ED 416 498   CS 216 214

AUTHOR   Egan-Robertson, Ann
TITLE   Learning about Culture, Language and Power: Understanding
                Relationships among Personhood, Literacy Practices and
                Intertextuality. Report Series 2.35.
INSTITUTION   National Research Center on English Learning and
                Achievement, Albany, NY.
SPONS AGENCY   Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED),
                Washington, DC.
PUB DATE   1998-00-00
NOTE   55p.
CONTRACT   R305A60005
PUB TYPE   Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Case Studies; Community Problems; *Cultural Context;
                Heuristics; Junior High Schools; *Language Role; *Literacy;
                Self Concept; Urban Education; Writing Research
IDENTIFIERS   Discourse Communities; Identity Formation; *Identity
                (Psychological); *Intertextuality; Power; Theoretical
                Orientation; Writing Groups

ABSTRACT
            This paper stems from a study of an eighth-grade writing
club in an urban school. The study asked: How would students use a
community-based set of texts to create identities for themselves and each
other in relation to their communities, their schooling, and writing and to
examine issues of personhood? The paper theorizes about what the notions of
personhood and intertextuality contribute to educators' conceptions of
literacy teaching and learning. It provides a definition of personhood,
reviews related research, and presents an analytical framework which includes
a rationale for why personhood and literacy are productively investigated
through the intertextuality heuristic. To elaborate on the theoretical ideas
presented, the paper focuses on two aspects of the writing club: (1) the ways
two students took up opportunities presented to them as they participated for
shaping and reshaping discourse practices about personhood along the
dimensions of history, music, racial and ethnic identity, and womanhood; and
(2) the significance of the study's framing in providing opportunities for
students to make intertextual links between their research studies and the
literacy practices of community members. In addressing how the students took
up their literacy practices, the paper elaborates on the discourse practices
that framed the writing project, which opened up what is described as an
"intertextual field" containing dynamic potential for students to create
intertextual links between their inquiry into community issues and the
inquiry of community members who were using research and writing to address
similar issues. (Contains two tables, five transcripts, eight notes, and 92
references.) (NKA)

LEARNING ABOUT CULTURE, LANGUAGE AND POWER: UNDERSTANDING RELATIONSHIPS AMONG PERSONHOOD, LITERACY PRACTICES AND INTERTEXTUALITY

ANN EGAN-ROBERTSON

CENTER ON

ENGLISH LEARNING

& ACHIEVEMENT

THE UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY ■ THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA ■ THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

LEARNING ABOUT CULTURE, LANGUAGE AND POWER: UNDERSTANDING RELATIONSHIPS AMONG PERSONHOOD, LITERACY PRACTICES AND INTERTEXTUALITY

Ann Egan-Robertson

To appear in *Journal of Literacy Research*.

National Research Center on English Learning & Achievement

University at Albany, School of Education, B-9
1400 Washington Avenue, Albany, NY 12222
http://cela.albany.edu/
518-442-5026

– CONTENTS –

5

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

6

LEARNING ABOUT CULTURE, LANGUAGE AND POWER: UNDERSTANDING RELATIONSHIPS AMONG PERSONHOOD, LITERACY PRACTICES AND INTERTEXTUALITY

Ann Egan-Robertson

I found two different kinds of music. Common music and political music. Common music is what we hear on the radio, on MTV, all the time. Some people call this popular music but I can't call it popular because it's not popular with a lot of people when it talks about women that way. I call it common music instead. Political music is music that gets people to do something about the problems of the world. At first I thought cultural music was a third kind of music. Then I decided that cultural music is a kind of political music because it brings back your culture. . . . For some people, your culture was never written in books. Cultural music tells you how your own history was. . . .

Sandra Verne. (1993). "Does Music Affect the Way We Think and Feel About People?"

Dear Teachers,
Through the years of my schooling up till now, I feel I have missed something. Teachers, you've been great. But there's a problem. The problem is we have been deprived of learning about other cultures. In the future, I hope you can consider this letter.

Denise Yothers. (1993). "Racism: A Problem in Riverside."

These excerpts are taken from an edited volume of student writing published by Marielis Flores, DeLayne Monson, Sandra Verne and Denise Yothers (pseudonyms), which they entitled *Life as Teenagers in the Nineties: Growing Up in Riverside.* These eighth-grade students, members of a writing club at their urban school, used a number of research methods to explore their social identities and to address issues of personhood that had importance to them. These issues included racism, alcohol abuse, gang violence, and images of women in music.

Denise Yothers wrote that she conducted "a survey on about five different topics. One of them was racism. You know it was amazing for me to find this out. One hundred kids surveyed. Eighty percent have experienced racism!" Marielis Flores researched "What needs to happen to keep kids off the streets?" She came to this question out of her lived experience; her best buddy from childhood was in jail because of his involvement in a gang-related killing that occurred outside the school two days before the start of the year. She wrote, "My goal for this book is to

keep kids off the streets. A lot of teenagers like having money but they are doing the wrong thing ... I know. I live in a bad neighborhood where you be seeing teenagers selling drugs. I'm writing this book to have kids stop selling and using." DeLayne Monson penned, "In writing this book, we are trying to better educate society and teenagers on what issues are affecting us and why they are so important for us to know about." Her inquiry into how to stop intergenerational alcoholism led the writing club to interview a group of high school peer health educators, who were writing a play called "End Racism in Our Schools; End Racism in the U.S.A.." DeLayne asked them in a befuddled voice why they were writing a play about racism when they were a health education group. She queried their director Marsha Davidson about connections they saw between alcoholism and racism. Sandra Verne's goal as a writer was "to let people know what music really is because kids/teenagers seem to think that music is just something to dance to. I'm trying to provide them with information that I have found by talking to people and researching." Sandra investigated the question "Does Music Affect the Way We Think and Feel About People?" out of her distress at being name-called by boys, including her twin brother.

Part of what makes these students' research and writing seem remarkable is that they had all been assigned to the lowest academic track in their school, which gave little attention to composition. Together, their inquiry and writing create an intertextual, polyphonic context for exploring a set of theoretical questions about literacy learning that frame this article: What is personhood and how can we understand these young women's writing as exploring and addressing issues of personhood? How does understanding relationships between personhood and literacy practices contribute to understanding the complexities of learning to read and write in school? How, and why, can the construct of intertextuality expand notions of how issues of personhood are embedded in literacy teaching and learning?

In this article I theorize about what the notions of personhood and intertextuality contribute to our conception of literacy teaching and learning. To do so, I provide a definition of personhood and review related research. I also present an analytical framework, which includes a rationale for why personhood and literacy are productively investigated through the heuristic of intertextuality. To elaborate on the theoretical ideas presented, I then focus on two aspects of the writing club: 1) the ways Denise Yothers and Sandra Verne took up opportunities presented to them as they participated in the writing club for shaping and reshaping discourse practices about personhood

along the dimensions of history, music, racial and ethnic identity, and womanhood, and 2) the significance of the framing of the study in providing opportunities for the students to make intertextual links between their research studies and the literacy practices of community members.

The study of the writing club focused on the question: How would students use a community-based set of texts to create social identities for themselves and each other in relation to their communities, their schooling, and writing and to examine issues of personhood?[1] It focused on this question because of the recent interest in an examination of issues of personhood as these relate to literacy education (Street, 1994; Willis, 1995). Interestingly, analysis of the question itself highlighted the importance of the intertextual links created in framing the project by myself as teacher-researcher. For example, a key part of the writing club involved interviews of community artists and activists of whom students asked questions such as: "Do you think there is a connection between alcoholism and racism?" "Do you think racism is connected to kids dropping out of school?" "Do you think music promotes sexism?" "Why did you start writing/investigating racism?" "Explain what you mean by racism." "How do you stop racism?" Therefore, in addressing how the students took up their literacy practices, this article elaborates on the discourse practices that framed the writing project, which opened up what I describe elsewhere as an intertextual field (Egan-Robertson, 1997a; Egan-Robertson, in press). This field contained dynamic potential for students to create intertextual links between their inquiry into community issues and the inquiry of community members who were using research and writing to address similar issues.

The Usefulness of Personhood in the Study of Literacy

> . . . [A]gencies including UNESCO came to associate literacy with the idea of a fully human person, with enlightenment in contrast to the dark space of "illiteracy." This, I would like to suggest, is characteristic of the ways in which literacy and personhood are intertwined in many cultural discourses . . . (Street, 1994, p. 141).

Literacy scholars in Australia, Great Britain and the United States (e.g., Davies, 1994; Street, 1993, 1994; Willis, 1995) have called for examination of the identities and personhoods constituted through literacy practices. They ask what kinds of literacy practices gain significance

and whose and what purposes are served by them. For example, Street (1994) asked: How is literacy a site for negotiation of dominant and subordinate discourses about people? The related questions he raises are refinements of the first broad question: What are the definitions and assumptions about writing and literacy? Who has the right to shape the literacy agenda? How do people adapt literacy to their own agenda (e.g., to challenge "structures of power and domination" [p. 7])? How is it that school literacy has become so dominant that local literacies go unrecognized there? Street (1993, 1994) links literacy and personhood by bringing together theories of language from the field of discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1992, 1995) with close ethnographic study of literacy in specific settings (cf. Hymes, 1974; Heath, 1982, 1983), such as in the Hmong community in Philadelphia (Weinstein-Shr, 1993). Street (1994) adopts the concept of personhood from anthropology to describe the ways cultural discourses about people are constituted through literacy practices: how some cultures come to "associate literacy with the idea of a fully human person, with enlightenment in contrast to the dark space of 'illiteracy.'" He categorizes literacy programs as following either an autonomous or ideological model. The autonomous model holds that literacy is a neutral technology that is acquired by individuals and results in cognitive consequences, such as the acquisition of rational thought; the ideological model sees literacy as constructing social and power relationships and asks who benefits from these relationships.

On the U.S. scene, Willis (1995) has raised questions about literacy and personhood based on her son's experiences as a writer in third grade: How do the cultural practices of African American students become marginalized as resources for composition in school? How can we understand issues of personhood related to double consciousness, feeling separate from while being part of a group? Willis reviews personhood, with a focus on double consciousness in African American literature. Ladson-Billings (1992, 1996) theorizes that the literacy achievement of African American students is enhanced when teachers create instructional contexts that assign significance to students' cultural identities and community knowledge. Most importantly, "successful teachers of African American students" explore with their students the question: "Literacy for what?" (Ladson-Billings, 1992, p. 318). These questions, which have significant implications for examining literacy in U.S. schools, animated the research elaborated in this article.

Defining Personhood

> Personhood is best viewed as a field that is ideologically structured in any society. . . .
> As an ideological sector, the notion of the person is not fully ordered by a privileged or
> dominant structure, but is a site of articulation of dominant and subordinate ideological
> components. It is this articulation, rather than approximations of a totalizing concept
> such as the individual, that may most fruitfully be examined in different cases. (Gergin &
> Davis, 1986, p. 1)

Personhood is a dynamic, cultural construct about who and what is considered to be a person; what attributes and rights are constructed as inherent to being a person; and what social positions are available within the construct of being a person. Discourses of "person" — and related discourses such as "self," "identity," "individual" — vary a great deal across situations, across people, across cultures and across subcultures (Kirkpatrick, 1983; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1989; Schwerder & Miller, 1983; Shotter & Gergin, 1989) as well as within cultures (DuBois, 1969). Geertz (1973, 1979, 1983) stresses the importance of personhood within cultures and asks questions about the meaning of a group's situated system of symbols (culture) within its discourse and what it allows members of a cultural group to do. For example, he discusses how people organize their lives and argues that research on personhood needs to consider what it is like to be a person at a particular historical moment in a particular place, articulating ideological notions about being a person.

