Noah's, Chelsey's, and Amy's conceptions and perceptions of the field of race did not seem to include White privilege as described by McIntosh (1989) and David as they each believed the places and spaces in which one lives influences the existence of White privilege. David challenged them to rethink their conceptions and perceptions by offering examples of how the field of racial privilege operates in the lived spaces with which they were familiar, such as CityMall.

The White privilege CO Circle discussion continued among David’s group for another ten minutes, though only non-participants and David took the floor. David took the floor to end the class period, as the field of schooling, the figured worlds of the students' SPEs, and the figured world of Connect placed a 2-hour time limit on Connect classes. In a typical discourse pattern for David in his position as the teacher, he closed the class period by summarizing what he wanted students to learn from the lesson. He stated:

1. so the goal of today it's not to like
2. you know tell anyone you're right or you're wrong
3. it's for us to start to notice why do I see the world the way I see it right↑
4. it's perspective
5. why is it that I have this way of thinking about this
6. why did I read the article the way I read it
7. right↑
8. and Christy read the article differently than you read it because she has a mixed race nephew right↑
9. and Non-Participant1 read the article differently than you because she has these two different parents and these experiences that she had right↑
10. each of us like
11. read
12. or like Katrina read the article the way she read it because she
13. comes from a white family in a predominantly white community and that's what she's experienced
14. and none of these are right or wrong
15. they are just kind of the eyes that we have for our reading
16. does that make sense↑ (Classroom Transcript, September 12, 2011, minute 2.02.30)

David continued by reminding students to meet in the library with their research materials, and then students began leaving the CO Circle and retrieving their personal items from the tables. In his position as teacher, David's conclusion to this particular CO Circle focused students back to the overarching theme of the unit, which was perspectives. While David claimed the goal of the discussion was "not to like you know tell anyone you're right or you're wrong" (lines 1-2), his challenges seemed to push students to rethink and change their perspectives to be more like David's perspectives on White privilege. It is possible that David's challenges might have helped students to better understand and articulate why they had particular conceptions and perceptions about the field of race and its privileges. As he had done throughout the discussion, David continued to position Connect members, such as myself (line 8), Non-Participant1 (line 9), and a participant student, Katrina (line 12), as particular identities based upon our personal histories as he understood them. His positionings of Connect members involved influences from other figured worlds and fields of power, and he seemed to base his positionings upon our appearances, our SPE's and corresponding residential neighborhoods, and our lived experiences, which we had shared with him previously.
and/or in the CO Circle. David's positionings provided him with a way in which to understand the identities Connect members were performing or were positioned upon us by other figured worlds and fields of power, but, by placing these identities upon other Connect members, David used his power as the teacher in such a way that members might have felt their senses of agency and identity were taken from them. I do not believe it was David's intention to take away anyone's sense of agency and/or identity, but he instead positioned others to make the point that each of us has different conceptions and perceptions about the world, with its multiple figured worlds and fields of power, that is based upon our lived experiences in multiple spaces. David ended his CO Circle on this day by emphasizing the importance of understanding one another's conceived, perceived, and lived spaces instead of judging one another as if there are right or wrong perspectives (lines 14-16).

On September 13, 2011, as David's group met in the library to research, Erma and her student research groups read and discussed McIntosh's (1989) "White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack." Erma decided to use a different place within the church than David had used for his CO Circle discussion. She invited students to come into the Youth Room, which was a smaller place than the auditorium with a couch, cushions, and carpeted floor space. Students came into the Youth Room as they finished silently reading, and when most students arrived in the room for a CO Circle Discussion, Erma began:

1. so
2. (2 seconds pause)
3. Non-Participant1 and Joe read this and they're really angry [they had been discussing as students began to fill the room] because a lot of it was true
4. and sometimes stuff like this again can be painful because it is not about you as a person
5. it just happens to be because you belong to a group
6. and seeing it written down like makes things real
7. (Someone says "yeah")
8. and it can be really crappy
9. but over here+ when she was talking about specific incidents
10. you know I think sometimes people who are white are really quick to say
11. oh it can't be that way it must be something else (Classroom Transcript, September 13, 2011, minute 1.32.00)

In her position as teacher, Erma opened her group's CO Circle discussion space, but she did so in such a way that she accepted the difficult emotions that might be present among students after reading McIntosh (1989). This was a typical discourse style that Erma used throughout my observations, and her tendency to discuss emotions more than David might be connected to her identities as a woman, an artist, and/or “just the facilitator,” which might have afforded her time to focus more on the students and their individual experiences rather than administrative tasks like recruitment or funding. Erma specifically acknowledged that "people who are White" can sometimes dismiss what McIntosh (1989) said (lines 10-11), but she also recognized that "sometimes stuff like this can be painful because it is not about you as a person it just happens to be because you belong to a group" (lines 4-5). Erma's CO Circle discussion space, thus, was set up differently than David's, but Connect members still seemed to show resistance as they tried to orchestrate the field of racial privilege with their own conceptions and perceptions about race.

Erma's CO Circle discussion immediately discussed the list of White privileges McIntosh (1989) included in her article, though, using her position as the teacher, Erma tried throughout this CO Circle discussion to shift the topic to White privilege as a
historical, structural use of power. During our interview on April 5, 2012, Erma told me "if we have a discussion there are times when I want it to go in a completely different way than it does but part of the point of Connect is allowing the students to find their route so to speak." This particular CO Circle discussion provided evidence for her claim. Once students finished talking about Non-Participant1's experience, a participant student, Regina, called on another participant student, Dawn, who shifted the topic on the floor to McIntosh's (1989) list. Dawn stated:

1. like when she started like this sentence seemed a little dated
2. like she started listing off all these things
3. and I think
4. number+
5. like 17 at the top
6. "I can talk with my mouth full and not have people put this down to my color"
7. that's really disgusting
8. **(Other students agree and talk over one another)**
9. **Erma:** I think the idea here is I mean we get there are some of those things you don't agree with but
10. that's not the point
11. you know not like dismissing what you're saying but
12. **Dawn:** no I was like
13. **Erma:** you know
14. **Dawn:** then I started thinking about it
15. I was like how would that affect anybody's race
16. like I looked like
17. at a white person they're doing that but when it's a black person it's not anymore disgusting than
18. the other
19. I don't know if that's how I was raised but
20. it's just like I don't agree with that
21. **Erma:** Mark (Classroom Transcript, September 13, 2011, minute 1.33.30)

Mark, followed by Michelle, took the floor to discuss a particular incident on the list, which shifted the topic on the floor to particular instances of White privilege with which they did not agree. Dawn seemed to take up the belief that she was color blind, and she had been raised by her family to see the act of talking with one's mouth full as disgusting
no matter who the person was. In her position as teacher, Erma tried to explain, after
Dawn's first interactional unit, that the point of article was not about the list of "things"
(line 9). Erma hedged her dismissal by saying she's "not like dismissing what you're
saying" (line 11), so Dawn elaborated on her particular point, seemingly unperturbed by
Erma's point that she was off-topic (line 10). Continuing in her position as teacher, Erma
called on Mark to take the floor when Dawn finished in line 20. Mark and Michelle also
seemed to take up Dawn's lead to the list of incidents despite Erma's statement that the
disagreeing with "some of those things...that's not the point" (lines 9-10).

After Michelle finished explaining another instance of White privilege from
McIntosh’s (1989) list, Erma took up her position as the teacher who wanted students to
understand the field of race and its privileges. From her position as the teacher who had a
learning outcome students needed to get, Erma tried to focus students back to the
institutionalized nature of White privilege. She stated:

1. before we get to like looking at each of these little things
2. let's just talk about the idea of white privilege
3. okay
4. this kind of power
5. or advantage
6. that white people have that they have not asked for
7. they just have it
8. (2 seconds pause)
9. did she convince you that it exists†
10. (Some students answer affirmatively)
11. do you not believe it exists†
12. I'm going with Non-Participant3 first and then you pick (Classroom
   Transcript, September 13, 2011, minute 1.35.30)

Non-Participant3 then discussed another individual incident from McIntosh's (1989) list,
despite Erma's direct questions in lines 9 and 10, which requested students discuss their
beliefs in the existence of White privilege. Erma tried to exercise her power as the teacher
by providing students with questions focused directly on the field of racial privilege yet students resisted answering these questions. At the time, as a participant observer, I thought students were trying hard to resist discussing White privilege. During my interviews with them, Amy, Callie, and Chelsey each offered evidence for another explanation for their resistance in answering Erma's questions. They each positioned Erma more as the friendly co-facilitator rather than an authority figure like David. For example, Chelsey described David as “very fatherly” while Erma was “very buddy buddy with everyone which is good but it's like (sigh) sometimes you need to be a teacher and sometimes you need to stand up and be like hey you need to quit that” (Chelsey’s Interview, March 26, 2012). Callie elaborated a bit more on David’s position as an authority figure; she believed David appeared more strict because he’s “like no I'm going to hold you to this you're going to do this cause you said you're going to do it this is the program” (Callie’s Interview, April 4, 2012). These particular positionings might have influenced the students to ignore Erma’s questions in the above transcript in favor of their interests as they did not take up her position as a teacher with power to control the topics on the discussion floor.

Non-Participant3’s individual incident from McIntosh’s (1989) list remained the topic on the floor for 4 minutes even though he was not answering the direct questions Erma had posed earlier in the CO Circle discussion. After Non-Participant3 ended his comments, Erma tried again to shift the topic to White privilege as a systemic use of power. When students still seemed to be missing the point she was making about the field of race, she provided an extended example of what she meant in a more didactic style of teaching, which she did not often use. She stated:
1. **right now**
2. I just want to know
3. do you think white privilege yes no↑
4. Dee your hand has been up for a while
5. **Dee:** well I think
6. most of these things they're true
7. it talked about how we're like
8. almost trained not to recognized it I think
9. but my question throughout this whole thing was like
10. was the other way around if whites were the minority would like
11. the other race have these privileges too
12. **Erma:** yeah it's about who has the power
13. **Dee:** yeah
14. **Erma:** you know
15. **Dee:** I think it goes both ways
16. like if I'm the only white person in the room
17. like
18. would
19. like would it be flipped
20. (1 second pause)
21. **Erma:** I don't know
22. if you were the only white person in a room
23. you want to answer this↑ *(eye gaze turned towards Susan)*
24. okay
25. **Susan:** I've been to like Dubai
26. and Bangladesh and Mexico
27. I think it's over there too
28. like if you're
29. my dad's white and
30. like they treat us like royalty when we go there
31. like it's the same kind of thing
32. **Erma:** what this is talking about is not like
33. you're the only White person in the room whose privilege
34. **Susan:** yeah, yeah
35. **Erma:** that's a momentary thing
36. this article is talking about an institutionalized+ attitude+ and privilege that
    has been here **historically**
37. for example
38. (2 seconds pause)
39. there's a thing called hidden curriculum
40. if I go to school
41. I can't say EastCity anymore because they rehabbed the building
42. but if I go to say Francis Smith okay
43. the school building pretty much sucks
44. *(Students interject a few comments)*
well I used to teach there so I am aware of that school
so facilities are terrible
and they probably haven't updated textbooks in a long time
my population is mostly people of color but certainly the majority are
what was it in the game of lower classes that are the triangles [This refers to a prior activity where students carried out a simulation based on socioeconomic differences. Each socioeconomic class had a shape to represent their group.]
I don't remember
the majority are triangles
and I go and I play a game at NewBurb
and I'm not picking on anybody
but you know
ok I'll say P-Burb
(Student laugh)
that's the new building
(Student laugh)
so you go out to P-Burb and P-Burb looks like the Taj Mahal
their facilities are fantastic
and although nobody says to me
honey
maybe your education isn't as important as this one
I get it
that's what like white privilege is
it's an institutionalized thing
people don't necessarily say
you're black that's why your credit card was declined [referring back to Non-Participant1's narrative she had shared prior to this CO Circle Discussion]
they say things like huh figures
like happened to Non-Participant1
ok↑
that is what white privilege is
it's the idea that
you can't drive in B-Burb being black
because you're going to get pulled over
even if you are going the speed limit
(2 seconds pause)
am I right or am I right↑
(Some students agree she is right and laugh) (Classroom Transcript, September 13, 2011, minute 1.39.50)

This segment ended as 2 non-participants vied for the floor to share personal experiences, which eventually shifted the topic to these personal experiences and not towards the larger field of race and its privileges. Erma began this segment by loudly insisting
students discuss whether or not White privilege existed (lines 1-3), and she gave the floor to Dee to do so. Dee asserted she believed White privilege existed, but she said throughout the article she wondered if other minorities would be privileged if they were in the majority. When Erma answered her in line 12 with "yeah it's about who has the power," Dee then shifted White privilege out of the institutionalized nature that Erma wanted to discuss and into a more individual example of one White person in a room of non-Whites (lines 16-19). As Erma went to respond to Dee, Susan raised her hand to gain the floor, which Erma gave to her (line 23). Susan provided personal examples about White privilege occurring in places across the globe (lines 25-30), yet Erma still seemed to believe the students were examining White privilege on an individualized basis. In lines 35-79, Erma took up her position as a teacher whose students needed a lecture, and she provided an example of the field of racial privilege operating in the figured worlds of the students' SPEs. Her lecture showed students what she wanted them to see and understand about White privilege as a historical, structural system of power. She drew upon particular residential communities in MidwestCity, such as NewBurb (line 52), P-Burb (line 55), and B-Burb (line 74), to connect White privilege to the places/spaces in which students lived. Even though Erma provided students with this lecture, the non-participant that followed her lecture shared a personal story about a friend who was driving and then police had pulled over without cause, which did not take up the systemic nature of the field of race as described by Erma.

Erma's CO Circle discussion continued until she, like David the day before, used her power as the teacher to end the class period after 2 hours as the field of schooling and the students’ SPEs influenced the CO Circle space. She ended the discussion by stating
the importance of deeper understandings of race and its privileges through hearing other people's stories, which provided a link to the next day's lesson. As her conclusion, Erma said:

1. I know we've had really interesting discussion today
2. we have kind of scratched the surface on a lot
3. of much deeper issues which we may or may not have a chance to revisit
4. tomorrow we are having a privilege panel
5. in which
6. people of color it's not all African American I think there's a
7. I don't know a Latino gentleman
8. are going to come in talk to you about their personal experiences
9. with issues of privilege
10. it is easy to read about this stuff
11. and go oh yeah maybe it's around maybe it's not
12. but once you hear people's personal stories like when Non-Participant1 told
   her story about how she was treated at a store all the sudden you're like
13. oh+
14. so when you hear these personal stories it makes
15. things politics basically come alive (Classroom Transcript, September 13, 2011, minute 2.02.30)

Erma then assigned students a homework task of writing down a few questions to ask the panelists tomorrow, and the class period ended as students talked and left the room to collect their belongings from the auditorium. In her position as teacher, Erma concluded class, assigned homework tasks, and linked today's lessons to the next day's lesson. Her conclusion, in comparison to David's, began with a focus on the co-constructed nature of the discussion as she made use of the pronoun "we" four times in the first four lines, which David used only once at the end of his concluding remarks (see line 15, Classroom Transcript, September 12, 2011). She then shifted to discussing the co-construction of conceptions and perceptions in the field of racial privilege by explaining how listening to others' "personal experiences" (line 8) helps "politics basically come alive" (line 15) by providing examples of personal experiences in lived spaces, which helps "you" go "like
oh" (lines 1-13), which seemed to mean a recognition and understanding of the field of racial privilege.

CO Circles as evidenced in this first example provided Connect members with a discussion space in which all members could voice their opinions. While the space was conceived by David and Erma as one in which all members were equal, as a lived space, CO Circle did not seem to provide equal power to all participants. David and Erma maintained control of the discussion floor, and he or she often had particular perspectives he or she wanted students to hear and/or take up. When students in both groups seemed to disagree with the field of racial privilege as described by McIntosh (1989), both David and Erma took the discussion floor to challenge the students’ beliefs. In CO Circle example 2, which is also focused on the field of race, David and Erma continued to construct and put into practice CO Circle in a similar way, but the tensions between group identity and one’s individual identities that appeared at the beginning of David’s and Erma’s group CO Circle discussion about White privilege become more apparent in the CO Circle discussion about *The Help* (Columbus, Barnathan, Green, & Taylor, 2011).

**CO circle example 2: The Help.** Connect members saw *The Help*, produced by Chris Columbus, Michael Barnathan, and Brunson Green and directed by Tate Taylor (2011), at a local movie theater during class time on Friday, September 30, 2011. Some members of the class, including Erma, had also read the written alphabetic text, *The Help* by Kathryn Stockett (2009), which Tate Taylor had adapted in his written screenplay for the audio-visual text. Since the movie went longer than usual class time and took place at a public movie theater, Connect members did not discuss the movie until they returned to class on Monday, October 3, 2011. I did not read/view either text prior to the CO Circle
Discussion on October 3, 2011 because I lacked the time in my schedule to do so and I was unfortunately unavailable to observe the field trip to the movie theater on September 30, 2011.

While there was a CO Circle Discussion about *The Help* (Columbus et al., 2011) near the end of the class time on October 3, 2011, David had started a discussion about the audio-visual text on the group Facebook wall at 4:38 pm on September 30, 2011. He posted, "So can 52 people have a movie discussion on Facebook? What did you think of The Help? How does it relate to the idea of perspectives?" Six students, including two participants, and Stephen, one of the pre-service teachers, posted replies. Naomi replied, "I thought it was quite touching and a good movie. I cried a few times haha. It really brings out the points of views. I loved it!" Mark replied right after Naomi, "It's amazing how one person in the right position can make such a difference on the behalf of the less fortunate side! This movie was great! Thanks for allowing this experience :)" Stephen then replied:

At first I thought the movie was hilarious. Then I started thinking about why I was leaving the theater thinking about how funny a movie about racial inequality was, because I was honestly expecting to be in tears for half the movie. It was almost like the pain they did include was just a set-up to make you laugh harder at an extended poop joke. Are more people going to leave talking about Medgar Evers or Two Slice Hilly?

That being said, I'm not convinced that the movie was primarily about race. I think race was at times a vehicle for talking about the less apparent issues of gender inequality.

Stephen's reply received one like, and he was the only participant asked by David to bring up his reply in the CO Circle on October 3, 2011. His Facebook post was also the only one that specifically named the perspectives he believed the movie included.
The CO Circle Discussion focused on *The Help* (Columbus et al., 2011) occurred after students had discussed the film on the group Facebook wall as well as discussed the fields of power, such as those involving race, sexuality, and gender, during previous classes. During the CO Circle Discussion on October 3, 2011, Erma seemed to be the lead co-facilitator of the discussion as she opened the discussion floor as well as controlled its use throughout the twenty-three minute discussion. As in her CO Circle discussion on McIntosh's (1989) article, Erma also seemed to have a particular plan and learning outcomes for the discussion based upon assumptions she had made about how the students viewed the movie, though the students seemed again to resist Erma's topics for discussion in the CO Circle. The field of schooling and the figured worlds of the students' SPEs influential use of time also affected the discussion; I noticed the discussion seemed rushed as Erma often cut students’ comments short and she and David referenced the short amount of time throughout the discussion, which included the use of the common Connect phrase, "short version," seven times. “Short version” become a common phrase used by David and Erma during discussions to remind students to keep their replies short and succinct, and it functioned as a time management technique throughout my observations. Erma started the CO Circle discussion about *The Help* (Columbus et al., 2011) in the following way:

1. now we did go see the movie *The Help* in the middle of the perspectives project
2. you know so think about the perspectives you saw maybe some perspectives that you didn't↑
3. your overall idea+ about the movie and let's talk about that for a little bit
4. we don't have a lot of time+ so please listen to each other so you aren't saying the same comment over and over
5. and let's go for the short version
6. really think about what you are going to say before you start talking
7. and keep it you know succinct
8. so what perspectives do you think were in *The Help*↑
9. what did you think of it↑
10. we are going to start over here+ *(points finger towards Allison)*
11. **Allison:** I just like how um I mean its kinda like on how+ the only reason that Skeeter got published was because she's a White author but *(Someone coughs)* she was like totally representing the Black help↑
12. I was curious if a Black woman in those days could have wrote a book on like the perspectives

13. **Erma:** so you are assuming that the movie is a true story
14. **Allison:** no I mean *(inaudible as her voice level is very low)*
15. is it possible in those days↑
16. **Erma:** oh+++ you mean in the South at that time↑
17. **Allison:** yeah
18. **Erma:** in Europe there were different things going on so I don't know
19. A Non-Participant then asked a clarifying question about the movie being based on a true story.
20. **Erma:** it is not based that book is not based on a true story
21. **Students** begin to talk to one another, and **Stephen** laughs.
22. **Erma:** sh+ just what I thought would happen this is a work of fiction *(Classroom Transcript, October 3, 2011, minute 1.29.35)*

The segment ended as Allison pointed at a Non-Participant, whose name she did not know, which changed the topic on the floor to the need to know one another's names. In opening the CO Circle discussion, Erma focused students on the overarching learning goal of the unit, which was to understand multiple perspectives, while also reminding them of the limited amount of time they had to discuss the perspectives present and/or absent in *The Help* (Columbus et al., 2011). Time was a constant force from the field of schooling that affected how Connect members participated in CO Circle spaces. Erma referenced the limited amount of time for this discussion four times in lines 3-7. She also quickly cut off Allison when she seemed to reference the audio-visual text as fact rather than fiction, though this quick effort seemed more connected to her concern, which she had shared with me before class started, that the students had not critically analyzed the audio-visual text based on the Facebook discussion as well as individual comments after
the field trip to the local movie theater. Erma wanted students to see the movie as a work of fiction that was set in the South of the United States during the 1960s (lines 16 & 18). In line 22, she admitted that her conceptions about the students believing the movie represented fact were correct, as the statements made by Allison and the non-participant provided evidence that they believed a fictional movie to be "based on a true story" (line 20). Allison's response, however, had focused on the field of racial privileges as presented in the movie, which answered the questions with which Erma's had opened the floor. Allison wanted to know "if a Black woman in those days could have wrote [sic] a book on like the perspectives" (line 12). While Allison seemed to be on topic, Erma seemed to dismiss her historical question and focused instead on making sure the students understood the movie was historical fiction. Erma's reaction to Allison's response seemed to keep Allison from engaging any further in this CO Circle discussion, as Allison did not contribute any further and I noticed her doodling in her CoNo as the discussion continued.

Students continued to share with one another in the CO Circle about the perspectives they thought were present and/or absent in The Help (Columbus et al., 2011). After about 10 minutes, Erma shifted the focus away from the individual Connect members' experiences of the film towards the more global aspects of the movie such as the field of race and how "the African-American especially women community" viewed the movie. After Melissa finished her comment, Erma said:
1. we have to move on to a different part of the discussion or we are not going to get through the day so put your hand down

2. we are going

3. David (cutting off Erma): the good news is that the (Erma begins a sh+ that extends throughout this message unit) Facebook discussion is wide open

4. Erma: sh++

5. David: so whenever you do get a chance to talk about perspectives please just jump in and participate in the Facebook discussion [No one added to the Facebook discussion based on my final Facebook check on July 9, 2012]

6. I mean uh there's a lot to be said a lot left unsaid maybe we can share there

7. Erma: what's coming around are two very short pieces about African-American women who don't agree with The Help

8. they don't agree with its message and there has actually been quite a lot of uproar in the African-American especially women community about this movie

9. and it is interesting to me online that the people who did reply were like oh it's a great message

10. oh it tells teaches us so many lessons but you know what are they↑

11. (3 second pause)

12. you know it is really easy to look at that movie and not kind of analyze it or look at it from a perspective from somebody who is probably a descendant of an African-American maid

13. so just take a look at these

14. and see what you think↑ (Classroom Transcript, October 3, 2011, minute 1.38.45)

The segment ended as students took 2.5 minutes to read the two articles that Erma had passed around the CO Circle. Erma stopped students from further taking the floor to discuss their own understandings of The Help (Columbus et al., 2011). In her position as teacher, Erma provided students with texts written by African-American women in order to help students examine The Help (Columbus et al., 2011) through the field of race, which was the lens she wanted students to use in their analyses. While her focus seemed to be the field of race, the field of gender was also being taken up by her choice of texts written by women authors as well as the movie's central characters being female. In his position as co-facilitator, and perhaps acting upon his conceptions of his figured world of
Connect based in “The 17 Guiding Principles,” which stated students' voices mattered and should be heard by other Connect members, David interrupted Erma's assignment to provide students with another way to share their perspectives with one another through the use of the group’s Facebook wall. In previous classes, David and Erma had both shared a belief with Connect members that students' thoughts mattered and the CO Circle discussion space was a space to share these thoughts with others without judgments.

During this CO Circle, Erma, in her position as teacher and perhaps acting upon her conceptions of her figured world of Connect as a school/classroom, entered the CO Circle discussion space with learning outcomes for students to become critical media viewers and thinking about multiple perspectives. With her strong belief in the importance of these learning outcomes, she often controlled the discussion through methods involving topic on the floor, time management, and even selection of speakers on the floor. In the transcript segment above, Erma provided students with texts that presented the key perspectives about which she wanted them to think, though not all students took up these texts in the way she had planned.

Students remained in the CO Circle while they silently read the texts Erma had distributed. After the majority of students seemed to be looking up from the articles, Erma decided to continue the CO Circle Discussion though the focus shifted to discussing the more global field of race and its privileges by examining African-American women's perspectives on *The Help* (Columbus et al., 2011). She continued in her position as a teacher, especially reminiscent of English teachers I had learned from in high school, by using the practice of referring to multiple texts and providing students
with literary terminology for analyzing the texts. Erma opened the floor for this part of the discussion:

1. Before we comment on this stuff there is a much longer article that really talks about this topic in depth that I am going to post to the Facebook page and the writer's really young so she writes very colloquially like you are having a conversation with her so you will really like to read it
2. but one of the things she talks about and the main reason I was involved in looking into this is because I was at a poetry reading last Tuesday and a young African-American woman got up and said I hope you don't like The Help because I am reading a poem about how horrible it was because I am tired of the magical Negro
3. has anyone ever heard that phrase? You have (looks toward Allison who appears to be nodding her head up and down)
4. Allison (who had been doodling, with her eye gaze on the paper, before she started nodding): wait what was the phrase?
5. Erma: the phrase was the magical Negro
6. Allison: oh
7. Erma: it's a trope
8. a trope is like a stereotype used in movies all the time in which there is an African-American character that shows up and has some profound knowledge that helps the White protagonist and then leaves
9. like have you seen Ghost? how many of you have seen Ghost?
10. (A few students raise their hands)
11. (Students laugh)
12. Erma: the movie Ghost Patrick Swayze and Whoopi Goldberg is like the magical Negro
13. she comes in and does her thing has anyone ever seen The Shawshank Redemption
14. (More students raise their hands for this movie than Ghost)
15. Morgan Freeman's character is the magical Negro who gets everything
16. Sex and the City [Refers to the movie not the television show]
17. Jennifer Hudson is the magical Negro who comes in and shows Sarah Jessica Parker what love is and then she leaves
18. so it's just something that Spike Lee introduced the term back in the 80s and this woman writes you know
19. here we have a movie with thirteen magical Negros
20. and so
21. I listened to this poet's side and did some reading about it and it's just interesting to see who is actually helped in the movie
22. you know the maids are helped by getting a voice but Skeeter is the one who goes off and gets a new job+
23. and is kind of free from this life of female enslavement in Jackson [Mississippi] but you know the maids are still there
24. so it's just there's lots of interesting things about it
25. and you++ want to go first Amy↑ (Classroom Transcript, October 3, 2011, minute 1.42.45)

Erma began this segment of the CO Circle discussion with an explanation for why she had taken an interest in the perspectives of African-American women and why they were important for Connect members to explore too. Erma's introduction included a reference to her identity as a Connect person who attends poetry readings in urban places outside of Connect time and spaces. Erma then repositioned herself as an English teacher who provided her students with direct instruction on the literary term, "trope," though none of the Connect members took up this term, or Spike Lee's phrase "magical Negro" (line 2), throughout the remaining CO Circle discussion. Like English teachers I remember from high school, Erma listed numerous examples of "the magical Negro" in other texts, as a way to help students understand the term as well as its application to The Help (Columbus et al., 2011). Erma seemed to provide students with a way in which to critically examine texts by considering the field of racial privileges. By looking for how "African-American character[s]" were portrayed in various films (line 8), students might begin to consider "who is actually helped in the movie" (line 21). Students, however, did not take up this way of being a critical viewer in the CO Circle as the discussion continued.

