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This twenty-three month ethnographic study seeks to understand how citizenship status impacts the everyday lives of undocumented youth in mixed-status families, examining their experiences at home, in public schools, and community settings. The focal participants in this study lived in Millvalley, Pennsylvania (a pseudonym) and were mixed-status families in which the parents and eldest siblings were undocumented migrants from Mexico and the younger siblings were U.S. citizens by birth. This research examines three critical issues: first, the home and school learning experiences of mixed-status Mexican families, second, the way that language use functions as the central medium through which migrant families co-construct their identities, and third, the local policy shifts that occur in response to emerging Spanish-speaking communities. The findings indicate that migratory status influenced the ways in which parents and children engaged in or discussed educational activities, and these activities varied according to the ages of the focal children. At the same time, there were shared linguistic resources that all families used to co-construct national identity and to account for the relationship between citizenship and education. In addition to contributing theoretical and methodological insights about undocumented migrant youth attending U.S. public schools, the findings from this study can inform the development of educational pedagogy and policy in a growing number of post-industrial urban centers where mixed-status Mexican communities are beginning to emerge.
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Chapter One
Introduction

One Saturday morning in February 2009, I sat in Marta Alvarez and Carlos Utuado’s living room drinking coffee and debriefing after a visit to a nearby car dealership. I had translated between Marta and a salesman as she inquired about the possibility of buying a used minivan. Marta was eager to buy a vehicle because the brutal winter was taking its toll on the family; everyday, they had to wait outside for Igor’s bus to pick him up and drop him off from preschool, and they had to walk Jose to and from elementary school. Not unlike other conversations that I had translated for Marta, once the salesman began listing the kinds of identification she needed to provide in order to complete the transaction (in this case, a Pennsylvania driver’s license or international driver’s license and visa), she turned to me and said, Ok, dile que lo pensamos y ya vamonos (OK, tell him we’ll think about it and let’s go now). Marta and Carlos were undocumented migrants from Mexico and did not have these forms of identification; moreover, they were afraid of letting strangers find out about their migratory status. As we walked up the hill to their house, Marta called an undocumented friend who had purchased cars in neighboring Ohio to ask if he would drive the family to one of his trusted dealerships across the state border.

As Marta, Carlos and I talked about their possible trip to Ohio, eight-year-old José (a Mexican citizen and undocumented migrant) and four-year-old Igor (a U.S. citizen) began to poke their heads into the living room from the bedroom where they had been sleeping, a bedroom they shared with their parents. Marta recounted a conversation that they recently had on one of their wintry walks home from Jose’s elementary school. On this walk, Marta told the boys that she had a carta que iba escribir con un abogado (letter that she was going to draft with a lawyer). She told them that the letter se trata de que va pasar a ustedes si algo nos pasa (has to do with what will happen to you both if something happens to us). Igor asked what kinds of things could happen and José answered si se mueren o si los agarra la policía (if they die or if the police catches them). Marta explained that como nosotros no tenemos papeles nos pueden devolver a México (since we don’t have papers, they can send us back to Mexico). José added that if that happened, se tendría que ir a México porque la abuela es la única que nos cuida bien (we would have to go to Mexico because grandma is the only one who takes good care of us). As they continued talking, José proposed ¿por qué no le dices a la abuela que venga y nos cuida acá? (Why don’t you tell grandma to come and take care of us here?) Marta replied that some things were easier said than done. Igor, Marta recounted with a laugh, had one final plea: pero si nosotros vamos a México, escribe en la carta que nos gusta pizza y dulces (but if we have to go to Mexico, the letter should say that we like pizza and candy). Carlos joined in laughing too.

Over a year later, on a spring day in May 2010, I spent the morning at home drafting this chapter. Late in the afternoon, I met Marta, Carlos, José and Igor at the preschool that Igor attended. Marta had invited me to join them for this month’s parent meeting because she knew I would be interested in the immigration discussion on the agenda. She explained to me that Alexis, the program director, was hesitant about my coming because the topic was highly sensitive and the parents’ migratory status was confidential; but Marta had assured her that I was a trusted friend. There were around ten families present at this reunion. The undocumented

---

1 Pseudonyms have been assigned to all of the locations, institutions, and people in and around Millvalley.
Mexican and Central American mothers and fathers gathered in a room on the first floor of the center while childcare volunteers entertained the children in the upstairs classrooms. The meeting began when Alexis welcomed everyone and made several announcements about upcoming events, including the end of year celebration for the children moving on to Kindergarten in the fall.

After making her opening remarks, Alexis quickly moved to the heart of the agenda. She explained that she had been thinking a lot about recent events in the Latino community in which parents had been detained or deported and family members had been separated in the process. She expressed concern about what would happen to the students enrolled in the program if the parents were deported. She strongly urged the parents to do two things: first, to find a trusted family member or friend who was a U.S. citizen and who would care for the children in the event that they were deported and second, to have a lawyer draft a *carta de responsabilidad* (letter of responsibility) that would give that person the power of attorney over the children’s well being in the event of deportation. The message was clear—the parents ought to have a plan in place so that someone could return their children to them in Mexico or Central America. The letter was one way to avoid having the children placed in the U.S. foster care system and to minimize the risk of not being reunited as a family. Marta alternated between burying her head in her hands and looking up and despairingly asking *pero ¿quién va hacer eso?* (but, who is going to do that?).