Scholars in the area of critical discourse analysis (e.g., Fairclough, 1995; Gee, 1996; Luke, 1995-1996) provide definitions of discourse that have significant implications for understanding personhood. Gee (1996) defines discourses as "ways of behaving, interacting, valuing, thinking, believing, speaking, and often reading and writing that are accepted as instantiations of particular roles (or types of people) by specific groups of people. . . ." (p. viii). Fairclough (1989, 1995), drawing on sociologists of language such as Bakhtin (1981), Bourdieu (1977) and Foucault (1972) and sociolinguists such as Halliday (1978), discusses how language positions people. For example, the way a doctor talks to a person "positions" that person as a patient with a particular set of rights for talk but also with cultural implications for acting and thinking as a patient, which is a cultural category of being a person. Fairclough has developed a useful rubric for critical discourse analysis that involves three components: textual analysis; interpretation of the

5

11

interactional processes involved in a text's production and consumption; and explanation of "how interaction process relates to social action" (1989, p. 11). *Textual analysis* includes ideational, or content, analysis of what counts as knowledge, analysis of social relations, and analysis of social identities; *intertextual analysis* combines textual analysis with interactional analysis; and *explanatory analysis* brings together these two types of analyses with analysis of sociocultural practice at the situational, institutional and societal levels.

While discourses about personhood are dynamic in that they are built and rebuilt as people interact within and across social and institutional contexts, it is also the case that notions of personhood can be viewed as fixatives within discourse practices that constrain and delimit the possibilities for creating identities for oneself and others. These fixatives are manifest in the form of systems for organizing people, such as academic tracks. Discourse practices associated with personhood are part of the social realities that people must deal with (Carby, 1987; Davies, 1994; Davies & Harre, 1996; Fairclough, 1995; Gee, 1996). Classrooms provide a good example of how historically situated and interactionally negotiated discourses of personhood are related.

Discourses of Personhood in Classrooms

Before the beginning of the school year, before either the teacher or students have set foot in the classroom, discourse practices of "person" may already have been put in place by the nature of the arrangement of the furniture, the forms that have to be filled out, the written records of prior work, and by the classroom experiences that the teacher and students bring with them. There are also systems of classification and divisions that organize pedagogy. It is in this sense that personhood can be viewed as both constructed and as "historical" construct. A student may be constructed as a member of a particular reading group, and often as part of an academic track. For example, Denise, Marielis, DeLayne and Sandra were each assigned to the lowest academic track in their school. Marielis, a bilingual speaker of Spanish and English, and DeLayne, a bidialectal speaker of African American and "Standard" English, were also categorized as special education students, reflective of national statistics in which bilingual and bidialectal students are positioned as having problems with language learning (Delpit, 1995; Garcia, 1988). These

students' placement in special education can also be understood as telling examples of discourses of deficit assigned to students from communities of color (Tate, 1997). When I invited the students to join a writing club, they indicated interest but commented that they "couldn't write." Their definition of themselves as nonwriters fit the discourse practices of their academic and special education tracks, in which basic skills and fill-in-the-blank worksheets abounded. Sandra stated that they had not had writing class since fifth grade "and then it was Dick and Jane." Interviews with the students and their teachers as well as data from a larger ethnographic study of their English language arts class confirmed that the students had not had many opportunities to do elaborative writing in school. These discourse practices are ones Street (1984) would describe as fitting the autonomous literacy model. Discourses about literacy practices and personhood in mainstream U.S. schools create organizational positions that require there to be academic achievers, underachievers and nonachievers, reflective of a sociocultural system of competitive stratification and status positions that often result in differential access to valuable learning opportunities (Apple, 1996; Oakes, 1985).[2]

Part of the "historical" aspect of personhood in many U.S. classrooms is that students are defined as gendered children or adolescents of particular racial/ethnic background and language group(s), as are teachers. Terms such as race, ethnicity, gender, age, economic class, and even academic track, which are so often used in educational forms and by educators to categorize students, come to be closely associated with discourse practices associated with personhood.[3] Thus, there is a complex of factors involved in school and classroom literacy practices that together constitute discursive practices associated with personhood. It is at the level of the purposes of literacy and education that meanings of personhood are constituted (King, 1995; Street, 1994).

In another example, Lee (1995), who is working at a Chicago high school to create a culturally relevant approach to teaching literature, argues that stigmatization of African American students occurs through the omission of, or negative judgment about, their linguistic practices as academic resources. Such exclusionary and deficit views of a community's language and literacy practices, Lee (1995) argues, often lead to silence among African American students. These practices can be understood through the construction of personhood, from a linguistic standpoint: How does language omission contribute to a definition of personhood? Who has a language/

7

dialect that is viewed as acceptable and proper? Negating or devaluing the linguistic resources of a community can be understood as a way of negating an attribute of personhood. Lee's (1993) scholarship redefines how everyday linguistic practices can become academic resources as students take up new positions vis-a-vis school-based literacy. For example, Lee uses the everyday linguistic practice of "signifying as a scaffold" to teach African American students to analyze literature.

Willis (1995) asks teachers to be cognizant of how classroom literacy practices influence African American students' sense of personhood. Building on the work of DuBois (1969), she analyzes the way her son experienced double consciousness as a writer in third grade when he realized that he could not draw on his cultural experiences as a member of the African American community because his classmates and teacher would not understand their significance. The accuracy of her son's claim became painfully evident when, in composing an essay for a national contest, the rules forbade him from referencing his experience as an African American, thus defining him as a nonperson.

Ladson-Billings (1994, 1995, 1996) can be understood as raising questions about personhood from the interrelated standpoints of academic achievement, cultural competence and critical consciousness: Are African American students viewed as educable, as capable of high academic achievement? Are students allowed to demonstrate their cultural competence as African Americans as they participate in school-based learning? Do students and teachers examine together the ways knowledge, literacy and education contribute to or constrain social justice for all? Indeed, Ladson-Billings argues that establishing teaching and learning practices that critically examine the broader society helps successful teachers of African American students to meet the twin goals of academic achievement and cultural competence. Similarly, Gadsden (1992) implicitly raises questions about personhood and multicultural literacy education: Which communities count as having a literate tradition? Gadsden, whose research documents literacy practices across four generations of African Americans in rural South Carolina, calls for educational programs that build on the "literacy legacies" African American students bring to school.

The questions that these scholars raise from the perspective of literacy and teacher education are useful for addressing questions about personhood and classroom practices in general.

Namely, to what extent and how do discursive definitions of personhood get established along various dimensions in classrooms and literacy practices (e.g., who counts as a person, and as a member of a community, with linguistic and literary resources, with academic ability and valued educational and literacy agendas)? To what extent and how do they provide different moment-to-moment access to literacy for students and socialize students to particular views of personhood, and define the curriculum? The questions that Ladson-Billings (1995), Lee (1995), Gadsden (1992), and Willis (1995), among others (e.g., Au & Kawakami, 1994; Guiterrez, et al., 1995; Foster, 1992, 1995; King, 1995; McCarthy & Crichlow, 1993; Walsh, 1991), raise also suggest that paying explicit attention to how personhood is being defined may provide a means for restructuring classroom and literacy education in ways that address the goals of educational equity and multicultural education. However, to do so, a dramatic commitment to diversity is often requisite (Ladson-Billings, 1996), one that is likely to include the social construction of intertextual links to students' communities. In designing the writing club, I intentionally created intertextual links between the students' research problems and questions and the literacy practices of community members who were associated with social change work in their various communities. Given the above review of scholarship on literacy and personhood, I reasoned that it was important for students to examine the reasons and methods community members hold for addressing issues of personhood in the community and wider society.[3]

Examining Personhood Through Intertextuality

Although the questions discussed above establish the importance of examining personhood in classrooms and although I have noted that classrooms may be predisposed to particular definitions of personhood, I have not yet addressed why it is useful theoretically to investigate issues of personhood through the construct of intertextuality. *Intertextuality focuses analytical attention on the ways sets of texts are brought together and made use of by readers and writers.* The analytical approach I take builds on critical discourse analysis scholarship in education, which in turn builds on sociocultural scholarship that posits the constructed nature of everyday life, including the constructed nature of ideology and personhood. Since there is extensive

9

literature on sociolinguistic and discourse analysis of classrooms, I will not review it here (for reviews, see Cazden, 1988; Gee, et al., 1992; Hicks, 1996; Hornberger & Corson, 1997; Luke, 1995-1996; McKay & Hornberger, 1996). Briefly, from this perspective, it is through patterns of interaction that discourses of everyday life create ideologies of the world. In classrooms and schools, ideologies often account for who has access to what educational opportunities and what and whose knowledge is valued as significant. This sociocultural scholarship has contributed to our understanding of how classroom norms and values are socially constructed through the face-to-face interaction of teachers and students (e.g., Bloome, 1989; Heath, 1982, 1983; Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group, 1993). For example, the placement of students in reading groups positions students as particular kinds of literacy achievers and often accounts for the distribution of learning opportunities based on notions that basic skills, like spelling and grammar, need to be mastered in building-block fashion, before students are capable of critically interpreting texts. As Egan-Robertson and Willett (1997) argue, the contribution of ethnographic and sociolinguistic research to education includes redefinitions of education, literacy and classroom practice.

Within this broad area of research, there has been a good deal of recent interest in inter-textuality (Beach & Anson, 1992; Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993; Fairclough, 1992, 1995; Hartman, 1992; Hicks, 1996; Kamberelis & Scott, 1993; Lemke, 1992, 1995; Luke, 1995-1996; Short, 1992). One approach is to explore intertextuality and intercontextuality (Beach & Phinney, in press; Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993; Floriani, 1993; Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group, 1993) as socially constructed resources through which teachers and students create relationships in and across educational activities. From this perspective, intertextuality involves more than the juxtapositioning of texts. Bloome and I (1993) argue that social recognition, acknowledgment, and social significance are assigned to juxtaposed texts as a central part of the meaning construction process in classroom settings. We have argued that there are three types of intertextual relationships that together comprise the cultural ideology of a local event: inter-textual substance, intertextual process, and intertextual rights. *Intertextual substance* has to do with the set of texts, including the content of the texts, that can be juxtaposed. It addresses the question: What is among the sayable in an event in this social institution? *Intertextual process* refers to the norms, or particular ways, for assigning significance. In other words, it responds to anthropological questions such as how, where, when and for what purposes juxtapositions are

recognized, acknowledged, and assigned social significance. *Intertextual rights* refers to who can do the saying. Describing the social consequences of intertextuality "requires identification of the social positioning and other social work done . . . in the construction of an ongoing event" (p. 320). From this perspective, intertextuality is viewed as a socially constructed resource people use to construct culture and ideology. The study presented in this article expands the understanding of the social construction of intertextuality by exploring how it is connected to the construction of literacy practices and personhood.

Fairclough (1992, 1995) provides a complimentary perspective on the significance of intertextuality in critical discourse analysis. Fairclough's (1995) analytical framework features a combination of:

> a theory of power based upon Gramsci's concept of *hegemony* with a theory of discourse practice based upon the concept of intertextuality (or interdiscursivity). The connection between text and social practice is seen as being mediated by discourse practice: on the one hand, processes of text production and interpretation are shaped by (and help shape) the nature of the social practice, and on the other hand the production process shapes (and leaves 'traces' in) the text, and the interpretative process operates upon 'cues' in the text (p. 133; italics in the original).

Fairclough's approach to intertextuality provides an explanatory framework; that is, it goes beyond interpretative analysis to provide a critical analysis: one that explores issues of power related to language and literacy education. It is important, from this perspective, to analyze how power relationships are constructed through the use of language in everyday interactions in institutions like schools; specific settings, such as classrooms; and the intertextual practices in teachers' and students' composition and interpretation processes. My analytical framework for intertextuality incorporates, from Fairclough's framework, a theory that assumes, a priori, that language in use, or discursive practices, is rife with power relationships, with Bloome and Egan-Robertson's (1993) focus on generating an "emic" or insiders' understanding of who can make what kind of intertextual links and with what social consequences.