After Erma's opening of the floor of discussion to focus on African-American women’s perspectives on The Help (Columbus et al., 2011), which resembled the field of schooling, especially the figured world of the English classroom, students continued to participate in the CO Circle in ways that constructed the space to more resemble the collective figured world of Connect rather than the field of schooling or the figured world
of the English classroom. As in other CO Circle discussions, students seemed to be trying
to orchestrate the critics' perspectives with their own perspectives on *The Help*
(Columbus et al., 2011) and their conceptions of the fields of race and/or gender. After
gaining the floor from Erma, Amy stated:

1. I was reading the second article
2. and I can see their points but at the same time I'm very
3. kind of annoyed by how they're writing
4. she says at the same time where she says
5. that Davis "acknowledges the charged conversations...'because a white
woman was writing what I felt was our story, and once again she's going
to get it wrong and she's only going to skim the surface'...'" [Article two,
sentence six] and it just made me wonder the woman who is saying this is
what thirty or forty at most
6. so+ how is it her story I don't
7. if this was back in the [19]60s
8. I
9. it just kind of
10. it makes me feel like she is making herself a victim
11. she's calling it her story and I don't think she is one of the people who
experienced that first hand
12. I don't think she's a maid I
13. I think that she's
14. she's identifying with
15. the Black woman back in 1960 but it kind of struck me that she's saying
oh this woman doesn't know what she's talking when at the same time they
are probably the same
16. age
17. and
18. **Erma(cuts off Amy):** but they are not the same age
19. but that is neither here nor there
20. **Amy:** okay
21. there was one more thing but I don't remember what it was so+
22. **David:** quick comments, quick comments
23. **Amy:** Non-Participant
24. **Non-Participant** shares her thoughts though she wraps up her 1 minute
comment because
25. **Erma:** short
26. can we hear from somebody of color†
27. **(Students laugh)**
28. **Erma:** is there anyone in here†
29. I'm sorry (laughs)
30. **Callie:** yeah I'm of color
31. **Erma:** okay
32. **Callie:** but
33. I feel like they [the authors of the articles they just read] were looking
34. **Erma:** sh+
35. **Callie:** to pick out the bad+
36. like I feel like again if it's about Black people they're going to be like racists and
37. only talk about them as a Negro
38. it was like they weren't like looking at like the broad thing
39. they were like looking at like the specifics
40. they're
41. (2 seconds pause)
42. not getting the whole story
43. **Erma:** what is the whole story↑
44. **Callie:** like Black people own the right like right here [is referring to the text and points to it with her finger]
45. (1 second pause)
46. about+
47. the+
48. "sexual harassment that many Black women endured in the home" [Article two, sentence three]
49. it's just
50. yeah like that's the whole story
51. (2 seconds pause)
52. should I call someone↑
53. **Erma:** yeah (Classroom Transcript, October 3, 2011, minute 1.44.50)

The above segment ended when Callie called on a Non-Participant, who tried to defend the movie but his defense was cut off by David, who stated again there were just a few minutes left in the discussion. Throughout the transcript, Amy and Callie seemed to be orchestrating their own perspectives with those of "Black" women critics, and then Erma challenged their orchestrations. Amy took the floor first, and she was "kind of annoyed" that one of the author's claimed this was her story to tell even though she did not directly experience being a maid in the 1960s, which Erma had earlier, in her response to Allison, seemed to emphasize the importance of telling the "true story" (line 20, Classroom Transcript, October 3, 2011). Historical accuracy seemed to be of great concern to Erma
throughout the discussion, and Amy believed that while the author was Black and female, she, like Stockett (2009), was too young to claim the story of Black maids in the 1960s as her own (lines 5-12). Erma cut Amy off as she thought she was missing the points about racial privileging by focusing on the age of the authors instead of their race.

David and Erma both referred to the limited time after Amy and a non-participant shared (line 22 & 25), and then Erma asked for "somebody of color" to share (line 26). Like David, in his CO Circle discussion about McIntosh's (1989) text, Erma positioned students, like Callie, as being "of color" and thus having a different perspective than other Connect members, which everyone needed to hear. She also positioned Callie as speaking for a group of people rather than a more individualized perspective, which was a tension I noticed throughout my observations. In the collective figured world of Connect, individual perspectives were welcomed while at the same time individuals should work together and create a community based on shared characteristics and perspectives. Erma seemed to be searching for students who might share the critics' perspectives since they shared lived experiences based upon their identities as Black in a field of power which privileged White identities. Erma, like David during the CO Circle discussion about White privilege (Classroom Transcript, September 12, 2011), asked particular students to speak for an entire group of people who shared an identity with them. Despite sharing a common identity, Callie seemed to struggle to articulate the views of "the African-American especially women community" (line 8, Classroom Transcript, October 3, 2011), which Erma was hoping students would gain from reading the articles. In Connect, as a whole, there were few students who identified themselves as Black, mixed, or "of color," and on this particular day a few of these students were absent, which might be
why Erma asked in line 28 “is there anyone in here.” This comment by Erma drew
attention to the small number of students who identified as “of color” in the majority
White class, thus making the CO Circle a less free space as it became one in which
minority students had greater risks in sharing.

After a second non-participant, who claimed a Black identity, shared her thoughts
about the articles, David took the floor in his positions both as teacher and co-facilitator.
In his role as teacher, he was aware of the approaching end of class time and the need to
return graded research papers. In his role as co-facilitator, perhaps sensing Erma's
frustration with students not taking up the more global field of race or her learning
outcomes of critically viewing texts and understanding multiple' perspectives on The
Help (Columbus et al., 2011), he asked Stephen to rephrase his comments from
Facebook, which focused on the fields of racial and gender privileges. Both Stephen and
David, in their positions as social studies teachers, seemed to focus on the historical
pieces of the movie, which Erma had made clear earlier (Classroom Transcript, October
3, 2011) was fictional despite its historical setting. The segment began as Stephen took
the floor at David's request:

1. so my first thought leaving the theater was that movie was really good and I
   thought it was hilarious and then I stopped and thought why I am leaving this
   theater thinking that a movie about racial oppression and segregation is
   hilarious
2. that just didn't sit right with me because I was expecting to go into that movie
   and come out crying
3. it just seemed there were just too many neatly tied ends and the pain that they
   did show was almost in contrast or an extended poop joke
4. (Students laugh)
5. it it
6. there is just something about that that seems like it wasn't telling the racial
   story effectively
7. so I started thinking well so what stories did they tell and somebody over+ it might have been Non-Participant mentioned there were like 2 guys in the whole movie um so that's why I started thinking maybe it was
8. you guys are talking about racial oppression but in some ways this story of racial oppression might be just have been a medium for comparing gendered oppression in the South and women trying to break out of women's roles as much as trying to fight off racial barriers so
9. **David:** I would just add real quick that I think the movie really does feel good about the White woman standing up and the Black people standing up and everybody coming off unscathed and the truth is when some
10. when people there were plenty of examples of both African-American and White that stood up to segregation and oppression a lot of them got killed and some others got bloody and it was not always usually that funny or pretty and
11. so you know the poop kind of stayed there in that dimension that might have really fallen in real life
12. you know very convenient and funny but not necessarily how it actually went down like the all those women White and Black probably had that really happened would have suffered much crueler and less cinematically fun fates
13. do you want to add anything Erma because I have to pass out the papers
14. I'm sorry if you have anything else it can go straight on the Facebook page as there are a ton of great things [again no one added to the Facebook discussion based on my final Facebook check on July 9, 2012] (Classroom Transcript, October 3, 2011, minute 1.49.30)

The segment ended as Erma indicated by shaking her head left to right that she did not have anything to add and David passed out and discussed the graded research papers.

David and Stephen, who were two social studies teachers, tried to bring their historical knowledge into the discussion by providing details of how the story might have happened in the South in the 1960s in real life versus the "funny" lines and events (lines 10 & 12) and "neatly tied ends" (line 3) of the movie. David and Stephen both also connected the fields of race and gender, which were also intertwined throughout *The Help* (Columbus et al., 2011). David, despite Erma's position throughout the CO Circle discussion as the lead co-facilitator, took back his position as lead co-facilitator and teacher by providing students with the last words. David often used this practice as the final word giver in CO Circles in order to provide students with what he thought were key points, which thus
controlled what the students left the circle hearing last. From psychological studies, we know that the first and last items read and/or heard are often the most likely to be remembered by humans (Hockenberry & Hockenberry, 2003, p. 252). In his role as co-facilitator, David offered the floor to Erma verbally, but, as a teacher, in the field of schooling, he did not provide her time to take the floor as he needed "to pass out the papers" (line 13). He did offer students the group’s Facebook wall as a space to continue the discussion he had just ended, but no one took up the discussion any further on Facebook based on my observations.

The CO Circle Discussion about The Help (Columbus et al., 2011) did not end with David's verbal closing of the discussion floor, and this continuation after his closing of the floor did not happen often. As he passed out papers, a student argued with a co-facilitator, and arguments, especially with co-facilitators, were uncommon practices in CO Circles. Amy argued with Erma that the movie was a fictional account meant to provide entertainment to audiences so it did not need to be historically accurate and/or authentic to lived experiences. Erma disagreed, and when Amy began using Transformers as an example of entertaining movies, Erma stated, "when you are making a movie as important as civil rights and how to treat each other as humans it is different than Transformers which is just a movie." Erma attached greater significance to historical accuracy and/or authenticity in certain movies based on their content, and she believed Connect members should do the same based on her discourse throughout the discussion. Students, such as Amy, however, seemed to resist Erma's conceptions of how one should critically examine texts, though their resistance might have been influenced by their resistance to examine the fields of race and/or gender.
CO Circles as evidenced in this second example provided Connect members with a discussion space in which members could provide their own opinions as well as discuss multiple perspectives found in alphabetical texts. As example 1 showed, David and Erma conceived the CO Circle as one in which all members were equal, yet as a lived space, CO Circle did not seem to provide equal power to all participants. David and Erma maintained control of the discussion floor, and Erma had distinct learning outcomes for students in regards to The Help (Columbus et al., 2011) and the field of race. She, like David, in CO Circle example 1 positioned non-White students as having perspectives that deserved to be shared over White students’ perspectives. The co-facilitators seemed to believe that students could speak for groups of which they were members yet David and Erma both valued multiple perspectives and individuals’ opinions. Also, Connect identity involved individual traits such as being independent, confident, and doing “interesting” things that other students do not usually do (i.e. Classroom Transcript, September 6, 2011), while at the same time, Connect people were also members of the Connect community. This example of CO Circle provided evidence of the tensions between group identity and one’s individual identities, which appeared throughout Connect literacy and language events and practices, including the next artifact referred to as field trips by Connect members.

Artifact 2: Field Trips

The artifactual practice of field trip is similar to the one found in the field of schooling. In the field of schooling, field trips involve students going to a place/space different from their usual class place/space. At Connect, students self-transported and met at the field trip location unless the field trip occurred at the MidwestCity Art Museum, as
it was within walking distance of the church where Connect met on most days. Field trips occurred 17 times out of the 54 lessons I observed during the fall semester at Connect. Field trip locations included the MidwestCity Public Library, the Central Market, MidwestCounty Conservatory, MidwestCity Art Museum, Midwest State University Labyrinth, Midwest State University, the Buddhist temple, the Jewish synagogue, the Hindu temple, and the Islamic Center. Field trips included other Connect artifacts, such as guest speakers, CO Circles, and the Facebook wall, but field trips were distinct because they provided Connect members with learning experiences outside of the common Connect place/space of the church.

By examining one example of how Connect members participated in a field trip, we can begin to understand how field trips were key experiences in the collective figured world of Connect as well as how other figured worlds and fields of power influenced the Connect members, Connect spaces, and the figured world(s) of Connect. I have chosen this particular field trip to the Islamic Center to provide evidence of how Connect artifactual literacy and language practices occurred across places/spaces. David and/or Erma chose the focus of each field trip and listed each trip and its focus on the unit calendar. He or she also opened the CO Circle discussion after each field trip by providing students with a particular topic to discuss as a way of debriefing about their experiences after the field trip. The proposed topic on the floor shifted based on details spoken by participants, but David and/or Erma tried to keep the discussion focused on the field trip. In this particular example, the CO Circle debriefing discussion focused on the religion of Islam.
I observed three of the four Connect field trips to places of worship, and the field trip to the Islamic Center was our final field trip during the world religions unit. We visited the H-Burb Islamic Center, which included a mosque, on December 7, 2011. Our field trip experience was led by a female guest speaker, who shared a power point presentation with us in an auditorium and then took us upstairs to the women's worship area in order to view the main floor of the mosque. On December 8, 2011, David began class with a CO Circle debriefing discussion about our Islamic Center field trip. During this discussion, the fields of power involving religion, gender, and sexuality as well as Connect members' figured worlds of Islam seemed to circulate in a rather uncritical way in the Connect discussion space. In the previous CO Circle examples focused on the field of race, David and/or Erma challenged students to be critical thinkers about the multiple perspectives and fields of power at play in various texts throughout the CO Circle discussions on race. In this field trip example, however, David, Chelsey, and Michelle seemed to take up uncritical stances that aligned with the field trip’s leader’s stance on the role of women in Islam.

As some students were just arriving for the beginning of class, David told everyone to get into a CO Circle, and he opened the floor for the discussion about the field trip to the Islamic Center in H-Burb. Several non-participants shared at first, and one non-participant wanted to discuss the hijab. After her shift in topic, David stated:

1. can I just answer that [Non-Participant1's question of why a woman would want to wear the hijab] comment on that [still refers to Non-Participant1's question]
2. I thought about that yesterday too
3. I mean the hijab and the headcovering and the modest dress is all kind of rooted in and I hate
4. there is
5. definitely a necessary type thing it's not
6. it's based on like you know certain countries where like men require women to
do something they don't want to do
7. but in most places where women wear hijab
8. like in the United States or Europe or Indonesia or any other place other than
like Saudi Arabia
9. or probably like Taliban Afghanistan or something like
10. women are wearing it
11. voluntarily often
12. so you can say why would you want to wear that
13. but the whole idea of modesty
14. I was really thinking yesterday about
15. (2 seconds pause)
16. a lot of that about women's modesty like
17. we have this feminist movement in this country in the 1970s and it was like
women you know
18. like breaking away from like
19. you know being objectified by whatever
20. and it's almost like our response
21. our post-feminist attitude is
22. the most admirable thing a woman can do is like
23. be as out with her body as she wants to be
24. except in the end I don't know if that's really solved the problem because it
seems like women are still objects of men
25. and there's as much like discomfort about women's bodies and eating
disorders and all that stuff
26. and whatever so I
27. in a way I think the wisdom of it is just to say you know what
28. I'm not going to let myself be defined by my body or by my hair I'm going to
cover keep
29. I'm going to wear that modestly so people will know me by me not by
30. my physicality and the same thing with the prayer talk
31. and stuff like you know
32. to the extent that that
33. my body becomes
34. public that way is the degree to which I'll be defined by it↑
35. or something↑
36. you want to respond↑ (indicates with a head nod to female Non-Participant1
who started this topic) (Classroom Transcript, December 8, 2011, minute
11.40)

The non-participant who introduced this topic on the floor then responded to what David
had shared by questioning why women would also not lead religious services where men
were present, to which Chelsey and Michelle responded later (Classroom Transcript, December 8, 2011). David's extended reply to the non-participant seemed more focused on gender roles and the field of gender and/or sexuality privilege rather than the figured world of Islam or the field of religion. David spent 22 of his 36-line response providing students with a male perspective on American women’s modesty and feminism, while only 10 lines seemed focus specifically on Islamic women. In his position as a social studies teacher, David provided a historical, global description of the hijab (lines 3-11). Then, David discussed how women “are still objects of men” (line 24) and are "objectified by whatever" (line 19), which both remove the agentive nature of objectifying away from men. Throughout David's discourse segment, with the exception of line 6 where he stated "men require women to do something," men passively control women; David appeared to locate the agency against objectification with the females and their behaviors. He later stated "I think the wisdom of it is...I'm not going to let myself be defined by my body or by my hair..." (lines 27-28). David, by using "I," appeared to be taking up the identity of a female, yet he is male and probably does not have the same experiences of being defined by his "body" and "hair" as a female. As Amy had been annoyed during the CO Circle discussion on The Help (Columbus, Barnathan, Green, & Taylor, 2011) with the author claiming the story as her own, I was annoyed by David taking up a female identity in lines 27-35 as well as his extended discourse on women's modesty and feminism, which seemed to support a conception of the field of gender and/or sexuality privilege as one in which women were responsible for the ways in which men treated them. In my position as researcher, I did not voice my annoyance at the time.
as I wanted to see how the students would add to the discussion about the hijab and David's focus on the field of gender and/or sexuality privilege.

In response to Non-Participant1's continued questioning about women's roles in Islam, Chelsey took the floor in what was her first of several turns as a speaker during this CO Circle discussion about the field trip to the Islamic Center. Chelsey seemed particularly interested in discussing the hijab and women's roles in Islam, which she revealed later (Classroom Transcript, December 8, 2011) might have been the result of her lived experiences with an Islamic leader over the summer of 2011. Chelsey responded to the non-participant's questioning about women's roles:

1. I have a response to that actually
2. like that's not
3. that's for the mass one because of men being people on the ground staring at the
4. main person
5. they have female led groups
6. that are just female groups so there's no
7. Non-Participant1 starts to argue with her over why women cannot lead religious services.
8. Michelle: I don't know
9. Chelsey: I kind of get it
10. if you think about it
11. Michelle: I mean think about dudes
12. Chelsey: yeah
13. (Students laugh)
14. Erma: sh+
15. David: who's got the floor↑
16. Chelsey: I would rather girls be wearing
17. David: Amy will take it (Classroom Transcript, December 8, 2011, minute 13.58)

Given the floor by David, Amy shifted the topic to her appreciation for the honesty and straight-forwardness of the presenter. Chelsey, Michelle, and the Non-Participant1 orchestrated their understandings of women's role in Islamic services through their own
figured worlds of Islam as well as the fields of gender and heteronormativity based on their lived experiences. Chelsey and Michelle both seemed to take up David's figurings of the fields of gender and/or heteronormativity by placing the agency of sexual attraction with females to whom males cannot help but be attracted. Michelle verbally referenced her figuring of the field of heteronormativity with her comment in line 11, "think about dudes," as if men were unable to control their attraction when it came to women. Most students laughed at Michelle's comment, and Erma and David made moves to control the floor as students laughed (lines 14 & 15). David controlled the floor even as Chelsey vied to continue discussing gender roles by calling on Amy. Using his power from the field of schooling as the teacher, David chose someone who was not a part of the debate that had begun on the floor to speak so order would be re-established and the topic might shift to other issues.

Amy's topic shift was brief, lasting about 40 seconds, and then another non-participant took the floor and returned the topic on the floor to the hijab, with which she had personal experiences. The non-participant then returned the floor to Chelsey, whom David had cut off in the transcript above (Classroom Transcript, December 8, 2011) by giving the floor to Amy. Chelsey continued the topic shift back to the hijab and women's roles in Islam by providing a personal narrative.

1. I just want to say I
2. I had kind of like an Islamic
3. leader this summer and she was talking to me about like
4. marriage and all that kind of stuff like
5. all the things like
6. breaking the stereotypes that had to do with
7. Islam
8. and
9. she was talking to me about dying her hair
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and I was like why would you be doing that like it doesn't make sense if you're not showing your hair
and she was like well
when I'm at home I don't always wear it
and I take a lot of pride in wearing it
and she was just wearing like a regular hijab (makes a circle around her face with her right hand) she wasn't wearing the ones that covers
I don't know what they're called but they cover everything but the eyes (makes a line between her right and left eyes with her right hand and traces lines a few times)
but she used to always wear that
and that used to be like
what made her feel comfortable
and she loved wearing it so she did (Erma's phone chimes that she has a text)
but she might not have agreed
she was more of a modern Islam
David: Muslim (jumps to standing position)
Muslim
a person Muslim (walks behind Chelsey and off camera)
Chelsey: well yeah
a modern approach to the religion Islam
so she's a modern Muslim I guess
and she was totally fine with wearing what she had where she kind of chose to wear it
she felt liberated
and she like dye her hair
it's not that (David returns to his seat on the floor in the circle with a piece of paper)
nothing happens like they are just the same as everyone else
no matter what they're wearing (Classroom Transcript, December 8, 2011, minute 15.58)

The segment ended when Non-Participant1 who originally began the discussion about the hijab then asked about the Ka'aba, which shifted the topic on the floor. Chelsey tried to explain how one particular woman she had talked with over the summer orchestrated her identities as a female Muslim. David, perhaps from his position as a social studies teacher, interrupted Chelsey in lines 22-24 to provide her with the correct terminology for someone who follows Islam. Chelsey ended her example by providing details on how this female Muslim orchestrated her identities amongst her lived spaces, which were
influenced by the fields of gender, sexuality, and/or religion as well as her figured world of Islam and the "modern" world. Chelsey reminded Connect members "they [Muslims] are just the same as everyone else no matter what they're wearing" (lines 32-33). Chelsey's example provided further evidence to the previous parts of the discussion that Muslim women were using their own agency when wearing the hijab, but she also seemed to point out the influence of Western world's figured world of feminine beauty on her "Islamic leader" (lines 2-3), as she still cared about the appearance of her hair and liked to dye it (lines 9 & 30), even though no one in public would see it.

Erma did not contribute to the above discussion at the time, but she talked to me privately before class and before the audio-recordings began the next day about her apprehension of allowing Connect members to take up uncritical empathetic stances towards the hijab. She mentioned she had talked to David about feeling uneasy about how Connect members had not heard multiple perspectives around the wearing of hijabs. I agreed with her uneasiness about the lack of multiple perspectives about women's roles in Islam. According to my field notes on December 9, 2011, "Erma and I discussed the hijab and how we were not sure it is really a decision. She believes it still removes a woman’s identity and she is not sure as a program we should only be presenting it as a choice as some of the women we have talked with say that it is." She wanted to approach the hijab with a more critical lens, which we both felt was missing from the above field trip discussion, but she did not further pursue the discussion during my observations of Connect class time. In my position as researcher, I also never felt comfortable enough to approach David to discuss my own annoyance with his positioning of women during his lecture on women's modesty and feminism. At Connect, even the ways in which I
participated in Connect spaces involved not only the positions I was given by the field of schooling but also my own conceptions about the figured worlds of Connect and the fields of power involving gender roles, heteronormativity, and religion.

During the CO Circle debriefing discussion about the Islamic Center, the fields of gender privilege and heteronormativity seemed intricately interconnected with the field of religion as the mostly non-Muslim Connect members tried to orchestrate these fields and figured worlds with their own conceptions about the fields and figured worlds of gender, sexuality, and religion. Unlike the two examples of CO Circle discussion spaces, neither David or Erma challenged the students to take up critical lenses that might have changed how they looked at the fields of power operating among the topic of Islamic women's wearing of the hijab. In his position as a social studies teacher, David set up the discussion as one in which the field trip leader had "wisdom" (line 27, Classroom Transcript, December 8, 2011) on gender roles that American women seemed to lack since the feminist movement of the 1970s, which in ways reminded me of his privileged position as a man, who in the field of gender privilege and/or sexuality had power over how women could behave. David, Chelsey, and Michelle seemed to conceive that women in the figured world of Islam in the modern world had agency in their own identities as well as how others might perceive them through their choices to be modestly dressed. While Erma and I both felt uncomfortable with how this CO Circle debriefing discussion went, neither of us interrupted the discussion to challenge other Connect members' orchestrations of the figured worlds of Islam and the modern world or the fields of power involving religion, sexuality, and/or gender.
Field trips were literacy and language events that provided Connect members with learning experiences in places/spaces outside the church where Connect often met for the afternoon. Field trips also provided Connect members with expert perspectives on particular topics. As evidenced in the Islamic Center field trip example, Connect members positioned field trip experts as having particular “wisdom” about the topics they discussed based on the experts' identities and/or memberships in particular groups. During the debriefing discussion spaces after the field trips, Connect members often orchestrated their own perspectives with those they heard from the field trips’ experts. The CO Circle examples provided evidence of the ways in which students did not take up and/or challenge particular perspectives, and this example of the Islamic Center provides further evidence of how certain fields of power, such as religion, gender, and/or sexuality circulated in uncritical ways among Connect members despite David and/or Erma’s conceptions of Connect as a figured world in which multiple perspectives were important. Multiple perspectives were also key in the next artifactual literacy and language practice, which Connect members referred to as guest speakers, and this practice seemed to more successfully engage Connect members in thinking about multiple perspectives.

Artifact 3: Guest Speakers

Guest speakers, like CO Circles and field trips, were one of the "significant regularities" I noticed in Connect spaces (Holland et al., 1998, p. 53). While guest speakers were found in field trips as experts who helped us to understand the place/space we visited, the Connect practice of guest speakers involved one or more experts coming to the Connect space in the church to discuss particular topics with Connect members. Of
the 54 lessons I observed, 20 of the lessons included one or more guest speakers, whom David and/or Erma selected and invited to Connect, for at least twenty minutes of class time. While the practice of guest speakers coming to the classroom does not appear to be common in the field of schooling or the figured worlds of the students' SPEs, it was a common practice in the collective figured world of Connect. David and Erma, positioned as the teachers in the field of schooling, controlled the expertise found within Connect spaces based on their choices of guest speakers. One of the 20 lessons involved guests being part of the audience for small group presentations, which lasted two hours, and this lesson was the only one in which students also invited guests to speak with them. Five other guest speakers entered Connect spaces, after asking David and/or Erma to do so, in order to recruit students to be a part of their projects, such as art festivals or a TEDx Youth Conference. The remaining 14 lessons involved guest speakers selected by David and/or Erma talking to Connect members about their perspectives and/or their religions. Three of these lessons were guest speaker panels for the perspectives unit; these guest speakers discussed White privilege, heterosexual privilege, and international perspectives on the United States. The other 11 lessons involved a single guest speaker, whom David and/or Erma introduced as an expert in a particular field. Listed in the order I observed them, experts talked to Connect members about vegetarian/vegan lifestyles, local farming, labyrinths and spirituality, Hinduism, Buddhism, Judaism, Christian music, Druidry, religious art, Islam, and Protestant Christianity. Guest speakers in Connect spaces supported both David's conception of Connect as a culture and identity where multiple perspectives were valued and Erma's conception of Connect as a school and
classroom where multiple perspectives provided students with greater content knowledge and skills.

Guest speakers could be found in two different forms among the 14 content lessons I observed. They could either be single guest speakers, which were common throughout both units, or they could be guest speaker panels, which I only observed occurring during the perspectives unit. As an example of each of these types of speakers, I have chosen to provide partial transcripts of the whole group discussions that occurred with one example of each type: Matthew, who was a single guest speaker who spoke about Druidry, and Richard, who was a member of the White privilege panel. Both Matthew and Richard seemed to challenge students to rethink their conceptions about the fields of power and/or their own figured worlds of Druidry (Matthew) or immigration (Richard).

Single guest speakers were the most abundant type of guest speaker found across the two units I observed. As an example of how Connect members participated in single guest speaker lessons, I will offer the example of Matthew, a Druid priest, who visited Connect on December 5, 2011, to discuss Druidry. Connect members had seated themselves in chairs facing the stage, which was the common seating configuration for guest speakers and/or videos. Matthew provided students with a lecture as well as video clips about Druidry in general, and he explained how he himself had become a Druid priest. He welcomed Connect members' questions and comments throughout his presentation, which in my field notes I noted occurring throughout his 90-minute presentation. Even though Connect members had asked questions and/or made comments throughout Matthew's presentation, in the collective figured world of Connect, guest
speakers and field trips were followed by a time I called debriefing in my field notes. Connect members, as a whole group, discussed their perceptions based on their lived experiences with the person(s) and/or place(s). In this particular example, the debriefing occurred immediately after Matthew finished speaking, and Matthew decided to stay and talk with Connect members about their perceptions and lived experiences with him, which was an uncommon occurrence with guest speakers. David had told students to take out their CoNos and write about what they were thinking when David closed Matthew's presentation by thanking him while students clapped. After students had five minutes to write in their CoNos and/or individually come up to Matthew to thank him for his presentation, David, again feeling constrained by the time limits from the field of schooling and the figured worlds of the students' SPEs, opened the floor for a "short" discussion:

1. find yourself a seat
2. and Matthew's actually going to stick around and talk about it
3. this is good
4. so we've got like twelve minutes which is not a lot of time so
5. keep what you're saying kind of short
6. short versions
7. you know one or two sentences
8. like what did you hear that was interesting what's on your mind what're thinking about
9. speak to the whole group I know we're not in a circle [students had chairs already set up facing the stage, and with only 12 minutes left, David decided to leave them that way] but talk to each other
10. so Chelsey you want to start us out
11. **Chelsey:** yeah
12. I just love how freeing individualized it is
13. I think that really helps in this society (this line is very quiet and hard to make out)
14. **David:** how freeing what↑
15. **Chelsey:** how freeing the religion is
16. XX (again very quiet)
17. okay somebody else
18. Amy
19. **Amy:** I like I thought it was kind of neat you guys' policy on
drugs sex and abortion
21. **Sharon:** I just thought it was really interesting that people put stuff on the
internet doesn't make a lot of sense
22. **David:** say it real loud so people all the way back there can
23. **Sharon:** it was really cool having someone come and tell us about this
because it doesn't make sense on the Internet
25. **Matthew:** no it doesn't (laughs)
26. **Non-Participant** asked if there was a place to look for information online.
27. **Matthew:** there is a website MidwestCityGrove.org
28. or adf.org will get you to us as well
29. **Becky:** I thought it was really interesting
30. like the connection to Greek
31. I don't want to say mythology now
32. but like the Greek religious stories and things like that
33. it really
34. I don't know I never made **(Erma coughs)** the connection between that but
35. I don't know things like that I thought it was cool
36. **David:** I think it's interesting to hear you say Greek myth I don't want to say
mythology but religious stories
37. **Becky:** yeah
38. **David:** I often use to make I mean I used to sit in mythology classes
39. you know like the units in school
40. and it's like
41. someday we'll be like teaching Christian mythology
42. you know that would be insulting to people who are Christian
43. so
44. **Matthew:** from a religious studies perspective
45. **Becky:** m+uh
46. **Matthew:** mythology only means stories that are true
47. **Becky:** oh
48. **Matthew:** that's all it means
49. we've put the other idea that's it's fictional
50. **Becky:** ok ok
51. **Joe:** I just like the fact that the religion seems more like a less of an
argumentative religion where you don't
52. pick something out of a certain text find something to disagree with someone
53. it's more that's your opinion and it's okay and here's my opinion and it's okay
54. that's similar to other East
55. to other Eastern religions that
56. it's just more open to other people's ideas
57. than close minded
58. (14 second pause) (Classroom Transcript, December 5, 2011, minute 1.58.45)
This segment ended when a Non-Participant took the floor and shared his thoughts, though the discussion continued for another 8 minutes in a similar fashion around different topics. David opened the topic on the discussion floor (lines 1-10) to be "what did you hear that was interesting," which seemed to be a content focused question. Chelsey and Amy shared personal evaluations on Druidry based on their conceptions of the field of religion, while Sharon then stated her appreciation for Matthew coming to Connect to tell them about Druidry in a way that made "sense" unlike the "stuff on the Internet" (line 24). Becky, David, and Matthew then discussed mythology and its situatedness in the field of religion, with David referring to his lived experiences in the field of schooling and the figured world of mythology classes (lines 38-39). The field of religion was furthered referenced by Joe who connected Druidry to "other Eastern religions" (lines 54-55). Connect members used this Connect discussion space to talk with themselves and Matthew about the content knowledge they had gained, which connected in various ways with their conceptions about the fields of religion and/or schooling and their figured worlds of Druidry.

