

3

**Diverse Social Contexts of a Second-Language Classroom and
the Construction of Identity****Elizabeth Hirst**

Literacy education sits at the interface between the construction of social identities and the construction of the national, corporate, and global social relations. Theories of literacy need to contend with this interface—both at the micro classroom level and the macro level of social and institutional planes of activity. Developing a repertoire of literacy practices involves the appropriation and mastery of the technologies of representation, of mediational means; it is a set of mediated actions or social practices constructed in political economies. Literacy practices cannot be quarantined from the “real world” and considered as a set of asocial, amoral skills to be mastered; they are always shaped, produced, and consumed in relation to broader social and cultural conditions and inevitably involve issues of identity. Similarly, second-language literacy education can never stand alone. It is always used and produced within particular social and cultural contexts. In this chapter I argue that these contexts are not sites, locations, or containers for the learning of literacy—where the classroom context starts at the classroom door—but are active and constitutive in the appropriation and mastery of literate practices and the construction of identity.

The second-language classroom, like any other classroom, is a meeting place of a range of discursive practices, sites of “heteroglossic articulations of various historical, class, and cultural interests contending for social power and capital” (A. Luke, 1998, p. 52). Learning

another language, or another set of discursive practices, is the process of appropriating the cultural resources or voices of these communities (Wertsch, 1991); it is a semiotic apprenticeship (Gee, 1992; Wells, 1999). In this process the individual and the social are always mutually reconstituting, and the fundamental unit of communication, the utterance, is not only a site where the personal and the social meet, it is a site where the person and the society alike are produced. Identity is thus conceived as “mediated action” (Wertsch, 1998), a point of articulation and suture between discourses and practices which produce subjectivities and the agency of the individual to take up these practices.

This chapter is premised on the assumption that Language Other Than English (LOTE) classes are key sites for the contestation and construction of identity in what theorists such as Stuart Hall refer to as “New Times,” times of rapid political transitions, of the new socioeconomic order of “new capitalism” (Fairclough, 2000), characterized by changed and uneven patterns of flow of capital and bodies, resulting in the emergence of “underclasses,” of new poor and geographically marginalized communities, along with various forms of fundamentalism (Castells, 1996). These changes impact on school practices, including issues of work intensification, the introduction of contracts, and the commodification of education, which reflect the emergent new capitalist economy with “a strong emphasis on bringing about change in schools and thereby changing the values and attitudes of tomorrow’s workers” (Gee, Hull, & Lankshear, 1996, p. 31). The new workers who are interpellated by these neoliberal discourses and the language of new capitalism have major implications for the nature of schools and schooling.

Discursive practices are generally analyzed in terms of conversations or dialogical encounters and are rarely conceived spatially or temporally, not only as meaningful texts or

actions, but also in relation to the reproduction and production of different spaces and times (Leander, 2001). However, the dialogical nature of utterance, as Bakhtin (1981b) insists, is a constant struggle over meaning which, he argues, obliges us to examine the conditions of “dialogised heteroglossia” (p. 276). This term describes the living interaction of the word, within the “elastic environment” of other “alien” (not one’s own) words, that gives import not only to its linguistic character but also to the significance of the associated socially constructed temporal and spatial conditions. These conditions are not just environments or backdrops or places, although the construction of space involves each of these elements, but are significant as a result of how they come to be engaged and changed by social practices. Not only are the social contexts of LOTE classes constituted through these discursive practices, but also different groups often construct them differently, and some constructions are more privileged than others. An understanding of the discursive and ideological activity of the classroom and the corresponding concept of identity are contingent upon an understanding of the production of both social space and time, and their associated patterns of flow and exchange.

Therefore, mediated action, individuals operating with mediational means in a social context (Wertsch, 1998), can be considered as a “trialectical” relationship, rather than a dialectical binary relationship of individual and tool user, which tends to consign social context to “backdrop.” “Trialectics” is the term that Soja (1996) coins to describe Lefebvre’s (1976) principle of “thirling-as-Othering”: a determination to incorporate a third element to “crack open” traditional binaries by “introducing an-Other term, a third possibility or ‘moment’ that partakes of the original pairing but not just a simple combination of an ‘in-between’ position along some all inclusive continuum” (p. 60). For example, in the traditional Marxist binary of labor and capital Lefebvre (1976) asserts the significance of land, which, he argues, enriches a

Marxist analysis and makes it more complex. Similarly, Soja argues that discourse analysis is incomplete without including an analysis of space. Thus, I argue that the three elements of mediated action cannot be understood in isolation or separated for analysis; in this chapter the third element of the trialectical relationship of mediated action, social context, is conceived in terms of temporal and spatial practices and relationships.

An analysis of temporal and spatial relationships is of particular salience where the time and space LOTE populates, both real and imaginary, emerges as an arena of conflict. Not only do these struggles over meaning and privilege tell us something about the positioning of LOTE in the school curriculum and within the community, but also the ways that time is conceptualized and space is reproduced in the classroom are intrinsic elements in the production of certain kinds of minds, certain kinds of people. Thus, the classroom is reframed, Luke (in press) suggests, “as a social field engaged in a series of flows and exchanges that enable the production of texts and literate practices (and the omission of others).”

I contend that an analysis of second-language literacy education, of the interface between the macro and micro activity, is incomplete without taking account of the temporal and spatial realities and imaginaries that shape the material conditions that characterize New Times—times in which, Bhabha (1994) argues, the importance of theorizing these relations of time and space has become more critical:

The power of historical locality becomes particularly persuasive as the problem of cultural identity is staged in discourses of geographical complexity—migration, diaspora, postcoloniality. The demand for specificity increases as the subject of cultural citizenship becomes inscribed with more and more of the striations of difference found in a multicultural, pluralist, late capitalist global

society. The call for historical locality is also then a dislocation of the agency of cultural and disciplinary identity. (p. 2)

This is of particular note in the study drawn on this chapter, which considers the interactions in a second-language classroom taught by an Indonesian national in an Australian classroom—a result of policies of engagement between Asia and Australia.

A\ Analytical Framework

Identity is often theorized in terms of its construction and manifestation in discourse, with the need to study the texts of everyday life to observe the mechanisms of these processes. The ways that discourses operate in society need sophisticated linguistic and intertextual analysis to see how this happens (Fairclough, 1992). One of the aims of this chapter is to apply that kind of analysis to the texts of a LOTE classroom, analyzing the role spatial and temporal practices play in establishing power relations that constitute and sustain identities and ideologies. Considering space and time as material conditions recognizes that diverse spatialities exist simultaneously within the same physical location, each constituted by particular economic and political relations and each with its own pattern of flow and exchange which entails the production of certain texts and literate practices (Sheehy, 1999). Foucault's (1986) description of "heterotopia" provides a useful way of considering the relationships between these spaces. The socially constructed spaces in the classroom do not stand alone but are inextricably linked; nevertheless, they can be incompatible. As Foucault posits, heterotopia has "the curious property of being in relation with all the other sites, but in such a way as to suspect, neutralize, or invert the set of relations that they happen to designate, mirror or reflect" (p. 25). The LOTE classroom is a place where the rules of the normal classroom are transgressed, where the established relationships of power are challenged as students undermine the LOTE teacher's legitimacy to take up the powerful identity

of teacher. Much like Bakhtin's concept of carnival, with its parodic systems, the established order of the classroom is disrupted. Furthermore, Foucault argues that each heterotopia has "a precise and determined function" (p. 25); they are not just spontaneous or idiosyncratic, but act as microcosms both reflecting and constituting larger cultural patterns. Thus, the events that occur in the classroom are not incidental but, as Soja (1996, p. 46) reminds us, "part of the (social) production of (social) space, the construction of individual and societal spatialities."