From the theoretical perspective taken in this study, it is important for the researcher to position herself within the research. I locate myself as a member of a middle-class, multiracial family and as a professional engaged in researching dimensions of my society. These dimensions, literacy practices and personhood in educational and classroom discourse, evolved, in part, from my interdisciplinary teaching of language arts and social studies at the secondary level. As West

(1994) notes, any discussion of our peoplehood as a nation needs to begin with a recognition of race as a salient aspect of our history and our present. Foundational questions in the nation's legal and literary history from this perspective include: who counts as a citizen and as a writer, and who counts as contributing to our country's history and literary tradition (e.g., Berry, 1994; Carby, 1987; DuBois, 1969; Franklin, 1974; Gates & McKay, 1997; West, 1995). My personal story within this sociocultural context situates me on a dynamic field with continuously shifting borders demarcated by a distant past, in which my Irish immigrant ancestors encountered signs in store windows that read N.I.N.A.: No Irish Need Apply, my childhood during which my mother, a member of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, worked as a seamstress, the present in which I read and negotiate the world as the mother of my two-year-old daughter Maya, who is of African American and European American heritage, and a future in which Maya will deal with the complex legacies of discourse practices about personhood in a society still rife with conflicts about issues of race, class and gender, particularly in institutions, such as schools.

Multiple Studies within a Study

To conduct the study, I implemented a students-as-ethnographers writing club at an urban K-8 school.[4] The school where the study took place is located in the heart of a working-class New England city, in a neighborhood rich in history of social activism of various ethnic groups (e.g., Puerto Ricans, African Americans, Irish Americans). At the time of the study, the community was experiencing the high tide of poverty and associated wave of violence endemic to inner-cities in the early to mid 1990s. The study focused on several young women as they examined questions about community life. I invited eighth-grade students who were interested in researching and writing about the community to join a writing club, which I convened for approximately three hours per week between February and June, 1993. Thus, the study from which data are taken involved teaching a small group of middle school students how to be ethnographers of their own communities, and it involved researching what the students did (the literacy practices in which they engaged as they researched their own communities). The two sets of studies, the students' and my own, adopted a collective question about community-based

literacy practices, asking who was researching and writing about the community, how they did so and what their purposes were.

The corpus of data included: fieldnotes, 45 hours of audio- and videotapes of writing club activities, conversations, and interviews collected over a four-and-a-half month period, collection of written artifacts, especially student writing, eight months of participant observation in the students' language arts classroom, select audiotapes of English classroom interactions, demographic data on the school and community, and interviews with the students' English and special education teachers.

This study involved a set of concurrent ethnographic studies: the studies conducted by the students, the writing club's study of community-based writing practices, and my study of these studies as they developed. The accompanying Table provides a diagram of the relationships among these studies. The vertical axis highlights phases in the life cycle of the writing project: orientation phase, interviewing and fieldwork phase, and the book writing and publishing phase, which culminated in a book signing event. The horizontal axis provides key information about each life cycle phase from the perspective of a particular study. Column 1 of the Table highlights the students' research questions, the types of writing they did, the people they interviewed, their processes of data analysis and report writing, and the book publication party they hosted. Column 2 highlights the students' and my research of community-based literacy practices and provides details related to this collaborative study. Column 3 features highlights of my study of the students and our collective study.

Data Analysis

The goal of the data analysis was to explore the relationships among personhood and literacy practices, using the construct of intertextuality. Analysis was conducted using discourse analytic techniques (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993; Fairclough 1989, 1995). I conducted twelve microanalyses of videotaped segments of club meetings to analyze the social interactions within the group, noting the social positioning being done as texts were recognized, acknowledged, and assigned social significance as the students engaged in research of their communities. To conduct the analyses, I drew on several sources, each of which has been elaborated in the discussion of

13

TABLE 1: Relationships among Research Studies

Students' Individual Studies:	Vega Community Writing Club's Study of Community-Based Literacy Practices:	Egan-Robertson's Study
Orientation Phase: Students introduced to the work of students in similar projects; Students Select Research Questions • Sandra Verne: Does the kind of music you listen to affect the way you feel about people? • Marielis Flores: What needs to happen to keep kids off the streets? • DeLayne Monson: How can you keep from becoming an alcoholic if your parents drink? • Denise Yothers: Is racism a problem in Riverside?	**Orientation Phase:** Students Agree to Suggestion that We Collectively to Investigate the Following Questions About Literacy: • Who researches and writes about the community? • How do they do so? • And, why do community members research and write? • Students introduced to the work of contemporary and historical local researchers and writers • I contact friends and colleagues who are community artists and activists	**Orientation Phase:** Gaining Access; Writing Club is part of larger study of literacy in students' English language arts teacher's classes. Formation of writing club to examine How would students use an alternative set of texts to create social identities for themselves and each other in relation to their communities, their schooling, and writing? What were the social and power relationships established in the writing club? What were the linguistic strategies employed in various literacy events by students, community members and myself? What is the usefulness of intertextuality as a social construction to understanding relationships between literacy practices, identity and personhood?
Interviewing and Field Work Students do various types of writing - questions. field notes, logging of tapes, memoes Students Interview Together: • Carlos Vega - director of Vega Community Center • Terrell Thomas - school substance abuse counselor • Earl Ackerman - director of Community Music School • Neighborhood family who was dealing with intergenerational alcoholism • Church youth group leader	**Interviewing and Field Work** Students do various types of writing - questions, field notes, logging of tapes, memoes Group Interviews: • Irma Ashton - playwright, director and actress in political theater • Teresa Cruz - poet, playwright and actress in children's theater • Marsha Davidson - playwright and director of adolescent theater group, university researcher of multicultural education	**Data Collection and Analysis** • Participant observation in role as writing club facilitator • Field Notes • Taping of all meetings • Transcription of all interviews • Collection of Artifacts, especially student writing
Book Writing and Publishing • Students read the transcripts of their interviews numerous times as a basis for generating analyses • Students decide to publish their reports in an edited volume which they entitle *Life As Teenagers in the Nineties: Growing Up in Riverside*	**Book Writing and Publishing** • Students read the transcripts of their interviews numerous times as a basis for generating analyses • Students ask Irma Ashton to help them with the drafting and, send her a prospectus of their book	**Continued Analysis**
Book Signing Event Family, friends and community members attend - as do Students and I talk about our research and writing and distribute 50 copies of the book and keep 6 each for ourselves	**Book Signing Event** Some of the Community artists and activists the students interviewed	**Continued Analysis** • Incorporating data collected by students and by us as we studied community-based literacy practices • Mapping of Intertextuality

20

related literature presented above. It is important to emphasize that, based on the previous theoretical discussion, I use the abstract term of personhood to describe, interpret and explain the issues the students were investigating and writing about; however, the students and community members did not use this term, nor did I use this scholarly term with the students. However, the students, community members and I explicitly used related terms, such as race and racism, gender and sexism.

Learning about Culture, Language and Power

I begin by discussing excerpts from Denise Yother's and Sandra Verne's writing to illustrate the analyses generated by students and to show how their writing was produced. I next present a "macro" analysis of the intertextual links proposed by me as teacher-researcher of the writing club, illustrating the importance of intertextual links made by a teacher to the opportunities available for students to craft school-based literacy practices.[5] I highlight the importance of these initial intertextual links in framing young people's opportunities for taking up discourses about various dimensions of personhood. Then, I discuss a set of transcript segments, taken from the third writing club meeting, to illustrate how from the onset of the writing club, membership involved constructing literacy practices of researchers interested in examining issues of racial and ethnic identity and racial prejudice. I included a brief excerpt from a community artist is included to represent the pattern of reasons for and ways of researching and writing that the students encountered as they investigated community members' literacy agendas. This data is important to include, because it significantly influenced the content and processes students adapted in their own writing. Finally, data from Sandra Verne's writing conference with a community artist illustrates the ways in which students created intertextual links with the discourses and methods raised by community members in composing their reports.

15

"Is Racism a Problem in Riverside?"

> When I started researching this chapter, I had racism and racial prejudice confused. When
> the writers club interviewed Teresa Cruz, she asked, "Has anyone experienced racism?".
> . . I started saying I did by being called, 'That white girl,' 'Honky' and 'Gringa.' Then I found
> out that is not racism! What that is called is racial prejudice . . . . Like Marsha Davidson
> said in words teens can understand, 'Racism = prejudice + power.'
> > Denise Yothers. (1993). "Racism: A Problem in Riverside."

This excerpt from Denise's ethnographic report can be understood as articulating "dominant
and subordinate ideological components" (Gergin & Davis, 1986) of personhood, along
dimensions of racial identity, racism and gender. The quote provides an example of the kind of
analyses Denise generated to report findings related to her research question: "Is racism a
problem in Riverside?" She illustrates her process of coming to critical awareness
(consciousness, in Freire's [1972] term) by providing an example from her personal experience as
a researcher to educate her readers about key terms she had encountered (racial prejudice and
racism), their meanings and the centrality of power relationships to racism. Her choice of
examples makes visible the intersection of gendered and raced identities and how these
discourses of personhood are used among adolescents ("I started saying I did [experience racism]
by being called, 'That white girl,' 'Honky' and 'Gringa.' ").

Her words suggest some recognition of racism as a system of penalty and privilege based on
skin color ("Racism = prejudice + power"). Her understanding of issues of power related to
racism are reflected in her letter to teachers, cited at the start of this article. In the letter, Denise
asks her elementary and middle school teachers to change their teaching practices to provide
multicultural perspectives, writing that, "there's a problem. The problem is we have been
deprived of learning about other cultures." Her writing suggests that she has begun to see that
some groups of people within our society are set apart and excluded from the curriculum. Denise
wrote the letter as a response to Irma Ashton's (a community artist who met with the students on
three occasions) suggestion that she write a skit in which an adult and a young person discuss
racism. Denise's use of the phrase "other cultures" provides an example of how discourse is a site
of articulation of dominant and subordinate notions about personhood: it works to normalize a
Euro-centric perspective that views "other cultures" as apart rather than a central component of
our society.

Taken together these quotes from Denise's writing represent the kinds of connections she made for herself and her readers based on issues of race and racism as these related 1) to interactions among peers (being called "That white girl," "Honky" and "Gringa") and 2) to classroom interactions around official texts (e.g., whose history and culture is taught and whose is excluded from the curriculum). Two of the European American teachers in attendance at the students' book signing event cried when Denise read her letter aloud along with a quote she included from Carlos Vega, director of the Puerto Rican Cultural Center: "I think racism is a society problem. Everyone in this society has to work to end it. It can't be one-sided. Teachers can't do it alone. The principals can't do it alone. The superintendent can't do it alone. The mayor can't do it alone. It has to be done by parents, the church, the educators. Ending racism has to be valued by everyone that's part of society. We all need to work at it." This example from Denise's research report illustrates how she made intertextual links between her inquiry process and the "minority discourses" (Luke's term, 1995-1996) about social change that she and her co-researchers encountered and incorporated into their writing. Literacy became recognized, within the writing club and the students' writing, as a site of negotiation of dominant and subordinate discourse practices about personhood.

"How Does Music Affect Your Feelings?"

> *My goal for this chapter is to let people know what music really is because kids/teenagers seem to think that music is just something to dance to. I'm trying to provide them with information that I have found by talking to people and researching.*
> Sandra Verne. (1993). "Does Music Affect the Way We Think and Feel About People?"