Marta and Carlos thought about this *carta* (letter) often, and the topic had come up many times during walks home with the children from school and conversations around the dinner table. They often talked with me about the various people they considered asking to become *responsable para los niños si algo nos pasa* (responsible for the children if something should happen to us). They explained to me that they feared being separated from José and Igor, losing them within a vast and unknown U.S. legal system, and being stripped of the right to reunite with them or to ensure their educational and social well being once they crossed the border into Mexico. Marta and Carlos worried that no *ciudadanos Americanos* (American citizens) would be willing to accept this responsibility; and yet, it was quite possible that their family’s survival might depend on this act of good will.

Between June 2008 and June 2010, I got to know the Utuado-Alvarez family very well as I documented how and when they referred to their members’ different migratory statuses during routine afterschool activities that took place at home, in community settings and a variety of public spaces. This visit, coming so close to the end of my research, was a poignant reminder of the severity and proximity of the threats facing the family. The Utuado-Alvarez family had many accomplishments to celebrate—Igor was transitioning into Kindergarten next year, both boys were going to be baptized on Sunday, and Marta and Carlos were studying English. And yet, in spite of their success and celebration, they continued to live with the fears and preoccupations unique to being a mixed-status family in the U.S. My work with the families who opened their hearts and homes to me for this study has an end, has a conclusion, but, as the preschool meeting made intensely clear, the threats under which these families live are ongoing and very real.

For twenty-three months, I conducted an ethnographic study in the homes of the Utuado-Alvarez, Marinero-Chavez, Medina-Castillo, and Mendez-Castro families and in the emerging Latino community in the city of Millvalley. This study considers the complex ways that parents, children, and community members demonstrate the significance of macro juridical categories of
migratory status during micro interactional language socialization processes. It is the first language socialization study to track the importance of citizenship status to migrant children, youth, and their parents by documenting the ways that they refer to and talk about citizenship in their everyday lives. The primary foci of this study are: first, the effects of macro categories like undocumented versus U.S. citizen on micro interactions in students’ educational experiences and second, how parent’s and children’s identities are shaped by their citizenship statuses (for undocumented Mexican-born versus U.S.-born siblings) and how such statuses shape their participation across settings (homes and schools). This dissertation seeks to answer the following sets of research questions:

1. How are parent’s and children’s perceptions of citizenship status, and the challenges and opportunities afforded by their varying migratory statuses, expressed during everyday interactions in mixed-status Mexican families? How do the family members resist or reproduce the discourses embedded within immigration and education policies as they interact with relatives, community members residing in Millvalley, and public school employees?

2. How do parents and their children socialize one another to identify with distinct national frames of reference—Mexican and American—through language use? Does citizenship impact an individual’s participation within the family? For example, are participants socialized to expert and novice roles based upon national identity, citizenship status, fluency in Spanish or English, and/or other criteria? How are these socialization processes different across developmental stages in families where the undocumented siblings are adolescents or children?

3. How do children and youth in mixed-status families assert their identities as U.S.-born citizens or undocumented migrants during routine activities at home? In what ways do educational activities carried out in the home shape routine interactions between parents and children? How is citizenship status relevant to family members’ participation in these activities?

Citizenship status is of immense significance to the language socialization experiences of the four focal families who participated in this study and to the millions of mixed-status families living in the U.S. According to the 2008 Current Population Survey, 8.8 million people living in the U.S. were members of mixed-status families (Passel & Cohn, 2009). Mixed-status families are comprised of various combinations of both undocumented migrant and U.S. citizen members (Fix & Zimmerman, 2001). In most mixed-status families, the parents were born in Mexico (Fortuny, Capps, Simms & Chaudry, 2009). The families who participated in this study exemplified this national trend. Each of the focal families had at least one U.S.-born child and two of them had two or more U.S.-born children. The U.S.-born siblings were the younger children in the families. The eldest child in each focal family was undocumented like their parents and had been living in the U.S. for five years or less.

Of the 8.8 million mixed-status family members, 5.5 million were children and almost three quarters of these children were U.S. citizens (Chaudry, Capps, Pedroza, Castañeda, Santos & Scott, 2010). The other 1.5 million children were undocumented migrants like their parents. The younger children in mixed-status families tend to be U.S.-born while the older siblings tend to be undocumented migrants from the same country of origin as their parents (Passel & Cohn, 2009). The focal families who participated in this study exemplified this national trend. Each of the focal families had at least one U.S.-born child and two of them had two or more U.S.-born children. The U.S.-born siblings were the younger children in the families. The eldest child in each focal family was undocumented like their parents and had been living in the U.S. for five years or less.