To address this interface and the intrinsic spatial and temporal relations of discursive practices, to analyze "dialogised heteroglossia," Bakhtin (1981b) utilized the principle of chronotopicity. He contends that "every entry into the sphere of meaning is accomplished only through the gates of the chronotope" (1981b, p. 199). In his analysis of the genres of the novel, he shows how their structures reveal a patterned series of events and how these events are constituted within particular relations of time and space. Using the concept of the chronotope to express the inseparability of time and space, Bakhtin identifies the unity of texts through distinct chronotopes: ways in which temporal and spatial realities are represented. Chronotopes, he argues, function as the primary means by which time is materialized in space; they are "organizing centers" for significant narrative events presented by the text. Time and space are material conditions; they are not divorced from the text but intrinsic elements of it.

The spaces of the LOTE classroom are social constructions constituted through enactive and recognitive work (Gee, 2000), informed by and implicated in cultural understandings of time and space. It is, Leander (1999, p. 2) suggests, through the production of the classroom chronotope that classroom discourse is stabilized and thus can be recognized as a generic practice. For example, the spatial and temporal organization of the classroom and patterns of flow and exchange that characterize the IRE (an initiation, response, and evaluation tripartite

exchange dominated by the teacher) pattern of classroom talk readily conjure up a particular kind of classroom, an “old space” (Sheehy, 1999) constituted by authoritarian social relations and recognizable teacher and student identities. Bloome and Katz (1997), drawing on Bakhtin’s analysis of chronotopes, describe how different conceptions of time may operate in the classroom, with different sets of social relations and identity practices. For some participants, the chronotope of the LOTE classroom may be implicitly conceptualized as “theater,” the “public square,” or “adventure-time”—a time and place for overcoming obstacles and emerging unscathed and untouched by the experience, with identities fundamentally unchanged. Thus, chronotopes provide a way of analyzing classroom genres by considering how relations of time and space are differently constituted. For example, the teacher may attempt to construct the genre of the “Indonesian lesson,” drawing on cultural repertoires of “the lesson”: the ways in which time and space are marked out with their characteristic patterns of flow; the ways bodies are positioned in space and time; and the ways in which time is valued and measured. Meanwhile other classroom participants may reconstitute a genre that is characterized by very different social practices and cultural identities, characterized, for example, by Bakhtin’s (1981b) description of the chronotope of “adventure-time.” These genres frame incompatible and sometimes conflicting cultural identities and relations of power. Deploying the principle of chronotopicity enables an examination of the ways social contexts are constituted, privileged, and territorialized, a focus on how the students in these classrooms acquire and master certain literate practices, take up particular identities, and how these practices are constituted by and constitute institutional, national, and global spatial and temporal practices.

B\ The Classroom

This study forms part of a larger investigation at an elementary school (Hirst, 2002), which serves students from low to medium socioeconomic backgrounds across a wide geographical area of outer suburbs. Data were collected using video and audio tapes, observational notes, and interviews over an eight-month period from a year 7 LOTE (Indonesian) class, comprising 23 students (11 to 13 years of age): 12 boys and 11 girls. Four of the students are of Aboriginal background, 2 boys and 2 girls; 1 boy is of Asian descent. The students have been learning Indonesian since year 5, scheduled in three half-hour lessons each week. Pak Asheed (all names used in this chapter are pseudonyms), the itinerant LOTE teacher, services two schools and is employed as part of a cooperative agreement between an Indonesian provincial administration and the Queensland State Government. His first language is a regional Indonesian language and his second language is Bahasa Indonesia. He trained as a secondary English-language teacher in Indonesia. This study was conducted from the beginning of his second year in Australia and his first year of appointment as a LOTE teacher. Prior to this he was employed as an assistant at two high schools in the metropolitan area. Before his current appointment he had no experience of primary teaching and had neither planned nor taught independently in Australia.

A\ LOTE's Chronotopes

B\ "Third Space" Possibilities

The "third space" is a construct to describe how other spaces might interanimate and create the possibility of a potentially more heteroglossic authentic interaction (Gutierrez, Rymes, & Larson, 1995); it is a space, Homi Bhabha (1990) argues, which entails the generation of new meanings and the emergence of hybrid identities:

This third space displaces the histories that constitute it, and sets up new structures of authority, new political initiatives....[T]he process of cultural hybridity gives rise to something different, something new and unrecognizable, a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation. (p. 211)

In similar vein, Bakhtin discusses hybridization not as simply a combination of chronotopes but as a process whereby they interanimate and which “radically changes their character” (Bakhtin, 1981b, p. 165) of the new chronotope that is generated. This hybridity is envisaged by Bakhtin “as a highly productive form of dialogue between persons in past, present, and future space-times” (Leander, 2001).

Second-language classrooms are characterized by heterogeneity, considered as an essential platform for dialogical interanimation (Ballenger, 1997; Gutierrez et al., 1995; Haworth, 1999), and afford the potential for negotiation of diversity, the articulation of cultural differences, thus the development of third spaces (Byram, 1999; Carr, 1999; C. Kramsch, 1998). It is these affordances that are envisaged in the rhetoric of policies and resulted in the introduction of LOTE as a compulsory curriculum area in the middle and upper years of elementary schooling over the last decade in Queensland. These educational policies, as Luke (2003, p.132) posits, “are bids to regulate and govern flows of discourse, fiscal capital, physical and human resources across the time/space boundaries of educational systems.” They envision students as mastering or appropriating certain voices and taking up particular identities, becoming certain sorts of people. LOTE classrooms are imagined as an opportunity for two (or more) cultures to come into contact, and potentially into dialogue, enabling new forms of understanding to develop, diverse voices to interanimate, and for dialogic learning to eventuate, with the concomitant construction of hybrid cultural identities (Hirst & Renshaw, in press).

Notwithstanding the cogency of the policies and initiatives, realizing these outcomes has been problematic (MacKerras, 1995). In many schools in Queensland LOTE has found itself in a marginal space in the school curriculum through challenges to its legitimacy from school administrators, classroom teachers, parents, and students (Djite, 1994; Rix, 1999). The policies themselves, although framed in terms of developing intercultural competence through the negotiation of diversity, are underpinned by other discourses, notably the discourse of the market, where diversity is commodified and conceptualized as a resource to be accumulated (Connell, 2002).

B\ Spaces of Economic Rationality: “The Time-Management Chronotope”

The economic rationale that underpins these second-language policies is most obvious in initiatives that prioritized the expansion of Asian languages programs (COAG, 1994). Building on the positive correlation between linguistic skills and export growth (Stanley, Ingram, & Chittick, 1990), these initiatives not only sought to facilitate this growth but also to address “the importance of minimizing resistance to export growth due to linguistic, cultural and attitudinal resistance to Asia” (MacKerras, 1995, p. 5). The underlying assumption is that by adding value to students’ linguistic capital, economic benefits accrue in the nation’s capital, or, more obtusely, by valuing adding tolerance, students’ resistance to Asia will be reduced, facilitating the positive flow of economic capital (MacKerras, 1995).