In this text and the one at the start of this article, Sandra positions herself as a teenager, researcher, interviewer and author, and as someone who is an authority on the topic she has researched. Through a chain of discursive actions, Sandra builds an argument; she creates a picture of music as something that has become accepted as entertainment by teenagers. She establishes a goal ("to let people know what music really is") and a position of authority to speak from; and she demonstrates how she has elected to address the problem through taking public action as a writer ("I'm trying to provide them [teenagers] with information I found by talking to

17

people and researching"). In her writing there is evidence that Sandra is using contrast (e.g., between common music and cultural music) to illustrate some of what she has learned about the potential impact of music on people. Sandra's writing task was to write a chapter prospectus to several audiences: to ask the principal for money to publish the book that she and her fellow students were writing; to inform her English teacher about their work in the writing club, which counted as their English class three days per week; and to communicate with a local artist the students asked to return to help them "write up their reports;" and most importantly to provide information to her peers about her research findings. The writing task itself provided a series of positions from which she could have written; from among these she chose that of a researcher having information to share that would make a positive difference in people's lives. She wants teenagers to know that music affects the way they think and feel about women; that it "puts messages across." She wrote: "In music there are references to women as 'whores', 'hussies' or 'bitches.' We are affected by music when people go up to other people and start making false accusations. . . . When people say those things, they think it is okay because they see it on T.V. and repeat it." Sandra had generated a critical discourse analysis of how ideas about women become normalized through the media. She reveals to her readers her process of generating a contrastive analysis between "common" music and "political" music, providing definitions of her terms for readers and detailing the decisions she made as an analyst ("Common music is what we hear on the radio, on MTV, all the time. Some people call this popular music but I can't call it popular because it's not popular with a lot of people when it talks about women that way. I call it common music instead.") Her awareness of the power inherent in words is clear in her explanation of cultural music as a kind of political music ("Political music is music that gets people to do something about the problems of the world. At first I thought cultural music was a third kind of music. Then I decided that cultural music is a kind of political music because it brings back your culture. . . . For some people, your culture was never written in books.") As in Denise's writing, there are traces of the way dominant versions of history have excluded the history of many communities of color. For example, Sandra includes in her chapter information she learned from Irma Ashton that the drum could not be played by Africans in captivity as slaves, once slave holders realized that the drums were used as a form of communication. Sandra reports one of the "minority discourses" she accessed for learning history from the community's perspective ("Cultural music tells you how your own history was. . . ."). Bringing "back your

18

culture" was a theme evident in questions Sandra asked of community members across the interviews. In her field notes from a March 3rd interview of Irma Ashton, Sandra wrote, "She told us about how her daughter traced her family roots. . . ." On May 10th, Sandra asked Teresa Cruz, "How did you go about tracing your roots?" "At what age did you realize that you wanted to trace your roots?" In these writing excerpts, Sandra's process of coming to consciousness 1) about the importance of learning history from the community's perspective and 2) about how "the production and reproduction of the social order [in this case discourses about cultural groups and about women] depend . . . upon practices and processes of a broadly cultural nature" (Fairclough, 1995, p. 219). The particular data selected for inclusion in the next sections of this article articulate dimensions of Sandra's and (to some extent) Denise's production of their texts, through identifying intertextual links to various aspects of the writing club.

Intertextual Links Proposed in the Formation of the Writing Club

In this section I highlight that the analyses of culture, language and power presented in the students' writing were influenced by the macro-level juxtapositions made by myself as teacher-researcher and, then, by the community members the students interviewed. Thus I elaborate here on intertextual links I made in forming the writing club. Table 2 is a copy of the flier I distributed to students who had chosen free time during an activity period.[6]

TABLE 2: Flier for the Community Writing Club

> ## VEGA SCHOOL
> ## COMMUNITY WRITING CLUB
>
> ## <u>FORMING NOW!</u>
>
> WHEN: TUESDAYS, WEDNESDAYS, AND THURSDAYS DURING
>   ACTIVITY PERIOD
>
> FOR WHOM: POD 9 STUDENTS INTERESTED IN WRITING AND
>   RESEARCHING WHO ARE NOT INVOLVED IN ANOTHER
>   ACTIVITY DURING THIS TIME.
>
> WHAT WE WILL DO:
> - WRITE ABOUT YOUR COMMUNITY
> - LEARN TO DO ACTION RESEARCH
> - INTERVIEW COMMUNITY WRITERS, ARTISTS,
>   ACTIVISTS, AND OTHERS
>   READ THE WRITING OF STUDENT WRITERS
>   FROM OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTRY
> - PUBLISH OUR WRITING
> - MAKE DECISIONS TOGETHER
>
> HOW TO SIGN UP:
>   SEE MS. EGAN-ROBERTSON FOR A PERMISSION FORM,
>   OR IF YOU WANT MORE INFORMATION.

26

Many types of activities were associated with writing club meetings during different phases of its life cycle. Initially, the group read and heard about the work of teenage ethnographers from around the country. At the first meeting, I raised potential questions that they might be interested in researching: "What's it like being a young woman growing up in Riverside? As a young African American woman? As a young Latina? As a young white woman?" As will be illustrated later in this article, this is an important theoretical point, because the students then adopted questions to investigate and helped each other design and implement research plans in which they built intertextual links with the questions I used to frame the study. As part of the study of their communities, students interviewed a number of family and community members. Most of the interviewing was done collectively. The students wrote in variety of ethnographic genres and narratives and presented their findings in an edited volume. In establishing the writing club, I drew on my social network of colleagues and friends, with whom I had done similar critical educational work in the past. One of the people was Irma Ashton,[7] a local theater producer, director and actress. Before the students interviewed Ashton, I brought in a copy of *The Narrative of Sojourner Truth* (Washington, 1993). I shared this book for theoretical, methodological, historical and political reasons: Truth had lived in the area in the mid-19th century, and Ashton was known for her dramatic portrayals of Truth. Indeed, Ashton was sometimes publicly referred to as "The Prophetess," much as Truth once had been. Also, in preparation for their interview with Ashton, the students read a biographical sketch of her, which was included in a playbill for a show about Ida B. Wells, a 19th century journalist and anti-lynching activist. Ashton acted as Wells in the two-woman show, touring regionally before traveling to South Africa with the show. I also brought in Wells' autobiography *Crusade for Justice* (Duster, 1970). Thus, from the beginning, acting as the teacher-researcher, I proposed to the students an intertextual framework and analysis that deliberately incorporated community texts and discursive practices based on critique. My actions are relevant to the theoretical problem and question raised in this article because they focus attention on the kinds of literacy practices that were assigned significance by me as teacher-researcher and highlighted for students whose and what purposes were served by the community-based literacy practices of the artists and activists they met through the writing club. As noted in the literature review section, what kinds, whose and what purposes are served in literacy practices are central concerns in the construction of discursive practices of personhood.

Talking Literacy Practices and Personhood into Being in the Writing Club

Through analysis of the actions of members in three transcript segments from the third writing club meeting, I attempt here to make visible the ways in which discursive practices constructed in the writing club provided an opportunity for students to explore issues of personhood based on constructing an analysis of intertextual links between issues of culture, language and power and their personal experiences. To make visible the social positioning occurring on a line-to-line basis in the transcripts of conversations, I use three types of markings in the right hand column of the transcript chart: I have **bold-faced words** that emphasize **intertextual processes**. *Italicized words* highlight *intertextual substance*, and underlined words mark explicit dimensions of personhood and identity. Using the theoretical framework crafted for this study, my analysis illustrates how literacy practices were being socially constructed and how relationships between literacy practices and personhood were being constructed through face-to-face interactions among writing club members from the early days of the writing club. For example, there is evidence of intertextual links that Shanae makes to the questions I posed to frame the writing club project and there is evidence that Denise crafts an intertextual link to expand the focus of Shanae's topic to include her interest in issues of racial prejudice, an interest that was grounded in her experiences as a young white woman.

An analysis of the general pattern of interaction during the first two days of the writing club show that we generated, discussed and revised questions that the students wanted to pursue. The activity of choosing research topics and questions framed conversations about issues that were of critical concern to students, thus linking an academic task with personal interest. These discussions were preceded and/or followed by quiet writing time. Sometimes a student read aloud what she had written; then the other students recounted their experiences on the topic. Transcript 1 from the third day of the writing club provides a basis for examining this pattern of practice.[8] This segment of transcript was selected because the pattern becomes visible as participants already in the group help a new member with this pattern (lines 25-26). There are four actors in this excerpt: myself, (Ann, the teacher-researcher), DeLayne (an entering member), and Shanae and Sandra (returning members). The interactions of the two groups of participants, returning and new, provide a point in time where the expectations for participating become visible as members respond to my request to "say one again." As Fairclough (1989) argues, at

22

such moments, members make visible to each other, and thus to observers — or in this case, readers — what is expected of participants.

Transcript 1: Excerpt from 3rd Writing Club Meeting

Three types of markings make visible the social positioning:
- bold-faced words emphasize intertextual processes,
- *Italicized words* highlight *intertextual substance*, and
- underlined words mark explicit discursive dimensions of personhood.

Ln #	SPK	Descriptive Analysis	Intertextual Positioning
25.	Ann	Could you **say** one again,	**Creates** reason for repeating self
26.		**for DeLayne?**	**Orienting** new member to group literacy practices
27.	Shanae	*What's it like*	**Defines self as researcher** who adapts the personhood question frame "what's it **like**"
28.		*being or having two nationalities?*	to **examine** issues of multiracial identity.
29.	Ann	**Mmm-hmm.**	**Acknowledges** interest in question; **creates** space for **discussion** of this dimension of personhood
30.	Shanae	**Some people** *probably can't answer it* 'cause —	**Framing** *question in relation to group*
31.	Sandra	*I could!*	Sandra **defines** self as *multiracial*
32.	DeLayne	*I could!*	DeLayne **defines** self as *multiracial*
33.	Shanae	--**some people** only probably *have* one nationality.	Shanae **creates** a *problematic* space, by **raising** issue of whether all members of the group could *respond to the question*
34.	Denise	Tomorrow —	Denise, who is European American, takes the opportunity created by Shanae to **establish an angle** on Shanae's *topic* that relates to her interest in *issues of race*
35.		I was **telling** her *how I have a question of the day*	**Referencing** earlier conversation with me as teacher-researcher
36.		or *questions*	**Establishes self as researcher** with a *question,*
37.		which I was doing today with my *survey*.	**adapting method of survey** to **explore** *peers' reactions to a set of topics*

38.		Tomorrow I'm *going to research* this one.	Denise **defines self as researcher,**
39.		My question number three from yesterday,	
40.		it's *prejudice*: who does it really *hurt*?	interested in **examining** issues of _race,_
41.		The *person who's being prejudiced or both*?	*from multiple perspectives*

In lines 25-26, Ann asks Shanae, "Could you say one again for DeLayne?" In making the request to ". . . say one again for DeLayne," I draw on members' knowledge of prior texts constructed by members and practices used to construct the texts (intertextuality, Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993). The research question is based on my adaptation of ones I raised at the first club meeting: 'What's it like growing up as young women in Riverside? As an African American young woman? . . ."

In sharing this question, Shanae is making an intertextual connection between the current event and an earlier one; that is, she is demonstrating to those who were present in the previous events (including me) that she recognizes the links between these events and that she is assigning social significance to both the prior event and the current one. In "saying" this question, she is also interactionally accomplishing the intertextual link and sharing the cultural knowledge with the new member.

Additionally, her next response makes visible how members can interact with the question. In this response she comments on her question (lines 30 and 33). Sandra's and DeLayne's responses to her comment overlap hers. The second part of her comment creates a problematic space by raising the issue of whether all members of the group could respond to the question. Thus, Shanae both provides an intertextual link and makes visible the literacy practice associated with posing a research question — that members can comment or respond to the research questions of others.