While Connect members were familiar with participating in the artifactual literacy and language practice of single guest speakers, there were three instances in which guest speakers visited Connect spaces in the form of guest speaker panels, which provided Connect members with multiple perspectives from experts during one class period. These panels were only found during the Perspectives Unit, and these panels tended to challenge students' conceptions about the fields of power and privilege operating in our society more than single guest speakers tended to do. As an example, I will describe how Richard's challenge to take action and live without borders was taken up by David and
Erma the following day in a CO Circle debriefing discussion. Richard, along with Holly and a former Connect student, made up the first guest speaker panel on September 14, 2011, which focused on White privilege. Each panelist shared their personal narratives around White Privilege, which took up the first 55 minutes of class. Connect members then talked with the panelists by providing comments and questions, the remaining 65 minutes of class. During the discussion after the panelists’ sharing, Mark, a participant student said:

1. when I was at boarding school somebody who was from Mexico
2. somebody who was from Canada
3. they were both there
4. the Canadian person was actually
5. at the school illegally
6. no visa or anything
7. and the Mexican person had gotten a visa so she was able to attend this school
8. people all the time was asking her was she illegally there
9. you know what's going to happen if they found out she wasn't legally there
10. she would say she had a visa some people wouldn't believe her about that
11. but nobody asked the Canadian kid that question
12. they assumed
13. he had a right to be there
14. XX (inaudible)
15. Richard: well that's white privilege
16. we get that all the time
17. 9/11 changed a lot of things
18. one of the things it changed was our fight for
19. immigration reform
20. because somehow we got bamboozled into
21. we were led to believe
22. by securing the southern border that
23. that was about the big issue of terrorism and all this other stuff
24. so we kind of shifted that
25. and that's what we do
26. whatever's closer to you right↑
27. whatever's closer to you that's threatening or differing
28. and then whether it is said by people that believe and have the ability and the means and the power to do that
29. it's a crazy thing
30. but again I want to say what do I do
31. how do I do
32. what is that I do
33. I don't want to lose sight of that
34. cause otherwise I lose sight of everything
35. it's all about righting it and
36. what's your name
37. Mark: Mark
38. Richard: it's all about what you do Mark and so
39. it does
40. that's a good example of white privilege is
41. I always say what about the Northern border↑
42. where's the wall there you know↑
43. Mark: XX (inaudible)
44. Richard: but make no mistake
45. it's like the whole putting up a fence in your yard
46. it's like if you do that you will keep people out
47. that's so so un
48. that's not the way we're designed
49. we're designed to be a community (Classroom Transcript, September 14, 2011, minute 1.33.24)

This segment ended when David changed the topic on the floor by giving students five minutes to write down their final thoughts in their CoNos. Mark and Richard seemed to be moving between their local experiences within the field of power based on immigration/citizenship status and the more global, historical experiences of others in the field of power based on immigration and/or citizenship status, which is interconnected to one's ethnicity and/or race. While Mark and Richard discussed events involving the nation-states of Canada, Mexico, and United States, they both also included references to their personal local experiences. Richard and Mark's discussion seemed to place White privilege as operating across local and global places/spaces. Richard also seemed to be providing Connect members with the challenge to change their conceptions about the fields of power based on identities, such as immigrant, citizen, ethnicity, and/or race. He explained how he did not want to lose sight of "righting" the wrongs of White privilege.
(line 35), and he gave the same task to Mark (line 38). Richard seemed to be challenging Connect members to take up their agency as humans and work to "right" the wrongs of White privilege by building communities across borders, rather than constructing fences. This part of the panelist discussion around local-global perspectives, borders, and community did not end when David changed the topic on the floor; both borders and communities seemed to be recontextualized by Erma the next day during the CO Circle debriefing discussion, which occurred after the Heterosexual Privilege Panel.

On September 15, 2011, after the Heterosexual Privilege Panel, David and Erma co-facilitated the CO Circle debriefing discussion about the guest speakers they had heard over the last two days, which included Richard, Holly, and the former Connect student from September 14, 2011. As this particular CO Circle debriefing discussion came to a close, a non-participant wondered if one can really listen to someone who has very strong opposing views. David and Erma tried to answer the non-participant by providing students with a critical thinking challenge through conceptualizing learning as occurring in the border area, or perhaps Richard's unfenced yard (line 45, Classroom Transcript, September 14, 2011). David took the floor after the non-participant seemed to finish her statement with a pause. David stated:

1. yeah it [Non-Participant's comment] just raises a question
2. can you hear from somebody you feel strongly another way from you and still respect that and still hear what they have to say or
3. or not
4. it's a really challenging question
5. I don't know
6. **Erma:** it's an interesting thing
7. **David:** I know
8. **Erma:** there's like this idea that
9. you know that if you're in your camp *(motioned with hand to right side of body)* and they're in this camp *(motioned with hand to left side of body)*
10. there's really no learning that can take place
11. but when you meet in basically what's the border
12. when you meet in this place (*motioned with hands a middle area*)
13. and try to negotiate how to get along and how to communicate
14. that's where learning takes place
15. sometimes it ends up being not so much learning and too defensive
16. but if you can actually be curious about other people's personalities
17. that border becomes a place of learning
18. as opposed to always being *here* (*motioned with hand to right side of body again*) where you're just hearing the same stuff
19. **David:** Even if the learning results in you just agreeing to disagree
20. but at least you can understand how you see the world (Classroom Transcript, September 15, 2011, minute 23.35)

This segment ended when David changed the topic on the floor to being out of time for the day, which again involves the influence of time from the field of schooling as well as the figured worlds of the students' SPEs. Throughout the segment, David and Erma verbally co-constructed a conception of learning in their figured world of Connect. At Connect, learning occurs "when you meet in this place" (line 12), "basically what's the border" (line 11), and you "try to negotiate how to get along and how to communicate" (line 13). Learning cannot occur without "be[ing] curious about other people's personalities" (line 16). The figured worlds of Connect needed overlapping spaces and identities so members could learn among these differences, which seems to differ from the conception of learning found in the field of schooling and the figured worlds of the students' SPEs as described by Crystal and Chelsey in their interviews. Learning in the field of schooling and the figured worlds of the students' SPEs involves, according to Chelsey (Interview, March 26, 2012), involves following “the curriculum,” and, according to Crystal (Interview, April 4, 2012), includes “teachers droning on” and “reading from a textbook for two hours.” David and Erma, along with the guest panelists, such as Richard, challenged Connect members to critically examine the fields of power
and the figured worlds around them through thinking about their own identities and actions within those local and global spaces and making changes through their everyday interactions with people in these spaces.

The artifactual literacy and language practice of guest speakers provided Connect members with multiple perspectives from experts who visited the Connect space within the church where they usually met for the afternoon class period. The artifactual practice of guest speakers supported Connect members’ critical examination of the fields of power, which operate in our lived spaces and influence our conceived and perceived spaces. As in the field of schooling, guest speakers provided Connect members with content information, and unlike in the figured worlds of their SPEs and the field of schooling, Connect students believed guest speakers were important to the learning process in their figured worlds of Connect. Guest speakers created border areas for students to learn with others, even those with perspectives different from their own. David and Erma conceived learning in their figured world of Connect to include not only talking with experts, both on field trips and in Connect space at the church, but also interacting with people outside of Connect time and spaces through attending activities across Midwest City and completing projects about those activities, which they called Outside Learning Projects.

**Artifact 4: Outside Learning Projects**

Operating in the field of schooling, School Partnership had hired David and Erma in the positions of teachers, who would plan and assign tasks for students to complete often through the creation of written alphabetical texts. David and Erma aligned these assignments with the learning outcomes of the units, as given to the students in the form
of project goals and enduring understandings on their project overview sheets (Appendix D), as well as the learning outcomes set forth in “The 17 Guiding Principles.” Also influencing these assignments were the different conceptions David and Erma had of their figured worlds of Connect; Erma conceived Connect more as a school and classroom than David who conceived of Connect as a culture and identity. David and Erma, thus, often had to negotiate their plans for activities, artifacts, and expected behaviors for Connect members. These negotiations sometimes occurred in front of students as they discussed the assignments.

One of the key assignments David and Erma assigned Connect students to complete was called the Outside Learning Project. The Outside Learning Project required a typed reflection/reaction of at least 1-2 pages in length about attending an event outside of Connect class time in MidwestCity that students were not already involved in attending or occurred in their SPEs. It is one of the "significant regularities" of the collective figured world of Connect for several reasons. First, during the students' introduction to the CO life on the first day of Connect, outside learning experiences were one of the four lists CO2 students provided as examples of their living a CO life during the summer. Second, Outside Learning Projects occurred across both units I observed. Third, the Outside Learning Projects were discussed throughout my 54 class observations, especially at the beginning or end of class in CO Circle when Connect members shared upcoming or recently past events and experiences in MidwestCity.

David and Erma assigned students to complete one Outside Learning Project per unit during my 54 class observations that spanned two units. For the Perspectives Outside Learning Project, students received a full typed sheet explaining the assignment
(reproduced in Appendix D, Assignment 6, Column 3), which Erma posted in its entirety on October 13, 2011 to the Facebook group page. This structuring of the Outside Learning Project seemed to follow the assignment structure found in the figured worlds of the students' SPEs and the field of schooling. For the Religions Outside Learning Project, however, students received a paragraph explanation on the World Religions Project Outline (reproduced Appendix D, Assignment 13, Column 3). This paragraph provided an overview of the assignment, but David and Erma had not provided detailed questions and/or format requirements, for which the students would later ask. On November 21, 2011, after students asked for guidance about what to write for the Religions Outside Learning Project, Erma posted to the Facebook group page a larger assignment page in the form of a document (Appendix E), which provided students with the questions they should answer in their two-page reflection.  

David and Erma introduced the Outside Learning Projects to students on September 6, 2011. They provided Connect members with expectations for the assignment that went beyond those they had written and distributed on paper. David and Erma negotiated their expectations during their verbal instructions to students in the

---

I would like to note it is possible students received an assignment sheet for the Religions Outside Learning Project on a day in which I was absent. I asked for copies of items passed out in my absence, but at times there were no extra copies to share with me.
following segment, which I noticed they did at other times when verbally explaining assignments to students. David and Erma's negotiations provide details into their conceptions of learning and their figured world of Connect as well as their positionings as co-facilitators with unequal power. Erma began to discuss the Outside Learning Projects as David passed out the assignment sheet (reproduced in Appendix D, Assignment 6, Column 3). Erma said:

1. Speaking of being out there [refers to the topic on the floor before this segment which focused on what students had done over the Labor Day weekend] we have mentioned this a number of times how part of Connect we really expect you to be out there and in MidwestCity and experiencing new things and getting out of your comfort zone a little bit and seeing how great this city actually is
2. and part of this is just because we want you to know that learning doesn't stop at 2:50 and at the door
3. that learning can take place anywhere anytime as long as you are open to it
4. but the other part of it is also a requirement for your cultural studies grade
5. oh we don't you know we are not about oh you have to do is get the grade
6. you should do it to have the experience but the reality of it is it is part of your cultural studies grade
7. and for are we doing this per project↑
8. David: this one is just for the perspectives project
9. Erma: so during the perspectives project
10. you will need to do your first outside learning activity
11. and what this is
12. is you get to go out into the world hopefully to a new experience and then write about it
13. okay↑
14. sometimes we just function and let things happen without thinking about it
15. so this one allows you to have an experience then thinking about it
16. oh what did I learn here
17. what was it like
18. um who did I go with
19. how did that impact my experience
20. so this is kind of being reflective on how you are when you are doing new stuff
21. so if you read through this [reproduced in Appendix D, Assignment 6, Column 3]
22. you notice you need to do one outside learning during the perspectives project
23. okay
24. your date night [Connect activity organized by CO2 students in which CO2 and CO1 students go to an event in MidwestCity to experience it together as they get to know one another] will not be one of these outside learnings
25. that is a whole other fun thing that you are just doing
26. so if you do the artist preview night that would be considered an outside learning
27. but outside learnings
28. you know we really want you to go out there
29. and outside learning is not going to see Planet of the Apes
30. David: or your school play
31. Erma: ok outside learning might be going to see Rocky Horror at Studio 1 if you've never seen it before
32. there's a big stage thing that goes on with it
33. so that's very different than going to the you know 2:00 showing of something at Movie Theater 1
34. and a lot of you are going to text us something is watching a documentary at my house an outside learning
35. No that is not
36. going to the Diamond Theater or the Arch [another theater] to see a documentary film or going to the University Arts Center is an outside learning
37. David: right and I would even say maybe not even the Diamond but
38. if you go to the University Arts Center and there's a documentary followed by a panel discussion or something like that so there is actually a live component to it that would be great
39. Erma: and an arts experience is performing arts experience
40. ok it's not going to a gallery and just looking at art
41. ok now if you go to a gallery and the artists are there and you can ask them questions about the work so you are having an active experience then that's ok
42. so you get the difference between active and passive
43. yes (Classroom Transcript, September 6, 2011, minute 31.30)

This segment ended as a non-participant asked a question about the assignment sheet, which Erma had asked students to read over in line 21. Erma provided students with conceptions about her figured world of Connect, which were more like David's conceptions of Connect as a culture and an identity, and her conceptions about what counts as learning in the first three lines of the segment. According to Erma, as members of the Connect community, "we [David and Erma] really expect you [the students] to be out there and in MidwestCity experiencing new things and getting out of your comfort
zone" (line 1). Learning requires students to be "open to it," and learning "can take place anywhere anytime" (line 3). She contrasted these conceptions beginning in line 4 with her word choice of "but." She then explained "the reality" of the assignment was it would be counted as a part of their cultural studies grade (line 6). The reality Erma seemed to be referring to is the figured worlds of their SPEs, which required David and Erma to report grades to them each grading period, and the field of schooling, where students must complete assignments, especially written texts, in order to show learning, which is then evaluated by the teacher. In her opening remarks, Erma seemed to have negotiated her conceptions of her figured world of Connect with those of David, while also placing value on learning as a process which can occur "anywhere anytime" (line 3) though "anywhere" seems to mean only urban spaces in MidwestCity in which students are not already participating (line 1).

In David’s and Erma’s figured worlds of Connect, certain learning experiences were more valued than others, and David and Erma had the power to decide which experiences counted in Connect spaces. The Outside Learning Projects provided direct examples of what learning that occurred outside of class time and spaces would be counted in the co-facilitators figured worlds of Connect. Erma's description of the assignment began with expectations of students to "go out into the world" (line 4). Around line 26, Erma and David began to list what she meant by "the world," which seemed to be defined as events occurring in places in MidwestCity, or as she stated earlier "out there" (line 20). Throughout the remainder of the classroom transcript (September 6, 2011), Erma and David, as co-facilitators, negotiated and explained what experiences counted or not for this assignment. While positioned as co-facilitators, David
was the lead co-facilitator of CO1 and program director with more years of experience at Connect than Erma, which seemed to give him more power in Connect decisions. His more powerful positioning seemed evidenced by their disagreement over what counted as an Outside Learning experience. David disagreed with Erma's willingness to count watching a documentary at urban theaters, such as the Diamond or the Arch (line 29), and he suggested the Outside Learning event needed "actually a live component to it" (line 30). While Erma had not made this distinction in her prior explanations, she seemed to take up David's additional requirement by explaining "the difference between active and passive" (line 24) in regards to arts experiences. David and Erma both seemed to conceive of learning occurring across particular urban spaces, but their particular conceptions about what counted as learning experiences within these urban spaces were negotiated in front of students in ways that showed their unequal positions in the class despite the label of co-facilitators.

After students read the assignment sheet, they began to ask question about the Outside Learning Project, which included whether or not a particular event would count. Erma took the floor to answer the students’ questions about which particular events counted as Outside Learning Projects. She stated:

1. it [the event just described] sounds like it [an Outside Learning event] the truth of the matter is we have not been to every single event in MidwestCity so to some degree we trust you to make the decision to whether or not this is good enough for an outside learning paper
2. David: yeah I think you really have to consider the spirit of this assignment
3. like here's like here let me rip down the facade of what we really want is for you to be a person who does this stuff all the time
4. you want you to be like CO2 Exemplar right↑ who just does stuff like this all the time cause she thinks it's cool
5. she gets it
6. but the problem is you are still coming out of school
7. school environment where a lot of times well do I have to do it I don't know
8. so when you just say hey this stuff its cool a third of people would or half the
   people would and half people wouldn't
9. because inertia didn't move them
10. they shouldn't get off their couches or whatever
11. so we are requiring it
12. we are assigning it and we are giving it a grade
13. if you don't do an outside learning during this project
14. you will get an F on your report card for cultural studies
15. **(Student says "Oh")**
16. Just an F
17. a real F
18. **Erma:** that's a half credit and it's just based on whether you can get off your
    butt and do something
19. **David:** Exactly
20. **Erma:** it's one thing
21. **David:** this is the easiest A
22. **Erma:** it's not an every week
23. **David:** easiest A in CO
24. just go do something and
25. **David and Erma:** write about it
26. **David:** Its really easy
27. if you don't do it you will get an F on your report card for cultural studies
28. the only reason we do that
29. is because sometimes that's the motivator at this stage of your CO experience
30. that's the motivator you need to kind of go out on your own
31. and then maybe second nine weeks it will be similar
32. and by the end of the year next you will just be doing stuff because you get
    that it's cool
33. so we are kind of like do you get what I am saying?
34. **Erma:** Yeah and a short anecdote one of our students from last year over the
    weekend went to the Greek Fest
35. and there's 2 CO2 students and 2 of their friends
36. and they were walking through the Near Center [local arts area] and the CO
    students were like oh let's look at this oh let's look at this oh let's look at this
37. and their friends were like damn we hate CO
38. **(Students laugh)**
39. they make you want to see everything
40. **(Student laugh louder)**
41. and they're not getting any credit for doing what they're doing but by going
    through this program it's like opened their eyes to there's all this cool stuff out
    there
42. you know and I thought it was a hilarious story
43. **David:** Yeah and even though we're using like even though we're using the
    kind of grade and the assignment as a tool to get you to start doing it
44. don't be a tool about how you use it

45. (Students laugh)

46. like the goal is not like oh I got to check this off the list I have to find the easiest thing to do

47. I mean the goal of the whole

48. the whole reason we are doing the assignment is you go out there and really check something out

49. like really experience something (Classroom Transcript, September 6, 2011, minute 37.40)

This segment ended as David began listing again the events students might try to experience in MidwestCity in order to fulfill the Outside Learning Project assignment. Throughout the transcript, David and Erma worked to describe the conceptions of their figured world of Connect as a culture and an identity that undergird the assignment, yet in lines 6-32 and then lines 43-46 they discuss the necessity to assign grades to learning events due to requirements for grades from the students' SPEs, which are operating within the field of schooling. In a typical Connect co-facilitator discourse pattern, which involved describing the rationale for particular assignments and/or lessons, David said he will "rip down the facade of what we really want" (line 3) for students to do with this assignment. Unlike Erma, who had focused on explaining what counted as learning in her figured world of Connect, David built upon his conceptions of his figured world of Connect as an identity by explaining the identities he wanted students to take on by completing the Outside Learning Project. He stated, "we [David and Erma] really want..you to be a person who does this stuff" (line 2). Ultimately, according to David, he and Erma wanted them to do this stuff because it was "cool" (Lines 3 & 31). Following David's shift in focus, Erma, in her often narrative style discourse, built upon his directives on identity as a CO person by providing students with a retelling of a story about two CO2 students and their experience at Greek Fest with two non-CO students. In
this retelling, Erma reiterated that a CO person "want[s] to see everything" (line 38). By asking students to assume the identity of a CO person, David and Erma tried to create a CO community and the collective figured world of Connect, where members acted in ways that David and/or Erma conceived they should act. While David and/or Erma tried to persuade students to be CO people, students had the agency to take up, change, and/or resist the identity as a CO person.

The second Outside Learning Project, which focused on world religions, received more time on discussion floors than the first Outside Learning Projects. Connect students talked with one another about the World Religions Outside Learning Projects, especially what events they planned to and/or did attend. Students discussed the project in class during CO Circles and on the Facebook group page, though only 17 out of the 21 participants successfully completed the written portion of the assignment (see Appendix D). Students negotiated not only the events they attended in various urban, suburban, or rural places to complete the assignment, but they also provided instances of uptake of the Connect conception of learning occurring across spaces with people with varying perspectives during non-class time. As an example, on November 7, 2011, while in a CO Circle, David brought up the Outside Learning Projects, and Chelsey and Mark discussed two different religious places they planned to attend. After students had shared with one another Connect experiences they had encountered over the weekend, David reminded students:

1. Just as a reminder everybody needs to go out and check out a service a worship service before the end of the project
2. I know it's a little early and you're just going to start interviewing soon and you'll start making connections or whatever
3. Chelsey
4. **Chelsey:** this Sunday there's an evangelical church in
   5. H-Burb off of H-Burb Road
   6. and I got
   7. **after Jesus Camp** [a video students watched in class on November 3, 2011] I
      was a little afraid and I was like well I'm going to go see the non-radical side
      of it all
   8. so it's evangelical Lutheran church
   9. my mom said that's probably a little more toned down than
   10. the other+ type of evangelical and I'm going on Sunday for service
   11. and yeah
   12. **David:** Non-Participant
   13. **Non-Participant** discussed a Somali holiday that occurred yesterday.
   14. **David:** Mark
   15. **Mark:** I called the Church of Scientology to
   16. ask questions
   17. and they said they were open from like 9 [a.m.] to 9 [p.m.]
   18. and you could like go in there and have like classes but they were unclear
      about like services
   19. and on top of that my dad said they are like in an office building
   20. **David:** yeah
   21. **Erma:** yeah they don't really have services
   22. **Mark:** they don't
   23. so that's not a good one to do
   24. **Erma:** it's a one-on-one thing
   25. I think you should go and tell us about it
   **26. (Students laugh)**
   27. have a spy cam on
   28. **Michelle:** Mark I'll go with you (Classroom Transcript, November 7, 2011,
      minute 10.46)

The segment ended as two CO2 students entered the auditorium area and Connect
members talked among themselves. Eventually, David gave the floor to Allison who
shifted the topic away from the Outside Learning Projects. In a discourse pattern similar
to one used by the co-facilitators, Chelsey connected the World Religions Outside
Learning assignment to a previous class lesson, which involved students watching *Jesus
Camp* and then discussing the video in a CO Circle (line 7). Chelsey wanted to explore a
different perspective of the evangelical faith (lines 7-10) than the one presented in class,
which seemed to show her uptake of the Connect conception of learning occurring
through, as Erma said during the CO Circle debriefing discussion about the White privilege and heterosexual privilege panels, "be[ing] curious about other people's personalities" (line 16) and discussing it with them in the "border" (line 11, Classroom Transcript, September 15, 2011). This particular conception of learning in the did not seemed to be supported by Erma’s figured world of Connect, however, with Mark's selection of the Church of Scientology as his World Religions Outside Learning event.

Like Chelsey, Mark also followed David and Erma's assignment directions to pick a religion different from one's own, and he sought a religion about which he was curious. David and Erma, however, did not seem to support Mark's choice of the Church of Scientology. David only offered "yeah" in reply to Mark's description of times, place location, and the lack of clarity on services. Erma did offer details about services at the Church of Scientology, and then told Mark he should "wear a spy cam" (line 27) after students laughed (line 26) at her suggestion that Mark "go and tell us about it" (line 25). In Erma’s figured world of Connect, it seemed that Erma conceived learning as occurring in border areas among people with different perspectives, but, her humor about the Church of Scientology seemed to indicate that not all border areas and people with different perspectives were spaces she was willing to enter and learn. While I could not locate any mention in my field notes of Chelsey or Mark talking about attending the religious events they discussed above (Classroom Transcript, November 5, 2011), Mark did post to Facebook: "So they [sic] church of Scientology was pretty interesting actually. They gave me some DVD's when I left (they really liked DVD's) So I figured I'd let them float around connect for anyone who is interested in it." Stacy, a participant student, was the only Connect member to like the status; no one posted a comment. This appears to be
one instance in which the Connect conception of learning in the border collided with the field of Judeo-Christian privilege in such a way that Mark went outside at least some of the Connect members’ comfort zones and learned with people with religious perspectives that were non-privileged in the field of religion.

In addition to class discussions in CO Circles about Outside Learning Projects, the Facebook group page wall included announcements and invitations to attend religious events throughout the World Religions Unit. For example, on December 10, 2011, Chelsey posted to Facebook: "Hey everyone! The Jain temple is open on SUNDAY not Saturday, so please feel free to join me :) the time open is 10:30 to 12, I plan on being there by 10:30, let me know if you want to go!" No one liked or replied to this posting so I am unsure if others joined her as it was not brought up in class after her visit. After initially being unsure of how to complete the Outside Learning Projects to fulfill David's conceptions of it as part of living a CO life, some students seemed to take up the projects across spaces, though there was student resistance and/or improvisation of the project by refusing to complete it, doing so to get the grade rather than live a CO life, and/or using events that did not meet the original parameters negotiated by David and Erma on September 6, 2011.

In the collective figured world of Connect, Outside Learning Projects represented the ways in which David and/or Erma conceived learning. Students took up, challenged, and/or resisted David and/or Erma’s conceptions of learning in the ways in which they completed (or not) and/or discussed (or not) the assignment. In the collective figured world of Connect, the artifactual literacy and language practice of Outside Learning Projects, like field trips and guest speakers, connected Connect spaces with places/spaces
across Midwest City. The field of schooling influenced the Outside Learning Projects as David and Erma attached a grade to its proper completion, so students often had less agency in how they learned and/or interconnected their lived spaces. Unlike this particular artifactual literacy and language practice, the fifth artifact in the form of the Connect Facebook wall provided students with a more agentive space in which they could take up, challenge, and/or resist the identities and activities of the collective figured world of Connect, the field of schooling, and the fields of power, such as race, gender, sexuality, class, and/or religion.

**Artifact 5: Facebook Wall**

David and Erma created the Connect Facebook group page as "a place for members of the connect1 2011-2012 class to get to know each other, share interesting events, make friends and keep in touch" (About page, Connect Facebook group page). Connect members made frequent use of the Facebook group page, which I believe made it a key artifact in the collective figured world of Connect. In order to more fully understand how Connect members participated in this online space, I collected screenshots of the Facebook group page from August 28, 2011 until January 15, 2012. Using my knowledge from my almost daily class observations during the time of the Facebook posts, I analyzed the 315 posts written by participants I collected based on how the post functioned, and I came up with eight categories, which I have listed in Table 5:
Table 5.
*Types of Connect Facebook Posts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Post</th>
<th>Total Number of Posts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge/Skills</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Notices for MidwestCity</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Procedural Instructions</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheer</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Get-Togethers</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictures/Videos from Class</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random (or Posts that Seemed out of Place)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleas for Help</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These postings functioned as an artifact of how Connect members took up, changed, and/or resisted the Connect identities and behaviors of David's or Erma's figured world of Connect. While the posts seemed to function as I have labeled them, the posts also represent the ways in which Connect members used literacy and language practices to create engaging and/or community generative spaces with one another through this online space.

Not all of the Connect members consented/assented to participate in my study, and not all of my participants allowed me to track their participation in the Connect Facebook group page. As a result, I analyzed only the posts that were originally written and posted by the 23 participants and myself, who consented/assented to my tracking their Facebook participation. Table 6 summarizes the types of posts each of the consented/assented participants posted during my data collection phase.
Table 6.  
*Connect Members’ Facebook Posts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Total Posts</th>
<th>Content Knowledge and Skills</th>
<th>Event Notices for Midwest City</th>
<th>Class Procedural Instructions</th>
<th>Cheer</th>
<th>Planning Get-Togethers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allison (S)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy (S)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky (S)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belinda (S)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callie (S)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsey (S)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christy (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal (S)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David (CF)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn (S)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee (S)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erma (CF)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katrina (S)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark (S)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa (S)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle (S)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi (S)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah (S)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina (S)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon (S)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacy (S)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie (PT)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen (PT)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan (S)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)

*Note.* (S) means students, (R) means researcher, (CF) means co-facilitators, and (PT) means pre-service teachers.
Based upon these 315 posts represented in Table 6, I believe the online space of Facebook provided Connect members with an agentive space to take up, change, and/or resist the identities and behaviors that David and/or Erma conceived as being part of their figured worlds of Connect. While I am discussing Facebook as a separate space and artifact from other Connect spaces and artifacts, such as CO Circles or field trips, Connect members participated in various Connect spaces, especially Facebook, in interconnected ways that helped to create learning spaces that were engaging and/or
community generative. I will begin this section with a description of how the co-facilitators, David and Erma modeled the use literacy and language practices to practice Connect identities and behaviors in the online space of Facebook. In the second subsection, I will examine how students took up, improvised, and/or resisted the identities and behaviors of the collective figured world of Connect on Facebook through their use of literacy and language practices.

**How co-facilitators used the Connect Facebook space.** David and Erma created the Connect group page on Facebook as a "closed" group page. As a "closed" group, the administrators of the page, which were David and Erma, had to accept members' requests to be a part of the group. Only members of the group page could access the information that members posted to the group wall. As a 10th grade social studies teacher at the time social media sites were expanding, administrators had regularly and strongly warned me and my colleagues against entering the online social networking spaces with our students. David and Erma, however, explained to students on August 30, 2011 why they had chosen to use Facebook, and in 18 instances, Twitter. Before the five minute break David and/or Erma often gave students in the middle of the two-hour Connect class, David and Erma provided directions on how to join and/or follow Connect on Twitter, Facebook, email and texts. As a way to transition into these directions, Erma said:

1. the information is always out there we're just trying to get it to
2. you the fastest way
3. and also you know
4. where you live has changed over the past five years a lot of you live online to some degree
5. we're trying to go where you are
6. to make it easier to communicate
7. **David:** right we used to do a lot of email
8. and now we're moving into Facebook
This segment ended as David took the floor to direct students on how to access the Connect Twitter and Facebook accounts, if they had not already done so. In the field of schooling, teachers are wary to enter social media spaces with their students, but in their figured world of Connect, David and Erma chose to "go where you [the students] are" (line 5), because, as Erma stated, "over the past five years a lot of you live online to some degree" (line 4). David and Erma’s figured world of Connect, thus, acknowledged and appropriated students’ literacy and language practices in online spaces in ways that the figured worlds of the students' SPEs and the field of schooling largely did not.