These neoliberal discourses permeate the organization and arrangement of LOTE in schools. For the most part the institutional chronotope of LOTE is an issue of time and space management: how and where to fit it efficiently both temporally and spatially so that it provides the greatest amount of benefit to students (for LOTE learning) and classroom teachers (for noncontact time, NCT), and the least amount of problems (behaviorally), a principle to enable

the flow of goods. This evokes a spatiality of the market in which the flow and exchange of goods follows established and recognized patterns of trade. Time is conceptualized as a valued commodity to be segmented and used efficiently to facilitate productivity: a resource to be distributed. Rämö (1999) argues that the ideas found in managerial discourses are equal to chronotopes: “the common denominator among these management ideas is the creation of smooth, swift and thrifty flows” (p. 319). In this time-management chronotope, Pak Asheed represents a “container”—the epitome of efficient and effective management. The container is prepacked, transported in, unloaded, and transported out. Time is quantifiable and equated with efficiency and regarded as an important yardstick to measure the value of activities. LOTE policy documents calculate that 420 hours are required for the transfer of goods to enable students to gain a certain level of linguistic competency. The chronotope of the LOTE lesson is established institutionally as a management device.

Time and space are inherently implicated in the institution’s cultural ideology, including its educational ideology. Not only issues of curriculum and pedagogy but also administrative arrangements by which the school is organized define teachers’ work and thus teachers’ identities. Although other chronotopes must exist at the institutional level, the time-management chronotope is privileged. School administration mirrors and reinforces the patterns of dominance and subordination found in the wider society (Troyna & Rizvi, 1997), leading to a tendency to avoid examination of cultural concerns and favor the technical. This bureaucratic rationality structures much of the discourse of schooling, making it difficult to accommodate differences, whether cultural or political, except in certain symbolic ways. These are more often contained and/or commodified, for example, in the celebration of multicultural days, National Aboriginal and Islander Day of Celebration, and, it seems, LOTE lessons.

These institutional practices seriously mitigate against the legitimacy and status of the teacher and the successful implementation and sustainability of LOTE policies (NALSAS, 1998). The itinerant nature of primary LOTE teachers' work and school management practices of time-tabling LOTE to provide NCT for classroom teachers can impair the inclusion or support of both the teacher and the LOTE in the school community (Miller, 1997b; Roulston, 1998). This marginal position has in many cases been further intensified by contracting overseas born and trained teachers, native speakers of the LOTE, to counter the projected and current shortfall of LOTE teachers both in terms of numbers (Djite, 1994) and proficiency (MacKerras, 1995). These teachers, Kamler, Santoro, and Reid (1998) argue, neither count, numerically, culturally, or professionally, nor receive systemic support. This is of particular moment, "if we acknowledge that parochial attitudes and covert racism are a part of the experience of overseas born teachers" (Kamler et al., 1998, p. 509). These cultural patterns can be situated within the production and reproduction of new capitalist spatiality, and, as Berland (1992) notes, one is implicated in the production of the other. The dominance of the time-management chronotope exemplifies one way in which an educational system within the emerging postmodern state is implicated in this production, through its demand for more at the lowest cost (Lingard, Ladwig, & Luke, 1998).

B\ "Our" Space: A National(ist) Agenda

The dilemma between, on the one hand, policy initiatives which mandate for the increase and expansion of LOTE teaching, particularly Asian languages, in order to underpin Australia's economic future through the skilling of future workers with desirable linguistic competencies and attitudes, and, on the other hand, the institutional issues, which include shortfall in teachers, itinerancy, and NCT, can be located within a broader framework of wider community attitudes.

Historically, Lo Bianco (1998) argues, “Australian linguistic culture made a virtue of steadfast monolingualism....[T]hese broad patterns of background civilization have an impact on the implementability of ambitious plans for languages, for these plans can never be divorced from the society which gives them life” (p. 8). These “ambitious plans” respond to a globalization agenda, but, as Castells (1996) observes, other emergent responses include various forms of fundamentalisms, in a harkening back to the imagined security and simplicity of the way it used to be, to traditional values, when lines of authority and status were firmly established and recognized. In Australia these times were explicitly “white times,” constituted by homogenizing assimilationist practices and the marginalization of difference. These practices, Macedo (2000) argues, sustain the structures and mechanisms of a colonial ideology designed to devalue the cultural capital and values of the Other, they also constitute a national identity defined through exclusionary practices by its “constitutive outside” (Hall, 1996).

In Australia, Pauline Hanson’s One Nation Party represents the re-emergence of nationalism in Australian political landscape. This party, according to Clyne (1998), “sanctions” racialized discursive practices by reconstituting spaces of “whiteness” and monolingualism: “we speak English here” (Hanson, cited in Clyne, 1998, p. 3). This has particular bearing for this study, located in an electorate whose One Nation candidate gained 57% of the primary vote (Parliament of Australia, 1998).

B\ The Communicative Chronotope

Other chronotopes also characterize LOTE at the institutional level. Curriculum documents (QSCC, 2000) encourage LOTE teachers to facilitate “communicative tasks” in their classes by engaging “learners in using real language for real or lifelike purposes” (p. 8). Students are asked to suspend belief and participate in these communicative tasks as other “real” times

and spaces are imagined. However, all too often this dialogue is used as a rehearsal so that students will appropriate pre-existing ways of using language (Morgan & Cain, 2000), and the “real” is “mock,” making LOTE classrooms “strange places” (Macaro, 1997, p. 55). These imaginary spaces and times are mapped onto the everyday geographies of classroom life, and students are expected to participate in and move seamlessly between these classroom chronotopes, taking up different voices, for example, an Indonesian shopkeeper or an Australian tourist.

Mimicry is a significant pedagogical practice in constructing these contexts. Macaro (1997) comments, “It is a wonder that the participants ‘play the game’ at all and abide by the rules” (p. 56). Abiding by the rules suggests that these utterances are “uni-directional” (Knoeller, 1998), that the intentions of the speaker are aligned with the original speaker. Mimicry is closely related to parody, a form of humor that saturates the LOTE classroom. Bakhtin (1981a) describes parody as “the borrowing by one voice of the recognizable style and timbre of another; it is ‘an artistic image of another language’” (p. 362). He highlights the dialogic process, arguing that the speakers may use the discourse of others for their own purposes by inserting new semantic intentions. Thus, in one utterance two semantic intentions, or two voices, are not only heard but intentionally executed in order to be heard—it is because of their audibility as two voices that the parody works. Humor depends on difference or incongruity, on the switch from one interpretative position to another. The first speaker’s utterance is distorted and undermined by the second speaker’s utterance; it calls into question the first speaker’s utterance, undermining it by drawing it into the humorous domain (Mulkay, 1988). In this play on language and the construction of these systems of parody at least two chronotopes can be constructed, the second

being directly related though often not compatible with the first, for example, the official space and the counterspace (Gutierrez et al., 1995).

B\ Play Time

Play is an aspect that frames the practices in the LOTE classroom and stands in stark contrast to the time-management chronotope. Previous experience and an expectation of significant behavioral problems with students during LOTE lessons underpinned the advice I received from a school principal as a beginning LOTE teacher to just play some games, sing some songs, and ensure students enjoyed the lesson to prevent behavioral problems. It is paradoxical that LOTE is framed so heavily by the managerialist chronotope yet treated playfully, as the principal recommended. The insertion of play and other infantile activities is consistent with a particular kindergarten chronotope—where students are allowed to move around the classroom, to talk more freely, and to play with artifacts and language.

To summarize, it is evident that the LOTE classroom is differently constituted through a variety of chronotopic practices. These practices are not always conducive to students' dialogic engagement with diverse cultural resources offered by the LOTE teacher. In the following I explore how actions in this time and space, designated by the institution for LOTE teaching and learning, reconstruct, contest, or subvert the spatiality and temporality of social contexts.