The interactions among members of the group illustrate how literacy practices were shaped by members. They also show how members began from early in the project to shape and reshape local views of personhood. In asking the question, "What's it like being or having two nationalities?" (lines 27-28), Shanae is raising for investigation discourse practices surrounding multiracial positioning. She later goes on to articulate this position as a subordinate position: she

and Sandra, she claims, have experienced some difficulties being accepted as Puerto Rican. Shanae asked us if she "looked Puerto Rican." In making the claim that some people cannot answer her question (line 30) because some people probably have only one nationality (line 33), she can be viewed as opening a space for considering this issue, while simultaneously suggesting the possibility that there might be some people in the group who could not answer the question (Denise and me). In this way, she opens space for considering multiracial personhood as a research issue and as one that is potentially exclusionary.

Shanae articulates this problem in a way that provides space for agreement, disagreement, renegotiation and expansion of a question by members, as they express that their relationship to her question is problematic. DeLayne and Sandra (lines 31-32) respond to Shanae, acknowledging their multiracial identities and interest in Shanae's topic. Shanae (line 33) finishes her statement of concern with a clarification about whether every member of the group had personal experiences related to her question. Denise, who is European American, takes the floor (lines 34-41) to respond to Shanae and other students, recognizing that she cannot answer the specific question but establishing a shared interest in questions about racial and ethnic relations. She creates a conversational position from which she can address the theme of power relationships regarding racial identities embedded in Shanae's question. Denise implies that she understood Shanae's question to be about racial "prejudice" and finds aspects of her personhood at issue in the conversation.

The transcript markings illustrate how shared expectations for the social construction of intertextuality were interactionally built in moment-to-moment interactions. The intertextual substance of the students' questions (issues of racial identity and racial prejudice) and intertextual processes (raising a question to research) begin to be shaped and reshaped within the discourse practices of the writing club. In this way, views of personhood (issues of acceptance as a multiracial person, issues of racial prejudice) and literacy practices (keeping a research notebook, having a research question, shaping an analysis based on personal experiences as Shanae does based on attributes of looks and language [see Transcript 2]; creating an angle to take up a co-researcher's topic of interest) were being shaped and reshaped and explored through their interactions as the students engaged in discussion about their community research projects. Students raised questions about ethnic identity and about issues of personhood associated with it (being accepted as a member of a racial or ethnic group, the emotional effect of prejudice).

25

Further evidence of analysis of discourse patterns associated with issues of race and racial identity as these emerged in our interactions can be seen in the next excerpt from the same meeting (Transcript 2). In their roles as researchers and in the social relationships they were constructing as writing club members, the students took up opportunities to examine attributes and attitudes about people based on race and gender, and often did so in relation to how these categories intersected in their lives. The students can be viewed as assigning intertextual significance to the questions I raised as I framed the study: "What's it like growing up as a young woman in Riverside? As an African American young woman? As a Latina? As a young white woman?" The issues associated with gender are so embedded in this particular transcript that it can be hard to see them. However, this was a multiracial group of women researchers and the experiences of issues of personhood differed among us based on our particular intersections. Transcript 2 shows traces of the way students began to take up these intersections of dimensions of personhood. We all spoke based on our experiences as women and the talk in these transcripts illustrates how issues of race and racial identity varied among us.

Transcript 2: Excerpt from 3rd Writing Club Meeting

> Three types of markings make visible the social positioning:
> ●**bold-faced words** emphasize **intertextual processes**,
> ●*Italicized words* highlight *intertextual substance*, and
> ●<u>underlined words</u> mark <u>explicit discursive dimensions of personhood</u>.

Ln #	SPK	Descriptive Analysis	Intertextual Positioning
54.	Ann	What do *you think*?	I position Shanae as an <u>*analyst*</u>
55.	Shanae	Sometimes when you **tell** somebody your <u>*nationality,*</u>	Shanae indicates the **negotiated** <u>nature of identity</u>
56.		it's gotta really	
57.		it's gotta really *show*	Shanae **defines** <u>appearance as attribute for negotiation of cultural identity</u>; Shanae **identifies** <u>visible inscription as a basis for negotiating inclusion and/or exclusion in a group</u>
58.		or they'll **call** you a *"wannabe."*	Shanae **identifies** the code "wannabe" as **how** teens can **respond** to someone who is not **viewed** as <u>*visibly inscribed as a part of a racial/ethnic group*</u>

26

59.		*'Cause like for her,*	Shanae *uses Sandra's experience as a basis for supporting her claim*
60.		she's got Puerto Rican in her,	
61.		but yet it's still--	
62.		when she **tells** people that,	
63.		they pick on her and call her "wannabe"	Shanae establishes Sandra as having difficulty being
64.		cause it don't look like she's Puerto Rican.	accepted as Puerto Rican because she is constructed by her peers as not "looking" Puerto Rican

Transcript 2 provides further evidence of how the theme of personhood was being negotiated. In lines 55-64, Shanae describes tensions around establishing one's multiracial identity as a member of a particular community within the peer network. Shanae raises name-calling ("wannabe") as a salient linguistic practice among adolescents (lines 58 and 63). In discussing what counts to people, she argues that membership in a group is often based on appearance (line 64). Thus, appearance is described as one attribute for negotiating inclusion or exclusion of racial/ethnic group membership. The discourse practice Shanae raises has to do with inclusion or exclusion from community membership and how that has to do with who has the power to define one's racial identity.

In Transcript 3, Shanae discusses additional dimensions that people (teens) use to define members. She suggests that if you are able to talk Spanish (lines 99-102), you are accepted by peers as Puerto Rican even if you are not immediately viewed as "looking it." Thus, Shanae elaborates on language as a boundary similar to appearance in defining community membership (line 100). She compares her experiences with Sandra's (lines 101-102). Notice how Shanae argues for linguistic competence as establishing a way of negotiating community membership. She uses her personal experience (line 99) as a case and supports her claim (line 101) by presenting Sandra's experience as a counter example. Shanae is making an intertextual link as she analyzes not only her experiences as being multiracial, but compares these experiences with how her peers negotiate their multiracial or multiethnic identities.

Transcript 3: Excerpt from 3rd Writing Club Meeting

> Three types of markings make visible the social positioning:
> - **bold-faced words** emphasize **intertextual processes**,
> - *Italicized words* highlight *intertextual substance*, and
> - <u>underlined words</u> mark <u>explicit discursive dimensions of personhood</u>.

Ln #	SPK	Descriptive Analysis	Intertextual Positioning
99.	Shanae	And I **talk** *it*..	Shanae **identified** <u>*linguistic competence as one attribute of cultural competence*</u>
100.		So that's why.	Shanae **established** <u>*talk and appearance as aspects of cultural competence*</u>
101.		But see, *she don't talk it*.	Shanae makes a *contrastive analysis* between her experience and Sandra's. She indicates that Sandra's *lack of knowledge* of *Spanish* contributes to peers' *assessment* of Sandra as not *culturally Puerto Rican*
102.		*She only talks it a little bit.*	Shanae **assessed** Sandra's *competence as a speaker of Spanish*
103.	Ann	Well, I think *it depends on how aware you are*, too.	Ann established *cultural knowledge as basic to negotiating group membership*
104.		of Puerto Rican culture	Puerto Rican culture as
105.		as being a blend of European,	*multiracial: European,*
106.		of African,	*African established as important*
107.		and of Indian,	*Indian important part of identity*
108.		right?	

Transcript 3 can be understood as an example of my intertextual practice as teacher-researcher in establishing literacy practices and personhood. I (the Ann in the transcript) acknowledge the comparison Shanae has made between her experience and Sandra's by responding to the earlier discussion (lines 55- 64) of looks or visual inscription as a basis for negotiating group membership. I suggest the significance of cultural knowledge to the negotiation of community membership (lines 103-108). Having read the text of where the group's conversation is going, I confirm the level of analysis Shanae is generating as appropriate research discourse. I also keep the topic open, rather than letting it close down around traditional views.

My actions can be understood as indicating to students that no simple answer explains various points of view; that is, there is more to consider. From the perspective taken in this analysis, by making an intertextual link to the topic of bicultural competence, I position Shanae as a researcher who has taken up a topic worthy of serious academic inquiry.

One major way that the students took up the opportunities presented to them to analyze dimensions of personhood was through generation of analyses of what teenagers do in their interactions. For example, at the end of Shanae's leading the discussion about her research question, Sandra posed her research question for group discusssion: "How does music affect you, and how do you affect music?" The "you" in her question refers, in particular, to young people. The excerpts from the students' writing quoted earlier in this article indicate that the audience to whom they selected to report their findings was teenagers. Analysis of the third writing club meeting indicates that this interest in issues of who has the power to define whom and as what kind of person within the peer group was evident from early in their work as researchers. The three transcripts taken from the third writing club meeting illustrate the jointly produced literacy practices of the writing club and how Shanae and Denise were positioned by me and positioned themselves and each other as researchers, group members, racialized beings, among other roles and relationships. This analysis also shows one way that the activities of the writing club can be understood as having provided the students with an opportunity to examine issues of racial identity associated with discourses about personhood.

Intertextuality as an Everyday Community-Based Literacy Practice

The writing club provided students with opportunities to meet community members who had adapted literacy for the purpose of repositioning themselves and their community in relation to the broader society regarding their racialized identities. As shown in Transcript 4, the students had an opportunity to encounter a set of community-based literacy practices as a resource for academic literacy. The literacy practices they encountered focused their attention on analyzing societal notions about particular communities and their history and culture. Literacy practices in this study came to include language practices that generate a reading of the world, in the Freirian sense (Freire & Macedo, 1995).

Transcript 4 is taken from the students' interview of Irma Ashton, at the sixth writing club meeting. Ashton is a well known community member who is active in local and regional theater productions. She founded a theater company to expand her work with area youth in and out of school settings. This excerpt succinctly captures the intertextual practices community members conveyed to students for critically examining discourse practices associated with personhood. In essence, Ashton is showing the students how she has gained control over the form and substance of literacy and how she can use them productively to challenge, both within her community and in multiracial settings, the way she and the African American community often have been positioned negatively in the wider cultural context.

Transcript 4: Excerpt from Interview with Irma Ashton

Three types of markings make visible the social positioning:
- bold-faced words emphasize intertextual processes,
- *Italicized words* highlight *intertextual substance*, and
- <u>underlined words</u> mark <u>explicit discursive dimensions of personhood</u>.

Ln. #	SPK	Descriptive Analysis	Intertextual Positioning
1.	Ashton	My main **goal** as an artist is	*Purpose* as a *writer and researcher*
2.		to **give back** to my *community*,	
3.		to the *African American community*,	*Purpose* as a *writer and researcher*
4.		to the *youth*	
5.		and to **give back**	
6.		to *youth of all races*	*Purpose* as a *writer and researcher*
7.		**what I've learned about myself**	To use *personal experience* to examine *forms of oppression*
8.		**and about my people**	To use *personal experience* to examine *forms of oppression*
9.		And about **how I fit into the scheme of things**	To examine how *positioned by society and*
10.		in America as an American citizen.	*how to reposition self within society*
11.		I'm an **advocate** to **dismantle racism** in this county,	*To reconstruct personhood, that is, to reconstruct power relationships among groups associated with culture, history, and language*
12.		because I think it's very dangerous.	