Through modeling acceptable posts, David and, less frequently, Erma helped students to use the Facebook group page in ways that created engaging and community generative learning spaces of which they conceived their figured world of Connect to be comprised. David and Erma were the most prolific Facebook posters of the entire Connect community, yet their total number of postings differed substantially from one another. David posted 82 posts, while Erma posted almost half of David's numbers with 48 posts. Table 7 summarizes the type of posts they each made.
Table 7.  
*Types of Co-Facilitators’ Facebook Posts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Post</th>
<th>David</th>
<th>Erma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge/Skills</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Notices for MidwestCity</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Procedural Instructions</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Get-Togethers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictures/Videos from Class</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleas for Help</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the number of posts, David's most common post was to provide instructions dealing with class time. This type of post was linked to his position as the lead co-facilitator for the afternoon class, and it was not commonly found among any other Connect members' posts, since they did not share this position with David. David's next most common posts were either content posts or event notices, which both provided examples of how one should be living a CO life by always learning through attending various events across MidwestCity. Erma's most common posts were event notices, which seemed to be an extension of her Connect position as the co-facilitator who most often made announcements in class for MidwestCity events as well as her identity as a someone interested in the arts.

Stephen and Stephanie, the two pre-service teachers who were participant-observers during the two units I observed, seemed to follow David and Erma's lead in how members who have the position of co-facilitators in the collective figured world of Connect should participate in literacy and language practices on the Facebook group page. While they were not a focus of this study, I counted Stephen and Stephanie's posts as members of the Connect community who had consented to be a part of the study.
Neither Stephen nor Stephanie were as prolific posters as David and Erma, but the type of posts they made were similar to David’s posts more often than Erma's posts as represented below in Table 8. This may have been a result of David’s position as their mentor teacher.

Table 8.
Types of Pre-Service Teachers’ Facebook Posts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Post</th>
<th>Stephanie</th>
<th>Stephen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge/Skills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Notices for MidwestCity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Procedural Instructions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Get-Togethers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictures/Videos from Class</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleas for Help</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stephanie and Stephen posted more often as they began their student teaching unit where they took on David and Erma's positions as co-facilitators. Connect co-facilitators, even those in-training, often used the Connect Facebook page as a space to provide class procedural instructions, further content knowledge and/or skills, or notices about upcoming MidwestCity events.

David and Erma also provided students as well as pre-service teachers with a model for how to orchestrate and improvise the literacy and language practices often found online, particularly on Facebook, for use on the Connect Facebook page. Both David and Erma used a less academic writing style in their Facebook posts than they did in their in-class writings, such as assignment sheets or project overviews. On Facebook, they often used grammar practices such as exclamation marks, incomplete sentences, all
capital letters, and/or no capitalization, which would be inappropriate in academic writing but wholly acceptable in writing for online social networking sites. David and Erma also made use of the like button throughout the school year as a way of support for a particular post, often made by someone else. They, also, both replied to posts by adding an alphabetical textual response by hitting the reply button under the original post. In these replies, they continued to use an online style of writing, and they provided support by answering questions, sharing greater details, providing more links, or even giving a personal reaction to the original post. In this myriad of ways, David and Erma provided students with a model for the acceptable use of literacy and language practices from the field of online social networking which they could use on the Connect Facebook page.

David and/or Erma, throughout my observations, provided students with direct instruction on how they should participate in particular literacy and language events, such as CO Circles and Outside Learning projects, yet their instruction for participation in the Facebook space was largely through modeling. I observed only one instance in which David directly instructed students on how they should participate in the literacy and language practices on the Connect Facebook page. On December 14, 2011, as students began to discuss how to improve the community issue of cliques and still not knowing everyone in the group, Michelle replied:

1. I think we can utilize the Facebook page even more and invite people as a group just like hey does anyone want to go to dinner before we go to this thing or
2. I don't know
3. I don't know what things we would be going to but whatever
4. I think we use it well but we could use it even more
5. **David:** I should really quickly comment
6. I just want to make two really quick comments on Facebook etiquette
7. like I know like you know when somebody leaves their computer open and like you can like change their Facebook status to something really funny its funny but I really want to ask that people don't do that here
8. like we had like we had some issues with that and it was some concern for some people people took stuff down but like
9. a parent was concerned by like you might make a joke on their kids' Facebook thing and it's like up there and then like people like colleges people are applying to colleges and colleges look at that
10. it's just like one of those things
11. so I really want to ask you to respect each other's Facebook
12. you should log off if you don't log off
13. second thing is I just want to remind you really quickly
14. I love the Facebook communication
15. like Christy's on there she's doing research
16. parents can get on there
17. people can look at it it is a public space so I just want you to observe the same kind of level of decorum there that you do here
18. in terms of like profanity and whatever that kind of stuff
19. I mean definitely a cool place to hang out but try to keep the same rules of hanging out on Facebook that you have that you have here in terms of like conduct
20. public conduct
21. so
22. Non-Participant (Classroom Transcript, December 14, 2011, minute 1.34.34)

This segment ended as the non-participant to whom David gave the floor shifted the topic back to the issue of getting to know everyone in the community. As students in the CO Circle discussed how to improve the Connect community, David "want[ed] to make two real quick comments on Facebook etiquette" (line 6). Both of the issues on which he commented are acceptable practices in the field of online social networking sites, but they are not acceptable practices in the field of schooling or David's figured world of Connect, according to David. The first issue was the changing of someone's status when they are not looking, whether that is a result of them looking away from the electronic device or having left themselves logged into a more public electronic device. While the practice of status changes even has its own terminology, such as being hacked or hijacked, in the
field of online social networking, in the field of schooling this practice is impolite and might even border on bullying, depending upon the post. David also implied this hacking/hijacking practice and posting jokes to other people's page could affect people who "are applying to colleges" because as he explains one parent conceived the figured world of college as one in which "colleges look at that" and will not respond favorably to someone with such "a joke" on their page (line 10). David's second concern involved the use of "profanity and whatever that kind of stuff" (line 19). He wanted students "to observe the same kind of level of decorum that you do here" (line 18). The use of "profanity" is unacceptable in the field of schooling and among many figured worlds of the students' SPEs, but it was allowable for use in the lived spaces of Connect, based on my observations. David seemed to conceive his figured world of Connect as one in which profanity was below the acceptable "level of decorum" (line 18), yet the collective figured world of Connect was constructed by all of the Connect members as they participated and lived in the Connect spaces.

David and Erma created the Facebook group page as space for students to practice literacy and language practices in ways that took up their conceptions of their figured worlds of Connect, which included engaging and community generative spaces. The Facebook wall offered students opportunities to take up the identities and behaviors conceived by David and/or Erma to belong to members of their figured worlds of Connect. How students participated with one another in the Connect Facebook space varied tremendously among the individuals. David and Erma's models were taken up, challenged, and resisted by the students as they orchestrated and improvised their own identities and their figured worlds of Connect in the online space of Facebook.
How students used the Connect Facebook space. Of the 21 students who consented/assented to be a part of this study, I was unable to track two participants’ use of literacy and language practices on Facebook. Angel did join discussions online but asked to not be tracked, while Joe, who also asked to not be tracked, never sought acceptance to become a part of the Facebook group page throughout the school year. The remaining 19 students varied in how they participated in literacy and language practices on Facebook, especially in how they took up, challenged, and/or resisted the CO identity and the figured worlds of Connect as conceived by David or Erma.

Overall, the student participants posted 166 posts to the Facebook group page. Table 9 shows how their postings compared with those posted by David and Erma as the co-facilitators of Connect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Post</th>
<th>Co-Facilitators</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge/Skills</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Notices for MidwestCity</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Procedural Instructions</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Get-Togethers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictures/Videos from Class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleas for Help</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the 166 student posts, the five most prolific student posters to the Connect Facebook page were Naomi, who had 34 posts, Mark, who had 16 posts, Chelsey, who had 15 posts, Amy, who had 14 posts, and Sharon, who also had 14 posts. On the other side of the spectrum, the four students who posted to Facebook most sparingly were
Katrina, who posted 2 times, Crystal, who posted 3 times, Michelle, who also posted 3 times, and Stacy, who also posted 3 times. The purpose of students’ posts, unlike David's or Erma’s posts, varied greatly, perhaps because they did not have the same assigned positions as the co-facilitators did in the collective figured world of Connect.

The variation in purposes for students’ Facebook posts shows the multiple ways students participated in literacy and language practices on the online space of Facebook in ways that orchestrated and improvised the collective figured world of Connect as well as their own identities and roles in this figured world. The Connect Facebook space seemed to provide students with a space in which they had more agency in their participation in literacy and language practices, their identities and positions, and the collective figured world of Connect than they seemed to possess and/or use in other Connect spaces. In order to more fully understand how students were using literacy and language practices in the Connect Facebook space, I selected the three categories of student-authored posts that had the greatest number of replies from other Connect members in order to illustrate in greater detail how students took up, challenged, and/or resisted Connect literacy and language practices and identities on Facebook over the course of the first 4.5 months of the 2011-2012 school year. Using only posts with 6 or more replies, students most often replied to planning get-together posts, with replies ranging from 7-19, then content knowledge/skills posts, with the number of replies ranging from 7-12, and finally pictures/videos from class posts, with 6 replies each.

Planning get-togethers posts. Planning get-togethers were the responsibility of the students according to David and Erma, who spoke about this responsibility in CO Circle
discussions, especially those occurring on Community Days. Since David and Erma had positioned students as the ones in charge of planning experiences with one another, they posted 19 out of the 20 postings that I categorized as planning get-togethers. Erma authored the other post though she did so for a CO2 member who wanted to invite CO1 members to a live performance of *The Rocky Horror Picture Show* at HiddenCircle, a local theater, but she lacked access to the CO1 Facebook group page in order to do so on her own. Planning get-together posts seemed to function as community generating spaces in which students could suggest, invite, and organize common experiences with one another in ways that created communal bonds and sense of belonging among Connect members, which supported David's conception of Connect as a culture. Some students, such as Naomi and Callie, took up this role of Connect community generators on Facebook in ways I did not observe them doing during Connect class time.

Over the time in which I collected screenshots of the Connect Facebook page, Naomi authored the two most replied to posts. Both of her posts involved planning a get-together, though one of them was planning the food for a Connect traditional get-together known as the Holiday Party, which was the most overall replied to post of the entire study. Naomi, on December 13, 2011, posted to Facebook: "I think everyone should post what they will be bringing so we don't all have the same things LOL. XD" Her comment received 19 textual comments as students listed what they planned to bring. On December 17, 2011, Naomi posted "I'm missing Co already >~<" which she followed up

---

8 Community Days were a Connect language practice that occurred twice during my observations. On this day, at least one hour of class was spent in a CO Circle talking about what was working well and not so well in the Connect community.
the next day with the second most replied to post. On December 18, 2011, Naomi said "Co Date over the break anyone?" Her posts received 9 likes and 17 replies as students tried to plan a get-together over the winter break, though it never occurred as everyone seemed to have conflicting schedules.

Naomi, who authored 5 posts that involved planning get-togethers, was the most prolific student poster on Facebook, and, as evidenced in her post from December 13, 2011, she often made use of emoticons, such as XD, which is a laughing face, and SMS (Short Message Service) language or textese, such as LOL. Naomi orchestrated her literacy and language practices from other online spaces with her figured world of Connect in its online space of Facebook in ways that differed from David's or Erma's practices in the same Connect space. While her orchestration might have varied from David and Erma's orchestrations, she did seem to take up David's conceptions of a Connect culture and identity for herself, even using "CO" to formally name her get-together on December 18, 2011. Her many posts, including those discussed above, not only illustrated her own feelings of belongingness with CO members (i.e. post from 12.17.2011) but she also tried to create new bonds by organizing Connect get-togethers (i.e. posts from 12.13.2011 & 12.18.2011).

Naomi was not the only student who authored posts that involved planning get-togethers among Connect members. The student who authored the most posts that involved planning a get-together was Callie. Of the 7 posts she authored over the course of my Facebook data collection, 6 of her posts were about planning get-togethers, and two of these posts received more than 6 replies. On September 24, 2011, she posted, "This wednesday right after connect I'm going to the thrift store in case anyone wants to
go with me! We can have a CoThriftStoreAdventure! :))" This was Callie's most replied to post with 3 likes and 8 replies as students worked out details on who was going and how to get there. On October 26, 2011, her second most replied to post read, "We should totally do what Non-Participant said and have like a CoBowling Night! I'm looking forward to seeing someone who sucks worse than me at bowling :)" Students showed their willingness to join through their 6 likes and 7 replies, including one from the Non-Participant she referenced who had mentioned having a bowling night during the CO Circle Discussion earlier in the day. Callie's second post, much like Naomi's post about the Holiday Party, referred to something that occurred in Connect class time that was then carried over into the Connect online space of Facebook, which suggests the importance of Community Day and Holiday Party as community generative in-school spaces and language practices.

Callie made use of emoticons, especially the smiley face ":)," to end most of her posts. Like David and Erma, she also made use of exclamation marks and non-academic style capitalization throughout her Facebook posts and replies. Callie seemed to follow David and Erma's model for using literacy and language practices in Connect online spaces in her orchestration of her own literacy and language practices from other online spaces with her figured world of Connect in its online space of Facebook. Callie, like Naomi, seemed to take up David's conception of a Connect person as one who does things in MidwestCity with other Connect members. She even made use of "CO" as part of the capitalized name of the events she tried to plan. She tried to organize six different get-togethers among Connect members, but, despite the number of replies, she often attended the events alone or not at all, though, based on my discussions with her and the
small group of girls who joined her, the CO ThriftStoreAdventure was a successful bonding event for the small group that did go with her.

Two other get-together planning posts received more than 6 replies from other Connect members; these were authored by Susan and Amy. Susan, who authored 2 get-together posts overall, posted on December 14, 2011, "So I'm going to Sharon's art show tomorrow! Anyone else want to join??" Sharon had mentioned in class and on Facebook numerous times that a piece of her art would be shown at the Midwest State University Art Center, and Susan chose to use Facebook to organize a Connect group to go see it on opening night. Susan's post received 2 likes and 9 replies as students planned who was going, when to go, and where to eat. On September 3, 2011, Amy, who also authored 2 get-together posts overall, posted, "hey guys, this sounds really nerdy, but does anybody want to go geocaching with me and bob smith (he's in co2)! it's really cool, to learn more about it go to www.geocaching.com" Her post received 3 likes and 7 replies as Connect members asked for details and/or shared their own geocaching experiences. Both Susan and Amy used Facebook as a space to perform CO identity as they both planned and invited others to join in a get-together where they would go learn in MidwestCity by attending an event of which they were not already a part. Susan created a get-together that supported Sharon, another Connect member, while Amy created a get-together across the larger Connect community as she invited her CO1 classmates to join her and her CO2 friend. Susan was successful in her get-together, though Amy did not get other CO1 classmates to join her on her geocaching experience.

Connect students orchestrated their own literacy and language practices from other online spaces into their use of literacy and language practices on the Connect
Facebook page. Following David and Erma's model for writing styles, as well as their previous knowledge of writing styles in the field of online social networking, they chose less academic language practices in their Facebook posts. Despite no modeling of planning Connect get-togethers on Facebook from David or Erma, the students chose Facebook as the space in which to plan get-togethers. These get-togethers were one way in which Connect members could create senses of community as they bonded over common experiences in MidwestCity, which is how David seemed to conceive his figured world of Connect should operate. While students tried to plan 19 different get-togethers on Facebook, their success in enacting the plans varied greatly. Despite their varied amounts of success, students used the Connect Facebook page as a space to take up their identities as CO people and orchestrate their own literacy and language practices in online spaces in their figured world(s) of Connect.

*Content knowledge/skills posts.* David and Erma's second most common posts, which were content knowledge and/or skills related, were also the second most replied to student-authored posts. Content knowledge/skills posts accounted for one-third of all the Facebook posts I collected, and students authored 62 of the 105 posts. Student-authored content knowledge/skills posts involved 3 types of posts, which I have labeled as sharing links, personal applications to class topics/events, and questions about content knowledge/skills. In student-authored posts labeled sharing links, which were 37 of the 62 content knowledge/skills posts, students usually used alphabetical text (34 times) as well as web links to online videos, articles, and/or pictures (27 times) to provide Connect members with connections to content discussed during class time. Personal applications, which occurred 14 times, differed from sharing links in that the students provided
personal stories or statements that related to content from class time but they lacked any connection to other information beyond the students' personal experiences. These posts included poems by Mark, Allison, and Sharon and a self portrait by Naomi. The remaining 12 student-authored content knowledge/skills posts involved students asking questions about either content knowledge or skills related to class assignments.

Despite content questions being the least most likely content/knowledge skills posts, the most replied to content post was a question posted by Katrina on December 1, 2011. While most content questions were answered in no more than 3 replies, Katrina's question "Who was the man that spoke to us at the Jewish temple? The one with all the jokes.." received 12 replies. Often students asked questions, and David, Erma, Stephen, Stephanie, or even another student would respond with the answer. No discussion would ensue. In this post, an informal discussion developed among Mark, Amy, David, and 2 non-participants in the following manner. A non-participant answered Katrina's question, but Mark provided the correct spelling of the rabbi's name as well as his first name. David then posted "Good work gang. His first name is XX." Mark had given the wrong first name, and he posted back "haha whoops! i was thinking of his son....." Then another non-participant provided Mark with the rabbi's son's name, which Mark had still gotten wrong. After Amy posted, "lolololololololololololololololololololololololololololol" Mark replied with the final reply: "Haha I give up! I'm waving a white flag in front of my computer as we speak" While this Facebook discussion was atypical for the particular type of discussion that followed a content question post, it represents a typical interaction among Connect members on the Connect Facebook page. Connect members used less academic writing styles, including student use of SMS language. For this particular question, it took a communal effort
among members to provide Katrina with an answer, and the laughter throughout seemed to show an easiness among the Connect members in this online space.

The other most often replied to content knowledge/skills posts were those in which students provided copies of their poems. Sharon began this practice of sharing one's poetry on Facebook when she posted her "Feminist Poem" on September 29, 2011. Before she posted the poem, she wrote "Pretty sure I heard someone say they wanted me to post this so here it is..." She had read her poem at the end of the CO Circle discussion on September 29, 2011, and Connect members had asked her to post the poem on the Facebook page after her reading. On Facebook, her poem received 17 likes and 7 replies. The Facebook discussion began with her poem, and then students replied under it, which in alphabetical text format looked like this:

I am a feminist because
I live in a country where all men were created equal but I was not
I grew up in a world where my mother told me to reach for the stars,
the ones on the other side of that glass ceiling
Because I was taught young to be afraid, that being alone was NOT SAFE
because my indignant rage is just hysteria
because "sit down and shut up you can work and vote"
because everyone knows I have no sense of humor when rape jokes aren't funny
or I'm supposed to spend my life in a kitchen making you sandwiches.
I can't stand next to a man and expect the same opportunities
I will be asked if I plan to have a family
and judged when I don't want children
I am a feminist because we will get 74%
because this entire country has an opinion on what goes on inside my body
because I'm not allowed to enjoy sex or video games
because I've been slut-shamed and too plain
When it's typical that I'm bad at math
but it's okay because I have a boy to do it for me
because he can lift that box and I can't carry my own bag
Because we have the right to vote, so nothing else matters right?
because I am not a person, I am an object, made to be oggled for your enjoyment
a walking comment board
I am a feminist because I'm opinionated
and independent
Why should I be ashamed to have been born a girl?
Because I see it and it makes me angry
When he stands on ground higher than me.
I am a feminist because why shouldn't I be?

Stacy: good job Sharon!!!
September 29, 2011 at 8:45pm · Like
Sharon: Thanks everyone
September 29, 2011 at 8:56pm · Like
Sharon: ♥
September 29, 2011 at 8:56pm · Like
Non-Participant1: XXX
September 29, 2011 at 9:10pm via mobile · Like
Melissa: I have no right to write anymore... This blows everything out of the water!!
September 29, 2011 at 9:16pm via mobile · Like
Non-Participant 2: XXX
September 29, 2011 at 9:45pm via mobile · Like
Sharon: You should definitely not stop writing! that would be so sad...
I've actually been going to the Diamond City Cafe for the past two Mondays, it's like nice in this smallish-setting and free-ness kind of way, peoples should come to that...
September 29, 2011 at 10:38pm · Like · 1

Like all of the artistic endeavors I observed in class and online spaces, Sharon's poem received support from other Connect members. Using their experiences in the field of online social networks, Sharon, Stacy, and Melissa also followed David and Erma's lead by using less academic literacy and language practices in their replies, which included multiple exclamation marks, ellipses instead of periods, and a ♥. Sharon, Stacy, and Melissa also seemed to be building bonds with one another through the use of praise and gratitude. Sharon willingly shared a poem about her identity as a women and a feminist living in a world operating under the influence of the field of gender privilege, and, like David's conception of a Connect person, she presented herself as an agent of change in her own life as well as the larger communities in which she lives.
Allison and Mark also shared poems on the Connect Facebook group page, though Mark's poem only received 4 replies, which was atypical for this particular type of posting. It is possible Connect members did not respond in larger numbers because he had performed his poem in class as his religious art piece, and as was Connect custom, he had received written comments from Connect members after his performance of the poem. In January, students began a new unit which required each of them to read a poem of their choice to the whole class. Based on my observations from the winter of 2011, students read poems that other poets had written and published. Allison completed this assignment by performing her own poem in class, even though I had not understood that to be acceptable based on my previous observations. She then posted the poem she read in class to the Facebook wall on January 4, 2012, though her original post did not include the poem; she stated "Could I has a little critique holmies?" David posted, "If you want feedback on the poem, Allison, you should post it here so we can look at it more closely." Allison then posted the following poem as a reply, instead of a new original Facebook post:

Replay Girl

Replay it girl, read it again.
Read it until the pain fully sinks in.
Read it 'till you bleed,
read it 'till you need
to gasp for air,
in order to breathe,
in order to keep
your loveless heart pumping.
You feel that thumping,
blood pumping through your brain.
Eyes so blurry you cannot see yourself.
Replay every word, replay everything
you thought you heard from his eyes.
I thought you told yourself it wouldn't happen again girl?
I thought you said you wouldn't let another boy crush your world?
Stay in your corner, weak and defenseless, bleed it out.
Your heart torn out, it pumps out,
and stains your already tainted memories.
The drops of melancholia falling from your eyes drip upon the pages of your diary.
Your sadness sears your being, fiery.
Replay Girl, that's who you are.
But sometimes the world's ways just aren't fair.
So as you replay, remember the faces who care.
Remember that they are still there.
replay their love, play it on repeat.
Teach your heart to stop jumping out of its seat at every pretty boy it meets.
Just pause for once and think, keep your heart in its seat.

After her reply with the poem, her original post received 4 more replies for a total of 8 replies, which made it one of the top 4 content posts to which students replied. Two non-participants provided Allison with feedback on the speed in which she read the poem in class, while Belinda said "Even though it was a little fast, I liked the rhythm of your voice a lot." Though I am unsure why she decided to do so, Allison replied to each respondent's reply, which was not a typical online language practice used by Allison or any other CO member in the Connect Facebook space. Following typical Connect writing styles for the Facebook group page, Allison chose to write her post and her replies in a less academic style than her poem, and she made use of emoticons in three of her four responses.

Allison, along with Mark and Sharon, used the Connect Facebook group page as a space to share poems not about their identities as CO people but about their personal identities, such as their gender identities, as they live in a world with various fields of power. Their poems also focused on their feelings based on their lived experiences outside of Connect spaces and their figured world(s) of Connect. In the collective figured world of Connect, among the students' constructions of the Facebook wall, students who wanted to share
their identities and/or figured worlds were supported and given value by the other Connect students.

*Pictures/videos from class posts.* The final category of posts that received 6 or more replies were pictures or videos taken in class that students then posted to the Connect Facebook page. Like planning get-togethers, posts of pictures and videos from class were nearly exclusively posted by students. Of the 17 pictures and videos from class posted, students posted 16 of them. The students who posted the 16 pictures or videos to the Connect Facebook page included Belinda (6 pictures and 1 photo album), Mark (3 pictures and 1 video), Susan (2 pictures), Naomi (1 picture and 1 video), and Amy (1 picture). Erma posted, on the second day of class, a picture of students during CO Speed Dating, which was an ice-breaker activity in which students moved every three minutes to a new partner and during the three minutes they talked about 1 of 5 prompts provided by David and Erma in order to get to know one another better. This was the only picture/video from class post made by a co-facilitator, and, unlike get-togethers, which David and Erma had positioned as the responsibility of the students, I could not locate any co-facilitator verbal directions on picture or video posts in my field notes. Students used their agency and positions as people with readily accessible cameras to create bonds with one another through the taking of pictures and videos from class and posting them to the Connect Facebook space.

While the pictures and videos spanned the entire 4.5 months of class I observed, over two-thirds of the pictures/videos from class posts focused on the Holiday Party. Belinda took and posted 23 pictures of the Holiday Party, which she placed in an album she titled "Just Kidding, David" on the Connect Facebook page. Since the album
appeared as only one post on the Facebook page, I counted it as only one post even though it contained many pictures. She posted six separate pictures before she posted the album, in which she then placed the six pictures she had previously posted to the Facebook page separately. Many of Belinda's pictures received comments, but only one of her pictures received 6 replies. This picture was actually four pictures put together in a box with a red frame around them. David appeared as the focus of each picture, and he replied "I have a strange feeling....like I'm being watched...." Three non-participants shared their care for David, Amy added "lolololololol" and the final reply came from Stephanie, who posted "Nice stalker photos Belinda :)") This particular picture connected not only to the happenings in class during the Holiday Party but also to the class events over the two previous days, in which David had learned during the CO Circle Discussion on Community Day that students were talking poorly about him behind his back. He had discussed the situation with students the day before the Holiday Party, because according to my field notes on December 15, 2011, "he left [class after Community Day] feeling like he doesn't know who to trust." Belinda, with the help of other students, posed and took pictures the next day at the Holiday Party to show David that in the students’ figured world of Connect he mattered and the Connect students did care about him.

The other picture post and the one video post that received 6 replies each focused on the hip hop/rap group presentation for the "In the Shoes of Another" class assignment. Mark, who was a member of the group, posted a picture of another group member, who was a non-participant in my study. Mark posted the first reply, which was "It's Kreayshawn!!!!" Five non-participants then replied in support of the non-participant and the character she was portraying, which referenced not only the figured world of
American rap/hip hop as well as the field of racial privilege as the presenters explained in their presentation. Naomi also posted a video of the hip hop/rap performance the group gave to the Connect community as a part of their presentation, which brought the figured world of American rap/hip hop into the Connect presentation space that day. Naomi’s post also received 6 replies. Three of these replies involved a brief discussion between Mark, who wanted a copy of the video, and Naomi, who said she would need to bring it on "an USB." Susan and 2 non-participants gave their support; Susan said, "You guys did such a great job:)") Both Mark's and Naomi's posts provided evidence of how other figured worlds and fields of power often influenced Connect spaces and artifacts while also showing support for one another as they created Connect artifacts.

The Facebook Wall provided students with an online social space in which they seemed to have more agency in taking up, changing, and/resisting the identities and activities of the collective figured world of Connect, the field of schooling, and the fields of power, such as race, gender, sexuality, and/or religion. While David and Erma conceived Connect spaces as ones in which students had agency in their identities and activities, students often were constrained in face-to-face Connect spaces in ways they did not experience in the online Connect space of the group’s Facebook wall. Each of the five artifactual literacy and language practices can help us rethink how school spaces are conceived and lived, and we must include how students perceived these spaces as community generative and/or engaging.
Community Generative and/or Engaging Learning Spaces: When, Where, and Under What Conditions Do These Occur at Connect

The figured world of Connect was different for each of its member, and each member brought with them different figurings of themselves, others, and spaces, such as school, learning, and disciplines, such as English, social studies, and art. The figured world of Connect depended upon each person's lived experiences and conceptions of how they should act in particular spaces as well as the orchestration of all these experiences and conceptions into a more socially agreed upon figuring of the Connect community. While I acknowledge the individualized nature of experiences and figurings of Connect spaces, I also believe my data shows important common figurings among participants. The participants orchestrated their figured worlds to create Connect spaces where they participated in literacy and language practices in ways that created learning spaces that were engaging and/or community generative based on commonly held conceptions about how they should do so. In order to provide deeper understandings into when, where, and under what conditions learning spaces become engaging and/or community generative, I will begin by examining how Connect members co-constructed lived spaces and artifacts provided evidence or not of engagement and/or community generation. Secondly, as an example and in order to more fully understand how Connect members experienced these lived spaces, I will examine how David, Erma, and five focal students perceived Connect spaces as community generative spaces.
Lived Spaces: Artifactual Evidence of Connect Members' Co-Constructions of
Community Generative and/or Engaging Learning Spaces at Connect

Whether and/or to what level Connect members experienced spaces as community
generative and/or engaging learning spaces varied across each individual participants’
perceptions as well as time and spaces. The perceptions of lived spaces as community
generative and/or engaging learning spaces were also influenced by the various figured
worlds, such as Connect, students' SPEs, and participants' local communities, and fields
of power, such as race, gender, sexuality, social class, and religion. As a result of the
many interconnected influences on how Connect members perceived their co-constructed
spaces at Connect, I wanted at first to avoid trying to answer the question of when,
where, and under what conditions learning spaces become community generative and/or
engaging. These questions, however, are why I entered Connect spaces, as I wanted to
help myself and other educators think about and possibly reconsider the literacy and
language practices we use in our classrooms. While I acknowledge I cannot over-
genralize my findings by labeling spaces simply engaging or not and/or community
generative or not, I believe Connect members, through their artifacts, lived spaces, and
discourses, can provide educators with possibilities for literacy events and practices that
may or may not create engaging and/or community generative spaces in not only other
alternative humanities classrooms but also potentially other content area classrooms.