A\ Chronotopes of the LOTE Classroom

B\ Meetings and Partings

Junctures between normal and LOTE lessons provide opportunities to examine the privileging of temporal and spatial practices. At these meetings and partings, which Bakhtin identified as significant motifs of the chronotope, the macro social material conditions

constituted in everyday micro interactional encounters can be made visible as tensions become evident. In the following I comment on four excerpts from data collected at these transitions.

C\ Juncture 1

This is Pak Asheed's second week of teaching at the school. His timetable indicates his teaching responsibilities, which include two primary schools; at this school he teaches 5 classes, each class is scheduled to have three thirty-minute lessons per week.

Pak Asheed concludes the LOTE lesson with a formal greeting, collects his resources from the table near the door, and departs, nodding to me as he leaves the room. There is no classroom teacher present when he leaves at 2:00 P.M. Most students remain at their desks talking quietly. Their conversations are cut short as Rae Moran, the classroom teacher, returns. She stands still at the door; news of her presence flows quietly and quickly around the class as students adjust their bodies, taking up a "student" posture. She looks for several seconds at the clock located at the front of the classroom above the blackboard and then turns to me, asking where Pak Asheed is. It is 2:05 P.M., the scheduled time for the LOTE lesson to finish. The students are quiet and this exchange can easily be overheard.

C\ Juncture 2

Comments about time are not uncommon, one week later:

Rae returns to class after Pak Asheed has left, she looks around pointedly, then asks me, "Why has he gone already? It is not time; he's a few minutes early." I suggest that he may not realize that the lesson concludes at 2:05. "I'll have to speak to him," Rae replies. This conversation is quite loud, the students are very quiet, and they can easily overhear.

C\ Juncture 3

Three weeks later Rae informs Pak Asheed of the finishing time of the LOTE lesson:

Pak Asheed and I continue with our conversation as we walk from the staff room over to the classroom. The students are sitting on the cement pathway just outside their classroom. As we enter the classroom Rae joins us, she does not greet Pak Asheed but tells him that the LOTE lesson finishes at 2:05, not 2:00. He looks surprised and asks if this was just for today. "No, it's always been like that," she replies. He seems flustered and checks his timetable. His timetable wrongly indicates that the lesson begins at 1:30 rather than 1:35. He checks his schedule with me several times, checking again that this is not just a change in today's routine. Meanwhile Rae supervises the students' entry into the classroom.

The temporal order of LOTE lessons, which has been institutionally defined, is policed and regulated by the classroom teacher. Time, defined in these encounters as a commodity, a scarce resource, is quantifiable and can be exchanged for goods. It needs to be used productively; thus, timekeeping is important to allow LOTE time to be exchanged for NCT time. The classroom teacher asserts her identity as one who can regulate these timekeeping practices. Not only is the chronotope of time/management privileged in these exchanges, but it is the classroom teacher who is the agent of this privileging. Likewise, she asserts her authority over spatial relations. She monitors students as they move from an outside space to an inside space of the classroom following their lunch break. This transition between physical spaces is accompanied by a transition in activity and genre. Students' behavior, both physical and verbal, is monitored differently in this space. The classroom teacher watches the students as they walk in, calling one

student back and insisting he repeat the performance correctly; his bodily practices are not privileged in this space at this time. Space relationships are reinscribed on the student's body; the authority over bodily practices is reconstituted (Sheehy, 1999). This authority is evident even when she is not present in this classroom as we see in the following.

C\ Juncture 4

Pak Asheed has walked into the classroom; he is sorting through his resources on a desk near the door. Rae Moran is about to leave; she turns at the door, "You don't look particularly settled year 7. Why you don't have your Indonesian books out is just a little beyond me." The students take up a "student pose"; as they sit on their chairs their upper bodies are bent forward over their desks. One student does not respond. Rae moves to the back of the class and, speaking loudly as though addressing the whole class, comments on his behavior. She warns that if his behavior is not appropriate, he will be excluded; then, just before leaving, she addresses the whole class, reminding them that if their behavior is not appropriate during the LOTE lesson the games hour she has planned for the following day maybe cancelled.

Not only is the classroom teacher monitoring spatial relationships and practices, and the regulation of bodily practices, she is also bargaining with students to exchange these practices in LOTE time for a reward; if they can be good, if there are no behavioral problems, the students can participate in games time. Likewise, at the beginning of another lesson she demands, "Promise me, I will not need to come back and mop up the mess after your LOTE lesson." The social context/genre is shaped by the powerful identity she adopts. Not only does she assume the power to make these bargains but also through her actions she diminishes the power of the Indonesian teacher and the value of the lesson. Bargaining for good behavior presupposes, and

suggests to students, that it is not anticipated. Although Pak Asheed is now the legitimate teacher in the physical space of this classroom, the classroom teacher's power to shape the social context/genre and students' actions is evident in the following exchange.

D\ Transcript 1: Meeting and Greeting

- | | | |
|----|------------|--|
| 26 | Lily | Shush. (to students as PA walks to front of class) |
| 27 | Pak Asheed | Stand up for a few seconds (two claps) <i>Selamat siang kelas tujuh</i> (good afternoon Year Seven). |
| 28 | Students | <i>Selamat siang</i> Pak Asheed. (not all students are standing) |
| 29 | Pak Asheed | Stand [up (gently clapping) |
| 30 | Mike | [Hey, Lily, [Lily, Lily. (Lily looks briefly at Mike then to PA) |
| 31 | Simon | [Stand up, we gotta be good. |
| 32 | Bill | Stand u:p Will. |

Here we see two students reproduce both the classroom teacher's authority and her conception of LOTE time. Simon reminds students of the contract that has been established by the classroom teacher (line 31), and Bill reinforces this (line 32) as he targets Will's noncompliance following Pak Asheed's second request to stand up. Simon's re-voicing of the classroom teacher's utterance does the work that students often do, that is to collaborate and cooperate with teachers to construct order in the classroom (Davies, 1997), not only a linguistic but a spatial and temporal order. In this way the classroom teacher's authority is being reconstituted, and, although not present, her presence shapes the temporal and spatial conditions of the classroom. As Nespor (1994) posits, when we act, we are acting not only with people, places, and things that are spatially and temporally present but also with those that are removed yet present in the social context—both are constitutive of the social context. These comments are

representative of a broad repertoire of comments made at junctures between normal lessons and LOTE lessons and draw on discourses that constitute LOTE time and space in the organization of school life.

The LOTE teacher does not have these bargaining privileges. He never comments on students' behavior in other classes nor starts a LOTE lesson whilst the classroom teacher is physically present unless she indicates that he can do so. Neither does he speak to the teacher about her timekeeping practices, although she has often continued teaching after the scheduled start time of the LOTE lesson and lessons have occasionally been cancelled without his prior knowledge. He never interrupts other classes, yet it is not unusual for teachers and other school staff to interrupt LOTE lessons. He is employed to facilitate the flow of linguistic and cultural goods to students in exchange for students' school time—time which students relinquish control over by giving their attention to the teacher, being prepared to be answerable and attuned to the space of another. The LOTE teacher's position has already been questioned by the identity the classroom teacher takes up as a monitor of his time management practices. In later episodes it is evident that the LOTE teacher's tenuous claim to the powerful identity of teacher is constantly under threat, even as he attempts to reconstitute the social context of the Indonesian lesson.