All of the preschool-aged children in the focal families attended preschool. This defied national trends indicating that despite the growing number of children born in the U.S. to migrant parents, these young children have been under-enrolled in public preschool because their parents
prefer to place them in home care settings (Capps, Fix, Ost, Reardon-Anderson & Passel, 2005). All of the school-aged siblings in the families attended U.S. public schools at the time of this study and belonged to the 6.8% of U.S. public school students enrolled in primary or secondary school who live in mixed-status families (Passel & Cohn, 2009). According to the 1982 U.S. Supreme Court decision *Plyler v. Doe*, undocumented students cannot be denied access to a public education (Petrinocolos & New, 1999). While this important ruling protects the right of undocumented students to a public education, its “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy has had the effect of rendering this population largely invisible and understudied in educational research. Moreover, because the undocumented status of parents is also protected in public school settings, we don’t know much about the social and educational experiences of U.S.-born children who have undocumented parents.

As a result, we know little about how growing up in a mixed-status family or being an undocumented student shapes children’s and parents’ participation in educational activities, undocumented parent and public school teacher relationships, and families’ language learning and literacy practices. Recent studies have shown that parenting practices, maternal and child health, and socioeconomic status impact the social and cognitive development of young Latino children (Fuller, Bein, Bridges, Livas, Mangual, Mireles, Jung, Kuo, Halfon & Rabe-Hasketh, 2009), that undocumented migratory status hinders mixed-status families’ access to healthcare, social services, and educational opportunities (Matthews & Ewen, 2006), and that deportations and family separations have a detrimental impact on the educational and social well-being of Mexican- and U.S.-born children of migrants (Chaudry et al., 2010). These findings underscore how important it is that we learn more about how juridical categories of citizenship status impact learning and development in public educational settings as well as home and community contexts. At the same time, scholars in education, anthropology, and sociology have called for new research on migration to examine the central role that children play in families’ migration experiences and the ways in which families negotiate macro social policies through micro cultural practices (Bhimji, 2005; García-Sánchez & Orellana, 2006; Orellana, Thorne, Chee, & Lam, 2003).

This dissertation contributes to this conversation by offering a nuanced understanding of the interplay between citizenship status and language socialization in mixed-status Mexican families residing in the U.S. The theoretical and methodological innovations made during this project can elucidate the ways in which migratory and educational processes are relevant to language use and learning in mixed-status families. My hope is that the findings presented in this dissertation will enhance our understanding of three critical issues in U.S. education: first, the home and school learning experiences of mixed-status Mexican families, second, the way that language use functions as the central medium through which migrant families co-construct their identities, and third, the local policy shifts that occur in response to emerging Spanish-speaking communities. These lessons highlight the complex relationship between citizenship status and socialization processes in mixed-status Mexican families living in the U.S.

Undocumented parents confronted a variety of challenges and opportunities in Millvalley as they sought to provide for their children. They made decisions about who to trust with information about their migratory status, worked to access goods and services that would improve their children’s quality of life, established a network of people and places through which they could obtain support, and learned about a range of economic and political processes from buying a car to the most recent changes in immigration law. At the same time, Mexican- and U.S.-born children in mixed-status families formed developmentally appropriate
understandings of migratory status beginning at a very young age. They demonstrated uptake of their parents’ ways of talking about citizenship during everyday routine activities. They also learned to maintain relationships with family members who lived across national borders and developed their own identities tied to place, nationality, and citizenship.

The siblings attended local public schools, and the relationships that they and their parents formed with teachers and staff shaped their participation in various social, educational, and political activities. As an emerging community of mixed-status families, the participants in this study found churches, schools, homes, and community organizations in which they could safely convene to share information and resources. These support systems allowed family members to plan for the future despite living day-to-day and paycheck-to-paycheck, and despite living in fear of deportation. At all of the levels of social organization observed in this study—the individual, family, school, and community—the participants revealed the relevance of migratory status to their everyday experiences through talk and interaction. These experiences were not unique to the Utuado-Alvarez family; they formed part of the lives and conversations in all four focal families. The themes that emerged in the conversation with Marta and Carlos that I recounted at the outset of this chapter foreshadow topics that will be explored in depth in subsequent chapters.

This dissertation is organized into the following six chapters. Chapter Two reviews the theoretical tenets from Language Socialization that form the basis for this research, surveys the literature on the focal activities analyzed in Chapters Five and Six, and defines the key terms used throughout this study, including, Latino, undocumented, migrant, and Diaspora. Chapter Three presents the ethnographic methods used to conduct fieldwork in the homes of the focal families and in the emerging Latino community of Millvalley. This chapter also introduces the reader to the four focal families in great detail. Chapter Four situates this emerging community within the New Latino Diaspora, drawing from participants’ firsthand accounts of their relationships to individuals and institutions in the U.S.

Chapters Five and Six closely examine the ways that family members’ migratory statuses were evoked during two routine activities in three of the families. In Chapter Five I elaborate on one such routine, the Homework Completion Routine, which recurred in the homes of the Utuado-Alvarez and Marinero-Chavez families. I explore how differing notions of citizenship came to the fore during the everyday collaboration between parents and elementary school-aged undocumented children to complete homework assignments. In Chapter Six I analyze the second domestic routine, the Planning for the Future Routine, which took place in the Mendez-Castro family. During this type of conversation in which parents and siblings discussed anticipated familial events, they evoked their migratory statuses in an attempt to reconcile why some members could participate while others could not. This chapter highlights the ways in which siblings of all ages make sense of the relationship between citizenship and participation in everyday family activities and long-term educational processes. Chapter Seven offers concluding thoughts about the pedagogies and policies that may be considered when working to meet the social and academic needs of this growing population.