In order to more fully understand when, where, and under what conditions
Connect learning spaces were engaging and/or community generative, I return to the five
artifactual literacy and language practices of the collective figured world of Connect: CO
Circle, field trips, guest speakers, Outside Learning Projects, and the Facebook wall. By
re-examining each of these artifacts as they were lived and perceived by the students, we can begin to understand how the learning spaces created around these artifacts may or may not have become community generative and/or engaging.

**Artifact 1: CO Circle.** Together, David and Erma established the CO circle seating configuration on the first day of class as one in which students entered a discussion with one another on equal footing though David and Erma retained control of the discussion floor throughout my observations. The CO Circle also allowed students to see one another as a whole community of learners who were there to listen and learn from one another. Students, however, perceived the CO Circle discussions in different ways. Some students perceived CO Circles as engaging learning spaces. For example, when I asked Becky to describe her favorite part of Connect during her interview, she stated:

BE-1 I really like
BE-2 the things where it's like big group
BE-3 like big group discussion sitting in the circle talking about something and listening to different people's perspectives on and learning about that or even
BE-4 half the group like just the bigger more than talking to a couple people and getting their perspective but talking to the group as a whole and underst thinking about getting so many different perspectives and so many different ideas that I wouldn't have thought about I think is really cool

(Becky’s Interview, April 18, 2012)

Becky acknowledged she enjoyed the CO Circle discussions, whether they were whole class (line BE-3) or whole research groups, which were half of the whole class (line BE-4). While I do not believe enjoyment necessarily denotes a space as engaging, I believe Becky provided evidence of how her enjoyment of the CO Circles was founded in her engagement in the discussions that within them occurred. To Becky, CO Circle was a space in which students came together to learn from one another, which she thought was
"really cool" (line BE-4). Becky seemed to believe coming together in a CO Circle and discussing multiple perspectives was an engaging learning space for students, such as herself.

In contrast to Becky's perceptions and experiences in the lived spaces of CO Circle, some students perceived the CO Circles as disengaging spaces, in which they strongly disliked participating. Again, while students' feelings about the spaces do not necessarily mean the same thing as engagement, their attitudes towards learning influence their engagement in the learning spaces. For example, Amy brought up her dislike of CO Circles twice during her interview. She did not experience or perceive the CO Circle as one in which Connect members were listening to one another, thus she perceived the CO Circle as a disengaging learning space. Her first mention of the CO Circle came in response to my question about what her least favorite part of Connect was. She said:

```
AM-1 I hate sitting in the circle
AM-2 I hate sitting in that circle when we spend an entire day in the circle
AM-3 why
AM-4 there's no point
AM-5 I just
AM-6 I know that people want to get their voices out
AM-7 but I think it would be a lot more effective to split up into groups and sit in a smaller circle and have discussions for a half an hour and everybody get their voices out and do something
AM-8 like go somewhere cool like the one time
AM-9 I was here for spring break with Erma and we were doing this art thing
AM-10 that was really cool we got to go out in town we got to go
AM-11 places and go to do things
AM-12 and it was really neat and I liked that and I was hoping there could be more like that (Amy’s Interview, April 4, 2012)
```

Amy, unlike Becky, did not think large group discussions were "effective" (line AM-7). She suggested "split[ting] up into groups and sit[ting] in a smaller circle" even though she would hear fewer perspectives than in the CO Circle (line AM-7). Amy also suggested,
instead of spending so much time in CO Circle discussions, Connect members could "go out in town" (line AM-10) and "do things" (line AM-11) like Erma had planned for the Connect students who did not have spring break the week of March 19, 2012 (line AM-9). Amy further expounded on her discontent in CO Circle discussions about twenty minutes later in her interview. She stated:

AM-1 like someone will say something and then it'll spark an idea in them
AM-2 and they'll kind of morph it into their own idea and they'll spit it out
AM-3 but it's still the same essential idea with their little add-ons
AM-4 and like
AM-5 back when there were a couple times we were sitting in the circle and I would share some things
AM-6 and they would be really insightful not to brag but I said a couple of insightful things over the year
AM-7 just a few but
AM-8 but there were like three people who went after me and they said the same exact thing
AM-9 but it was a little bit different and it was just kind of weird I guess
AM-10 I hope I don't do that I bet I do
AM-11 I don't mind that they go off of whatever my idea is
AM-12 I mean I think it's kind of a compliment that they thought my idea was good
AM-13 but
AM-14 they could have written it in their notebooks or something
AM-15 they them sharing just took up more time and we spent more time in the circle (Amy’s Interview, April 4, 2012)

Amy admitted about a minute later in our interview that "I don't listen in the circle when people are talking unless it [sic] David Erma or you I don't think you've shared in the circle or Stephanie or Steven." Amy did not agree with Becky that CO Circle discussions helped Connect members learn from one another. Amy experienced and perceived the CO Circle as a disengaging space in which people presented "the same essential idea with their little add-ons" (line AM-3) or "said the same exact thing but it was a little different" (lines AM-8 & AM-9). She suggested those who spoke after her "really insightful" (line
AM-6) comments "could have written it in their notebooks or something" instead of taking up more class time by sharing essentially her idea again (line AM-14). Amy perceived CO Circles as disengaging spaces because she did not learn from others as they often repeated one another's thoughts. She perceived she learned more effectively when she went out on field trips and did something.

The CO Circle was the primary language practice of Connect during my 54 observations. David and Erma set up the CO Circle as an engaging learning space in which members came together as equal participants to share with one another their perspectives in order to learn from and with one another. Some students, such as Becky, experienced CO Circle discussions in much the same way as David and Erma conceived the space would operate. but other students, such as Amy, experienced CO Circle discussions as disengaging spaces that were not effective learning spaces. How students experienced CO Circle discussions was individualized and varied across time, spaces, and topics on the floor, but I believe Becky and Amy offered some help in understanding when, where, and under what conditions CO Circles were engaging spaces. In order to be engaging, CO Circles, or other whole class discussions, need to be spaces in which participants were effectively communicating with one another, which required active listening and uptake of one another's ideas. In addition, in order to be engaging, CO Circles, or other whole class, discussions needed to be spaces focused on particular topics that offer opportunities for participants to share multiple perspectives in ways they could not otherwise do in the classroom space.

Students did not bring up the perceptions about CO Circles as being community generative spaces. While Erma had introduced the CO Circle as one in which all
members came together as equals, students did not talk about this during the interviews. During my observations, I did not note many instances in which the CO Circle seemed to be acting as a strong community generative space, but it did provide the primary space for community sharing of various experiences and literacy and language practices. The only times in which CO Circles seemed to be strong community generative spaces occurred during Community Days, which happened twice during my observations. Community Days involved CO Circle discussions focused on the positive aspects of the Connect community and the areas Connect members would like to see improved in the future in regards to the Connect community. In general, CO Circles were spaces in which Connect members discussed their identities, their experiences, the figured worlds in which they lived, and the fields of power that operated in their lives with one another. In CO Circles, Connect members bared their souls to one another, supported one another, and tried to work out differences of opinions and other problems that arose. The CO Circle provided the collective figured world of Connect with a way in which to practice behaviors found in community generative spaces, and perhaps its invisibility as such a space points to its importance as one of the "significant regularities" (Holland et al., 1998, p. 53) in Connect spaces.

**Artifact 2: Field trips.** David and/or Erma selected 17 places/spaces for Connect members to go to as field trips throughout my observations. According to Erma, “we do to our best ability use the community as our campus and as our library so to speak” (Erma’s Interview, April 5, 2012). Field trips were thus a way to bring Connect members into the MidwestCity community in ways that students often seemed to find engaging, but they often did not seem to take up field trips as community generative spaces.
According to my field notes, students' visible behaviors of engagement, such as note-taking, eye contact, and other non-verbal signs, such as nodding of one's head, differed greatly among individual students as well as across times, days, and places/spaces. Despite the varying levels of engagement I noted in my field notes, Amy, Crystal and Chelsey both discussed the engaging spaces they believed field trips to be that differed from their experiences in the figured worlds of their SPEs and the field of schooling.

Amy, during her discussion about CO Circle, brought up what she would prefer to do instead of sitting in the circle discussing topics with her classmates. She had elaborated how she found CO Circle disengaging, and she believed she was more engaged during the field trips over spring break. She stated:

AM-1 I was here for spring break with Erma and we were doing this art thing
AM-2 that was really cool we got to go out in town we got to go
AM-3 places and go to do things
AM-4 and it was really neat and I liked that and I was hoping there could be more like that (Amy’s Interview, April 4, 2012)

Amy’s desire to have more field trips seemed to be influenced by her engagement in the different learning spaces of Connect. Amy provided me with how she perceived the learning spaces of Connect, and I acknowledge that students’ perceptions vary across spaces and activities. Crystal and Chelsey, however, supported Amy’s perceptions about learning spaces at Connect by providing conceptions of and lived experiences in learning that further support the inclusion of field trips in the figured worlds of their SPEs and the field of schooling.

Crystal, who largely took up David and Erma’s conceptions of their figured world of Connect, believed the field trips of Connect helped her learn better than the
experiences she had in her SPE. When I asked Crystal to define learning during her interview, she shared her belief in the importance of experiential learning in the following way:

CR-1 I think as human beings
CR-2 and coming from the psychology student
CR-3 we learn through experience and by doing things
CR-4 like you can show someone a pamphlet or a video on how to
CR-5 make bread for example
CR-6 but
CR-7 then they go to do it
CR-8 they'd probably have to be thinking back to it you could
CR-9 the way I learn people showed me how like this is how you make the bread
CR-10 like
CR-11 showing me and doing it together at the same time
CR-12 and I don't like textbooks
CR-13 because I'm just reading about it I'm not
CR-14 seeing it
CR-15 I guess that's why I like movies because
CR-16 like history documentaries or
CR-17 because I can see it
CR-18 **Christy:** you kind of feel like you're experiencing it when you're
CR-19 **Crystal:** yeah
CR-20 **Christy:** at least for me when I see a movie I feel like
CR-21 almost there
CR-22 **Crystal:** like you're
CR-23 yeah
CR-24 **Christy:** so do you think CO does†
CR-25 **Crystal:** yes they take us out and we get to see things first hand and we get to do things and
CR-26 a lot of stuff you would not do in normal schools
CR-27 **Christy:** okay
CR-28 **Crystal:** a lot of things we wouldn't do in school (laughs)
CR-29 **Christy:** like what sorts of things are you thinking about†
CR-30 **Crystal:** field trips
CR-31 **Christy:** field trips
CR-32 do you do any field trips at your home school
CR-33 **Crystal:** (shakes her head side to side to indicate no)
CR-34 it's like we go to the Near Center
CR-35 we got to go around and see all the different shops and
CR-36 see the artists and going to the Central Market
CR-37 a lot of things called center up here
Christy: yes we do
Crystal: and got to eat our way around there and experience a lot of different cultural and different types of food and that was fun
Christy: I forgot about that trip that was a good one
Crystal: and the synagogue the mosque the Hindu temple the Buddhist temple
those were all first hand
got to go there got to see it got to do it experiences
Christy: can you think of an example from your home school where you're doing an experience↑
Crystal: my history teacher having us reenact trench warfare (laughs)
Christy: oh (laughs)
that's cool
(Crystal laughs)
how did that go↑
did your side win or↑
Crystal: we have no idea (laughs)
Christy: did you do it in the classroom↑
Crystal: yeah
turned over all the desks and chairs and created trench warfare (laughs)
(Crystal’s Interview, April 4, 2012)

This segment ended as I shifted the topic by asking another interview question. Crystal began by describing how she defined learning, which humans do “through experiences and by doing things” (line CR-3). When I followed up by asking her if that type of learning occurred at CO, she provided field trips to Near Center (line CR-34), Central Market (line CR-36), “the synagogue the mosque the Hindu temple [and] the Buddhist temple” (line CR-42) as examples of experiential learning at Connect. She compared her experiences at Connect, which she described as “got to go there got to see it got to do it experiences” (lines CR-44-CR-45), with her experiences at her SPE and the field of schooling. She claimed that Connect involved “a lot of stuff you would not do in normal schools” (line CR-26), but she did provide one example from her SPE of
experiential learning, which occurred within the classroom not on a field trip. Crystal seemed to believe field trips involved Connect members in experiential learning, which led to their deeper engagement in the process than “just reading about it” (line CR-13).

Like Crystal, Chelsey believed humans learned best through experiential learning. When I asked Chelsey about experiential learning experiences at her home school, she replied:

CH-1 we don't have field trips but
CH-2 I know in my IB class which is probably the most experimental class we have
CH-3 we do dissect something like every+
CH-5 well recently it's been like every other week

Chelsey stated field trips did not occur at her SPE, but she believed her IB bio class provided her with experiential learning through the use of dissections on a nearly weekly basis. The artifactual literacy and language practice of field trips was perceived by Amy as more engaging than CO Circle while Chelsey and Crystal perceived field trips as more engaging because they involved experiential learning, through which humans learn most deeply by engaging in doing things. Amy, Chelsey, and Crystal seem to suggest the field of schooling and their SPEs are not aligned with how humans learn best. The artifactual evidence from Connect of taking students to different places/spaces in order to learn from experts might challenge educators and policy makers to rethink their inclusion in the mandated curriculum though I acknowledge that the rules and laws from one’s school(s) and/or states may not allow field trips to occur in the same ways as they did in Connect spaces.
Artifact 3: Guest speakers. According to my field notes, students' visible behaviors of engagement, such as note-taking, eye contact, and other non-verbal signs, such as nodding of one's head, differed greatly among individual students as well as across times and days. Students' engagement with guest speakers seemed to also vary based on the guest speaker, his or her presentation style and skills, and the topic he or she was presenting. While guest speakers did not seem to provide particular evidence for when, where, and under what conditions spaces may become community generative, they did seem to provide some evidence for more fully understanding engaging spaces in the field of schooling.

The Connect artifact of guest speakers seemed to provide insights into how students perceived Connect spaces to be more engaging than the spaces in their SPEs and the larger field of schooling. Crystal and Chelsey both compared the Connect artifact of guest speakers with their lived experiences in their SPEs. In Crystal's figured world of her SPE, the teachers tended to be positioned as the experts in the classroom spaces. Other sources of information, such as textbooks or videos, might also be positioned as authorities on particular content. When I asked Crystal if interest affected her engagement, she provided the following response:

CR-1 like you go to like normal school [i.e. SPE] and like the teachers droning on and
CR-2 the kids gets bored and distracted and they don't
CR-3 they're not as engaged but
CR-4 I guess here we have a lot of room to talk
CR-5 and voice our opinions and say what we think
CR-6 and it's not really like the teachers are reading off saying this is what it is
CR-7 we go to professionals and they say
CR-8 oh we do this but sometimes we do this and they show us
CR-9 and it's not like reading from a textbook for two hours (laughs) (Crystal’s Interview, April 4, 2012)
Crystal's reply then turned towards describing the options students have at Connect in their reading materials, which shifted our discussion away from how knowledge was presented in her learning spaces. In Crystal's figured world of Connect, unlike "normal school" (like CR-1), "we go to professionals...and it's not like reading from a textbook for two hours" (lines CR 7 & CR-9). Crystal seemed to be engaged in learning that involved talking with and learning from professionals who say "...we do this but sometimes we do this and they show us" (line CR-8). Engaging spaces to Crystal involved learning about the changing nature of the topic and learning how to do things from people who are involved in the topic rather than reading about the topic from a decontextualized textbook, where the text often tells rather than shows how to do things.

Like Crystal, Chelsey also believed guest speakers were one type of Connect artifact, which helped to create engaging spaces. During her interview and in response to my question about experiential learning, Chelsey also discussed guest speakers and her desire to have more of them at her SPE. She described the "Connecty experience" (line CH-7) of having guest speakers in her SPE's International Baccalaureate Biology class. Chelsey said:

CH-1 we had lots of labs and things like that and
CH-2 we were talking about the olfactory system and we had a dog like a drug dog come in and
CH-3 explain like how that works and like training and how animal behavior works and all of that kind of stuff
CH-4 as well
CH-5 and+
CH-6 so it's kind of been a big
CH-7 Connecty experience but like
CH-8 I'll talk to my teacher and I'll be like can we have this speaker come in
CH-9 can we have a speaker like this↑ and she's just like what↑
I then changed the topic of our interview by asking Chelsey the next question on the interview question list, so this segment ended. Chelsey's figured world of Connect seemed to include guest speakers as she labeled her lived experiences in her IB Biology class as "Connecty" (line CH-7) because "a drug dog" was brought in as they discussed "olfactory system" (line CH-2). When Chelsey approached her teacher to ask about other guest speakers who might come in, as she had experienced 20 times in Connect spaces, her teacher seemed surprised (lines CH-8-CH-9). Chelsey believed at "regular schools" (line CH-12) engaging spaces created by guest speakers could not occur more often because "it takes time out of the curriculum" (line CH-10).

For Chelsey and Crystal, guest speakers were an integral part of their figured worlds of Connect, and the co-constructed learning spaces that occurred as a result of their presence in Connect spaces engaged students in learning from professionals in ways they did not feel occurred in their SPEs or the field of schooling, where the curriculum and textbooks reigned. As evidenced in the Connect artifactual literacy and language practice of guest speakers, students engaged in learning through discussions with experts and one another around content knowledge topics. After these experiences with guest speakers, Connect members took time to debrief with one another about the multiple perspectives and content knowledge they heard. Students, such as Crystal and Chelsey, found this literacy and language practice as more engaging than simply hearing and/or reading about the content as they commonly experienced in their SPEs and its
classrooms. It is time for educators to rethink the importance of the ways in which we provide students with content expertise in the classroom.

**Artifact 4: Outside learning projects.** While Outside Learning Projects seemed to follow the advice Amy gave during her interview of Connect activities needing to involve going out and doing things in MidwestCity, the Outside Learning Projects did not seem to create engaging learning spaces. Student engagement seems to be more involved than simply going on field trips and/or doing things, and the Outside Learning Projects seemed to suggest two additional pieces that are helpful in engaging students in learning spaces. First, teachers need to be aware and supportive of learning students are doing across spaces in ways that show they value all types of learning and knowledge in the classroom. Second, teachers need to be aware of and empathetic to the other places/spaces and figured worlds students must navigate and/or negotiate on a daily basis. Chelsey and Callie provided these additional insights into the creation of engaging learning spaces.

As I analyzed the data involving the Outside Learning Projects, I realized Chelsey had mentioned two different religious services, which included the evangelical church in H-Burb in the Classroom Transcript from November 7, 2011 and the Jain temple she had posted about on Facebook she "planned" to attend. It was interesting then as I looked over the completion record table (Appendix D) to see that she did not complete a written reflective text for the World Religions Outside Learning assignment. During her interview, Chelsey provided me with a deeper understanding of her own orchestrations of learning across places/spaces and the power of teachers in constructing what counts as
learning. When I asked her about what she might not share with future, potential Connect students, she stated:

CH-1 and it's so much work
CH-2 because I'm getting ready for all my IB [International Baccalaureate] tests but I'm also having to balance all their [motions with head nod towards the auditorium indicating David and Erma] projects and it's not like they're really asking all that much of you
CH-3 but for some reason I guess because I'm not crazy happy about my classes at school
CH-4 I'm trying to put Connect on top
CH-5 and because it's something new and I don't know
CH-6 it's just hard because you've got to balance out
CH-7 each one
CH-8 and I mean
CH-9 IB asks for like one hundred and twenty-seven hours outside of class to be devoted to each IB class that you do

CH-10 Christy: and you have how many↑
CH-11 Chelsey: I have three right now
CH-12 and Connect takes at least like
CH-13 probably a hundred twenty-seven hours outside of class and that's why like outside learnings are difficult because like
CH-14 I mean I have a job too [at a barn]
CH-15 I've got a job
CH-16 I've got a horse I have to take care of
CH-17 like I don't know it's just a lot of work
CH-18 it's hard to balance things out
CH-19 Christy: but you need
CH-20 like you need to work
CH-21 you need to [be with] the horse because that's what you're [going to do in life]

CH-22 Chelsey: I mean that's what my career is
CH-23 that's the thing I always feel bad about not putting
CH-24 certain things ahead of other things
CH-25 but I always put the barn ahead of everything else because
CH-26 I'm going to school to be an equestrian
CH-27 I'm going to school to be a professional horseman
CH-28 I'm not coming to school to be an accountant or
CH-29 teach anything so I'm not I don't know
CH-30 I'm not as engaged in school as I am at the barn
CH-31 I learn more at
CH-32 in the three years that I've been at the barn I feel like I've learned more than I have in the twelve years I have been in high school
CH-33 er in school
Chelsey's response influenced me to change the order of the interview questions at that time, so I responded to Chelsey's answer by asking her interview question 10, which asked about her interest in the program and shifted the topic on the interview. Chelsey reminded me that students had multiple places/spaces in which they participate on a daily basis, and each of these places/space offer learning opportunities. For Chelsey, her daily lived spaces included her SPE with its IB coursework (line CH-2), Connect with its various projects (line CH-2), the barn as well as her own horse (lines CH-14-CH-16), and her home with her family, which she had discussed prior in our interview. She had to orchestrate each of these lived spaces and figured worlds, while at the same time orchestrating her own identities and actions within them while thinking about her past, present, and future. While the Outside Learning Projects seemed to interest Chelsey based on her sharing in CO Circle and on Facebook, she chose not to complete the written portion of the assignment as she struggled to "balance things out" in her busy life among various spaces and figured worlds that competed for her limited time and energies. Chelsey also brought up how engaged she was in learning at the barn (line CH-30), yet she believed the figured world of her SPE and the figured world of Connect did not value the learning she gained at the barn, as these figured worlds valued learning that helped students become accountants (line CH-28) and teachers (line CH-29). Despite Erma's conception of learning occurring "anywhere anytime" (line 3, Classroom Transcript, September 6, 2011), Chelsey's "outside learning" at the barn did not count in figured world of Connect since it was already something she was doing in her local
neighborhood, and Chelsey, thus, did not try to bring in her "outside learning" from the
barn into Connect spaces or the Connect artifact known as the Outside Learning Project.

David and Erma often referred to the Outside Learning assignments as easy to
complete (i.e. Classroom Transcript, September 6, 2011), but Callie provided insights
into the complicated orchestrations involved in the completion of these "easy" Connect
assignments and other literacy practices. Callie provided me with a deeper understanding
of the complexities involved in navigating across geographic places in order to
successfully complete Outside Learning Projects as well as be a CO person. During her
interview, I asked Callie to describe herself as a CO student because we had heard David
tell us to live a CO life from the first day of Connect. Callie explained a continuum of
Connect people. She said "Kristy [CO2 exemplar who often attended CO1 class as a
guest and/or participant] is like the CO student and CO1 Non-Participant's like don't do
anything CO1 Non-participant does...I would fall closer to Kristy..." She, however,
struggled to identify herself as a CO person, because she admitted she did not "go to
anything on the CO [Facebook] page." Callie continued:

CA-1  but I go to the art classes†
CA-2  and I go to City Art Space and I go to the Cultural Arts Center when I feel
      like it
CA-3  and I visit artists at 400 West Central and yeah
CA-4  I just don't
CA-5  I don't have a car and it's kind of like I have to know my boundaries about
      where I can get after school
CA-6  so yeah that's kind of
CA-7  (2 seconds pause)
CA-8  I've been everywhere downtown
CA-9  like everywhere
CA-10 (We talked about Callie's lack of car, and then she continued)
CA-11 **Callie:** that's one of the major issues
CA-12  yeah
CA-13  or take the bus there
and I'm off the bus line
and that's also another issue cause then I don't have a way to get home
Christy: oh
Callie: so I kind of have to meet my mom at the library but I have to get
there before the library closes cause my mom is like late for everything
so [she needs to be inside the library before it closes or she will have to
stand outside and wait in the weather]
Christy: wow
Callie: I have to be home
like I have to be on the bus and it's like an hour long bus ride
and I have to be at the library by 8:45 (pm)
so it usually limits a lot of the things I can do
Christy: right
Callie: yeah
cause some of the stuff doesn't even start to 7:00 or 8:00 (pm)
wow
and it's an hour long bus ride
how do you get here↑
take the bus and I walk
yeah
it's not that long of a walk
Christy: will you take the bus back home↑
Callie: I take the bus to my mom's work
yeah
Christy: and then she takes you home↑
yeah unless I want to do something then I take the bus to the
library
ok gotcha you
wow
there's a lot of bus riding
Christy: there's a lot of bus riding do you get a lot of reading done or do
you do a lot of talking to other people or↑
a little bit of both
I don't really read that much cause I can't usually
I meant there's just so much going on that I want to look at it all
and also this is going to sound lame but I like make maps
and so like if I like see a store that I haven't seen before I'll like write it
down
so like it can always like kind of
if anyone's like hey where's a good place to eat oh there's a list of places
you can eat
like on Central Street because I know Central Street pretty well too cause
I ride the bus everyday
and so I like switch between windows to like see different places
Christy: so you're constantly paying attention to the locations you are passing
Callie: yeah yeah
Christy: that's awesome
Callie: oh thanks (Callie’s Interview, April 4, 2012)

This segment of the interview ended as I began a narrative about knowing the city by bus instead of knowing it by car, which shifted the topic away from Callie's navigation among places to complete Outside Learning Projects as well as CO identity work. Callie participated in multiple lived spaces, and she, like Chelsey, was involved in orchestrating her own identities and actions in these spaces. Unlike Chelsey's experience, Callie's orchestrations among places/spaces involved physically getting herself from one place to the next, which involved intricate planning. Callie seemed to take up Erma's conception of learning "anywhere anytime" (line 3, Classroom Transcript, September 6, 2011) as she learned how to successfully navigate transportation among places/spaces, such as art classes (line CA-1), downtown art spaces (line CA-2 & CA-3), the library (line CA-17), Connect (line CA-5), her mom's work (line CA-34), and her home (line CA-20). Getting to Outside Learning events, which were also part of being a CO person, was no easy task for Callie. During our interview, much like in Chelsey's interview, Callie also provided another example of students' outside learning experiences that were not necessarily taken up in the David's or Erma's figured worlds of Connect. Callie improvised a learning and literacy space on her bus rides, as she noticed and mapped the places she passed along the route. Callie's literacy practice in the bus space was something she thought others would find "lame" (line CA-45), and, even in the collective figured world of Connect, Callie did not feel comfortable sharing this improvised literacy practice in Connect spaces.
The Outside Learning Projects had been set up by Erma as an opportunity to build community though I did not collect evidence that supports students taking up the Outside Learning Projects as a community generative space. Erma's set-up of the Outside Learning Projects as a community generative space, occurred during her introduction of the assignment on September 6, 2011. After students read the assignment sheet David had distributed, Erma said:

1. you know so I really really encourage you not to just say [deeper voice as if mimicking a student] okay I'll just get this done later
2. but hook with other people here and do things
3. it's the way you build community you have new experiences **together**
4. it creates a bond
5. yes↑ [calls on a Non-Participant with this questioning yes]
6. **Non-Participant** asks whether a certain event will count.
7. **Erma:** It sounds like it the truth of the matter is we have not been to every single event in MidwestCity so to some degree we trust you to make the decision to whether or not this is good enough for an outside learning paper
   (Classroom Transcript, September 6, 2011, minute 36.40)

The segmented ended as David took the floor to explain the Outside Learning Assignment further. This is one of only a few instances in which David or Erma seemed to provide direction instruction on how to build the Connect community. She encouraged students to "hook with other people here and do things" (line 2). She explained by doing so the students would "build community" through creating a "bond" around experiencing things "together," which she emphasized with louder intonation (lines 3-4). While Erma tried to construct the Outside Learning Project as a community generative space, no one seemed to take up this construction. Even in the above transcript, the next speaker on the floor did not take up Erma's discourse on community as she focused on whether or not a specific event would be counted by David or Erma when grading the assignment.
Artifact 5: Facebook wall. The Connect Facebook wall provided members with an online space in which they could co-construct either existing or new engaging and/or community generative spaces. Despite the negativity towards such uses of online social networking sites in the field of schooling, Connect members provided evidence for how supervised use of a class Facebook wall could help teachers and students co-construct engaging and/or community generative spaces with one another across time and spaces. For example, since David and Erma had positioned students as the ones in charge of planning experiences with one another, students turned to the Facebook wall to coordinate getting together outside of Connect time and spaces. Planning get-together posts seemed to function as community generating spaces in which students could suggest, invite, and organize common experiences with one another in ways that created communal bonds and sense of belonging among Connect members. Some students, such as Naomi and Callie, took up this role of Connect community generators on Facebook in ways I did not observe them doing during Connect class time.

The Facebook wall also provided a space in which Connect members could continue to engage in learning content knowledge/skills outside of Connect class time and spaces. David, Erma, and students could extend CO Circle discussions and other Connect activities through the use of the Facebook wall. Topics of interest could be posted by any member of the Connect Facebook group, and these content knowledge/skills posts often included weblinks, videos, or other texts that provided further information for anyone who was further interested in the topic. Content knowledge/skills posted also provided Connect members with information that might help them form closer bonds with one another as they found out what topics interested
one another. Finding shared interests helped students feel like part of a group, and receiving comments and/or likes to one's posts provided students with support.

Pictures/videos from class posts allowed students to orchestrate the lived spaces of Connect with their online spaces in the form of social networking. As the name implies, social networking sites, such as Facebook, provide users with online spaces to share artifacts from their lives with others in the form of an online community. At Connect, the group Facebook wall provided an online space for students to post pictures and/or videos with one another in ways that showed not only their engagement in Connect activities but also their interactions with one another as a community. Belinda, who photographed the Holiday Party and posted 23 of her pictures to the Facebook wall, used her photography skills and talent to create and/or capture community generative spaces through her camera's lens. She then posted her photos to Facebook to create deeper and more far reaching communal bonds among Connect members as they could view, comment, and reminisce about the community event referred to as the Holiday Party. In their picture or videos post from the rap/hip hop group's presentation, both Mark and Naomi showed their engagement in the Connect learning spaces created by David and Erma's assignment as well as the hip hop/rap group's presentation in response to David and Erma’s assignment. They then took their documented engagement and posted it to the Connect Facebook wall in a way that created support among Connect members and communal bonds over group experiences.