C\ Barriers to Free Trade

In the time-management chronotope, time and space are commodities to be exchanged for goods—most notably, NCT for the teacher, playtime for the students, and (it seems, of much less importance) Indonesian linguistic competence. The most frequent issue that is addressed in administrative talk about LOTE and that inhibits this free flow of trade is constructed as the LOTE teacher's lack of competence in the management of student behavior. This is identified as one of the central issues for LOTE teachers, particularly LBOTE (language background other

than English) teachers (Kingdon, 1995). If there are no complaints and no behavioral problems that spill out of the LOTE classroom, if difference is contained and the normal mainstream times and spaces are not invaded, the administrators generally do not become involved with what occurs in the LOTE classroom. These practices are not exclusive to this school, as reflected in a national report (NALSAS, 1998), which documents the lack of support for LOTE teachers and comments, “They [principals] are only bothered if there is a behavior problem” (p. 42).

Institutionally, then, LOTE is constituted as an obstacle in the daily life of the school, a problem, a space for the containment of difference, not a space or time for engagement with difference.

Cultural difference, rather than a resource for constructing intercultural understanding, is being constituted as a deficit and engaged in the creation of cultural borders (Erickson, 2001). The construction of these borders is not only evident through the competing and incompatible chronotopes operating in the classroom, but through other key episodes which include interruptions, or invasions of the time and space of the Indonesian lesson. Other teachers will sometimes enter the class and speak to students without acknowledging or speaking to the LOTE teacher. These incursions, which work to undermine the teacher’s authority to establish the social context of the Indonesian lesson, are often framed as ways of supporting the LOTE teacher, for example, by reprimanding a student. Although, generally, these are well meaning (to avoid lengthy and difficult discussions with the LOTE teacher), these actions of the mainly middle-class teachers implicitly reconstitute some aspects of their own invisible culture (Delpit, 1995).

During the period of observations, the school administration became involved in several incidents that did spill out of the LOTE classroom. Strategies were offered to fix-up the LOTE teacher to facilitate the flow of goods from teacher to student and from teacher to teacher. In attempting to employ these strategies, insisting in one lesson that students’ lunch break time

become Indonesian time, Pak Asheed was ridiculed and challenged by students for his inability to perform expertly with these tools. Rather than facilitating the flow of goods, they worked to further inhibit the flow. Ironically, although his difference is commodified and valued and desirable in the time-management chronotope, it is this very difference that promotes barriers to the smooth, swift, and thrifty free trade of linguistic goods.

C\ Marking the Indonesian Border

Policy documents do not guarantee a space for LOTE classes, thus the normal classroom space, a space teeming with Australian and English symbols, has to be re-territorialized as LOTE space. The LOTE teacher attempts to re-inscribe relations of time and space for Indonesian as he moves from classroom to classroom, drawing on his cultural expectations of classroom practices. The conceived space of the classroom includes expectations of how participants use space and time, the identities taken up, the kinds of talk, values, behavior, body orientation, and movement. One way he signals the beginning of the Indonesian lesson, marking the transition to these new spatial and temporal relations, is through ritual salutations: the “standing and greeting” performances (see transcript 1). These linguistic and bodily devices significantly shape subsequent events.

Linguistic proficiency in the ritual greeting performance involves mastery of two rhythmic and semantic pairs: *Selamat siang kelas tujuh* / *Selamat siang Pak Asheed*; *Apa kabar?* / *Baik-baik terima kasih* (Good day year 7 / Good day Pak Asheed. How are you? / Fine, thank you). The sing-song intonation pattern of this couplet is reminiscent of chorusing activities of younger children, for example, as they sing the times tables. Crucial elements in this performance are the bodily practices that accompany it. Pak Asheed attempts to reconstitute the power of the *guru* (teacher) by claiming authority over students’ bodies, expecting students to

stand behind their chairs as they greet him, although he does this tentatively: “Stand up for a few seconds” (line 27). “Stand up” (line 29). Bodies are crucial sites to watch for the production of power, and, from his study of Indonesia classrooms, Kuipers (1998, p.143) posits that “one’s bodily attitude (*sikap*) is seen as an expression of one’s relationship to authority.” It is through this ritualized performance that the teacher marks out the relationships of authority in this space as he attempts to reproduce his dominance of a space and time that is controlled by another and to populate this space with other symbols. Pak Asheed embodies authority as a flow from the top down. This embodiment derives in part from the arrangement of the lines of power in classrooms in Indonesia, where the teacher is not only at the front but often also on a dais and students are addressed collectively, and even in their individual responses are still treated as a collective body.

Enacting a genre serves to reconstitute the teacher’s authority, and to interpellate students as a class and not individuals is a characteristic of the genre of the “Indonesian lesson”. Similarly, the practice of insisting on this physical as well as a linguistic performance is a cultural convention of classroom discourse in Indonesia. Although students master some rudimentary vocabulary, this performance it is more about the assertion of relationships of power than the development of linguistic competence (Kress & Fowler, 1979, p. 69). These ritualized performances are community resources; their utility is constantly negotiated through social exchange. This cultural tool is no longer a shared community resource in Australian schools, where the marking of power relations has become less overt. This is not to suggest that power relations are any more democratic, but rather more implicit. The power of the classroom teacher is evident as students’ bodies and voices reconstitute the time and place of the normal classroom

when she returns. Her physicality embodies the institutional power in a way that Pak Asheed's does not.

B\ Counterspace

Indeed, the symbolic force of this ritual which serves to mark a boundary for the frontier of the Indonesian lesson, where patterns of flow and practices of privileging of identities is other to that of the normal classroom, also functions as an element of very different but related set of generic practices—of heterotopia. Many of the students show their noncompliance, some do eventually stand, whilst others lean forward with elbows on their desks, or kneel on their chairs. Sometimes students appear too busy to stand, they are tying their shoelaces, tidying their desks, or moving around the classroom. But it is the systems of parody that serve to mark out the counterspace.

Pak Asheed stops after his first utterance, asking Will to stand. Will complains of sore knees, another student impatiently asks him to stand, but he ignores the requests, and PA resumes the greeting. Halfway through this second attempt, Lily turns to Mike and, smiling, shakes a finger at him, a mock warning, a parody of teacher performance, once again reminding him of the omnipresence of the classroom teacher in this space. In the final response to the greeting, Lily answers with a deep sing-song voice, prolonging the final syllable of the last two words, which Mike then repeats and then another pupil mimics. Mike then appropriates the final sound of the word and repeats it, making it into a laughter sound—hee hee. After PA has requested that the students sit, Mike makes a final comment, getting the last word in the exchange, then waggles his bottom at the student behind him before sitting.

Mike's parody of the teacher voice and display of irreverence for the ritual meeting performance indicate the dialogical conflict of two spaces—the Indonesian space that Pak Asheed has constructed for the students, a space governed not only by the teacher but by the cultural displays of obedience to the *guru*, where the performance is a mark of respect and acknowledgment of authority, and the counterspace of irreverent resistance. This latter space is constructed in opposition to the teacher's space and draws upon it for its content. It is not an alternative space but tied to the old space. It is this binary, at the intersection of old and counterspace, which Lefebvre sought to crack open, to third, in an effort to transform its closed logic, to create a "thirdspace."

The construction of these counterspaces, where time and space are differently conceived, is a common occurrence, not sanctioned in the normal classroom. These conceptualizations not only frame plot development in the counterspace but also identity. Students experience adventures, overcome various obstacles, and take up different identities. Here the flow of cultural resources is distributed in unplanned and unpredictable ways; there is no top-down structure. The motif of standing and greeting signals something akin to Bakhtin's (1981b) description of the chronotope that characterizes "adventure-time":

Moments of adventurous time occur at those points when the normal course of events, the normal, intended or purposeful sequences of life's events is interrupted. These points provide an opening for the intrusion of non-human forces—fate, gods, villains—and it is precisely these forces, and not the heroes, who in adventure-time take all the initiative. (p.95)

In the following I examine one student's practices as she takes the initiative, taking up the role of the rogue or the clown, creating around herself the chronotope of theater time.