These chapters will help scholars understand the central role that language plays in the construction of identity, the heterogeneity of cultural practice and experience within one ethnic group, and the ongoing negotiations of policy in participants’ daily lives. Moreover, this study illuminates the daily experiences of mixed-status Mexican migrants who are both central figures in contemporary U.S. public discourse and marginal subjects in educational research. As this study shows, the affordances and limitations of migratory status have a strong influence on
children’s development and inform their learning across language codes and settings. It is my hope that this study will support the efforts of scholars, educators, and practitioners who advocate for the well being of foreign- and U.S.-born children of migrants living in the U.S.
Chapter Two
Literature Review

This chapter has three goals: first, to review key tenets from the field of Language Socialization (LS) that form the basis for this dissertation and second, to survey the literature on the focal activities that I analyze in later chapters. These focal activities include parents and children’s homework completion at home and undocumented adolescents’ talk about their migratory status. The third goal is to define the demographic terms used to describe the migratory context and participants that are the foci of this study.

Theoretical Framework

LS is an interdisciplinary field of study that focuses on the interrelated processes of language acquisition and socialization (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008). In LS, language learning is a process that entails both gaining proficiency in the grammatical conventions of a particular linguistic code as well as becoming competent in the social norms for communicating with others in a particular cultural context. Socialization is the process by which, “children and other novices in society acquire tacit knowledge of principles of social order and systems of belief…through exposure to and participation in language-mediated interactions” (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986b, p. 2). From this perspective, members of a community participate in a lifelong social process of teaching, learning, and co-constructing a shared set of conventions for acting and talking. These social expectations can be overt and tacit and are at times explicitly stated or implicitly indexed through language use (Ochs, 1996). Learning is a process of acquisition but also of potential change, as individual learners adopt, question, and redefine the norms that they learn through interaction with others (Duranti, 1997).

One of the central concerns for LS researchers is to understand which approaches to childhood socialization can be considered universal and which are unique to particular cultures and societies (Ochs, 2002). Drawing from linguistic anthropology (Hymes, 1972; Gumperz, 1968/2001), LS examines the ways in which adults and children teach and learn a shared set of beliefs and actions during everyday interactions (Duff, 2007). Coupled with insights from cultural psychology, LS researchers attend to participants’ language use during culturally organized activities in order to document the way that learning processes lead to membership in a community and a shared body of knowledge over time (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Rogoff, 1990). Children are considered agentic social actors who participate in the co-construction of cultural practices as they are taught and learned (Whiting, 1980; Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008). As such, individuals at all developmental stages and who occupy multiple social roles can take up both expert and novice positions during interaction (Baquedano-López, 1997).

A comparative approach to the study of cultural practices gives us insight into the scope of childrearing practices within a group or across settings (Ochs, 1996). Researchers have examined the language and cultural practices of groups across different societies and settings (Heath, 1983; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984; Phillips, 1970/2001), studied the experiences of multilingual groups who employ multiple language codes and cultures within one society (Baquedano-López, 2004; Garrett, 2005; Kroskrity, 2000), and documented the diversity of socialization practices within one ethnic or professional group (Echevarria, 2003; Fader, 2006; Jacobs-Huey, 2007). This study builds upon these insights by focusing on the ways in which socialization varies across language codes (Spanish and English), across settings (home and
school), and within a family (across citizenship statuses). By documenting the experiences of Mexican- and U.S.-born relatives, I explore which aspects of behavior and language use constitute shared family practices and which are unique to members living in the U.S. as undocumented migrants or U.S. citizens.

In addition to the concern about the scope or specificity of cultural practices, LS research seeks to identify which aspects of a community’s everyday activities are reflective of the larger social, economic, and political characteristics of the society. Definitions of community have shifted from geographically bounded notions in which face-to-face interaction was a prerequisite for membership (Bloomfield, 1933) and in which one-to-one correspondences between shared language and cultural homogeneity were assumed (Silverstein, 2000), to a focus on variation and the co-construction of shared communicative repertoires (Gumperz, 1962, 1968/2001; see Baquedano-López & Manguel Figueroa, 2010 for a more detailed discussion of the shifting conceptualization of community). Yet what has endured in LS is the perspective, drawing in large part from the work of Bourdieu (1977), that the social practices of a group are shaped by their shared historical experiences while remaining open to change according to the contemporary opportunities and limitations faced by the group.

Through their participation in everyday activities, individuals learn ways of behaving and talking that are part of a cultural repertoire that they share with others (Ochs, 2002). These activities are mediated by language use and are opportunities for collaborative learning and development between less and “more capable peers” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86). The routine exchanges that take place between experts and novices (who can be adults and children, teachers and students, etc.) are productive moments for socialization to a community’s norms for competent language use and behavior. As these social norms are learned, they become part of the shared body of knowledge that is taken for granted by members of that community (Garfinkel, 1967; Schutz, 1932/1970). Drawing on insights gained from ethnomethodological theory, LS researchers attend to moments of social tension because it is in these moments, known as breaches (Garfinkel, 1967), that individuals talk about, renegotiate, and apprentice each other into the norms for behavior in that setting (Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002).