30

Ln. #	SPK	Descriptive Analysis	Intertextual Positioning
19.		as an *artist*	
20.		and as *an African American woman,*	**Identifies** *that forms of oppression* **can overlap**
21.		that is my *main goal*:	**Answers** question about *why she researches*
22.		*to use my art to eradicate racism*	**Uses** *personal experience to* address *double consciousness and overlapping forms of oppression*

It is important to include analysis of a community member's reasons for researching and writing about the community because the students built intertextual links to community artists' and activists' purposes for and practices of researching and writing. Ashton builds these genres through a chain of discursive actions, a model for argument. She creates a picture of intertextuality as personal and public resource: She establishes a goal (lines 1-2; 22), a position to speak from (lines 1-10), and she establishes a problem (line 11). She states that she has elected to address the problem through taking public action as an artist (line 1 & 19). These are processes that were identified and discussed in Sandra's writing earlier in this article. However, central to these intertextual processes for argument that Ashton builds is the intertextual substance of what Ashton is examining in her argument.

Ashton begins by talking about her goals as an artist in the African American and multiracial theater. In beginning this way, Ashton demonstrates for the students how literacy may be used for personal and public goals associated with personhood. The interview with Ashton was similar to other interviews in the sense that the interviewees viewed themselves as writers and researchers who use their art as a vehicle for ending racism. In lines 7-10, Ashton's comment, "What I've learned about myself and . . . how I fit into the scheme of things in America as an American citizen" is an analysis of personal experience that can be taken up by the students. This comment, paired with Ashton's remark that her goal as an artist is to give back what she has learned to her community . . . and to youth of all races (lines 1-6) opens a space for multiracial dialogue about discourses of personhood. One dimension of analyzing personal experience discussed by Ashton is looking at how forms of oppression overlap. This overlap is shown in Ashton's statement "as an African American woman" in line 20 and in her elaboration of what that means to her. Ashton

had earlier talked to the students about the current theater production in which she portrayed Ida B. Wells, whose work as a political activist and writing as a journalist explicitly and inspirationally attacked prevailing discourse practices about the personhood of African Americans (Carby, 1987; Gates & McKay, 1997).

The intertextual processes and substance involved in asserting one's identity and reconstructing discursive practices of personhood are dynamic and fluid, not stable, static or ontological (Shotter & Gergin, 1989). The ongoing struggle of redefining personhood is illustrated by Ashton in her remarks to the students about her work as an artist. The literacy practices used by Ashton oriented the students toward reconstructing discourse practices about personhood by addressing racism as a structural problem located in cultural, linguistic and historical practices. Making intertextual critical discourse analyses about what it means to be an American becomes a way of intervening to counter dominant cultural practices, given DuBois' (1969) discussion of personhood, Willis' (1995) and Street's (1993) discussions of literacy and personhood, Fairclough's (1995) discussion of critical discourse analysis, and what Freire and Macedo (1995) call dialogue: "[T]he sharing of experiences must always be understood within a social praxis that entails both reflection and political action. In short, dialogue as a process of learning and knowing must always involve a political project with the objectives of dismantling oppressive structures and mechanisms prevalent both in education and society" (p. 380).

Demonstrating a New Student Identity as Writer, Researcher, Proud Community Member: Sandra's Writing Conference with Ashton

The excerpt in Transcript 5 was chosen to provide a telling case of the students' writing conferences with Ashton, to whom they sent a book proposal and asked for help in writing their chapters. It reveals the oral production by Ashton of a text written by Sandra. The writing presented in the transcript reflects Sandra's adaptation of the community-based literacy practice of using everyday experience as a resource for reconstructing culture and cultural identity, in this case experiences of race and ethnicity. Much as Flores (1993) describes the process of coming to critical awareness that can be found in the writing of many Puerto Rican writers, there is evidence in Sandra's writing that she has learned about the potential impact of cultural music on

the process of reconstructing discourses about self and other members of the community from assimilationist ones to ones based on cultural pride and political awareness.

In the transcript, Ashton reads aloud a piece of Sandra's writing (which is italicized in the transcript). Sandra produced this piece of writing in response to a writing "exercise" Ashton had given her. In assigning the writing exercise, Ashton had said: "I want you to write your observations or an example of how music can empower people or how it can hurt people. You can use things about sexism or racism, because these can really hurt people. Well, it's a form of communication, whether it's negative or positive.' Ashton then turned to me to ask for my ideas about genre. When I suggested a format of progressive disclosure in which Sandra would share her process of coming to awareness about issues of culture, language and power related to music, Ashton grimaced and said, "You mean write an essay." We continued to brainstorm ideas with Sandra about genre and decided on poetry, after considering ballad. When Sandra remarked that it would be a very long poem, Ashton laughed saying, "It's an epic." This exchange among Ashton, Sandra and myself illustrates the significance assigned to genre within the group as the students engaged in their writing processes.

After this discussion, Sandra put her head down on her notebook and wrote her thoughts in narrative form for the next ten minutes or so, while Ashton continued to conference with one individual at a time around the table. When there was a break, Sandra handed her notebook to Ashton. Referring to Sandra's draft, which she was reviewing as she spoke, Ashton said, "This certainly could empower, so you have to use this [in your book]." Sandra had written a poem about a family reunion.

She drew on her knowledge of the data she had collected and the analysis she had generated over three-and-a-half-months of research. In particular she drew from her experience attending a family reunion with Marielis. In addition, Sandra made certain informed decisions as a writer.

Transcript 5: Sandra's Conference with Ashton about Her Writing

Three types of markings make visible the social positioning:
- **bold-faced words** emphasize **intertextual processes**,
- *Italicized words* highlight *intertextual substance*, and
- <u>underlined words</u> mark <u>explicit discursive dimensions of personhood.</u>

Ln. #	SPK	Descriptive Analysis	Intertextual Positioning
5.	IA:	*No place for hate . . .*	Sandra **defining norms** for family reunion
6.	Reading	*Celebrate.*	Sandra **establishes tone** of event
7.		*The music was loud*	<u>Common music</u> in background
8.		*but no one was dancing.*	
9.		*Because they were all too busy*	<u>Family members</u> **share** *news/stories*
10.		*catching up on things that had happened.*	with <u>each other.</u>
11.		*Dancing.*	
12.		*Then one song came on.*	**Change in action** related to *change in music.* **Foregrounds** (what comes to be
13.		[long pause. Ashton points to place in text.	recognized as) <u>*cultural music*</u>
14.		Sandra leans forward and marks the paper, saying]:	
15.	SV:	That's supposed to be "and."	
16.	IA:	*Then grandma started moving and singing along*	Sandra **establishes** <u>*grandmother as affected positively by cultural music*</u>
17.		*This got their attention*	**Impact** of <u>*cultural music*</u> on
18.		*every last one.*	<u>grandmother</u> **acknowledged** by
19.		*They all started laughing*	<u>family members</u>
20.		*and having a ball.*	
21.		*That's the best reunion of all.*	<u>*Establishes importance of cultural*</u>
22.		*The song that came on*	<u>*music in establishing tone of family solidarity*</u>
23.		*was from her homeland.*	**Establishes** <u>grandmother's</u> **personal,**
24.		*From when she knew the whole band.*	**social relationship** to <u>cultural music.</u>
25.		*She felt so happy.*	<u>*Establishes influence of cultural music*</u>
26.		*So full of life.*	<u>*on sustaining sense of cultural identity, sense of self.*</u>
27.		[Ashton continues reading, but in an inaudible voice.]	
28.	IA:	That's beautiful.	<u>Ashton</u> **defines** <u>Sandra</u> as a <u>*writer*</u>
29.	SV:	I know!	<u>Sandra</u> **defines** <u>self</u> as a <u>*writer*</u>
30.	IA:	See.	
31.		you did it!	Ashton **establishes** that Sandra took

34

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

32.		[Ashton looks over the writing again.]	up *community literacy practice* of **telling a story** based on *personal experience* **to reconstruct**, in this case, *cultural identity*
33.		You did it!	Ashton **defines** Sandra as successfully **conveying** an account about **how** *music can empower*
34.	DM:	It rhymes a little	*DeLayne* **evaluates** the **literariness**
35.		and it doesn't.	of the writing
36.		[DeLayne punctuates her point with her finger.]	DeLayne **defines** Sandra as successful writer
37.	IA:	Nice!	
38.	SV:	I'm putting that in my book.	Sandra **defines** *self as published writer*

In discussing this transcript, I provide two analyses. The first discusses Ashton and her literacy practices. The second focuses on the literacy practices Sandra used to create the text she wrote. As Ashton reads, she is doing more than performing the text. She is engaging the students in learning about genre practices. For example, Ashton puts in line breaks that were not in Sandra's text. These line breaks are represented by separate lines in the transcript. In adding these line breaks as she reads the text, Ashton makes visible the poetic literacy practice of representing the ebb and flow of poetry through the rhythm of language. In essence, Ashton transforms Sandra's narrative text to poetic form, illustrating to the students through her talk a genre form not used when Sandra wrote it.

Having discussed what Ashton was accomplishing through her performance of Sandra's text, I want to revisit Sandra's text to see what social positioning Sandra was establishing through the way she constructed her text. Sandra positions what we later come to recognize must be commercial music in the background (lines 7-8), foregrounds the tone of the event, and notes the relatives' verbal communication with each other ("they were all too busy catching up on things that had happened."). She makes a shift at the situational level of the text in line 12 ("Then one song came on."), when music becomes foregrounded as the grandmother begins to improvise and perform. Sandra creates in her text a shift in people's attention and key (line 19). She describes the song as special to the grandmother in lines 22-24 ("The song that came . . . from her homeland. From when she knew the whole band.") and situates the meaning of the music in the grandmother's personal history, prior to emigration. Sandra positions personal and social relationships as central to the interaction within the scene. For example, she implies that the

35

grandmother's friendship with band members (line 24) influenced the grandmother's reaction to the music. Additionally, Sandra positions the relatives' responses to the grandmother's emotional reaction to the song, to her happiness and zest (lines 25-26) through her words, "They all started laughing and having a ball" (lines 19-20). Sandra's text can be understood as highlighting the importance of the family members' interactions around the "song that came from her homeland" to the shift in tone of the event (line 21, "That's the best reunion of all."). To compose this piece, Sandra had to draw on the body of data from her fieldwork to create what VanMannen (1988) might describe as an impressionistic tale about how music can affect the way we think and feel about people. In the brief excerpt presented above, Sandra positions herself and is positioned within the group as a successful researcher and writer because she reexamined a personal experience to illustrate how music can empower someone.

Sandra's exclamation, "I'm going to put that in my book!", reveals a new-found sense of identity as a writer. She wrote in the introduction to her book chapter, "I am so excited. Who would ever think of me writing a book?" Sandra surprised herself and felt she surprised her teachers, peers and family through taking up the identity of a published writer. Ashton's "You did it!" expresses her delight that Sandra was able to write about the joyous dancing at a family reunion as an example of how cultural music can be a means to reconstruct cultural identity. However, Sandra's comment can be understood as underscoring the discourse practices of personhood associated with being a low track student ("Who would ever think of me writing a book?"). I argue that it was the shift at the level of personhood of the discursive practices established within the writing club that can be understood, from the perspective taken in this article, as accounting for the shift in students' identities as writers and as people who could talk and write about their racial and ethnic identities and related issues of culture, language and power. I also argue that, to enhance significantly the literacy learning opportunities of students of color, a shift at the level of personhood in educational discourse practices at the sociocultual level is required.

42

Interrelationships Among Personhood, Literacy Practices and Intertextuality

This article represents an attempt to theorize what the notions of personhood and intertextuality contribute to our conception of literacy teaching and learning. To do so, I have provided definitions of key terms and a review of related literature from literacy studies, critical discourse analysis and multicultural education. I have crafted and applied an analytical framework for understanding interrelationships among these constructs. I have illustrated how discourses about personhood were investigated, along various dimensions of history, music, racial and ethnic identity and womanhood, in the literacy practices of a school-based writing club. In the writing club, students were positioned by myself and by community members they interviewed, as having academic ability, as members of communities with linguistic and literary resources and with valued educational and literacy agendas. The analysis of student writing and transcript segments of interactions from two writing club meetings indicates ways students were socialized to investigate dominant and subordinate discourses about dimensions of personhood.