C\ Theater Time

Just as Pak Asheed attempts through his enactive work (Gee, 2000) to interpellate the roles of *guru* and class, Lily also constitutes the students as audience, but, in the spatial and temporal relations she constitutes and embodies, constructs an anomalous social context.

D\ Transcript 2: Bend Over

- 84 Pak Asheed Excuse [me, listen. (Will walks up behind Matt's chair)
- 85 Lily [Shush.
- 86 Jared I'm listening.
- 87 Pak Asheed In doing this you can sit behind.. er beside your partner but not walk around or
- 88 make a noise. [Right? Choose your seats=
- 89 Will [Work around or make a noise? (looking at Matt and
- 90 laughing)
- 91 Pak Asheed =and go to them but do not walk around.
- 92 Lily (to Will) Walk around, you Nigel.
- 93 (to PA quietly) He's making fun of you.
- 94 (to Will) Bend over touch your toes (looks at PA) and Pak Asheed will take
- 95 you out to the shed. (PA moves to stand in front of Lily) Haha.

Pak Asheed is standing in front of the class, slightly to the left of the central aisle that divides the rows of desks arranged across the classroom. Lily occupies the third desk from the center in the front left-hand row; Matt is on her left. Sitting less than a meter from Pak Asheed, she first admonishes Will for his lack of understanding (line 92) and then quietly addresses Pak Asheed as she explicitly acknowledges the teasing genre (line 93), that Will is "taking the piss." But even more insulting and ridiculing, speaking more loudly, she smiles as she draws on a popular currency of abuse by ventriloquizing a homophobic voice suggesting to Will that he

might engage in homosexual activity with Pak Asheed. There have been other references in the counterscript to the teacher's sexuality, references that seem to be founded on the clothes that Pak Asheed wears—tight trousers and a patterned shirt tucked in at the waist. For example, Lily has remarked that Pak Asheed wears “gay pants,” constituting a social reality where outer differences are noticed and inner differences assumed. His clothes are cultural tools, at the interface of body and other, and provide the material for Lily to take up the role of comedian. In this role she plays with meaning, constructing another place and time, the “shed”—a private male space—implying the sexual orientations and relationships of the participants.

As a comedian she plays to her audience, shocking them, ridiculing Pak Asheed. This figure, Bakhtin (1981b) argues, plays an enormous role in the consciousness: “The rogue and the clown create around themselves their own special little world, their own chronotope” (p. 159). These figures carry with them the “theatrical trappings of the public square”—they are connected to the public square, where common people congregate. For her humor to work, the audience needs to have an intimate knowledge of their cultural practices, shared access to the chronotope that Lily maps on to classroom practices, and the incongruity of the embodied chronotopes. Later in the same lesson we again hear and see Lily taking up this role.

D\ Transcript 3: Bloody Bastard

112	Lily	(to Jared) Can I be a partner with you?
113	Jared	Honestly, I'm working with Matt.
114	Lily	Please.
115	Jared	You work (?) like a woman.
116	Lily	<u>Plea:se</u>

117 Pak Asheed (Claps hands) One minute excuse me (indis) walking around except
 118 [(indis.)
 119 Lily [Bloody idiot ... bloody bastard. (cockney accent)
 120 Jared Haha
 121 Lily Bloody bastard (smiling)...bloody bastard (looking directly at PA who is
 122 standing behind Matt)=
 123 Jarod/Matt/Will Haha (looking at PA, then turn away)
 124 Lily =bloody bastard (stands up pushes her chair under her desk flamboyantly
 125 and moves toward PA) bloody bastard (laughing, PA is blocking her
 126 pathway as she tries to pass they stand toe to toe for a moment, she points
 127 over his shoulder to Nancy and he moves, allowing her through, and
 128 watches her progress)
 129 Will (indis) (to Jarrod & Matt)
 130 Matt Indonesian.
 131 Jared Well what else would I write about?
 132 Will (Turns to Matt) See?
 133 Lily Bloody bastard (into microphone)

In this episode, after being denied access to a legitimate classroom space in which she could potentially take up the identity of student, Lily swears directly at the teacher, using a thick cockney accent that she appears to have revoiced from a popular TV show. At the time the classroom episode above was recorded, an episode of *The Simpsons* was shown on local television; the episode was set in Australia and included instances of characters swearing in an “Aussie” accent—in fact, the accent was not authentically Australian but sounded like a London cockney accent. Lily appears to be drawing on both the cockney voice and the attitude of disrespect to authority figures that Bart Simpson displays on the show. The teacher does not

appear to understand what Lily is saying—in fact, it is this lack of recognition that provides the impetus for her to repeat the phrase several times. This is daring and disrespectful behavior for which Lily is not held accountable because the teacher cannot understand her.

Already we have seen that the LOTE teacher is operating in a time and space which have been marginalized in the life of the school and in which he has little power; he is operating in alien territory that he attempts to claim for the Indonesian lesson. This space is already populated with conflicting chronotopes. Students challenge the space that the teacher seeks to occupy; they make forays into this territory, attempting to make it their own. Power here is about a struggle and conflict over resources and public spaces—students challenge Pak Asheed’s power to claim this space. But Lily does more even than this by investing in the role of rogue, as does Bart Simpson; she is not only appropriating his speaking position in the classroom, she is also recasting Pak Asheed as the fool, and as incompetent in his performance in the Indonesian lesson. However, as Bakhtin posits, the rogue or clown cannot be understood in a direct and unmediated way but only grasped metaphorically: “their existence is a reflection of some other’s mode of being—and even then, not a direct reflection—they are life maskers” (Bakhtin, 1981b, p. 159). Deploying the mask of the rogue, Lily reflects and distorts Pak Asheed’s mode of being as she performs to the public gallery, self-consciously saying taboo words (bloody bastard) right into the microphone, the one that I am using to collect classroom data. This microphone becomes a tool, a prop, in the production of theater time.

Indeed, it is important to consider the audience for Lily’s remarks; who are the people of the public square? Her utterances are made directly to the teacher, but she clearly does not expect him to reply to her comments. She is not talking to the teacher so much as talking for the amusement of her classmates. I am unable to hear her clearly as I am sitting in the opposite

corner of the classroom; however, her use of the microphone would indicate that I, too, am interpellated as audience. Reconstituting this space as theater time, she acts for the student audience—she is performing burlesque by making Pak Asheed appear foolish. The students can hear her and are very much aware of what she is doing. She flaunts her bravado as she performs for them. This is dangerous ground, she has ties to the real world of the normal classroom, and she has to trust that her fellow students won't inform; she also has to trust me. Though the risk she is taking is great (this behavior could get her suspended from school), so are the kudos she is earning. She builds solidarity with her audience and exposes the teacher—she is constructing an alternative reality, one in which she has a significant stake-holding.

When Lily makes these comments, she does not appear to be angry or upset but seems to be playing, almost baiting the teacher—poking a metaphorical stick at him and seeing if he will bite. “Taking the piss” can be a game of verbal jousting if both players know the rules and are ready to play. In this instance the teacher cannot play, so Lily plays to her peers and to the camera. Sheehy (1999, p. 221) suggests that finding the barb that will silence the Other is tied to dominant-dominated binary; the game is initiated when one authority questions another authority and there is no vision for diversity. Together the group reproduces societal violence, each mark, situated in a network of social practices, reconstitutes class, race, gender, and body norms. There is no third space imaginary with which to reposition themselves with one another.