Studies that exemplify this premise include: Hymes’ (1986/2001) analysis of how communities’ implicit norms were revealed during a “confrontation of different systems of competency” (p. 68); Ochs’ (2002) research on how adult’s responses to autistic children exposed their expectations about normative childhood behavior (see also Ochs, Solomon & Sterponi, 2005); Baquedano-López, Kattan, and Solís’ (2005) illustration of how breaches prompted participants to improvise “adaptations” to the learning process in classroom settings; and Jacobs-Huey’s (2007) examination of breaches as teachable moments in which experts socialized novice community members. I follow in this tradition by examining how tacit understandings about citizenship are revealed as family members negotiate social tensions produced by the contradictory experiences of their U.S.- and Mexican-born members in domestic and academic settings.

A third component of the LS paradigm is the perspective that language is both a linguistic system governed by grammatical rules and a cultural framework used for expressing beliefs, desires, and relationships. Ochs (1996) has shown that indexicality is at the heart of socialization because by establishing relationships between the self and the surrounding world, and expressing them through language, people come to act in the world in culturally specific ways. Therefore, speakers’ indexical language use signals membership in a community (Gumperz, 1982) and demonstrates their mastery of competent behaviors appropriate for use in a particular social
group like a classroom or family (Ochs, 2002). Deictic reference is a kind of indexicality in which talk is seen not as an egocentric act on the part of one speaker, but a sociocentric act that establishes relationships between herself and her surroundings (Hanks, 1990, 2007).

Hanks’ (2005) work, drawing from Bourdieu’s (1985) theories of field and habitus, has shown that the temporal and spatial dimensions of social context referenced through talk are laden with power and status. The linguistic forms used to refer to these fields (and the objects, people, and ideas contained therein) encode the social hierarchy that the speaker perceives. Context is not a neutral concept that provides a backdrop for individual experience, but is instead a hierarchical set of dimensions which the speaker foregrounds through talk and other communicative resources (for example, pointing). As a result, “a study focused on language would compare fields in terms of their discursive resources, the kinds of effects they have when put to use, the sorts of strategies producers (speakers) pursue and the ends they achieve” (Hanks, 2005, p. 74). This dissertation shows how participants’ sense of identity and social positioning, as expressed through deictic reference, hinges on their nationality and citizenship status in the U.S. I work towards this end by locating the homologies (Bourdieu, 1983) between the way that citizenship is constructed in familial and educational fields, the communicative resources that individuals use to refer to and make sense of this term across fields, and the impact they have on their socialization to social identities as mixed-status family members. This moves from type-level analyses of Spanish-speakers located within a predetermined social setting to token-level understandings of how a speaker’s use of deictic language positions her within multiple social fields.

**Communicative resources for socialization**

In “Becoming a Speaker of Culture” (Ochs, 2002) and “Joint Commitment and Common Ground in a Ritual Event” (Hanks, 2006), Ochs and Hanks examined the ways in which expert and novice interlocutors accomplished a shared activity to which the participants brought different levels of knowledge, authority, and interest. Ochs and Hanks have stated that the norms that guide interaction, as well as the social meanings communicated during interaction, are largely implicit in what people say and do. As a result, much of social interaction is dependent upon individuals’ abilities to infer and monitor each other’s intentions and beliefs as interactional sequences unfold. The participants’ ability to interpret an unfolding interaction is predicated upon their knowledge of the norms of culturally competent behavior underlying the event at hand.

In Ochs’ (2002) framework for ethnographic studies of “the socialization of cultural competence” (p. 108) she claimed that novice members of a community learn about the behavioral norms that are relevant in a particular social setting by interacting with other, more expert, interlocutors. In other words, as individuals talk to one another, they co-construct what it means to act appropriately and competently in a variety of social contexts such as classrooms or homes. Ochs (2002) argued, “Every social group has available to its members a repertoire of linguistic forms. Like a communicative palette, members draw on this repertoire to portray stances, acts, activities, and identities” (p. 113). These four interrelated dimensions are both inextricably linked and hierarchical; that is, actions and stances are the building blocks of activities and identities. While Ochs acknowledged that individuals also draw on symbolic and material resources available to them, she stressed that language is the primary medium for the
socialization of cultural competence and that the four dimensions of social context are encoded in language use.

According to Ochs (2002), a social activity is defined by “at least two co-ordinated, situated actions and/or stance displays by one or multiple persons” (p. 108). In the routine activities that I analyze in Chapters Five and Six, mothers and children collaborate to complete a homework assignment and siblings engage in conversations about their upcoming social and academic plans. A social identity is “a cover term for a range of social personae, including social statuses, roles, positions, relationships” taken up or assigned to others in interaction (Ochs, 1993, p. 288). These chapters examine the ways in which members of mixed-status families co-construct their social identities as undocumented and U.S.-born individuals. The identities that individuals take up during particular activities are constituted by the stances and actions that they and their interlocutors display.