Facebook seems to offer educators an effective online space in which teachers and students can participate with one another in ways that create engaging and/or community generative spaces, though this online space can be a slippery slope in educative settings.
By setting up a closed Facebook group, with David and Erma as the administrators, this particular Connect space provided an online space in which Connect members could continue to engage in spaces created in class and/or create new engaging and/or community generative spaces among themselves from time and spaces outside of Connect. While Facebook provided the opportunity for such co-constructions of spaces, not everyone took up Facebook in such ways. Some students even resisted using Facebook at all in their participation of Connect literacy and language practices, which was not detrimental to their position in the Connect class spaces, though they did miss opportunities outside of class spaces as other members created and provided these opportunities in their Facebook posts.

**Perceived Spaces: Connect Members' Perceptions of Community Generative Spaces at Connect**

As I noted at the beginning of this chapter, “The 17 Guiding Principles” (Appendix C) offered a framework for the collective figured world of Connect. While the word community is absent from “The 17 Guiding Principles,” feelings of belongingness and care, both factors in community generation, seem most apparent in Principle 2, which is the program's belief "in the creation of caring relationships among students and between individual students and their facilitators,” and Principle 4, which is the program's belief "that in a trusting, emotionally safe environment students are able to fully express their ideas and personalities, feel valued, and gain self-confidence." How Connect members perceived and possibly took up these principles in their co-constructions of Connect spaces differed widely.
David, who had the most years of experience with Connect and a more crystallized identity with the program, seemed to emphasize the importance of community more often than Erma both during his interview and his interactions with students throughout the year. David's emphasis on community might be a result of his position as a social studies teacher, whose training and standards support his role as an creator of democratic citizens for the future. As an example of David's focus on community, on the first day of school, while discussing procedural tasks at Connect, he elaborated on Connect parking procedures. David talked about how parking in the church lot instead of the appropriate Connect lot could break the community. He stated:

1. in that it [parking in the church lot] starts to unravel the kind of fabric of a community  
2. do you know what I'm saying↑  
3. like it starts to be like hey what do you why do you and then there starts to be a kind of certain acrimony and a negativity because somebody resents you  
4. because you're  
5. not respecting the game that we're in  
6. so don't do it just not because you don't want to be that guy but also because you don't want to undo this community in that way  
7. by kind of creating this division or derisiveness or negativity  
8. does that make sense↑ (Classroom Transcript, August 29, 2011, minute 12.30)

Erma then took the floor and shifted the topic of discussion to another Connect procedure, which were the sign-in/sign-out sheets on the table by the main entrance to the auditorium, and she did not take up the term "community" as she went over how students needed to sign in and out every day. Throughout the transcripts from the first day of class, David assumed that the Connect members were a community (line 6), in which members should not create "negativity" (lines 3 & 7) by "not respecting the game that we're in" (line 5). David's use of community as a game seems to imply Connect members
should use strategies to create a Connect community, which seemed to be the end goal of the game, and he provided Connect members with a few strategies, such as not parking in the church parking lot and not bringing in "acrimony and a negativity" into Connect spaces. According to David, winning the game of community involved people who followed the Connect rules (line 1) and worked against "creating this division or derisiveness or negativity" (line 7). As in the above example, David typically used the word community during class discussions more often than Erma.

David had mentioned community in various ways throughout our interview but I specifically asked him to explain to me why he believed community was such an important component of Connect. He responded to my question in the following way:

DA-1 I think we have lost a lot of community in our culture
DA-2 and I think if you look back fifty years ago that people had more
DA-3 stronger neighborhood communities
DA-4 stronger you know places of worship communities
DA-5 stronger connected like now with
DA-6 in some ways the global
DA-7 technology and communication has created like
DA-8 way more of an international global community kids can be connected to people all over the world and playing you know virtual games with kids from Australia or whatever
DA-9 but I think it's really diminished in many ways our local communities
DA-10 so
DA-11 a big part of Connect is about kind of helping kids develop and sustain a real meaningful local community
DA-12 and
DA-13 I mean what that means to us is that
DA-14 kind of I mean you know one of our you know seventeen guiding principles is
DA-15 about we believe you know diversity makes us stronger because it enables us to kind of know
DA-16 reach new understandings of the world
DA-17 and all that stuff
DA-18 we're trying to do that with bringing diverse class of kids together
DA-19 and we're trying to help them
I then shifted the topic of discussion to understanding the amount of students they target for the program each year, as David's discussion in lines DA-27-DA-30 had aroused my curiosity about why 50 students had been selected this year when I knew the CO1 group of the 2010-2011 school year was smaller. Throughout the above answer as I listened to David explaining the importance of community to Connect, I was reminded of coursework I completed during my undergraduate studies in social studies education. David, while not specifically citing critics of American society such as Alexis de Tocqueville (1831) or Robert Putnam (1995), described their critiques of the rise of individualism and independence over community and interdependence. David believes Connect is an important learning space for students to learn to skills, such as "develop and sustain a real meaningful local community" (line DA-11), "build bridges to each other and build up that community" (line DA-20), and "bridge differences and to work
together and to overcome you know differences of opinion or differences of style or differences of background" (lines DA-35-DA-36). David conceived his figured world of Connect to be a "small scale model for kids to learn how to be" a community (line DA-34), which, as I will describe below, some students took up and others challenged and/or resisted.

During class, David was more likely to use the word community in his speech than Erma was in her discourse. Erma, however, also believed community was "really important to Connect," though her conceptions and perceptions about its importance differed from David. When I asked Erma during her interview if community was an important piece of Connect, Erma's explanation involved not the field of social studies or other global perspectives but the figured world of adolescence and their need to feel supported and/or part of a group. When I asked her about community during our interview, she elaborated on why "community is really important to Connect" in the following way:

ER-1 first of all I think it's important that the kids are meeting other kids outside of their neighborhood because the MidwestCity Cosmopolitan area is very self-segregated through neighborhoods
ER-2 you'll have kids from H-Burb who have never left H-Burb
ER-3 it's amazing to me because I did not come from a world like that
ER-4 so I think it's really important and not just for issues of meeting people of a different race or ethnic or class background
ER-5 it's just important to get out of your bubble
ER-6 and I think
ER-7 at the beginning of every Connect year you have the Connect high
ER-8 the kids are meeting new people everyone has chosen to be there which I could complain about the community and what-not but
ER-9 you know I've taught in schools where you know kids don't want to be there and the parents don't care these kids have chosen to be there
ER-10 their parents are supporting them driving downtown every day into who knows where

Christy: and some of them are paying for it
Erma: some kids are paying for it so+
so you already have kids who want to be there and they're kind of on this
level of well we're all here to discover something
so you always have this Connect high and the community gets really close
and the first art show they bare their souls+
and (makes grunting noise)
so I think that's really important
I think it allows some of the students to take
artistic risks maybe not academic risks but they definitely do take artistic
risks and feel supported
and feel like they're a part of something
because all these kids want to belong
and that's another main reason I think they come to Connect it's they do
not feel they belong in their school
(1 second pause)
and they found something they belong in
but then you hit like December or January
the first second or third community day [CO Circle discussion focused on
the positive aspects of community at Connect as well as those areas that
need to be worked on] is cliques have formed and drama happens
which to some degree is human nature the whole birds of a feather thing
some years are worse than others
but by and large kids have each others' backs

and I think
David and I and to a lesser extent the student teachers do a great deal to
create a space for that community
in today's world of testing and day-by-day curricular goals
nobody can take a day to create a classroom culture or create a classroom
community and we're very much invested in doing that (Erma’s Interview,
April 5, 2012)

Erma then paused for 2 seconds after line ER-32, and we shifted the topic of the
interview towards the Connect practice called Community Day, which involved Connect
members talking about things they liked as well as wanted to change in the Connect
community. While this discussion on Community Day provided evidence of one way in
which Erma believes David and she "create(s) a space for that community in today's
world of testing and day-by-day curricular goals" (line ER-31), the topic did not provide
further insights into her conceptions and perceptions of Connect as a community. In the
excerpt above, Erma's explanation of the importance of community at Connect drew upon the figured world of adolescence in which teenagers are trying to find themselves and need the support of adults and one another to do so. Also, perhaps in her position as "just the" co-facilitator (line ER-17, Erma’s Interview, April 5, 2012) and her identity as a woman, who took up the gendered role of care-giver, Erma focused on the needs of adolescence in her care instead of the larger global reasons for creating community generative spaces at Connect.

David's or Erma's conceptions and perceptions of Connect spaces and their figured worlds of Connect were taken up, changed, and/or resisted by students as they co-constructed the Connect spaces and the collective figured world of Connect through their every day interactions and participation in literacy and language events and practices. I could not understand fully how students perceived Connect spaces and their figured worlds of Connect through classroom observations, so I asked five focal students to help me understand their perceptions through individual interviews in March and April of 2012. While they supported David's and/or Erma's conceptions of Connect as a community, they offered different perspectives on how they actually experienced the Connect spaces and their figured worlds of Connect.

During their interviews, two focal students focused their discussions about Connect as a community on the formation of cliques, which they felt detrimentally affected members' senses of belonging. Amy, a senior from G-Burb, believed the community aspect of Connect was important enough to share with future prospective students, and she, at first, thought she would hesitate to tell them about the cliques. When I asked her what she would share with future prospective students, she answered:
you really get to know everybody in the group
you get
to make friends and stuff
even the people I don't know very well I still know them and it wouldn't be weird of me to go talk with them
so I think that's really cool
I think the community part that Connect has
yeared to create was really successful I think that they've really done a good job
and it's not like we're all one big happy family cause I know there's people who don't like people and
I mean that's fine and that happens
but
I feel like there are a few people who are kind of outcasted because they've not found a good clique and so I mean
that doesn't personally affect me but I know there are a few people I kind of feel bad for
but honestly I don't like them very much so I
I don't know
... actually now that I'm thinking about it
I was going to say Crystal but her and NON-participant1 are pretty good friends I think
I don't know
I think there are people who are not in exact groups
but I do think they have friends so maybe that's not such a big thing
Christy: do you think there is just anybody completely without someone to talk to here?
Amy: I don't think so
I've not
I don't think I've seen anybody who just kind of sits there all by themselves cause even people like the quiet people like NON-participant2 and NON-participant3
Non-Participant2's got a girlfriend
and we hang out with him and stuff and
Non-Participant3 doesn't like sit and talk with people I go over and talk to him sometimes and I know people talk to him a lot and
I think him and Noah kind of talk they're friends
but
I
and Noah I feel like Noah's kind of dorky but he's still
he's got friends and stuff we talk to him like me and NON-participant4 and them
Amy continued to talk about students without a group, though largely she just listed more names and then listed their friends before I asked her the next question, which shifted the topic away from cliques. Amy thought the community aspect of Connect was one of the important components about which she would have informed future students, yet she believed cliques could be found in the community about which future students might not need to know as it might keep them from applying. As she talked with me, she seemed to realize that most every student had some other person with whom to talk, and she did not discuss how cliques particularly hurt students. She even stated that even though she knew "people who don't like people" (line AM-8), she knew "everybody in the group" (line AM-1) and "it wouldn't be weird of me to go talk with them" (line AM-4). Amy's perceived communal spaces involved cliques, which seemed to support Erma's perceptions of the Connect community. Amy's perceived figured world of Connect, however, was a community where students could belong and share themselves with others.

During her interview, Chelsey, a senior from D-Burb, shared her perception that Connect was not a community. She believed the cliques described by Amy actually rendered Connect a non-community as they did not work together to better their places/spaces. She was the only focal student who did not think Connect was a community, and she was also the only focal student to compare Connect to her local community of D-Burb, which she also believed was not a community. She explained why she believed Connect and D-Burb were not communities despite the rhetoric from both
spaces that they were communities. When I asked her about community at Connect, she stated:

CH-1 I think certain people get along with each other certain people don't and I think it's not
CH-2 (2 seconds pause)
CH-3 I think it's a front
CH-4 it's a lot like D-Burb
CH-5 I think (laughing)
CH-6 I think that we [D-Burb, or so I understood her to mean during the interview] preach that we're a community and we preach that we're
CH-7 this great like connected thing but
CH-8 I only know teenagers I don't know anything that any of these adults are doing for the community I don't know anything like that like
CH-9 really I don't think anyone is doing anything for D-Burb
CH-10 besides putting more money into things that
CH-11 aren't needed
CH-12 it's like putting
CH-13 eggs in a basket with a hole in the bottom you're just going to break stuff
CH-14 so it's like why
CH-15 why preach community if there is no community
CH-16 and honestly
CH-17 I mean yes there I've learned I've met a lot of people that I love here [Connect] like
CH-18 and I have but there are other people that
CH-19 I still think are very stuck in their ways and are not able to come out of their shell
CH-20 not shyness but like out of their
CH-21 (1 second pause)
CH-22 **Christy:** perspective
CH-23 **Chelsey:** mold that they're
CH-24 yeah they've been formed into and it's just like
CH-25 I don't know I just don't like that
CH-26 **Christy:** so do you think there are cliques of community perhaps↑
CH-27 like
CH-28 **Chelsey:** yes there are groups of friends it's like
CH-29 it's like high school it's a clique
CH-30 it's
CH-31 multiple different cliques and like I feel bad saying that cause this school [Connect] is like+
CH-32 oh we're different than home school lalala but it's really not
CH-33 the content's the only thing that's different
CH-34 **Christy:** they try
CH-35 **Chelsey:** yeah
Christy: I think
Chelsey: but I mean
that's just how people work
people are drawn to certain kinds of people people are not comfortable
with other kinds of people and that's just how they work (Chelsey’s
Interview, March 26, 2012)

I changed the focus of the interview by discussing how the MidwestCity community
seems to operate in a similar way to the one she described for Connect and D-Burb, and
then I asked another question, which shifted the focus of the interview discussion.
Chelsey believed Connect was not a community because the students did not care for all
Connect members and some of the members were unwilling to change (line CH-19). She
later admitted in line CH-29, however, that "it's like high school it's a clique," which is
similar to Erma's conception she shared in her interview, it "is human nature the whole
birds of a feather thing" (line ER-26, Erma’s Interview, April 5, 2012). Chelsey's
orchestrations of her experiences in her local community of D-Burb, which seemed to fit
with David's conceptions of lost communal ties, and with cliques in her high school with
her experiences in the Connect community led to a complicated perception of Connect as
"no community" (line CH-15). Chelsey was the only focal student who discussed her
experiences in her local community, despite David's conception that in his figured world
of Connect students learned how to become active participants in not only the Connect
community but also their local communities. Chelsey seemed to resist the conceptions of
community occurring within her lived spaces of D-Burb, her SPE, or Connect.

Two other focal students focused their discussions about Connect as a community
on how students feel like they belong, are supported by the group, and can, as Erma said,
"bare their souls" (line ER-14, Erma’s Interview, April 5, 2012). Callie, a junior from W-
Burb, and Crystal, a junior from West-Burb, both believed Connect was a community where they felt they could share things about themselves. In turn, Connect members would be interested in and supportive of whatever they shared with them. In her interview, Callie stated "even the person I like least here is like a better friend to me than like my best friend at W-Burb High." When I asked her to elaborate on what she meant by that, she added:

CA-1 like being able to tell them some things about my life
CA-2 like I wouldn't necessarily hang out with all of them after school but I can just share parts of myself and they aren't like oh
CA-3 poor [as in socioeconomic status] not talking to you anymore you know like
CA-4 they're like oh man that's so interesting and I'm like yeah (Callie’s Interview, April 4, 2012)

I then asked her the next question on the interview list, which shifted the topic away from community. Much like Amy, she "wouldn't necessarily hang out with all of them after school but I can just share parts of myself" (line CA-2) without judgment (CA-3). Connect as a community generative space seemed to be more of a support network based upon bonds of required shared time and spaces rather than a community based upon bonds of friendship built on the desire to spend time and spaces together. Callie, however, felt a sense of belonging, care, and support to bare her soul in ways missing in the spaces of her SPE. Similar to Callie's feelings on community, Crystal discussed the relationships among Connect members as it compared to her relationships at her SPE. She did so in response to my interview question of why she thought Connect was a community. She replied:

CR-1 we have all built relationships with each other and with David and Erma
CR-2 and it's like
CR-3 it's not like school where you see everyone in passing and
I then shifted the topic of the interview discussion by asking Crystal a question about her SPE. Like Callie, she believed her relationships at Connect were stronger than those she had experienced in the lived spaces of her SPE. She went further than any other focal student by stating "we have all built relationships with each other and with David and Erma" (line CR-1). Crystal seemed to be taking up David's conceptions of Connect as community, where everyone came together, and she is the only focal student who did not seem to change and/or resist the conception of Connect as a community. While both Crystal and Callie orchestrated their perceptions of Connect as a community with their experiences in the lived spaces of their SPEs, Crystal took up David's conceptions of Connect as a community in her perceptions in ways Callie did not. Callie resisted David's conceptions but perceived Connect as community of support that was missing in the lived spaces of her SPE.

Becky, during her interview, offered yet another perception on Connect spaces as community generative. She articulated the importance of community to "what Erma and David want for us" but she did not necessarily feel a part of the Connect community, as she did not share "the same" fundamental beliefs about life with other Connect members. Becky, a junior from Cosmo, has a strong belief system based in her religion of Protestant Christianity. She discussed how other Connect members did not believe in a god or an afterlife, and she felt disconnected from them as a result. When asked about Connect as a community, she said, "community is a good defining word even though it's
not completely there for me I think." In her interview, she elaborated on this statement when I asked her if Connect was a community and why or why not. She said:

BE-1 I think
BE-2 in theory that is the goal and that is what Erma and David want for us
BE-3 and I think the execution can be a little hazy because
BE-4 there are different views coming together and we are like a big mosaic of
different
BE-5 like pieces so+
BE-6 I think we try to be we try as best as we can to be and I think
BE-7 to some people
BE-8 maybe
BE-9 I don't know differently than me
BE-10 that it definitely is a place where they're just like absolutely best friends
ever and things like that
BE-11 but I think just for me having such different views than a lot of people and
feeling uncomfortable in certain situations and I have really like
BE-12 good friends at my school and people at my school care about learning so
it's eas like it's something we share as something that we care about
BE-13 so I think for me it's not
BE-14 quite what
BE-15 I don't know what it's supposed to be
BE-16 I think they are definitely people like it's cool to be able to have a
conversation with someone that is completely different from me and I
probably wouldn't have that opportunity if I wasn't here
BE-17 but I think that idea of being completely comfortable and being able to
talk to anyone about everything or anything is
BE-18 not quite there for me
BE-19 just because I think a lot of my views are different and there are some
people that
BE-20 there are definitely there are some people from my church here and others
that have like
BE-21 I have made it clear that they have very similar views that I do and
BE-22 I think it's cool to talk to them because it's like
BE-23 this really important thing is really important to you too so we have that
BE-24 as even just
BE-25 something that we have in common to start off with so I think
BE-26 those people and
BE-27 I don't know others too just getting to know people has been really great
but I think
BE-28 having that sort of camaraderie is a little different for me than
BE-29 for a lot of the other students who all share the same views (Becky’s
Interview, April 8, 2012)
Becky paused for one second, and I chose to ask her the next question on the interview list of questions, which shifted the topic. Becky seemed to define community as "camaraderie" (line BE-28), which she felt was missing at Connect for herself (lines BE-13, BE-18, & BE-28). She stated throughout her interview her strong Christian identity and how she worried that other people would judge her for her thoughts and spoken words, so while she agreed with other Connect members' conceptions of community involving belongingness, care, and support, she did not necessarily feel Connect provided those feelings for her. Her orchestrations of experiences with community at her SPE (line BE-12) and church as well as her strong Christian identity led to an appreciation for David's and Erma's conceptions of Connect as a community but a resistance of an identity as a Connect community member.

Students took up, orchestrated, and/or improvised their conceptions and perceptions of Connect as a community in different ways depending upon their own identities and previous experiences in other lived spaces and figured worlds, such as their SPEs, local communities, and/or churches. The students seemed to agree that community involved feelings of belongingness, care, and support, though they did not agree in their perceptions that the lived spaces and/or figured world of Connect included community generative spaces.

**Conclusion**

Throughout this chapter I have examined how Connect members conceived, perceived, and lived in Connect spaces as they participated in literacy and language events and practices on nearly a daily basis with one another. As evidenced in the artifactual literacy and language practices, the interconnections among spaces, figured
worlds, and fields created abundant possibilities for Connect members to take up, change, and/or resist the conceptions of CO identity and the co-facilitators’ figured world(s) of Connect as presented by David and/or Erma. David and Erma, each in their own ways, tried to create their figured world of Connect as one in which everyone was equal, but they could not remove the identities, agency, and power relations taken up and/or given during the events and practices occurring among Connect members. The artifacts of CO Circle, field trips, guest speakers, Outside Learning Projects, and the Facebook wall provided tangible evidence of the co-constructions of spaces and figured worlds, and within each of these artifactual practices Connect members had opportunities to critically examine their own identities and perspectives, engage in critical discussions with others, and create community generative spaces. Each of these artifactual literacy and language practices provide suggestions for how educators can co-construct more engaging and/or community generative spaces through literacy and language events and practices in content area classrooms within schools like the students’ SPEs. There were times in which CO Circles, field trips, guest speakers, Outside Learning Projects, and the Facebook wall seemed to create spaces that were disengaging, lacked community generation and/or perpetuated inequities, but these times often appeared when the field of schooling and fields of power, such as race, gender, sexuality, social class, and/or religion seemed to exert their strongest influences over Connect members as they tried to co-construct Connect spaces and negotiate the collective figured world of Connect.

The five artifacts of CO Circle, field trips, guest speakers, Outside Learning Projects, and the Facebook wall provided particular insights into how teachers and students co-construct learning spaces and participate in literacy and language events and
practices. David and Erma created CO Circle as a space in which students could engage with one another in a discussion space where everyone’s voice was welcomed, and, as a lived space, the field of schooling’s positioning of David and Erma as teachers as well as the fields of power, such as race, gender, sexuality, and/or religion at times influenced the co-construction of the CO Circle into an unequal discussion space where some perspectives and identities were positioned as more important. Field trips also provided evidence of fields of power, as field trip leaders were positioned as experts whose perspectives were not always critically discussed, but field trips, according to the students created more engaging spaces than CO Circles. Guest speakers brought their expertise to the church where Connect convened most afternoons, and they were also seen as experts in their fields. Guest speakers more often provided opportunities for Connect members to critically examine multiple perspectives. Unlike the first three artifacts, however, the Outside Learning Project was the artifactual literacy and language practice most like those found in the field of schooling. While Erma conceived the Outside Learning Project as a community generative practice, students did not seem to take up this practice as one in which they were engaged or creating community. Lastly, the Facebook wall seemed to provide the most agentive space for Connect members as they could take up, change, and/or resist CO identity and the collective figured world of Connect in their own ways in a space not controlled by the field of schooling. As educators, we need to become more aware of how we co-construct our class spaces and participate in literacy and language practices with our students as well as the many fields and other figured worlds that influence these constructed spaces, events, and practices. At Connect, while the co-facilitators tried to co-construct class spaces with the students, the fields of power and/or
schooling often continued to circulate in ways that provided certain individuals, especially the co-facilitators, with more power in these lived spaces. With these understandings of how fields of power circulate in lived spaces that educators are trying to create as more inclusive, we might be able to think about more effectively co-constructing these spaces with our students in ways that create engaging and community generative spaces in the figured world of our school/classroom and the field of schooling.

Throughout chapter 4, I have described the orchestrations I noticed among teachers' and students' conceptions, perceptions, and/or experiences of themselves and the Connect spaces through examination of their artifactual literacy and language practices. The first artifact of CO Circles provides evidence of the need for whole class discussion spaces in which participants effectively communicate with one another and focus on particular topics that offer opportunities for participants to share multiple perspectives in ways they could not otherwise do in the classroom space. The second artifact of field trips challenges the mandated curriculum based on standardized texts and tests in classroom spaces with the importance of taking students to places/spaces outside of the classroom in order to learn from experts. The third artifact of guest speakers shows how the inclusion of content experts in classroom spaces helps students engage in learning in ways they are not doing in classrooms where as Crystal described “teachers [are] droning on” and “[students are] reading from a textbook for two hours” (Crystal’s Interview, April 4, 2012). The fourth artifact cautions educators from simply going on field trips and/or doing things to create engaging spaces. The Outside Learning Projects remind teachers to be aware and supportive of the learning students are doing across spaces as well as being mindful of the places/spaces and figured worlds student navigate and/or
negotiate on a daily basis. The fifth and final artifact of the group Facebook wall provides evidence for how supervised use of a class Facebook wall could help teachers and students co-construct engaging and/or community generative spaces with one another across time and spaces. These five Connect artifacts and their implications for content area classrooms and perhaps the field of schooling will be described in greater detail in Chapter 5.
In chapter 4, I described how Connect members co-constructed spaces and the collective figured world of Connect through their literacy and language events and practices. While I focused on David, Erma, and the students' conceptions and perceptions of our lived spaces and their figured worlds of Connect, I did not often acknowledge my own conceptions and perceptions of these spaces and my figured world of Connect. I entered Connect with particular conceptions and perceptions about not only Connect but also teaching, learning, and Connect's positioning in the field of schooling. As a former social studies teacher, I supported a more content-integrated approach to learning, and I believed in the importance of using community places/spaces to help students learn various topics. Coming from a more rural setting, where alternative programs in the field of schooling were difficult to establish, I was curious how an alternative humanities program, such as Connect, with its project-based, integrated curriculum, operated within the field of schooling with its strong values in standardization and high-stakes testing. My perceptions privileged what I believed was happening at Connect over what I experienced in more traditional schools and classrooms. I acknowledge I entered my research site with particular conceptions and perceptions that may have influenced me to examine my data with certain biases, but I believe David, Erma, and the Connect students pushed me to critically examine my initial conceptions and perceptions in important ways, especially as
I thought about the implications of my data for other humanities, and perhaps other content area classrooms.

My research study of Connect provides details into how teachers and students from different neighborhoods/communities in MidwestCounty participated in literacy and language events and practices in an alternative humanities classroom. The ways in which they, both individually and collectively, conceived, perceived, and lived the spaces in which they participated in literacy and language events and practices provide suggestions for educators and researchers who work with adolescents in humanities classrooms and other content area classrooms. Connect members also provided understandings of when, where, and under what conditions spaces became engaging and/or community generative learning environments, which may not only provide suggestions for educators but also for policy makers within the field of schooling. In this chapter's first section, I will discuss some of the implications of this study for educators, researchers, and/or policy makers. I will end the chapter with a discussion of the many questions about which I am continuing to wonder.

**Discussion**

As I contemplated what I would say the implications of this study with Connect members were, I struggled to make generalizations from a study that focused on details of day-to-day interactions of one class of 50 students with 2 teachers and 2 pre-service teachers. One of the key understandings I gained from my year at Connect was the importance of each individual's conceptions and perceptions as they lived and co-constructed spaces and figured worlds. As I considered how I could make generalizations about processes and practices that were highly individualized, I realized
that there were collective conceptions and perceptions that created and co-constructed the
spaces and figured world of Connect. Without this collectivity of conceptions and
perceptions about the lived spaces and figured world of Connect, Connect members could
not have participated with one another in literacy and language events and practices that
seemed to construct the collective figured world of Connect. I, thus, drew upon these
collective conceptions and perceptions as well as the lived spaces in order to discuss what
I believe we can learn from my research study at Connect. Connect's literacy and
language events and practices provide beneficial understandings to educators and/or
researchers who are working with adolescents in humanities and other content area
classrooms as they think about literacy and language practices and co-constructing
classroom spaces. In section 1, I will discuss what we can learn about classroom practices
by bringing together trialectical spatial theories (Lefebvre, 1974/1992) and Holland et
al.’s (1998) theory of figured worlds. In section 2, I will examine what we can learn
about literacy and language practices from this research study. By considering Connect’s
literacy and/or language practices, we can re-think how educators apprentice students into
communities of practices, how classroom members use discourse, and how educators
might support students’ identity work and senses of agency. In section 3, I will explain
what we can learn about co-constructions of classroom spaces in general before moving
more specifically to how educators might create engaging spaces and community
generative spaces in classrooms.
What Can We Learn about Classroom Practices?

By bringing together trialectical spatial theories (Lefebvre, 1974/1992) and Holland et al.’s (1998) theory of figured worlds, this research study offers teachers and educational researchers ways in which to rethink classroom practices and spaces. Theories of space and figured worlds provide a useful path for gaining greater understanding of how teachers and students can and do use their agency and power in classroom spaces. Figure 1 from Chapter 2 offers a model for teachers and educational researchers to more deeply understanding classroom spaces. As an example of how this might occur, Figure 3 visually represents how trialectical theories of space (Lefebvre, 1974/1992) and Holland et al’s (1998) theory of figured worlds interconnected at Connect.
Figure 3. The Interconnectedness of Connect Spaces and Figured Worlds
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Figure 3 displays how trialectical theories of space (Lefebvre, 1974/1992) and Holland et al’s (1998) theory of figured worlds applied to Connect spaces based on the data collected during the 2011-2012 school year. As shown in Figure 3, fields of power are ever-present in classroom spaces as they influence not only individual and collective conceptions and perceptions of spaces and figured worlds but also the ways in which humans can or cannot co-construct these spaces and figured worlds through literacy and/or language events and practices. Teachers and educational researchers should be aware of the multiple fields of power that influence the ways in which teachers and students participate in literacy and language events and practices in classroom spaces. For example, individuals may have conceptions about other people that are stereotypical, which are rooted in fields of power involving race, gender, sexuality, social class, and/or religion. Building on these conceptions, individuals may perceive the classroom spaces as unequal or ones in which they have more or less power than others. These individual conceptions and/or perceptions may influence the ways in which collective conceptions and perceptions about classroom spaces and practices are co-constructed, which in turn may create spaces that are neither engaging for some students nor community generative.