It is through her use of “anti-language” (Halliday, 1978) that Lily contests the teacher's authority and displays her bravado to the other members of the class, with consequent foregrounding of interpersonal elements. Constituting interpersonal relations in opposition to the teacher, she looks to her audience for laughs and solidarity. In his discussion of anti-language, Halliday (1978) draws on Podgorecki's (1973) explanation of “second life,” the construction of

an alternative society which arises from the need to maintain inner solidarity under pressure; “at the individual level, the second life provides the means of maintaining identity in the face of its threatened destruction” (p. 168). Paradoxically, in this instance it is the LOTE teacher’s identity that is threatened; though, on the larger scale, in the face of changing demographics and globalization, it may indeed be the identity of communities like these, comprised of semi-skilled low socioeconomic groups, that are under threat. These communities, previously secure in industrial- and agricultural-based industries, have become particularly vulnerable to the changing patterns of flow of capital and the emergence of knowledge-based economies, which may relegate them to the underclass.

Lily is not known for either her academic prowess or good behavior; she is also an Aboriginal student. Perhaps she has little investment in the role of the good school student and, as Bakhtin (1981b) suggests, employing the mask of the rogue can sustain, albeit temporarily, a powerful identity:

In the struggle against conventions, and against the inadequacy of all available life slots to fit an authentic human being, these masks take on an extraordinary significance. They grant the right not to understand, the right to confuse, to tease, to hyperbolize life; the right to parody others while talking, the right to not be taken literally, not to be oneself; the right to live a life in the chronotope of the entr’acte, the chronotope of theatrical space, the right to act life as a comedy and to treat others as actors, the right to rip off masks, the right to rage at others with a primeval (almost cultic) rage—and finally, the right to betray to the public a personal life, down to its most private and prurient little secrets. (p.163)

At these moments, refusing to be limited by material circumstances, Lily creates a theatrical world and acts to constitute counter-reality. Perhaps, less directly oriented toward success in the world than many of her classmates, Lily fulfills her short-term intentions by being amusing and cultivating the imagination of her audience. But as she steps out of the boundaries of the social context in which she has been located as student and becomes a figure of a subaltern world, she also relinquishes her identity as student. This may have longer-term implications. At what cost does Lily take up this cultural identity, this mask, in the temporal and spatial relations of the counterscript: both for herself and for her fellow students? Is there any opportunity for dialogic interanimation of the Indonesian lesson and the counterspace, for the collapsing of their agendas and the development of a third space, for a new imaginary, for the relocation of chronotopic practices and the construction of shared times and spaces, for the development of intercultural literacy practices? Or are these practices hegemonically legitimated and practiced on our behalf by some of the least powerful in our society? Is Lily, an Aboriginal student, doing the dirty work of institutional racism?

A\ Conclusion

In the LOTE classroom teachers and students work to constitute diverse spatialities. Whilst Pak Asheed attempts to deploy resources to re-territorialize the mainstream space and mark the borders for the Indonesian lesson, some students mobilize other resources in their construction of counterspaces. There is conflict over the privileging of cultural resources. Who has the resources to claim authority over the public space of the classroom or restrict other's access to this space (de la Torre, 1999)? This classroom is a site of multilayered spaces, each with its own border, some more flexible than others. The counterspaces are not harmonious or entirely overlapping; their emergence reveals the inherently heterotopic nature of any classroom.

The borders between these spaces are constantly being negotiated and monitored. Diversity, represented in LOTE policies as a resource to be appropriated, is fundamental in the construction of these borders, borders for the containment of difference.

One of the goals of the LOTE program is to develop students' intercultural understandings, to develop the possibility of engaging in cross-cultural and multi-ethnic alliances, to afford students the potential to redesign and transform identities. The Queensland LOTE syllabus (QSCC, 2000) articulates these goals, suggesting transformative possibilities, encouraging students to engage with issues of cultural identity by reflecting on the cultural self as well as the other. But how potent is the LOTE classroom in exploiting the potential for the negotiation of diversity and the development of third spaces, for the formation of new identities? Kramsch (1993) argues that in these classes students can forge a new identity, one that is not established, in order "to realize a cross-cultural potential that is latent in any learner of a foreign language." In similar vein Freeman (1998, p. 81) proposes that schools can actively create opportunities for students to take up alternative social identities that are not readily available in the mainstream, for example, resist or refuse an identity that is underpinned by racist ideologies. This argument implies agency; the individual not only has the possibility of investing in a social identity or resisting a social identity but also of forging a new one. It also raises the question, What other discourses are available to students and teachers to draw on other than the metanarratives of nationalism and human capital (Allan Luke, 2002)? Although the LOTE policy is apparently a driver of the development of Australian identity, imagining a broader more inclusive identity whilst it privileges the human capital model, evident in the spatial and temporal practices in which its institutional presence is realized, it is unlikely to provide these affordances and may be antithetical to the intended development of second-language literacy.

References

- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981a). Discourse in the novel (C. Emerson, Trans.). In M. Holquist (Ed.), *The Dialogic Imagination* (pp. 259-422). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981b). Forms of time and the chronotope in the novel (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). In M. Holquist (Ed.), *The dialogic imagination: four essays* (pp. 84-258). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Ballenger, C. (1997). Social identities, moral narratives, scientific argumentation: Science talk in a bilingual classroom. *Language and Education: An International Journal*, 11(1), 1-14.
- Berland, J. (1992). Angels dancing: Cultural technologies and the production of space. In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson & P. A. Treichler (Eds.), *Cultural Studies* (pp. 38-55). London: Routledge.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1990). "The Third Space". In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity, Community, Culture, Difference* (pp. 207-221). London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Bloome, D., & Katz, L. (1997). Literacy as social practice and classroom chronotopes. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 13, 205-225.
- Byram, M. (1999). Questions of identity in foreign language learning. In J. Lo Bianco, A. J. Liddicoat & C. Crozet (Eds.), *Striving for the third place: Intercultural competence through language education* (pp. 91-102). Melbourne: Language Australia.
- Carr, J. (1999). From 'Sympathetic' to 'Dialogic' imagination: Cultural study in the foreign language classroom. In J. Lo Bianco, A. J. Liddicoat & C. Crozet (Eds.), *Striving for the third place: Intercultural competence through language education* (pp. 103-112). Melbourne: Language Australia.
- Castells, M. (1996). *Rise of the Network Society*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Clyne, M. (1998). The language of exclusion and inclusion. *Australian Language Matters*, 6(4), 3-10.
- COAG. (1994). *Asian languages and Australia's economic future. A report prepared for the Council of Australian Governments on a proposed national Asian languages/studies strategy for Australian schools* (No. Rudd Report). Brisbane: Queensland Government Printer.
- Connell, R. W. (2002, October 23). Rage against the dying of the light. *The Australian*, pp. 30-31.
- Davies, B. (1997). The subject of poststructuralism: A reply to Alison Jones. *Gender and Education*, 9, 271-283.
- de la Torre, C. (1999). Everyday forms of racism in contemporary Ecuador: The experiences of middle-class Indians. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(1), 92-112.
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: New Press.
- Djite, P. G. (1994). *From language policy to language planning: An overview of Languages other than English in Australian education*. Canberra: National Languages and Literacy Institute of Australia.