There are two kinds of stances that I will explore: “affective stances that represent emotional states of the speakers and epistemic stances that convey the speakers’ degree of certainty about their propositions” (Jaffe, 2009, p. 7). These stances are conveyed using a range of linguistic and paralinguistic signs (Gumperz, 1992) that indicate both the speakers’ and listeners’ response to the claims being made and identities being asserted during the activity. An action is broadly defined as a “socially recognized goal-directed behavior” (Ochs, 2002, p. 108) that is appropriate within the tacitly agreed-upon norms that guide participants’ behavior in the unfolding activity. These actions include both verbal and non-verbal behaviors that are understood by family members within the context of familiar routine activities.

While I agree with Ochs that language is the primary medium for communication, there are other key resources that mixed-status family members use to socialize one another when engaging in educational activities in their homes. Hanks’ (2006) discussion indicated that we should attend to three resources that participants use to communicate: linguistic, semiotic and perceptual. He argued that expert and novice interlocutors draw on all three resources to achieve “integration,” or a common understanding of the purpose of a social event and how to accomplish it (Hanks, 2006, p. 302). Integration is an interactional accomplishment, especially because interlocutors occupy different social roles that place them on unequal footing (for example, family members have different migratory statuses or are of different ages). Perceptual resources refer to the physical space in which an interaction takes place and semiotic resources include the local meanings that participants give to material objects located within that space. I have combined Ochs’ criteria for the four dimensions of social context and Hanks’ three-part formulation of the resources that interlocutors use when participating in culturally specific contexts. Figure 1 represents how these two frameworks fit together.
Figure 1. demonstrates that language is not the only resource that participants draw upon during social interaction. If we think of linguistic, semiotic and perceptual resources as interrelated entities, then we can expand our analysis of the communicative palette that interlocutors draw from to encode or formalize their actions, stances, identities, and activities within a social context. Family members in the focal homes used these three resources to achieve common orientation to and shared engagement within the activities that took place in their homes and to demonstrate the relevance of migratory status to the activity at hand.

This research hopes to contribute several new perspectives on learning and development by studying language socialization processes in mixed-status migrant families. Positioning the migrant family as a central social unit of analysis shows that they are more than simply a “backdrop or afterthought to the politics of inclusion” (Arzubiaga, Noguerón & Sullivan, 2009, p. 248). With the exception of Bhimji’s (2005) work which illustrated Mexican families’ uptake of immigration policies by referencing la migra (immigration officers) during routine language use in the home, we know little about how parents and their children make sense of migratory status in their daily lives. This dissertation explores how the process of demarcating what it means to belong in a family is complicated when mediated by a socio-political category like citizenship that creates institutionalized possibilities for and barriers to access and belonging in the U.S. The communicative resources used by parents and siblings are an important part of how mixed-status family members perceive themselves and relate to others in home and school contexts.

Second, by examining the shared and distinct language socialization experiences of parents and children who are labeled undocumented migrant or U.S.-born citizens, this work highlights the heterogeneous experiences of members of the same family. Focusing on diversity and difference even within a nuclear family helps to counteract tendencies to essentialize or homogenize the shared cultural practices of cultural group, a trend that LS researchers work against (Ochs, 2000). Locally-situated perspectives on socialization that highlight the dynamicity and diversity inherent in learning and development are needed to debunk deterministic views of
culture that lead to deficit models of historically marginalized groups (Gutierrez & Rogoff, 2003; Ovando, Collier & Combs, 2003; Valencia, 2002).

By viewing the language and cultural practices in Latino families as sites for learning, this study hopes to contribute to existing research that honors the ways in which individuals and community members’ participation in culturally specific activity systems shapes their “funds of knowledge” (Moll, Amanti & Neff, 1992, p. 133). I explore the ways that family members demonstrate their funds of knowledge by participating in a set of activities that are shaped by histories of migration. Children in mixed-status families learn “information” or “knowledge about” a set of cultural practices such as carpentry or farming (Moll, Amanti & Neff, 1992, p. 133), but they also learn about the practice of crossing borders and working to acquire papeles (immigration papers). In keeping with the funds of knowledge perspective, this study draws our attention to the social networks in which learning occurs. The social networks in mixed-status communities are saturated with concerns about citizenship status that are transmitted to children. A better understanding of these networks gives us insight into educational questions about how Latino students’ sense of belonging influences their learning (Suárez-Orozco, 2001).

Focal Activities

Mixed-status Mexican families use multiple communicative resources to explicitly and indexically refer to family members’ statuses as U.S. citizens or undocumented Mexican migrants. In so doing, they socialize one another to particular norms for what it means to act and talk appropriately according to their role in the family and their migratory status. These norms and beliefs guide parents’ and children’s participation in learning activities that take place at home, at school, and in their community. The empirical evidence presented in Chapters Five and Six focuses on talk and interaction during two routine activities that occurred in the families’ homes: the Homework Completion Routines (HCRs) and the Planning for the Future Routines (PFtFRs).