Teachers, however, are not without power and agency to create classroom spaces that are more equal for all students within these larger, ever-present fields of power. David and Erma provide powerful examples of how they worked to create more equal spaces that were engaging and/or community generative to all students by collectively conceiving, perceiving, and living Connect spaces and its figured world in particular ways. While David and Erma did not always agree on the details of assignments and/or activities, they did have a particular collective conception of Connect spaces. They both
believed in the importance of building a community of learners through Connect literacy and language events and practices. On the first day, students learned how to become members of the Connect community of practice, which in David’s figured world of Connect was a culture, or a way of being/living. David and Erma selected, planned, and implemented particular daily lessons in ways that reflected their collective conceptions of the figured world of Connect as one in which project based, experiential learning from multiple perspectives was paramount. During their interviews, the focal students were able to acknowledge these collective conceptions of the figured world of Connect as the ideal, even if they did not individually perceive these conceptions to be accurate descriptions of their lived individual experiences in Connect spaces.

While collective conceptions and perceptions were important ways in which teachers helped co-construct classroom spaces as more equal by building a community of learners, David and Erma also made a concerted effort to acknowledge students’ individual perceptions and conceptions. By beginning the school year with a unit on perspectives, David and Erma emphasized the importance of individuals’ perceptions and conceptions. They encouraged students to listen to not only one another’s perspectives but also the perspectives of guest speakers and individuals they met on field trips. Acknowledging the importance of individual conceptions and perceptions by asking students to share with one another on a daily basis helped students to use their agency to engage in learning, generate community, and co-construct Connect spaces. David and Erma also tried to support students’ individual interests by allowing them choices in books and topics to study, yet this was paired with challenging them to think more
critically about these interests and their related conceptions and/or perceptions about these interests.

At Connect, there was an ever-present tension between individual and collected conceptions and/or perceptions. David, as the lead co-facilitator, conceived and perceived Connect as a culture and community of learners. His conception, which was based in his 11 years of experience with the program and its 17 Guiding Principles, became the collective conception of the ideal lived Connect space, and students often seemed unable to change this ideal lived Connect space. As a result, at times, Connect lived spaces, such as those involving the Connect practices of CO Circles, field trips, and guest speakers, were perceived as spaces that were neither engaging nor community generative as students did not believe they had the power to co-construct these lived spaces. David, using his authority from fields of power and schooling, created these spaces and invited students to join in ways he conceived they should, which afforded the students the opportunity to take up and/or reject these collective lived spaces without providing them opportunities to powerfully co-construct these spaces with the co-facilitators.

Individual and collective conceptions and perceptions as well as fields of power are continuously operating parts of classroom spaces. They influence and interact with one another in a myriad of ways, which provides teachers, students, and educational researchers many opportunities in which to rethink and/or re-orchestrate classroom practices and spaces in ways that are more engaging, community generative, and agentive for all members of the class. The next two sections provide details on the ways in which engagement, community generation, and use of agency happened or could have happened
in particular Connect spaces by examining first literacy and language practices and then co-construction of classroom spaces.

**What Can We Learn about Literacy and Language Practices?**

As a humanities classroom that operates outside of a brick-and-mortar school building, Connect offered a rich space in which to examine the literacy and language practices of adolescents in hybrid spaces. Connect is a space filled with possibilities, and this section will examine the ways in which Connect members could have or did take up these opportunities effectively. In the first part, I will provide implications for how educators apprentice students into communities of practice. In the second part, I will discuss how classroom members use discourse in classroom spaces. In the final part, I will explain how educators can support students’ identity work and/or senses of agency.

**Apprenticing students into the communities of practice.** David conceived Connect as a culture and identity, while Erma conceived Connect more as a classroom though she did not seem to reject David’s conception. As I analyzed the data, I began to approach Connect more as a community of practice into which David, Erma, and/or former CO1 students apprenticed CO1 students (Lave & Wenger, 1991). From their introduction to the program by David in their informational sessions at the Schools of Primary Enrollment (SPEs) in the winter/spring before they apply to Connect, CO1 students learn about the 17 Guiding Principles, which are the foundational conceptions about the program. Upon acceptance into the program, CO1 students are invited to interact with other Connect students through planned social events, such as an ice cream social in May, orientation before school begins in August, and the first day picnic at a local park. Then, the first day of class, David and Erma review key rules for Connect
spaces, and then David introduces the practices of the Connect community through the CO2 Summer Artifact Activity. These practices include outside learning experiences, reading widely, experiencing events for the first time, and creating community. Connect students from their introduction to the program are learning how to become members of the Connect community through carefully selected and implemented activities and written texts.

David and/or Erma continued to provide students with direct instruction and modeling of how to be members of the Connect community of practice as the school year progressed. Early in the first unit, the co-facilitators passed out the unit calendar and overview, which detailed the literacy and/or language events Connect members would experience. As a result of these texts, students understood that learning in the Connect community of practice occurred through going on field trips, interacting with guest speakers at the church, completing outside learning experiences and research projects, reading a book from a chosen list for small group literature discussions as well as other texts in class as a whole group, and discussing all of these learning experiences with one another in CO circles. Through their oral directions, David or Erma would explain the rationale for nearly each written assignment or class activity. Students, thus, had a great deal of information about the Connect community practice as well as various ways in which to participate with one another in the community. Students had the agency to decide how they would participate across time and spaces in this community of practice. As evidenced throughout this study, students took up, changed, and/or resisted a Connect identity and/or participation in the Connect community of practice.
The ways in which David and Erma apprentice Connect students into the Connect community of practice offer guidance to educators. Starting with their first meetings with David and/or Erma, students were learning about the practices of the Connect community through discourse, written texts, and active participation in events. Connect students had choices among how they might participate in Connect literacy and language practices as well as many different experiences from which to learn, which appeared in the forms of field trips, guest speakers, Outside Learning Projects, research projects, and/or CO Circle discussions. The co-facilitators, however, had particular conceptions about how students would participate in Connect literacy and language practices, which in ways constrained how students might complete learning assignments or participate in CO practices. David or Erma often provided rationales for why students should participate in particular literacy and/or language events and practices. It is important to note that no matter what educators do students have the power to take up, change, and/or resist participation in the literacy and/or language events and practices of the community of practice. Students do not have to agree to become part-time or full members of any particular community. The ways in which they choose to participate is influenced by other factors, which I will discuss throughout the following sections.

Using discourse in classroom spaces. When I examined how the co-facilitators and the students were participating in literacy and language events and practices, I noticed it occurred most often in my data through the use of classroom discourse, which was a result of my methodological decisions to focus on classroom observations. Despite the program’s focus on multiple perspectives and celebrating diversity, discourse in the classroom often provided insights into how fields of power circulate in classrooms.
CO Circle provides an example of how fields of power circulate in classrooms in rather uncritical ways, even with the educators conceive and/or perceive their classroom spaces as inclusive. As I have described throughout this dissertation, CO Circle was a complex literacy and language practice that varied across time, spaces, and topics. The CO Circle was the primary language and sometimes literacy practice of Connect during my 54 observations. David and Erma conceived CO Circles as engaging learning spaces in which members came together as equal participants to discuss multiple perspectives about various topics. Some students, such as Becky, experienced CO Circles in the way David and Erma conceived they would operate, while other students, such as Amy, experienced CO Circles as disengaging spaces that were not effective learning spaces. Each student experienced and/or perceived the CO Circle in their own way, which varied across time, spaces, and topics on the floor.

David and Erma conceived and implemented unit plans around issues of diversity as the focus topics for learning during the first half of the 2011-2012 school year. Both co-facilitators believed in the importance of students understanding multiple perspectives as an ever-present constant on any topic. David believed he and Erma helped students to learn “how to build bridges to each other” across their differences (David’s Interview, March 14, 2012). The primary strategy for building these bridges to each other across their differences seemed to be through classroom discourse. As supported across the literature on culturally responsive pedagogies (Banks, 2000; Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995, 2009), David and/or Erma facilitated discussions around issues of diversity, and they opened discussion spaces in which students could share their personal experiences with such issues. Through their direct instruction, David and Erma provided students with
guidelines for how to share in whole class discussions with one another, which allowed students’ “funds of knowledge” (Moll et al., 1992) to be included in the classroom discourse. David and Erma also directly instructed students on how to form and use the CO Circle as a discussion strategy, and they continued to remind students of its structure and use through modeling and feedback until students took up CO Circle in ways similar to how David and/or Erma conceived it. David and Erma also made use of the CO Circle discussion strategy in such a way that all students were physically included in the discussion space as equal participants who were talking with one another. David, Erma, the student teachers, Stephen and Stephanie, and I also sat in the CO Circle usually interspersed among the students. While we could not remove our positions as the adults and/or teachers with power over the students from the field of schooling, we tried to show with our physical placement in the room our desire to learn with the students. Some students, however, such as Amy, did not perceive our position in the circle as being more equal, and they still conceived Connect spaces and learning within them as guided by the adults (Amy’s Interview, April 4, 2012).

While David and/or Erma believed in the importance of discussing issues of diversity in the classroom and created discussion spaces that offered opportunities for students to do so in ways not commonly found in their SPE classrooms, there were spaces of possibility that were not taken up by Connect members as conceptions of race, gender, sexuality, social class, and/or religion continued to operate and/or be espoused by Connect members in uncritical ways. During discussions on topics such as race, gender, and/or sexuality, the discourse often perpetuated the normalization of dominant identities and/or created artificial binaries among the issues, which are some of the very reasons
theories of culturally responsive pedagogies have been theorized, researched, and implemented. More specifically, as an example, in his discussion about White privilege, David positioned students as White or “not White” (line 4, Classroom Transcript, September 12, 2011), and when he and Chelsey both brought up the interconnections among race, social class, and/or gender, he refocused the topic on the floor to be solely on race. By not taking up the opportunity to explore the interconnections among fields of power as they operate in our lives and across spaces, Connect members decontextualized their own and others’ experiences in lived spaces, and they missed further opportunities to discuss how we might change these interconnected social structures of power in meaningful and effective ways. Throughout the fall semester, CO Circles included looking at different privileges based on identities as isolated from one another, which seemed to allow normative fields of power to operate throughout the discussions. For example, during the de-briefing CO Circle discussion about Islam, David, Chelsey, and Michelle perpetuated heteronormativity, while David perpetuated the power of men over women. As educators discuss issues of diversity with students, we need to be critically aware that how we focus these discussions may perpetuate the fields of power we want students to critically discuss and/or change.

Through classroom discourse, Connect members were positioned in particular ways by other Connect members, which provided further evidence of the ways in which fields of power operated in influential ways across Connect spaces. David and Erma both conceived CO Circle as a space in which all voices were appreciated, yet at times they positioned students to have more important perspectives than others based on identities David or Erma perceived the students had/performed. For example, David and/or Erma
positioned students as representatives of group perspectives, especially during CO Circle discussions about race. During CO Circle discussions about race, David asked for students who were "not White" to begin the discussion (line 4, Classroom Transcript, September 12, 2011), and Erma asked for students "of color" to share their perspectives when White students seemed to miss the point she was trying to make (line 26, Classroom Transcript, October 3, 2011). Students who spoke then provided their individual perspectives as members of a particular group, but, in ways, David or Erma had positioned the students as representing a particular identity group's perspective. In their effort to hear historically marginalized voices, David and/or Erma positioned students as experts of particular identity groups’ perspectives, which positioned them as members of marginalized groups as well as expected them to speak as experts of these marginalized groups. While culturally responsive pedagogies support teachers building upon students’ backgrounds and identities, teachers need to be aware of how their positioning of students influences how students are perceived by classmates as well as how such positioning influences how students participate in classroom discussions. Teachers and students need to be aware of and work with students to change the ways in which fields of power influence our interactions not only in the ways it normalizes dominant identities and/or creates artificial binaries among identities but also in the ways we position one another. In CO Circles, at times, David and/or Erma positioned students in ways that reminded the class participants of their power as teachers with dominant identities, which created spaces that were not engaging and/or community generative for all participants.
The CO Circle discussions, as well as other discussion spaces, were heavily influenced by time. The field of schooling and the students’ SPEs placed particular time constraints on the Connect spaces as students needed to be in class for 2 hours each day as well as some students needed to return to their SPEs by 3:30 or 4:00 pm in order to attend extracurricular activities. David and Erma often referred to the short amount of time the Connect members had, and the Connect community even created and used the CO phrase “short version” to remind one another of the short amount of time and the need to be succinct when speaking on the discussion floor. Not all Connect members, however, acted upon the discussion floor as if time was in short supply and he or she should be succinct. While some students, particularly a few non-participants, tended to hold the floor for extended periods of time, the co-facilitators, especially David, often took the most time on the discussion floor. David and/or Erma often spent time at the beginning of each day and each activity during the day providing students with detailed directions and rationales for what they would be doing. David, and sometimes Erma, opened and closed the discussion floors most days, and I could not locate any days in which students took control and closed the discussion floor. David also utilized a language practice in which he in his role as teacher ended the discussion floor or the focus on a particular topic on the discussion floor by providing concluding remarks, which at times took up students’ perspectives but often represented his perspectives, which he wanted students to hear. David and Erma both had been positioned by the field of schooling as the teachers in the Connect spaces; as teachers, they controlled the ways in which Connect members used time. David and Erma, however, conceived Connect discussion spaces, especially CO Circles, as ones in which all members were equal.
While educators are in control of how time is used in the classroom, they must provide time in classroom spaces for students to be agents of their own learning. By taking up the limited class time with their own speech, either in the form of directions, their own points of view, and conclusions, the co-facilitators, especially David, left less time for students to participate in literacy and language events and practices with one another. At times, this left some perspectives out of the discussion; at other times, I perceived the discussion as so hurried that it negatively affected the ways in which classroom participants might take up and critically consider the perspectives provided on the floor.

Like Wells and Aruaz (2006), who found fewer IRE/IRF sequences in classrooms where teachers adopted “...an inquiry orientation to curriculum...” (p. 414), I found few IRE/IRF sequence structures in the classroom discourse of Connect members. At Connect, David and Erma created more dialogically centered discussion spaces. In these discussion spaces, “the significance of language in the production, maintenance, and hang of social relations of power” was ever present (Fairclough, 1989, p. 1), not only in the ways in which David, and to a lesser extent Erma, used Connect time in ways that referenced their powerful positions as teachers but also in the ways fields of power, such as those involving race, gender, sexuality, social class, and/or religion, circulated in these discussion spaces. The Connect program was conceived as a space that would build upon the diversity of its students, and David and Erma both believed in embracing and working with diverse perspectives. The classroom discourse around issues of diversity provides important implications for educators.

The focal students' perceptions of CO Circle might help educators re-think whole class discussions. In order to be engaging, whole class discussions, perhaps in the form of
a CO Circle, need to be spaces in which participants are effectively communicating with one another. Effective communication requires active listening and uptake of one another's ideas. Active listening and lack of uptake seemed to be a problem in CO Circles, which despite direct instruction on doing so was not consistently resolved during the 2011-2012 school year. In addition to these important discussion skills, in order to be engaging, CO Circles needed to be spaces focused on particular topics that offered opportunities for participants to share multiple perspectives. When students repeated the same perspectives in different ways, other students became disengaged from the CO Circle. With honed skills in active listening, which includes uptake of former comments from the discussion floor, whole class discussions can be engaging spaces in which students learn from one another through their multiple perspectives on various topics.

**Supporting students' identity work and senses of agency.** As described above, Connect members used discourse to position one another. Connect members, however, could take up, change, and/or resist these positions as they performed their identities across Connect spaces. While students tried to navigate their individual identities, they also had to negotiate their identity in particular groups. In the collective figured world of Connect, there was a tension between being an individual and being an active member of one's communities, which might include one's group identities. For example, during the first day’s lesson which asked CO1 students to learn about CO culture by looking at CO2 students’ summer artifacts, David asked students to complete the activity without talking and jotting their thoughts in their CO notebook. In an activity in which Connect members were learning how to be members of the Connect community and how to take up a CO identity, they were to do so individually. Students resolved this tension between self and
communal identities in different ways depending on how they performed their identities across spaces. Some students, such as a few non-participants, rejected CO identities as well as participation in the Connect community. Other students, like Becky and Chelsey, took up and/or changed CO identities and/or participation in the Connect community in ways that fit with their senses of self, but they did not perceive themselves as being CO people as they did not seem to fit the collective ideal of a CO identity, which was based in David’s conceptions of Connect. Still other students, like Kristy the CO2 exemplar who was mentioned by Callie in her interview (April 4, 2012), embraced and took up a CO identity and participation in the Connect community in ways that transformed their lives.

There is an ever-present tension between being an individual and being a member of a group, and students will negotiate this tension in their own ways. Those who work with adolescents in classrooms might rethink how they construct classroom spaces in such ways that students can negotiate between their individual and group identities in their own ways without being positioned to do so in front of their peers. For example, during the first unit after my intense data collection phase, CO students explored their own identities through an autobiography project. This unit allowed students to understand, articulate, and position themselves over a four week period through a variety of assignments instead of being positioned by David and/or Erma on the spot in CO Circle to be a representative of certain group perspectives. While David and Erma chose to place this unit after the Perspectives and World Religions Units in order to help students more fully understand their multiple identities, this unit’s placement earlier in the year might provide students with the opportunity to position themselves and articulate
their perspectives in CO Circles, thus providing them with more agency and power in Connect lived spaces.

In the collective figured world of Connect, especially David and/or Erma’s figured world of Connect, certain perspectives also seemed more privileged than others. For example, David and Erma seemed to place a strong value on urban experiences. When students shared experiences with one another in CO Circle, they often referred to experiences that happened in MidwestCity. Chelsey, who spent a lot of her time at the barn caring for her horse and training for horse shows, rarely shared these experiences during class, but she and I often discussed them before class began. During Becky's interview, I learned she did not feel her Christian identity was one that was welcomed in Connect spaces, so despite the importance she placed on this part of her identity, she did not often share experiences or beliefs in CO Circles that were connected with her Christian identity. David, Erma, myself, and other educators need to reconsider how open and/or safe our discussion spaces are actually lived, or co-constructed, among ourselves and our students. While I am not suggesting free-for-all discussion spaces, I believe it is important that educators reassess how our own values, as well as the ones perpetuated by the fields of power as I described above, shape the "safe spaces" we want to create in our classroom spaces. At Connect, Chelsey and Becky did not perceive CO Circles as spaces in which they could share identities they felt were important as David and/or Erma had set up the CO Circle and Connect as including only certain perspectives. It seemed the Connect community’s values were based in the dominant fields of power, which includes White, male, middle class, and/or heterosexual perspectives. With this valuing of more
dominant perspectives, not all students perceived Connect spaces as engaging, community generative, and/or including them.

The most interesting implication to me from my time with Connect members was the power of the group Facebook page as an agentive space for students. Through Facebook, teachers and students interacted with one another in ways they chose to do so (or not). Students could take up, change, and/or resist the CO identity and/or the collective figured world of Connect through their online literacy and language practices. Facebook provided a space in which students could (or not) show engagement in content from class discussions or in Connect behaviors, such as planning get-togethers to generate community. The power of Facebook as an agentive space for Connect students seems to suggest its useful in other classrooms, but I believe it is important to consider how Connect members made use of Facebook because I am not suggesting that it should be solely reappropriated for classroom use.

One of the reasons Facebook seemed to be such an agentive space is David and Erma allowed students to participate and interact in this space in their own ways. As administrators of the Facebook page, they supervised the space, which included monitoring for appropriate behaviors/posts, but posting to Facebook was a classroom assignment only once when Erma asked students to post their pictures of art from their communities during her MidwestCity art unit over spring break. The only purpose listed on the group Facebook page for its existence was "a place for members of the connect1 2011-2012 class to get to know each other, share interesting events, make friends and keep in touch" (About page, Connect Facebook group page). At Connect, the group Facebook page operated as a social networking space, which is the way in which it
presently functions across the world on the Internet. The group Facebook page was an extension of the Connect community more than the Connect classroom spaces. David, Erma, and the students did connect their Facebook posts with the classroom spaces, but they had the power to decide how to do this throughout their interactions. The ways in which teachers and students participated in literacy and language events and practices on the group Facebook page suggest educators and administrators should reconsider what I experienced as a ban on teachers and students interacting together on social networking sites. Using Connect's Facebook practices as an example, other educators may find the benefits of including such an agentive space in their efforts to engage student in their own learning as well as build communities with one another.

What Can We Learn about Co-Constructing Classroom Spaces?

The interconnections among spaces, figured worlds, and fields create abundant possibilities for the co-constructions of classroom spaces. At Connect, there were many multilayered, multi-connected spaces, figured worlds, and fields that influenced the ways in which the co-facilitators and the students interacted and participated in literacy and language events and practices. David and Erma tried to create Connect spaces where everyone's voice was welcomed and given equal attention, but no one could completely remove the identities, agency, and power relations taken up and/or given during the literacy and language events and practices that occurred in the Connect spaces. Despite the teachers’ efforts of conceiving and trying to implement “safe spaces” in the class, fields of power were ever present. The ways in which these fields of power influenced Connect members' co-construction of spaces is important to helping educators and
researchers rethink and reconsider how we conceive and implement certain literacy and language practices in classroom spaces.

The field of schooling positioned David and Erma as more powerful agents in the co-construction of Connect spaces. Teachers are required by the field of schooling to plan and implement certain activities in order to ensure that students meet certain learning standards. Drawing upon their belief in learning theories such as sociocultural (Vygotsky, 1978), experiential (Dewey, 1938/1997) and/or situated (Lave & Wenger, 1991) learning theories, David and/or Erma selected the topics and perspectives that would be presented in class through the experiences, such as guest speakers, field trips, and other activities, they planned and implemented. In the field of schooling, they had been positioned as the decision makers for the whole class, and they used their own expertise from various fields and experiences to make decisions on whose perspectives were heard by the Connect members. While they thus had greater control over whose voices were heard in whole group lessons, they did provide students choices on the books they read as well as the focus of their research topics for each unit. The field of schooling, thus, influenced the ways in which David and/or Erma conceived and planned the Connect spaces, which influenced the power students seemed to have over their own learning. Students then could take up, change, and/or resist the Connect spaces as they were conceived and implemented by David and/or Erma, though students perceived David’s conceptions as the way in which Connect spaces should operate. The ways in which students did so resulted in the lived spaces of Connect, which were co-constructions among its members.

The field of schooling did not give equal power to David and Erma in their positions as co-facilitators. Despite the name "co-facilitators," David and Erma did not
have equal roles at Connect. In his position as the program director, lead CO1 facilitator, and the co-facilitator with the most years of experience with the program, David's conceptions were often the ones implemented, which became apparent during in-class directions on particular assignments, such as the Outside Learning Projects. Erma maintained she was "just the facilitator" which afforded her the opportunity to focus solely on the students and their learning (Erma's Interview, April 5, 2012), while David had to focus on administrative tasks, such as budgeting and recruiting, which he understood were important for the longevity of the program. While I did not focus on how David and Erma negotiated their co-facilitator roles with one another, I believe they do provide an example of how two teachers worked together to teach a humanities class. I have observed in humanities classrooms, where the social studies and English teachers took turns on who taught the class each day, but David and Erma worked together to teach the class with one another. While they did split the leadership of the CO1 and CO2 classes, they both were present and integral members of the CO1 class throughout the 2011-2012 school year. They deferred to one another's strengths depending on the topic for the day, but not in a turn-taking sort of way. They were a team, and they each helped students to learn social studies, English, cultural studies, and the arts.

Students could take up, change, and/or resist the ways in which David and/or Erma conceived of Connect spaces. David conceived Connect as a culture and identity that he believed students wanted to take up as a result of their applying to the program. Erma conceived Connect more as a classroom in the field of schooling, though she did not dismiss or resist David's conceptions of Connect as a culture and identity. Erma's conceptions, however, often were subordinated to David's, which created Connect spaces
that were less classroom-like, which influenced how the students perceived the Connect spaces. At times, students asked for more classroom-like spaces in order to know what to do (i.e. their requests for questions for the World Religions Outside Learning Projects). Some students did not come to Connect because they wanted the particular learning experiences as David conceived they did. Some, as Erma mentioned in her interview (April 5, 2012), were escaping their Schools of Primary Enrollment (SPEs), and these students did not take up and/or construct the Connect spaces in the same ways as David hoped they would. As trialectical theorists (Lefebvre, 1974/1992; Soja, 1996) and educational researchers, such as Sheehy (2010), have discussed, the co-construction of classroom spaces is more complex than a teacher simply conceiving and implementing particular activities and expectations. For educators, they take up the many possibilities afforded them by this complex process of space construction in their classrooms as they try to create effective learning spaces with many students in a particular amount of time around a particular topic in the field of study. For researchers, the complexity of space construction as evidenced at Connect should continue to challenge us to rethink and reformulate our theories to better understand the learning, literacy and language events and practices, and classroom spaces.

**Creating engaging learning spaces.** Like John Dewey (1938/1997), students at Connect believed that humans learned through experiences, which is the way in which I also believe humans learn. Based on their interviews and my observations of engagement behaviors, Connect’s most engaging spaces were those in which students were doing more than listening to lectures and/or reading from texts. These engaging spaces often included the literacy and language practices of field trips and guest speakers as students
were involved in going to a place/space and interacting with experts and artifacts in particular fields. As Schussler (2009) found in his study of an alternative school, these types of experiences seemed to provide students with instruction that “convey excitement for the content, and make learning relevant.” (p. 120). According to the focal students, these types of engaging spaces were rarely constructed in their SPEs. The interview data around field trips and guest speakers suggest students enjoyed the activities and recalled experiences and content knowledge from them many months later. While the field of schooling constrains educators from implementing as many field trips and/or guest speakers as I observed at Connect, there seem to be possibilities and opportunities for inclusion of these sorts of experiences in content area classrooms across the field of schooling. In thinking about their SPEs and experiential learning experiences, Chelsey mentioned the drug dog guest speaker from her biology class, while Crystal mentioned turning the desks over in her history class to re-enact trench warfare. Connect's literacy and language practices that involved experiential learning suggests educators and educational policy makers might rethink and reconsider the importance of "doing" learning to help students successfully gain content knowledge and skills.

My data does imply the need to include more experiential learning in classrooms, but the ways in which experiential learning is included is very important to the ways in which students engage in learning. As other educational researchers (Applebee et al., 2003; Carini et al., 2006; Skinner et al., 2009) have found, student engagement in learning is a multidimensional process, and this is apparent in Connect spaces. For example, the Outside Learning Projects brought in experiential learning yet students seemed to be less engaged in this literacy and language practice as reflected in the
number of students who did not complete the assignment. The lower levels of engagement occurred for a variety of reasons that were highly individualized, but I believe the Outside Learning Projects provide some additional evidence that is helpful in reconsidering how we engage students in learning. David and Erma's parameters for what counted as learning for the Outside Learning Projects heavily valued experiences in MidwestCity, and they requested students do something that they were not already involved with doing. I do not believe David or Erma meant to discourage students from learning across spaces, but they instead hoped to push students to try new things in MidwestCity so they may learn not only new content and/or find a new passion but also learn how to navigate new spaces and experiences with which they were unfamiliar. Chelsey, however, pointed out she had a difficult time meeting the expectations for the assignment with her busy schedule of school, work, and family, which mostly occurred in D-Burb and focused around her interest in equine science (Chelsey's Interview, March 26, 2012). Chelsey learned from her experiences outside of school, but those experiences did not fit the parameters of the Outside Learning Project. I believe Chelsey might have been more engaged in completing the Outside Learning Project if her outside learning experiences and interests had met David and/or Erma's expectations. This is a difficult statement to make, however, as I am also mindful of David and/or Erma's conceptions and rationales for the Outside Learning Projects. I do not want to imply that David and/or Erma should change their expectations for the Outside Learning Projects, but I do want to imply that when educators use experiential learning, they should keep in mind the learning students are already doing across spaces and try to value/support that learning in the classroom spaces.
In addition to experiential learning, another essential part of engaging spaces at Connect seemed to be student choice. As Clark et al. (2001) found in their study of motivation and engagement through a portfolio project, motivation and engagement were "triggered" by shifts among three key conceptual categories: "self, task, and fit" (p. 219). David and Erma’s figured world of Connect included offering choice in books and research topics, so students learned what interested them. Students also had choice in the ways in which they completed certain tasks, such as choosing the medium used during art tasks and selecting presentation styles for group projects. Students seemed more invested and engaged in their learning when they chose what they wanted to study and/or how they presented their learning. For example, during CO Circles, students often spoke more freely and in greater detail when the floor was open to more general comments on a particular topic. During the CO Circle discussion about *The Help* (Columbus et al., 2011), when the topic on the floor was about the personal experiences and knowledge gained on the field trip, a greater number of different students spoke. When Erma shifted the topic of discussion to focus on the views of the African-American community in regards to the film, student engagement behaviors became fewer as students began to doodle, avoid eye contact, and fewer students spoke. While many variables, including student resistance to discussing racial privileges, might have affected the students' engagement in discussing the field of race as represented in *The Help* (Columbus et al., 2011), there does seem to be evidence across the corpus of data that choice of the topic on the floor influenced their engagement in the CO Circle. At Connect, giving students' choice, and thus agency of their own learning, helped create engaging spaces.
Creating community generative spaces in classrooms. David and Erma both valued the time and energy they spent in creating a community among Connect members. David conceived these experiences in community building and sustainment helped students become better community members and citizens in their local and global places/spaces. Erma conceived the Connect community as one in which students supported one another as they all learned to take risks, perform their identities, and/or use content knowledge and skills. While the students perceived the Connect community in different ways, each of them seemed to believe the support and/or senses of belonging and caring they felt among the Connect members was a positive aspect of the program. The perception of Connect as a community did not simply occur as teachers and students came together to participate in literacy and language events and practices. David and/or Erma conceived and implemented particular literacy and language events and practices in order to create community generative spaces. Unlike in other educational research studies, I found the co-facilitators, especially David, explicitly talked with students about building community and conceiving of Connect as a community. Creating these community generative spaces and the collective figured world of Connect as a community took time and effort on the part of David, Erma, and eventually the students.