- Erickson, F. (2001). Culture in society and in educational practices. In J. Banks & C. McGee (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (4th ed., pp. 31-58). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and text: Linguistic and intertextual analysis within discourse analysis. *Discourse and Society*, 3(2), 193-217.
- Fairclough, N. (2000). Representaciones del cambio en discurso neoliberal (Representations of change in neo-liberal discourse). *Cuadernos de Relaciones Laborales*, 16, 13-36.
- Foucault, M. (1986). "Of other spaces". *Diacritics*, 16, 22-27.
- Freeman, R. D. (1998). *Bilingual education and social change*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Gee, J. P. (1992). *The social mind: language, ideology, and social practice*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.
- Gee, J. P. (2000). The new literacy studies: From "socially situated" to the work of the social. In D. Barton, M. Hamilton & R. Ivanic (Eds.), *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context* (pp. 180-196). London: Routledge.
- Gee, J. P., Hull, G., & Lankshear, C. (1996). *The new work order: Behind the language of the new capitalism*. St. Leonards, N.S.W.: Allen & Unwin.
- Gutierrez, K., Rymes, B., & Larson, J. (1995). Script, counterscript, and underlife in the classroom: James Brown versus Brown v. Board of Education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(3), 445-471.
- Hall, S. (1996). Introduction: Who needs 'Identity'? In S. Hall & P. du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity*. London: Sage Publications.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Haworth, A. (1999). Bakhtin in the classroom: What constitutes a dialogic text? Some lessons from small group interaction. *Language and Education: An International Journal*, 13(2), 99-117.
- Hirst, E. W. (2002). *Construction of identities in the LOTE Classroom: The interanimation of mediational means*. Unpublished PhD, University of Queensland, Brisbane.
- Hirst, E. W., & Renshaw, P. (in press). Diverse voices, dialogue and intercultural learning in a second language classroom. In P. Renshaw & J. van der Linden (Eds.), *Dialogic Perspectives On Learning, Teaching and Instruction*. Amsterdam: Kluwer Academic.
- Kamler, B., Santoro, N., & Reid, J. (1998). *Cultural differences in the teaching profession: How much does it count?* Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education Conference, Adelaide.
- Kingdon, M. (1995). Student behaviour management: Addressing the issues for teachers of languages other than English (LOTE). In R. Conway & J. Izard (Eds.), *Student Behaviour Outcomes: Choosing appropriate paths. Selected papers from National Conference on the Behaviour Management and Behaviour Change of Children and Youth with Emotional and/or Behavioural Problems* (pp. 86-91). Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Knoeller, C. (1998). *Voicing ourselves: Whose words we use when we talk about books*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Kramsch, C. (1998). The privilege of the intercultural speaker. In M. Byram & M. Fleming (Eds.), *Language learning in intercultural perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Kramsch, C. J. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kress, G., & Fowler, R. (1979). Interviews. In R. Fowler, B. Hodge, G. Kress & T. Trew (Eds.), *Language and Control* (pp. 63-80). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Kuipers, J. C. (1998). *Language, identity, and marginality in Indonesia: The changing nature of ritual speech on the Island of Sumba*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Leander, K. M. (1999). *Classroom community as spatialized discursive practice: mapping the production of identities in a high school discourse-space*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Montreal.
- Leander, K. M. (2001). "This is our freedom bus going home right now": Producing and hybridizing space-time contexts in pedagogical discourse. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 33(4), 637-.
- Lefebvre, H. (1976). *The survival of capitalism* (F. Bryant, Trans.). London: Allison and Busby.
- Lingard, B., Ladwig, J., & Luke, A. (1998). School effects in postmodern conditions. In R. Slee, G. Weiner & S. Tomlinson (Eds.), *School effectiveness for whom? Challenges to the school effectiveness and school improvement movements* (pp. 84-100). London: Falmer.
- Lo Bianco, J. (1998). The implications for languages of the emergence of the international university. *Australian Language Matters*, 6(4), 1/8/10.
- Luke, A. (1998). Critical discourse analysis. In L. Saha (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of Sociology of Education* (pp. 50-57). New York: Elsevier.
- Luke, A. (2002). Curriculum, ethics, metanarrative: Teaching and learning beyond the nation. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 22(1), 49-55.
- Luke, A. (2003). Literacy and the other: A sociological approach to literacy research and policy in multilingual societies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 38(1), 132-141.
- Luke, A. (in press). A polemical reconceptualisation of literacy as social practice. In *Literacy and the millennium*.
- Macaro, E. (1997). *Target language, collaborative learning and autonomy* (Vol. 5). Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters.
- Macedo, D. (2000). The colonialism of the English only movement. *Educational Researcher*, 29(3), 15-24.
- MacKerras, C. (1995). A policy initiative in Asian languages. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics (ARAL), Series S, 12*, 1-16.
- Miller, J. (1997b). Teachers who don't belong anywhere: Three themes of itinerancy. *Unicorn*, 23(1), 74-84.
- Morgan, C., & Cain, A. (2000). *Foreign language and culture learning from a dialogic perspective* (Vol. 15). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Mulkay, M. J. (1988). *On humour: its nature and its place in modern society*. Oxford: Polity Press in association with Basil Blackwell.
- National Asian Languages and Studies in Australian Schools (NALSAS). (1998). *Factors influencing the uptake of Modern Standard Chinese, Korean, Modern Greek & German at primary & secondary level in Australian schools*. Perth, WA: Education Department of Western Australia and Commonwealth Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs.
- National Asian Languages and Studies in Australian Schools (NALSAS) Taskforce. (1998). *Partnership for change: The NALSAS strategy - interim progress report of the first*

- quadrennium of the NALSAS strategy 1995-1998*. Carlton, Victoria: Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs.
- Nespor, J. (1994). *Knowledge in motion: Space, time, and curriculum in undergraduate physics and management*. London ; Washington, D.C.: Falmer Press.
- Parliament of Australia. (1998). *Current issues brief 2 1998-99: 1998 Queensland Election*, 2003, from <http://www.aph.gov.au/library/pubs/cib/1998-99/99cib02.htm>
- Podgórecki, A. (1973). *"Second Life" and its implications*: Mimeo.
- Queensland School Curriculum Council. (2000). *Languages Other Than English: Year 4 to 10 Indonesian Syllabus*. Brisbane: QSCC.
- Rämö, H. (1999). An Aristotelian human time-space manifold: From chronochora to kairotopos. *Time & Society*, 8(2), 309-328.
- Rix, A. (1999). *Review of the languages other than English (LOTE) program implementation*. Brisbane: Education Queensland.
- Roulston, K. (1998). Music teachers talk about itinerancy. *Queensland Journal of Educational Research*, 14(1), 59-74.
- Sheehy, M. (1999). *Unmaking space: A topological analysis of time and space representation in an urban Appalachian seventh grade civics project*. Unpublished PhD, Ohio State University.
- Soja, E. W. (1996). *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Stanley, J. D., Ingram, D., & Chittick, G. (1990). *The relationship between trade and linguistic competence*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Troyna, B., & Rizvi, F. (1997). Racialisation of difference and the cultural politics of teaching. In B. J. Biddle, I. Goodson & T. L. Good (Eds.), *International handbook of teachers and teaching* (Vol. 1, pp. 237-265). Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: Towards a sociocultural practice and theory of education*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1998). *Mind as action*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Author note:

All names used in this chapter are pseudonyms.

Key to transcript conventions:

Square brackets - simultaneous and overlapping utterances

Underscoring - emphasis on word or part thereof

Equals sign - contiguous utterances

Colon - elongation of a sound