The HCR took place in the homes of two focal families with undocumented children and the PFtFR that I examine in detail recurred in the home of one focal family with an undocumented adolescent. Both the HCR and the PFtFR constituted a “confrontation of systems of competency” (Hymes, 1986/2001, p. 68) between the culturally specific definitions of the term citizenship found in domestic and public settings. Competency entails the culturally specific, tacitly agreed-upon social rules for determining what forms of communication are possible, feasible, appropriate and performable during interaction. The norms for competency are learned throughout the lifespan and they shape an individuals’ understanding of language, society, and themselves. The tensions that arose during the HCRs and PFtFRs led to productive moments for family members’ socialization to identities that were inextricably linked to migratory status. During these points of contact between distinct frames of reference and normative sets of social expectations, they expressed their affiliations, allegiances, and adaptations.

There are two reasons for studying the HCRs and PFtFRs in the context of mixed-status families’ homes: first, existing qualitative research on Latino children’s participation in literacy activities at home has tended to focus on the relationship between ethnicity and language use while ignoring the relevance of migratory status. At the same time, the literature on undocumented Latino adolescents has focused on the educational barriers they face due to their juridical classification and examines the role that activist students play in social organizing, but
tends to neglect the way that citizenship shapes their talk and interactions during mundane activities. My examination of the HCRs and PfTRs in mixed-status families hopes to build on existing literature on Latino children and youth by analyzing the way that their migratory status influences learning and development in their everyday lives.

Ethnographic observations of caregiver and child interactions in the home are rich sites for understanding family socialization practices (Kremer-Sadlik & Paugh, 2007; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a). Specifically, parent-child interactions around homework organize long sequences of activity in the home in which family members negotiate their roles and responsibilities as well as the relative status of the activities themselves (Wingard, 2006, 2007). These negotiations are complex social acts and the ways that family members engage in homework activities depends upon their historically contingent dispositions to schooling and learning (Delgado-Gaitán, 1992).

Within the unfolding activity of homework completion, family members provide opportunities for and impose constraints on one another’s participation in the tasks (Gutiérrez & Arzubiaga, in press). Ethnographic studies of the ways that children complete homework reveal their perceptions about the purposes of homework and schooling, and demonstrate how these perceptions align with or diverge from teachers’ intentions (LaCasa, Reina, & Alburquerque, 2002). Children’s understanding of the significance of homework can provide a window into their perceptions not only of academic tasks but also of broader social issues such as employment, life goals and opportunities, and interpersonal relationships (Scharf & Stack, 1995).

My analysis focuses on two aspects of the HCR: first, how the HCR becomes a point of contact between the way in which citizenship is defined in the local public schools and in the families’ homes; and second, the way in which parents and children reference their social identities as migrants during this recurrent educational activity. I attend to the ways in which parents and children take up multiple stances during the HCR in order to show how undocumented parents’ and children’s identities become encoded in language use. This work can contribute to our current understandings of the ways that Latino children’s language use demonstrates how they learn to use multiple codes (Orellana et al., 2003), how they partake in multigenerational literacy activities (Gregory, Long & Volk, 2004), and how they interact with other siblings during educational activities (Gutiérrez & Arzubiaga, in press).

While migratory status is largely absent from the literature on young Latino children and learning, the educational literature on undocumented Latino youth tends to focus on the way that their migratory status limits their opportunities for post-secondary study. These studies focus on the ways in which some undocumented students, confronted with these educational barriers, become politically active in U.S. society. One form of political participation that has been examined closely is the act of giving testimonio or sharing personal testimony during political protests (Seif, 2009). As undocumented community members learn to give testimonio, they also co-construct a shared set of norms about how and when it is appropriate to display their vulnerable individual identities in public forums (González, Plata, García, Torres & Urrieta, 2003; Seif, 2004). Such work has chronicled undocumented students’ participation in grassroots efforts to reform education and immigration policy (Gonzales, 2008; Rogers, Saunders, Terrriquez & Velez, 2008). However, by focusing on the social activism of exceptional young people in exceptional circumstances like marches and protests, such work can give the impression that citizenship discourses only arise in such extreme instances. This dissertation illustrates the ways in which daily life is saturated with these discourses and their effects.

Research that closely examines Latino youth’s language use as a constitutive part of their complex social identities tends to focus on routine interactions at school sites or within peer
groups while research on family socialization through everyday discursive practices has been carried out mostly in white American middle class families. Rymes’ (2001) study of the narratives told by Latino youth in a charter school showed how the linguistic and social dimensions of these narratives shape students’ academic and social selves. Bucholtz’s (2009) detailed examination of the term güey (often translated into English as dude, the sociolinguistic implications of which she explores closely) highlighted the way that Mexican youths’ use of slang indexes particular gendered identities at school. Mendoza-Denton (2008) similarly explored youth speech in the context of Mexican youth gang interactions outside of school. Seminal work on routine domestic conversations in which members discuss family plans and socialize one another to time and identity has tended to focus on gendered role taking and discourse in middle class white homes (Ochs & Taylor, 1996; Wingard, 2007). As a result, we know little about how Latino youths’ talk with other family members during domestic interactions shapes their socialization to ethnic, national, and academic identities.