As the co-facilitators, David and Erma had power over how time and space would be used by the members of Connect. David and/or Erma configured particular spaces, such as Facebook and CO Circles, to have time and space for students to work together on building community and sustaining/improving the community. During the first few weeks of the school year, Erma helped CO2 students model planning get-togethers with CO1 students, though she made clear from the beginning that planning get-togethers was
the responsibility of the students. Some students often took up this responsibility by planning get-togethers through Facebook posts, as evidenced in the 19 get-together planning posts, as well as through one in-class event, referred to as the Holiday Party, which provided them with opportunities to plan communal events focused on creating relationships with one another, CO2 students, and former CO students. Even Holiday Party was partially planned and recorded using the Facebook space. Facebook offered a space in which students could interact with one another at any time they could access the Internet and chose to do so. As already described, it seemed to provide a space in which students could freely interact and/or engage in learning with one another. Through their participation in literacy and language practices in this online space, they began to build relationships around common experiences, which were foundational to creating the Connect community according to Erma’s conceptions of the CO Community.

In addition to Facebook, the nearly daily practice of CO Circle offered the possibility for a community generative space. During my observations, I did not record in my field notes many instances in which the CO Circle seemed to be acting as a strong community generative space, but it did provide the primary space for communal sharing of various experiences and literacy and language practices. In general, CO Circles were spaces in which Connect members discussed their identities, their experiences, the figured worlds in which they lived, and the fields of power that operated in their lives with one another. Opportunities existed in CO Circles for community generative spaces to appear, but these opportunities had to be taken up by the Connect members co-constructing the space. In CO Circles, Connect members supported one another and tried to work out differences of opinions and other problems that arose. The only times in
which CO Circles seemed to be strong community generative spaces occurred during Community Days, which happened twice during my observations. Community Days involved CO Circle discussions focused on the positive aspects of the Connect community as well as the areas that needed improving according to Connect members. The CO Circle provided the collective figured world of Connect with a way in which to practice behaviors found in community generative spaces, but as educators and researchers who work with people, we must remember that participants construct a space in ways that reflect their own figurings of that space. Educators can provide opportunities for community generative spaces in their classrooms, but classroom members may take up, change, and/or resist these possibilities.

**Further Questions**

My time with Connect helped me to better understand the complexities of lived spaces and literacy and language practices in one classroom, but I left with many new, unanswered questions. As I spent more time with Connect members and eventually my data, I found I had more questions about which I was curious. For this study, I believed I needed to follow the students throughout their year of experience with Connect. I wanted to show how the spaces and literacy and language events and practices evolved and become sedimented over time, but at the end of the year, I wanted to go even further into time with my participants. As I listened to my participants' interviews, I realized I was curious about what influences their year(s) at Connect might have on their lives in the future. How do the participants' conceptions and perceptions of themselves and/or the figured world of Connect influence their lives in other spaces outside of Connect? How do they believe Connect influenced their lives 1 year, 5 years, or even 10 years later?
How do David's conceptions of Connect as an identity and a culture get taken up, changed, and/or resisted by former Connect students in their adult lives? These questions were outside the scope of this study, but I believe their answers may provide deeper understandings into the space constructions and the literacy and language practices of Connect.

Several of my questions involved studies that I could not complete for my dissertation because I had time constraints. For example, I am curious about how this study might have looked if I had also completed a micro-ethnographically informed study in a more traditional humanities classroom in MidwestCity. My questions would be similar to this study, i.e. How do teachers and students from one local community in MidwestCity participate in literacy and language events and practices in a traditional humanities classroom? When, where and under what conditions do spaces/places become engaging and/or community generative learning environments? By examining a more traditional humanities classroom, I could build upon my research study at Connect to provide deeper understandings into similarities and differences among how teachers and students co-construct spaces and participate in literacy and language events and practices across classrooms in the field of schooling. This type of comparison study might help educators and/or researchers in how they rethink space constructions and literacy and language practices across classroom spaces.

As I began to think about the implications of my study, I also began to wonder what would happen if teachers in more traditional humanities and other content area classrooms took up some (or all) of the artifactual literacy and language practices I observed at Connect. Knowing what a strong influence the field of schooling had on
Connect spaces and practices, what sorts of possibilities did teachers in more traditional classroom have in taking up and/or changing Connect literacy and language practices in their own classrooms? How might teachers take up and/or change these literacy and language practices through conceiving and implementing them in more traditional classrooms? What would these literacy and language practices look like in a class more heavily influenced by the field of schooling? How might these literacy and language practices change in different spaces with different people co-constructing them? How these literacy and language practices would be perceived by the participants? I believe Connect members' literacy and language practices have implications for how educators think about literacy and language practices across content area classrooms, but I believe the implications could be stronger if I had further data from multiple classrooms in various content areas. We could more fully understand the more generalized processes of space co-constructions in classrooms, which include abundant opportunities for human interactions and participation in literacy and language practices, as well as students' identity and agency formation and use in classrooms.

Place is an important variable to me. At times during my doctoral program, I wanted to return home to West Virginia to complete my dissertation, but I did not as I was interested in learning about Connect, which has no equivalent to my knowledge in West Virginia. In David’s and/or Erma’s figured world(s) of Connect, there was great value given to urban experiences, which are not possible in the same ways in West Virginia as they are in MidwestState. At times, I felt like an outsider to the perspectives shared in class, such as the time in which the vegetarian/vegan lifestyles guest speaker claimed no one hunted to survive any more in the United States. She was unaware of my
family, friends, and former students who depend on the successful killing of deer, squirrels, and other game during the fall hunting seasons in order to have meat to eat throughout the winter. The undervaluing of rural experiences was disheartening to me. As an educational researcher, I wondered how this study might look if I went home or to another rural area to spend a year with a humanities classroom, or even an English and a social studies classroom as we do not have a humanities classroom in my former high school. While acknowledging that city places, spaces, and experiences were not as easily available as they were at Connect, I am curious how teachers and students might take up experiential learning in their classrooms. How do teachers and students in rural areas participate in literacy and language practices in humanities classrooms? When, where and under what conditions do spaces/places become engaging and/or community generative learning environments? What influence does place/space have on the answers to these questions? I believe the answers to these questions might expand our understandings of space constructions, literacy and language practices, and student identity and agency by expanding the research base to include more rural perspectives.
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Appendix A: Table of Daily Lessons
### Table 10.

**Daily Lessons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Large Group</th>
<th>CO Circle</th>
<th>Small Group</th>
<th>Youth Room</th>
<th>Classrooms</th>
<th>Field Trip</th>
<th>Video</th>
<th>Written Text</th>
<th>Artwork</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.29.2011</td>
<td>CO Summer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.30.2011</td>
<td>Lit Discuss Prep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.31.2011</td>
<td>Summer Lit Discuss</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6.2011</td>
<td>CO as the World</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.7.2011</td>
<td>Star Power</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9.2011</td>
<td>Video: Time for School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.12.2011</td>
<td>White Privilege</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.13.2011</td>
<td>White Privilege</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.14.2011</td>
<td>Privilege Panel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.15.2011</td>
<td>Heterosexism Privilege Panel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.19.2011</td>
<td>Mercy for Animals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.20.2011</td>
<td>Central Market</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.21.2011</td>
<td>Animal/Food Reflections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.22.2011</td>
<td>TedX and Writing Workshops</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.26.2011</td>
<td>Library Book Selection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.27.2011</td>
<td>Gender Out of the Box</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.28.2011</td>
<td>Killing Me Softly/Tough Guise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.29.2011</td>
<td>Reflect on Killing/Tough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3.2011</td>
<td>Lit Discuss1 Perspectives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4.2011</td>
<td>International Guests Panel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5.2011</td>
<td>Reflect on International Panel/Single Story</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6.2011</td>
<td>World Traveler Essay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.10.2011</td>
<td>Lit Discuss2 Perspectives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 0 means it did not occur. 1 means it did occur. Continued
Table 10 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Large Group</th>
<th>CO Circle</th>
<th>Small Group</th>
<th>Youth Room</th>
<th>Classrooms</th>
<th>Field Trip</th>
<th>Video</th>
<th>Written Text</th>
<th>Artwork</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.11.2011</td>
<td>Midwest County Conservatory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.12.2011</td>
<td>Perspective in Art Museum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.13.2011</td>
<td>In the Shoes of Another</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prep1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.17.2011</td>
<td>In the Shoes of Another</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prep3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.18.2011</td>
<td>In the Shoes of Another</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.19.2011</td>
<td>In the Shoes of Another</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.24.2011</td>
<td>Perspectives Art Show</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.25.2011</td>
<td>Labyrinth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.26.2011</td>
<td>Community Day</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.27.2011</td>
<td>World Religions Intro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.28.2011</td>
<td>Library Research-Religions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2.2011</td>
<td>Religions Presentation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3.2011</td>
<td>Jesus Camp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.4.2011</td>
<td>Religions of India Photos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exhibit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.7.2011</td>
<td>Lit Discuss1 Religions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.8.2011</td>
<td>Hindu Readings/Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.14.2011</td>
<td>Erma's Library</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15.2011</td>
<td>Erma's Buddhist Temple</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.16.2011</td>
<td>Lit Discuss2 Religions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.17.2011</td>
<td>Jewish Synagogue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.18.2011</td>
<td>Religious Music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
Table 10 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Large Group</th>
<th>CO Circle</th>
<th>Small Group</th>
<th>Youth Room</th>
<th>Classrooms</th>
<th>Field Trip</th>
<th>Video</th>
<th>Written Text</th>
<th>Artwork</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.21.2011</td>
<td>Interviews/Library (students choice)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5.2011</td>
<td>Druid Priest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.6.2011</td>
<td>Caravaggio Exhibit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.7.2011</td>
<td>Islamic Mosque</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.8.2011</td>
<td>Jigsaw Start/ Congregationalist Pastor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.9.2011</td>
<td>Jigsaw Practice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.12.2011</td>
<td>Jigsaw Presentations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.13.2011</td>
<td>Project Reflection/Evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.14.2011</td>
<td>Community Day</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.15.2011</td>
<td>Autobiography Project Intro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54 Lessons Observed</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Guest Speakers</th>
<th>CO2s/CO3 Present</th>
<th>Family Present</th>
<th>Friends Present</th>
<th>Other Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.29.2011</td>
<td>CO Summer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.30.2011</td>
<td>Lit Discuss Prep</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.31.2011</td>
<td>Summer Lit Discuss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6.2011</td>
<td>CO as the World</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.7.2011</td>
<td>Star Power</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9.2011</td>
<td>Video: Time for School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.12.2011</td>
<td>White Privilege</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.13.2011</td>
<td>White Privilege</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.14.2011</td>
<td>Privilege Panel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Guest Speakers</th>
<th>CO2s/CO3 Present</th>
<th>Family Present</th>
<th>Friends Present</th>
<th>Other Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.15.2011</td>
<td>Heterosexism Privilege Panel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.19.2011</td>
<td>Mercy for Animals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.20.2011</td>
<td>Central Market</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.21.2011</td>
<td>Animal/Food Reflections</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.22.2011</td>
<td>TedX and Writing Workshops</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.26.2011</td>
<td>Library Book Selection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.27.2011</td>
<td>Gender Out of the Box</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.28.2011</td>
<td>Killing Me Softly/Tough Guise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.29.2011</td>
<td>Reflect on Killing/Tough</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3.2011</td>
<td>Lit Discuss1 Perspectives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4.2011</td>
<td>International Guests Panel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5.2011</td>
<td>Reflect on International Panel/Single Story</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6.2011</td>
<td>World Traveler Essay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.10.2011</td>
<td>Lit Discuss2 Perspectives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11.2011</td>
<td>Midwest County Conservatory</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.12.2011</td>
<td>Perspective in Art Museum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.13.2011</td>
<td>In the Shoes of Another Prep1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.17.2011</td>
<td>In the Shoes of Another Prep3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.18.2011</td>
<td>In the Shoes of Another Present1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.19.2011</td>
<td>In the Shoes of Another Present2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.24.2011</td>
<td>Perspectives Art Show</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.25.2011</td>
<td>Labyrinth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Guest Speakers</th>
<th>CO2s/CO3 Present</th>
<th>Family Present</th>
<th>Friends Present</th>
<th>Other Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.26.2011</td>
<td>Community Day</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.27.2011</td>
<td>World Religions Intro</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.28.2011</td>
<td>Library Research-Religions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2.2011</td>
<td>Religions Presentation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3.2011</td>
<td>Jesus Camp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.4.2011</td>
<td>Religions of India Photos Exhibit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.7.2011</td>
<td>Lit Discuss1 Religions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.8.2011</td>
<td>Hindu Readings/Research Topics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.14.2011</td>
<td>Erma's Library</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15.2011</td>
<td>Erma's Buddhist Temple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.16.2011</td>
<td>Lit Discuss2 Religions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.17.2011</td>
<td>Jewish Synagogue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.18.2011</td>
<td>Religious Music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.21.2011</td>
<td>Interviews/Library (students choice)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5.2011</td>
<td>Druid Priest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.6.2011</td>
<td>Caravaggio Exhibit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.7.2011</td>
<td>Islamic Mosque</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.8.2011</td>
<td>Jigsaw Start/Congregationalist Pastor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.9.2011</td>
<td>Jigsaw Practice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.12.2011</td>
<td>Jigsaw Presentations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.13.2011</td>
<td>Project Reflection/Evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.14.2011</td>
<td>Community Day</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.15.2011</td>
<td>Autobiography Project Intro</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>54 Lessons Observed</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Table of Participants’ Identities
Table 11.  
*Participants‘ Identities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role in Class</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>SPE</th>
<th>Home Location</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Original Facebook Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christy</td>
<td>Participant-Observer</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Connect</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erma</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Connect</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Pre-Service Teacher</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Midwest State University</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Pre-Service Teacher</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Midwest State University</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>H-Burb Abraham</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>G-Burb</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>NewBurb</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Not Allowed to Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cosmo</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belinda</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cosmo</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callie</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>W-Burb William</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Biracial</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsey</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>D-Burb John</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>WestBurb Central</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>G-Burb</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>D-Burb George</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Not Allowed to Track</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>GroBurb James</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Not Allowed to Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katrina</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>D-Burb George</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>NewBurb</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>GroBurb James</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>WestBurb Central</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>GroBurb James</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>R-Burb</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>NewBurb</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Biracial</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cosmo</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacy</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cosmo</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>D-Burb John</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: 17 Guiding Principles of Connect
17 Guiding Principles

1. We believe that students learn best from an integrated, project-based curriculum that incorporates choice, active learning, and outside audiences.

2. We believe in the creation of caring relationships among students and between individual students and their facilitators.

3. We believe that diversity makes us stronger because it enables us to learn from people who are different from ourselves.

4. We believe that in a trusting, emotionally safe environment students are able to fully express their ideas and personalities, feel valued, and gain self-confidence.

5. We believe in individual solutions rather than one-size-fits-all rules.

6. We believe that student voice matters.

7. We believe that teens deserve to be treated like adults and are capable of being accountable for that responsibility.

8. We believe that differences of opinion are a valuable tool for learning if they are explored in a respectful, productive way.

9. We believe in helping students utilize their strengths and take advantage of their unique learning styles as tools to ensure their success.

10. We believe students in will do the right thing because they value the program and their relationships with the facilitators, not simply to avoid getting in trouble.

11. We value the student as self-guided learner, emphasizing reflection and self awareness. Facilitators are coaches of the learning.

12. We value the development of students’ collaboration skills.

13. We value learning for learning’s sake rather than for the purpose of getting the grade.

14. We value students who take on personal challenges and we provide support as they work toward success.

15. We value parents’ support and involvement in their child’s learning.

16. We value exploring multiple perspectives (points of view) as a means for gaining meaningful understanding of complex issues.

17. We believe learning is a way of life and therefore expect students to take advantage of the wide range of unique learning opportunities both within and outside school.

_We have high expectations for students and the program and we encourage students to have high expectations for themselves._
Appendix D: Table of Written Assignments Across Content Units
### Table 12.
**Written Assignments Across Content Units**

#### Perspectives Project Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Assignment Overview</th>
<th>What are students learning?</th>
<th>Artifacts- Students Produced; Teachers Graded</th>
<th>Completion Record (Total 21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8.31.2011| 1.) Summer Literature Discussion | (Taken from Assignment Prep Sheet) You will need to bring this sheet, your notes and the book itself to the inaugural literature discussion on Wednesday, August 31. Note: This preparation sheet is not about copying down entire passages from the book; it is about you locating elements of the book that have meaning for you. This sheet is to be looked at as a way to organize your ideas in note form so that you will be deeply prepared for the literary discussion. | • Skills-Critical reading; Internet research; discussion skills including making and supporting arguments and using appropriate words and behaviors in social interactions;  
• Values-reading alphabetic texts; personal connections to texts; aesthetic and efferent readings of texts; going beyond the text for deeper understandings  
• FW of CO connects/intersects with FW of school: At CO learning includes worksheets but the focus is on the individual and his or her thoughts  
• Based on questions asked, strong value placed on the text itself, not only content but how it is written  
• Knowledge of the author helps deepen one's understanding of his or her works  
• CO teachers expect more than filling up space on blank pages  
• Texts don’t provide all the answers; in fact, texts provoke questions for further investigation | Literature Discussion Prep Sheet and Self-Assessment Rubric | 21 |
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Continued
Authors use language to not only impart information, but also for its musicality, ability to create an image, and to give readers clues about character and theme. What did you observe about the writing style, devices, or use of language in the book?

- What was your personal response to the book? Did you relate any of the ideas or characters to your own life? How did it affect the way you think about your life?
- List three interesting facts/ideas about the author and/or the book you learned from doing research. Note your source, i.e.: Amazon.com, Salon.com, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.23.2011</td>
<td>2.) Perspectives Research Paper</td>
<td>Students will form groups of 4-5 based on a historical time period, era, issue, or event of interest to them. Each student will write a short (three pages of text) research paper on a perspective related to her/his topic. The paper should have standard MLA style formatting (typed, double-spaced, 1-inch margins, Times New Roman, 12-point font) and a properly formatted Works Cited page. - Content-varied depending on topic; parts of an academic research paper, including a works cited page - Skills-Critical reading; Internet and library research; writing an academic research paper; using MLA format; building a written argument based upon academic research; editing - Values-locating and reading alphabetic academic texts; written expression of argument; MLA formatting; composing and typing an academic research paper - FW of CO again connected to FW of school—academic research paper genre with specific formatting rules following MLA - FW of CO different though as everyone has different topic/perspective to write (arguments are individualized) - Teachers assume student background knowledge in academic research papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3.2011</td>
<td>3.) Perspectives Literature Discussion</td>
<td>Each group member will choose a different book to read that tells the story of the time period, era, or event through the lens of a particular individual (i.e. historical figure, fictional character, etc.). The book may be - Skills-Critical reading; Internet research; discussion skills including making and supporting arguments and using appropriate words and behaviors in social interactions; - Values-reading alphabetic texts; personal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
biography, autobiography, memoir, fiction, essays, or poetry. A facilitator must approve each book. As they read, students will pay particular attention to how time, place, circumstance, and other factors influence the development of an individual perspective. Students will complete preparatory sheets for each literary guild and share their knowledge with their fellow group members.

Connections to texts; aesthetic and efferent readings of texts; going beyond the text for deeper understandings; perspective consciousness
• FW of CO connects/intersects with FW of school: At CO learning includes worksheets but the focus is on the individual and his or her thoughts
• Based on questions asked, strong value placed on the text itself, not only content but how it is written
• Knowledge of the author helps deepen one's understanding of his or her works
• CO teachers expect more than filling up space on blank pages
• Texts don't provide all the answers; in fact, texts provoke questions for further investigation
• Students positioned as experts on his/her book's perspective (this work is done by teachers)

10.5.2011

CoNo Check
(Taken from CoNo Assignment Sheet)
Here’s the game:
• Bring your mo no to class with you EVERY DAY.
• Use it to capture your learnings, reactions, favorite quotes, and mental images.
• Be creative. Feel free to include illustrations, photos, collages, etc.
• Make your notebook the enduring document of your mosaic learning experience. It should be the place you can return years down the road to relive the intellectual encounters of your Co 1 year.

Every time we have a guest speaker or film you should take at least one page of notes. These notes reflect the big ideas or small facts you got from the speakers’ presentations. We • Skills-note-taking; writing to show learning; organizing and holding onto work over time;
• Values—“thinking about what you are learning”; college and "adult world" as well as preparing one's self for them; writing as a performance of learning; outside resources (guest speakers and films but no notes required on teachers’ lectures or student presentations); holding onto work for a extended time, preferably a lifetime
• Teachers expect students want to "relive the intellectual encounters" or even that they will have intellectual encounters that they will then track in their CoNos
• At CO, teachers expect creativity (defined as illustrations, photos, collages, etc.)
• FW of CO connects/intersects with FW of school: students need paper and writing

Notebook filled with handwritten notes
21
will periodically collect your notebooks and randomly check to see that you have complete notes. **These checks will make up a significant part of your cultural studies grade.**

Why are notes so important to us, you ask?
1. Taking notes is a way of thinking about what you are learning. The process of deciding what to write down engages you in the process of examining what the speaker says and determining what parts of the talk matter most to you.
2. Note-taking is an extremely important life skill. It is a great habit to develop, not only for your success in college, but for your success in the adult world.

- Cultural studies' content is comprised of guest speakers and films

---

10.10.2011

5.) Perspectives

Literature Discussion 2

Each group member will choose a different book to read that tells the story of the time period, era, or event **through the lens of a particular individual** (i.e. historical figure, fictional character, etc.). The book may be biography, autobiography, memoir, fiction, essays, or poetry. A facilitator must approve each book. As they read, students will pay particular attention to how time, place, circumstance, and other factors influence the development of an individual perspective. Students will complete preparatory sheets for each literary guild and share their knowledge with their fellow group members.

The 2 nd lit discussion will include a "process drama" where each student will play the role of the author or a character from the book.

- Skills-Critical reading; Internet research; discussion skills including making and supporting arguments and using appropriate words and behaviors in social interactions;
- Values-reading alphabetic texts; personal connections to texts; aesthetic and efferent readings of texts; going beyond the text for deeper understandings; perspective consciousness
- FW of CO connects/intersects with FW of school: At CO learning includes worksheets but the focus is on the individual and his or her thoughts
- Based on questions asked, strong value placed on the text itself, not only content but how it is written
- Knowledge of the author helps deepen one's understanding of his or her works
- CO teachers expect more than filling up space on blank pages
- Texts don’t provide all the answers; in fact, texts provoke questions for further investigation

Literature Discussion Prep Sheet and Self-Assessment Rubric
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10.19.2011</th>
<th>6.) Perspectives Outside Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Taken from Assignment Sheet)</td>
<td>During the Perspectives Project you will need to attend at least one outside learning or performing arts event in MidwestCity. <strong>Completion of this learning experience is required in order for students to pass cultural studies this grading period.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After you attend your performance and outside learning experiences, complete a Performing Arts/Outside Learning Experience Reaction Paper and turn it in to Max. <strong>Reaction papers must be turned in within ONE WEEK of the event.</strong> Reaction papers submitted more than one week of the experience will not be accepted. For performing arts events, please staple your ticket stub to the paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The reaction should have the following information (single spaced) at the top: Your Name Event Attended Venue Date of the event Who went with you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write a paragraph response to each of the following questions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Describe the event. Use details to tell about what specifically happened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Deeper understandings of perspectives come through pretending to be a person with such perspectives (This might be a value on empathy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Content-varied depending on what students attended but largely focused on artistic expressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Skills-locating and attending artistic events in MidwestCity; finding one's way around MidwestCity; writing to show learning;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Values-performing arts; urban events; navigation of a city (both in terms of transportation and knowing about events); writing as evidence of learning; learning across places/spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cultural studies content includes attending an outside CO event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Like notes in CoNo, one shows learning by writing about the experience (though the audience for this writing is Max and Erma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• FW of CO connects/intersects with FW of school: Heading at the top of reaction paper as well as a reaction paper to show learning from an experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• At CO, one can choose one's learning experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• At CO, teachers are interested in each students' learning experiences, which include thoughts and feelings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2-page typed paper</td>
<td>19 (missing for Katrina and Amy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### World Religions Project Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Assignment Overview (from Project Overview Sheet unless noted)</th>
<th>What are students learning?</th>
<th>Artifacts- Students Produced; Teachers Graded</th>
<th>Completion Record (Total 21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11.2.2011  | 8.) Religions Basic | To foster an understanding of each religion being studied, representatives from each religion will gather to share the basics of | • Content-Religions  
• Skills-Internet and library research; reading; writing answers to questions; collaborating;                                                                                       | Written answers to teacher questions on handouts as                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 21                          |
| 10.20.2011 | 7.) Synthesizing Seminar | Students will be engaged in a variety of activities that provide opportunities to extend and deepen their thinking about perspective development. These activities may include readings, guest speakers, and community experiences. Students will write about the connections and engage in a synthesizing seminar analyzing the relationship between the activities and the project's Enduring Understandings. | • Content-everything from this particular unit, which included perspectives on race, gender, sexual orientation, class, food, nationality as well as the research group topics  
• Skills-synthesizing; linking intended goals to actual knowledge/skills gained; writing to show learning; metacognition  
• Values-synthesizing; awareness of learning process over time (particularly one unit); metacognition; writing; agency of learner  
• FW of CO connects/intersects with FW of school: Assessment at the end of a unit where teachers already know the "correct" answers  
• At CO this assessment is different because students are not showing content knowledge but instead show how CO activities link to teacher objectives  
• Teaching involves creating activities that help learners reach particular intended goals (termed enduring understandings at CO)                                                                 | Enduring Understandings Prep Sheet                                                                                                                                          | 21                          |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Well as their presentation to small group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.7.2011</td>
<td>Students will have a choice of reading one of eight books to use as the basis of their lit discussions. Students will self-evaluate and complete reflections. Students who have already read one or more of the books on this list should choose one they have not read.</td>
<td>Students will have a choice of reading one of eight books to use as the basis of their lit discussions. Students will self-evaluate and complete reflections. Students who have already read one or more of the books on this list should choose one they have not read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.16.2011</td>
<td>Students will have a choice of reading one of eight books to use as the basis of their lit discussions. Students will self-evaluate and complete reflections. Students who have already read one or more of the books on this list should choose one they have not read.</td>
<td>Students will have a choice of reading one of eight books to use as the basis of their lit discussions. Students will self-evaluate and complete reflections. Students who have already read one or more of the books on this list should choose one they have not read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30.2011</td>
<td>Religions Interview</td>
<td>Interview a cleric or a follower of the religion. Each student should prepare a short list of questions high-lighting their paper topic and participate fully in the discussion. <strong>Each group member</strong> will turn in a short analysis of what (s)he learned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2.2011</td>
<td>Religions Research Paper</td>
<td>Students will write a team research paper with <strong>four of the following six</strong> sections: 1. <strong>Section A</strong>: Compare two different versions/forms/branches of the religion, for example orthodox and reform Judaism or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.14.2011</td>
<td>2. Section B: Analyze how a major culture has affected the growth and/or evolution of the religion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Section C: Explore the role of the religion in a contemporary world issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Section D: Explore the art of the religion: common motifs, examples, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Section E: An analysis of how the religion is presented through popular culture, looking at stereotypes, myths and contrasting such information with the reality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Section F: Ritual/Rites: Provide an in-depth analysis of either how people of this faith worship/connect with god OR analyze one of their religious rites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>using MLA format; building a written argument based upon academic research; editing (these are more implicit than before)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Values—locating and reading alphabetic academic texts; written expression of argument; MLA formatting; composing and typing an academic research paper (these are more implicit than before); collaboration (intended but as Erma said in interview not enacted)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FW of CO different though as everyone has different section to write (arguments are individualized)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing a collaborative research paper involves each person writing their section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers assume student background knowledge in academic research papers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.) Religions Outside Learning For this project, each student is required to study a religion different from his or her own. To facilitate this understanding, students are asked to attend a service at a church, synagogue, mosque, or meeting of a religion that is different from their own. Students may visit a religious site in a group and are encouraged to invite other Connect students to their personal place of worship. Following this visit, students will write a two-page reflection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: World Religions Outside Learning Instruction Sheet
World Religions Outside Learning Experience

One of the goals of World Religions is to help students experience the many amazing learning opportunities that exist in Browning. Specifically, the World Religions project hopes to facilitate understanding and create bridge of commonality between the different traditions represented in the area. To this end, each student is required to attend a “service” at a religious center different from his or her own. Students are encouraged to attend such events together. Students are encouraged to go beyond the “norm” and seek out more diverse events, such as attending meditation at a Buddhist temple or visit a Quaker Meeting House.

Completion of this assignment is required to pass the Cultural Studies portion of this project.

World Religions Outside Learning Reaction Paper

After you attend your outside learning experience, complete reaction paper and turn it in to WR. Students are expected to write up their experiences within a week of attendance so the information is fresh and the reflection more specific. The paper should be approximately two-pages, double-spaced, typed. Be specific in your recollection and reflection. Take notes immediately after the event so all the details are fresh in your mind.

The reaction paper should have the following information (single spaced) at the top:

Your Name
Event Attended
Place
Date of the event
Who went with you?

Write a paragraph response to each of the following questions:
Describe where you went—use the language of imagery to give the reader a feel for the place visited. What did it look like? Sound like? Smell like? Feel like? What kind of community was present—young, old, racial/ethnic make-up? Describe the event. Use details to tell about what specifically happened. What was the “service” about? Was there participation by the community? Was there singing? Meditation/prayer? Did congregants appear to be engaged? Why did you choose this particular event? What was new or unique for you about the experience? Did you enjoy the experience? Why or why not? What did you learn from the experience? You may describe new “content” you learned, new insights you gained, or something you learned about yourself from the experience.
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