Attention to how personhood was being defined provided a means for restructuring literacy teaching and learning in ways that resulted in students gaining access to valued educational opportunities. Identities as capable writers, researchers and literacy learners were not ones the students had achieved in their regular educational experiences. The shifts in students' identities that occurred during their participation in the writing club can be understood as related to the intertextual links at the level of personhood made in the framing of the writing club and between the students' literacy agenda and those of community artists and activists. As discussed earlier, these students were assigned to the lowest academic track and had not previously had the opportunity to do elaborative writing in school. The analyses presented in this article illustrate how two students used the tasks, goals and opportunities presented to them through the writing club to construct, with me as teacher-researcher and with community members, multiple positions as writers and researchers. Denise Yothers and Sandra Verne took up the opportunity to examine definitions and assumptions of literacy practices through their inquiry into the writing and research methods and purposes of local artists and activists. In doing so, the students saw how local community members adapted literacy to their own agendas, which can be understood as involving the analysis of views of personhood. All students in the writing club also explored issues of personhood from the perspectives of race and racism, gender and sexism.

37

Beyond the data drawn upon in this article, a case study of each student's writing revealed unique elements related, in part, to the research question she examined. DeLayne used her writing to reform social relationships in a family that had experienced intergenerational alcoholism. As she accessed in school the linguistic and literacy practices of her home and local community, practices that are used by many African American writers (see Egan-Robertson, in press, for a detailed account), DeLayne repositioned herself as a writer across the contexts of the writing club, and her school, family and community. Marielis took up the literacy practices of the writing club to make a compelling argument to teenagers to join youth groups, like the church group she belonged to, instead of hanging out on the streets. In doing so, she used her writing to address adolescent alienation. She also positioned adults as her audience, advocating that a priority be placed on finding more jobs for youth and opening more community-based youth groups. Thus, her analysis can be understood as highlighting the need to change the sociocultural context as a requisite part of addressing adolescent alienation. Denise wrote a play that Ashton told her would be useful to include in anti-racism workshops for young people. Thus, she reconstructed her notions about issues of race and racism, analyzing several differences between these two concerns.

In this article, I have illustrated how literacy practices contributed to the construction of personhood for the students in the writing club, and that as teachers and students interacted during literacy activities, they formulated and reformulated discourses about personhood, particularly aspects related to issues of race and racism. The writing club can be understood as a site of interaction in which a critical awareness about issues of culture, language and power were explored. The analyses across time and events illustrate ways in which literacy practices and personhood were intimately related in the writing club. I briefly described a set of literacy practices in a writing club to illustrate how literacy practices can be understood as articulating ideological notions of the person and as constructing opportunities for exploring and taking up new positions as readers and writers. I have also illustrated that one way to address and transform discourse practices about personhood is through socially constructing intertextual practices. That is, as students participated in bringing texts of their lives and communities together for the purpose of examining issues of personhood that were of concern to them, they adapted literacy practices of local artists and activists and their inquiry led to new insights about themselves, their relationships to the community and society, and how culture, language and power relationships

38

are constructed, contested and maintained. The students generated analyses of issues of race, racial identity, racism, gendered and racial discourses promoted in music, analysis of different kinds of music, and the importance of learning history from a community perspective. This is what occurred, in part, through the students' participation in the writing club. Intertextuality was shown to be useful to examining relationships of literacy practices and personhood: People socially position each other through literacy practices in ways that inscribe conceptualizations of what it means to be a person in particular settings and within the wider society.

My efforts in the study were an attempt to craft an analytical framework for exploring relationships among personhood, literacy practices and intertextuality. My framework synthesizes aspects of Street's work (1993, 1994) on personhood and literacy practices from the New Literacy Studies, with Fairclough's work (1989, 1992, 1995) on critical discourse analysis, Bloome's and my work on the social construction of intertextuality, and with scholarship from multicultural education. I extended the work Dave Bloome and I (1993) had done on the social construction of intertextuality by adapting it to: 1) investigate issues of identity and personhood as these relate to literacy learning, 2) to look at data across time and events (the original study focused on one 15-minute interaction), and 3) to generate an explanatory analysis, in addition to descriptive and intertpretive analyses. I adapted the scholarship of Fairclough to guide my analysis of how particular discursive practices promote particular assumptions about people (e.g., as women of a particular race and class). I adapted Street's scholarship to examine the way participants were positioning themselves to contest dominant discourses about personhood. Also, I adapted scholarship on literacy and multicultural education (Freire & Macedo, 1995; Gadsden, 1992; Ladson-Billings, 1994, 1995, 1996; Lee, 1993, 1995; King, 1995; Walsh, 1991; Willis, 1995), reading it as an argument for a shift in discourses and sociocultural practices related to personhood. Thus, the theoretical perspective taken in this article assumes that as people use language they are involved in constituting themselves and constituting others through discursive practices that provide positions of identity and personhood to be taken up. I argue that the students' identities as writers and their critical discourse analysis of issues of personhood illustrate how historical constructions of people and their communities can be renegotiated in particular educational settings. There is need to reconceptualize the teaching and learning of school literacy practices in ways that connect the purposes of literacy and education with critique

39

of the wider societal context, if the kinds of opportunities afforded the students in critical literacy projects are to become widely available in schools.

While my data come from a small group of adolescent women, my theoretical point is that this process is not unique to this group. Rather, the construction of school literacy practices can be understood as always involving issues of personhood and community. Fairclough (1989) writes: "Discourses and the texts which occur within them have histories, they belong to historical series, and the interpretation of intertextual context is a matter of deciding which series a text belongs to, and therefore can be taken as common ground for participants, or presupposed" (p. 152). This quote provides an insightful frame for elaborating on the significance of the intertextual juxtapositions I made as researcher and in my role as teacher of the writing club. The elaboration of the intertextual juxtapositions I made in these multiple roles is theoretically important because it provides a "macro" explanation for the curricular and community discourses that shaped the take up of discourses within the writing club. If literary texts and the texts students compose are primarily about people, and are one key way individuals are enculturated to views about people, the language arts (across the) curriculum are an important vehicle for promoting particular discourse practices about what a person is and what attributes and rights various people are constructed as having. Thus, the decisions teachers make in regard to the intertextual juxtapositions they propose in their educational discourse are critically important.

The analytical framework presented in this article illustrates that it is important to understand how literacy develops not just in students' encounters with print but also in their interactions with others about texts, and that a key part of literacy is about personhood. The community artists and activists the students interviewed argued the need for addressing issues of race and racism associated with schooling as requisite to improving the educational outcomes for students of color. Irma Ashton shared the way she uses her art as a vehicle for "dismantling racism" and her experiences as an African American woman as a basis for deconstructing dominant discourses about personhood based on race. This study, therefore, raises a set of questions for further research. Among the questions that the construct of personhood generates for researchers and educators interested in literacy education are: How does a social institution such as a school construct discursive practices about what it means to be a person? How are competing discourses about personhood constructed through the everyday literacy practices in classrooms and schools? How can instructional practices be developed to enable students to see these

disourses as shaping their own views of self, of role, social and power relationships, of others? How can intertextual links be made between local, community-based literacy practices used by artists and activists to address issues of racism and school-based literacy teaching and learning practices? And finally, what roles do literacy practices and intertextuality play in shaping and reshaping discoursive practices about personhood? These questions need to be examined in other educational contexts to develop a theoretical framework for understanding relationships among personhood, literacy practices and intertextuality.

ENDNOTES

1. I elaborate elsewhere (Egan-Robertson, in press) on the distinction among the concepts of identity, subjectivities and personhood. Briefly, the term *identity* often focuses attention on an individual's sense of self, whereas *personhood* focuses attention on the attitudes and assumptions about people embedded within the way a culture organizes itself through its discourse practices (Geertz, 1979; Shotter & Gergin, 1989), in institutions such as schools. Thus, the construct of personhood foregrounds concern with the range of possible identities available for an individual to take up. I argue that to take up a non-dominant identity involves a struggle of personhood. I use the term personhood in ways similar to some uses of the term *subjectivities* (see Luke, 1996 on subjectivities; see also Moje, in press). I prefer the term personhood/peoplehood (DuBois, 1969; West, 1995) because of its critical historical roots in the ongoing national conversation about citizenship: e.g., Who gets to count as a person with what kinds of rights in the United States in various eras and situations? The term subjectivities often implies a theoretical perspective that foregrounds attention to hegemonic discourses about personhood. My interest is on the dialectical relationship between dominant and subordinate discourses (e.g., Carby, 1987; Flores, 1994) as these relate to dialogic educational and classroom discourse practices (e.g., Freire & Macedo, 1995; Lankshear, 1997; Lankshear & McLaren, 1993; Walsh, 1991).

2. Nystrand, Gamoran and Carbonara (in press) provide an insightful metaphor of an ecological niche to describe the context in which students' writing develops. A niche influences the opportunities for discourse constructed in a particular classroom.

3. Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) argue that researchers need to build on the landmark work of scholars such as DuBois (1969) and use race as a theoretical lens or analytical tool in educational research. I use the term *personhood* to highlight the intersection of a myriad of complex sociological factors (e.g., race, class, gender). Ladson-Billings and Tate recognize this intersection while making a compelling argument for the development of "theoretical frameworks that allow for an expansive examination of race" (Tate, 1996). My intent in using the theoretical construct of personhood is to take up this challenge as I investigate issues of race and racism, and gender and sexism that are involved in learning to read and write in school.

4. I was interested in conducting a students-as-ethnographers project to build theoretically on the landmark work of Heath (1983) in reconceptualizing language arts teaching and learning around a base of ethnographic and sociolinguistic inquiry (cf. Heath, 1982, see also Egan-Robertson & Bloome, 1997; Fairclough, 1992; Foster, 1992; Moll, 1987; Robinson, 1991; Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group, 1993; Stock, 1995). For related scholarship on engaging learners as researchers, see Freire (1972), Lee (1993) and Oldfather & Dahl (1994).

5. See Cazden, et al. (1996) on multiliteracies and literacy education; see Applebee (1996) on the influence of teachers' disciplinary roots in shaping curriculum.

6. The reader may be interested in a little more background on the formation of the writing club: The language arts teacher and I had originally hoped to engage students as researchers of culture and language in her English classes. However, my schedule permitted me to be in the school three hours/day, from 12 - 3 p.m. Given that the school schedule was built on a six day rotation, I was not able to observe in any one class often enough to establish continuity for such an instructional intervention. The teacher suggested the alternative plan of my forming a writing club during an activity period. I invited a group of 18 students (nine boys and nine girls) to join the club. Six girls accepted the offer and participated in the club during most of the spring term. The writing club began near the start of the second half of the academic year and continued through the end of the school year. Four of the girls saw the project through the publication phase. The two who left to attend to other matters in their lives came to the publication party and were cited in the book as part of the group. My sense is that no boys joined the group because they did not recognize me as a potential resource to them.

7. The names of all the adults as well as students are pseudonyms.

8. The line breaks in the transcripts were constructed based on an analysis of the contextualization cues (that is, based on pause structure, rising and falling intonation, etc.) used by various speakers. This type of descriptive analysis of a transcript is based on Green & Wallat (1984). It grows out of the sociolinguistic notion that people signal meaning through more than the words they speak.

48

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Apple, M. (1996). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age*. New York: Routledge.

Applebee, A. (1996). *Curriculum as conversation*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Au, K. & Kawakami, A. (1994). Shaping a vision for the schooling of diverse populations: Cultural congruence in instruction. In E. R. Hollins, J. E. King & W.C. Hayman (Eds.). *Teaching diverse populations: Formulating a knowledge base*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. M. Holquist, Ed. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Beach, R. & Anson, C. M. (1992). Stance and intertextuality in written discourse. *Linguistics and education, 4* (3 & 4) 335-357.

Beach, R. & Phinney, M. Y. (in press). *Linguistics and Education: An International Journal*.

Berry, M. F. (1994). *Black resistance, white law: A history of constitutional racism in America.*. New York: Allen Lane The Penguin Press.

Bloome, D. (1989). *Literacy and Classrooms*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Press.

Bloome, D. & Egan-Robertson, A. (1993). The social construction of intertextuality in classroom reading and writing lessons. *Reading Research Quarterly, 28* (4) 305-333.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carby, H.V. (1987). *Reconstructing womanhood: The emergence of the Afro-American woman novelist*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Cazden, C. (1988). *Classroom discourse*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Press.

Cazden, C., Cope, B., Fairclough, N., Gee, J. P., Kalantzis, M., Kress, G., Luke, A., Luke, C., Michaels, S. & Nakata M. (The New London Group). (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard educational review 58* (3) 60-92.

Davies, B. (1994). *Shards of glass: Children reading & writing beyond gendered identities*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Davies, B. & Harre, R. (1996). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 20* (1) 43-63.

Delpit, L. (1995). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard educational review, 58* (3) 280-298.

DuBois, W.E.B. (1969). *The souls of black folks*. New York: Signet.

Duster, A. M. (1970). *Crusade for justice: The autobiography of Ida B. Wells*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Dyson, A.H. (1993). *The social worlds of children learning to write in an urban primary school*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Egan-Robertson, A. (in press). Telling and writing stories "around the kitchen table:" Issues of identity and intertextuality in a case study of an eighth-grader's writing. To appear in *Linguistics and education: An international journal*.

Egan-Robertson, A. (1997a). School literacy practices and the transformation of personhood. *Interpretations: The journal of the Western Australian Teachers' of English Association*.

Egan-Robertson, A. & Bloome, D. (Eds.). (1997b). *Students as researchers of culture and language in their own communities*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Egan-Robertson, A. & Willett, J. (1997). Thinking and doing ethnography: A bibliographic essay. In A. Egan-Robertson & D. Bloome, (Eds.). *Students as researchers of culture and language in their own communities*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.

Flores, J. (1993). "Qué assimilated, brother, yo soy asimilao:" The structuring of Puerto Rican identity in the U.S.. In J. Flores (Ed.). *Divided borders: Essays on Puerto Rican identity*. Houston, Texas: Arte Publico Press.

Floriani, A. (1993). Negotiating what counts: Roles, relationships, texts and contexts, content and meaning. *Linguistics and education: An international journal, 5*, 241-274.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language* (A. M. Sheridan-Smith, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.

Foster, M. (1995). Talking that talk: The language of control, curriculum and critique. *Linguistics and education: An international journal, 7*, 129-150.

Foster, M. (1992). Sociolinguistics and the African-American community: Implications for literacy. *Theory into practice, 31* (4) 303-311.

Franklin, J. H. (1974). *From slavery to freedom: A history of Negro Americans*. New York: Vintage Books.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabway.

Freire, P. & Macedo, D. (1995). A dialogue: Culture, language and race. *Harvard educational review, 65,* 377-402.

Gadsden, V. (1992). Giving meaning to literacy: Intergenerational beliefs about access. *Theory Into Practice, 31* (4), 328-336.

Garcia, E. (1988). *Effective instruction for language minority students*. Arlington, VA: National Clearninghouse for Bilingual Education.

Gates, H. L. & McKay, N. (Eds.). (1997). *Norton anthology of African American literature*. New York: Norton.

Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*. Second edition. London: Falmer Press.

Gee, J., Michaels, S. & O'Connor, M. C. (1992). Discourse analysis. In M. LeCompte, W. Millroy & J. Preissle (Eds.). *The handbook of qualitative research in education*. (pp. 227-291). New York: Academic Press.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

Geertz, C. (1979). From the native's point-of-view: On the nature of anthropological understanding. In K. Basso and H. Shelby (Eds.). *Meaning in anthropology*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Geertz, C. (1983). *Local knowledge*. New York: Basic Books.

Gergin, K. & Davis, K. (1986). *The social construction of the person*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Gilbert, P. (1989). *Gender, literacy, and the classroom*. Carlton South, Victoria: Australian Reading Association.

Green, J. & Dixon, C. (1993). Talking knowledge into being: Discursive and social practices in classrooms. *Linguistics and education: An international journal, 5,* 231-240.

Green, J., & Wallatt, C. (Eds.). (1983). *Ethnography and language in educational settings*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Guiterrez, K., Rymes, B. & Larson, J. (1995). Script, counterscript and underlife in the classroom: James Brown vs. Brown v. Board of education. *Harvard educational review, 65,* 445-471.

45

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic.* London: Edward Arnold.

Hartman, D. K. (1992). Intertextuality and reading: The text, the reader, the author, and the context. *Linguistics and education: An international journal,* 4 (3 & 4) 295-311.

Heath, S. B. (1982). What no bedtime story means: Narrative skills at home and at school. *Language in society, 11,* 49-76.

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hicks, D. (1996). Discourse, learning, and teaching. *Review of research in education.* Washington, D.C.: AERA.

Hornberger, N. & Corson, D. (Eds.). (1997). Research methods in language education. In *The encyclopedia of language and education* (Vol. 8). Boston/Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic introduction.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Kamberelis, G. & Scott, K.D. (1993). Other people's voices: The coarticulation of texts and subjectivities. *Linguistics and education: An international journal,* 4 (3&4), 359-403.

King, J.E. (1995). Culture-centered knowledge: Black studies, curriculum transformation, and social action. In J. A. Banks & C. A. McGee Banks (Eds.). *Handbook of research on multicultural education.* New York: Macmillan.

Kirkpatrick, J. (Ed.). (1983). *The Marquesan notion of the person.* Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. (1989). Authoring lives. *Journal of folklore research, 26,* 123-149.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1992). Reading between the lines and beyond the pages: A culturally relevant approach to literacy teaching. *Theory into practice, 31* (4) 312-320.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African-American children.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American educational research journal, 32* (3) 465-491.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1996). *The call of whose stories?* A paper presented at the The National Reading Conference, Charlotte, NC.

Ladson-Billings, G. & Tate, W. (1995). Toward a critical theory of education. *Teachers college record, 97*, 47-68.

Lankshear, C. (1997). *Changing literacies*. London: Open University Press.

Lankshear, C. & McLaren, P. (Eds.). (1993). *Critical literacy*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Lee, C. D. (1995). A culturally based cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching African American high school students skills in literary interpretation. *Reading research quarterly, 30* (4) 608-630.

Lee, C. (1993). *Signifying as a scaffold for literary interpretation: The pedagogical implications of an African American discourse genre*. Urbana, IL: National Council for Teachers of English

Lemke, J. (1995). *Textual politics*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Lemke, J. L. (1992). Intertextuality and educational research. *Linguistics and education: An international journal*, (3 & 4) 257-267.

Luke, A. (1995-96). Text and discourse in education: An introduction to critical discourse analysis. *Review of research in education, 21*, 3-48.

McCarthy, C. & Crichlow, W. (1993). *Race, identity and representation in education*. New York: Routledge.

McKay, S. & Hornberger, N. (Eds.). (1996) *Sociolinguistics and language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moje, E. B. & Fassio, K. (in press). Revisioning the writer's workshop. *Urban review*.

Moll, L. (1987). Writing as communication. In D. Bloome (Ed.). *Literacy and schooling*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Nystrand, M., Gamoran, A. & Carbonaro, W. (1997). *Towards an ecology of learning: The case of classroom discourse and its effect on writing development in high school English and social studies*. A paper presented at the Center on English Learning and Achievement. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin - Madison.

Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Oldfather, P. & Dahl, K. (1994). Toward a social constructivist reconceptualization of intrinsic motivation for literacy learning. *Journal on reading behavior: A journal of literacy, 26*, 139-158.

Robinson, J. (1991). *Conversations on the written word: Essays on language and literacy.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group (1993). Special edition of *Linguistics and education: An international journal, 5.*

Schwerder, R. & Miller, J. (1983). The social construction of the person: How is it possible? In J. Kirkpatrick (Ed.). *The Marquesan notion of the person.* Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press.

Short, K.G. (1992). Researching intertextuality within collaborative classroom learning environments. *Linguistics and education: An international journal* (3 & 4) 313-333.

Shotter, J. & Gergen, K. J. (Eds.). (1989). *Texts of identity.* London: Sage Publications.

Street, B. (Ed.). (1993). *Cross-cultural approaches to literacy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Street, B. (1994). Cross-cultural perspectives on literacy. In Janet Maybin (Ed.). *Language and literacy in social practice.* England: Multilingual Matters LTD.

Stock, P. (1996). *Dialogic curriculum.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Tate IV, W. F. (1996). Critical race theory and education: History, theory, and implications. In M. W. Apple (Ed.) *Review of research in education, v. 22,* 195-247. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

VanMaanen, J. (1988). *Tales of the field: On writing ethnography.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Walsh, C. (1991). *Pedagogy and the struggle for voice: Issues of language, power and schooling for Puerto Ricans.* New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Washington, M. (Edited and with Introduction) (1993). *Narrative of Sojourner Truth.* New York: Vintage Classics: A Division of Random House, Inc..

Weinstein-Shr, G. (1993). Literacy and social process: a community in transition. In B. Street (Ed.). *Cross-cultural approaches to literacy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

West, C. (1994). *Race matters.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Willis, A. I. (1995). Reading the world of school literacy: Contextualizing the experience of a young African American male. *Harvard educational review,* 65 (1) 30-49.

Please help us assess the quality of our research report series by completing and returning the questionnaire below:

NAME OF REPORT: **LEARNING ABOUT CULTURE, LANGUAGE AND POWER:**
                   Understanding Relationships among Personhood, Literacy Practices,
                   and Intertextuality

1.   Your position:
____ elementary school teacher   ___ state ed. agency staff   ___ policy maker
____ middle school teacher   ___ professional developer   ___ researcher
____ high school teacher   ___ school administrator   ___ education writer
____ college teacher/professor   ___ district administrator   other_____

2.   Clarity   Very well   Not at all
      a. The concepts in this report were clearly expressed.   1   2   3   4   5   N/A

      b. This report was well organized.   1   2   3   4   5   N/A

3.   Utility

      a. Reading this report gave me new information or
          insight into teaching or learning.   1   2   3   4   5   N/A

      b. This report addresses a current and important problem
          in education,   1   2   3   4   5   N/A

          . . . and offers a solution to the problem.   1   2   3   4   5   N/A
          . . . and/or helps the reader understand the
                  problem from a different perspective.   1   2   3   4   5   N/A

      c. I found the ideas and solutions offered in this report
          to be feasible given current realities of policy and
          practice.   1   2   3   4   5   N/A

4.   Scholarship
      a. The conclusions drawn in the report are
          . . . adequately supported by the research presented.   1   2   3   4   5   N/A
          . . . fully grounded in theory.   1   2   3   4   5   N/A

5.   Any other comments or suggestions regarding this report or additional research needs in the area of
      English and language arts teaching and learning are greatly appreciated.

      _____
      _____
      _____
      _____
      _____

Please return this form to: Janet Angelis, Associate Director
                               Center on English Learning & Achievement
                               University at Albany, State University of New York
                               1400 Washington Ave., ED, B-9
                               Albany, NY 12222   (518) 442-5023
                               jangelis@cnsvax.albany.edu

NOTICE

REPRODUCTION BASIS

☐ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☑ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").