I build on this research by examining talk and interactions between undocumented Mexican youth and their parents and siblings in routine familial interactions that take place in their homes. The analysis highlights the ways that migratory status shaped the everyday lives of members of mixed-status families, especially when they were making plans for upcoming family activities. As family members took up various stances expressed through talk, they indicated their beliefs about the social status associated with being a U.S.-born citizen or an undocumented migrant, and constructed complex understandings about their identity and participation in familial and educational activities. They employed multiple communicative resources as they indexed their own and other family members’ migratory status. During the PFtFR, siblings of all ages demonstrated that they were learning to talk about migratory status according to their family’s specific conventions.

This dissertation can broaden our understanding of the ways in which discourses about migratory status are evoked by members of the same family and demonstrate that siblings of all ages are cognizant of the ways that migratory status shapes their everyday lives and the lives of their relatives. As a result, it re-centers our unit of analysis from undocumented adolescents in the public sphere to undocumented adolescents and their younger U.S.-born siblings in the private space of the home. By documenting the experiences of undocumented youth in mixed-status families, I show how these experiences impact the entire family (Bloemraad & Trost, 2008) and not just the undocumented member. My hope is that these findings contribute to our understandings of the way that institutionalized educational policies and practices impact Latino students and shape their and their families’ sense of self worth (Valenzuela, 1999; O’Leary, González & Valdez-Gardea, 2008).

Key Terms

I have chosen to use the following terminology throughout this dissertation: Latino, undocumented, migrant, and Diaspora. In the following paragraphs, I will define them by citing the focal participants’ everyday talk as well as anthropological and educational literature on immigration. It is important to note that there is little consensus on what these terms mean in the ongoing academic, policy, and public debates. I will refer the reader to reviews that offer historical and contemporary perspectives on the use of these words in a U.S. context. This will help to anchor their meaning and provide a starting point for examining the ethnographic evidence that I provide in later chapters.
As an LS study, this dissertation presupposes that while “social identities have a sociohistorical reality independent of language behavior,” they are also constantly redefined by individuals who “in any given actual situation, at any given actual moment…are actively constructing their social identities rather than passively living out some cultural prescription for social identity” (Ochs, 1993, p. 296). The mixed-status identities of the Mexican families who participated in this study have, on the one hand, been assigned to them by regulatory bodies like Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), national governmental agencies in both the U.S. and Mexico, and the local law enforcement agencies that implement federal and state immigration policies on a daily basis. And yet, the sociohistorical and political significance of living in a mixed-status family is not an abstraction; rather, it is relevant to the lived experience of the individuals and families who are sorted into undocumented migrants (who are therefore deportable) and U.S. citizens (with all of the attendant rights and privileges). Through talk and interaction during daily routine activities, the focal families co-constructed locally situated understandings of what these terms meant to them. There is a tension, then, between the macro categories of juridical status or nationality assigned to groups of people and the ways that those same people reproduce, resist, and negotiate their social identities during micro interactions (Bourdieu, 1991; Wacquant, 2004). This tension, and the ways that parents and their children reconcile it on a daily basis at home and at school, forms the focal level of analysis for this study.

As cultural and legal anthropologist De Genova wrote in 2002, the conceptual problems embedded in terminology are symptomatic of deeper problems of intellectual—and ultimately political—orientation. Remarkably, little of this vast scholarship deploys ethnographic methods or other qualitative research techniques to elicit the perspectives and experiences of undocumented migrants themselves, or to evoke the kinds of densely descriptive and interpretive representations of everyday life that sociocultural anthropologists tend to relish (p. 421).

De Genova called for a rigorous study of the terms migrant, citizen, and undocumented that prevents the reification both of the categories themselves and the ideologies that they engender by documenting the emic perspectives of the communities to which they are applied. This dissertation study takes up De Genova’s charge by tracing the ways in which parents and siblings in mixed-status Mexican families make sense of generic terms and demonstrate their relevance during routine interactions.

The focal families used the terms Latino and Hispanic when referring to a pan-ethnic group of people from Latin America. I use the term Latino to refer to a mixed group of people of Latin American descent because it captures the heterogeneity of the multi-ethnic, multi-racial, and multi-national group to which it refers (Calderón, 1992; for a review of the problems and possibilities that arise when grouping individuals from diverse Latin American countries under one term, see Hayes-Bautista & Chapa, 1986). Furthermore, the term Latino was popularized during grassroots movements of the 1960’s and 70’s and signalled the potential for collective social identity and political struggle while Hispanic was a category invented and imposed through federal mandate by the US government in 1980 (Alcoff, 2005; Muñoz, 2007; for a review of the term’s origin placed within the context of legislative attempts to redress social inequality through the 1964 Civil Rights Act see Zaragoza, Juarez, Valenzuela Jr. & Gonzalez, 1992). When focal family members referred to specific people, they tended to use national labels (for example, Mexican and American) instead of the more inclusive category of Latino.
Throughout this dissertation, I use national categories (as in, mixed-status Mexican families) to describe the focal families because they most accurately depict the family members’ ways of describing themselves.

The undocumented parents and eldest siblings in the focal families hoped to become U.S. citizens through a process of legalization known as amnesty (for a review of U.S. immigration policy that explains how the 1986 amnesty impacted large numbers of Latino immigrants, see Sierra, Carillo, DeSipio & Jones-Correa, 2000). The families used the phrase la reforma (the reform) as an informal way of referring to the proposed immigration reforms that Obama referenced during his campaign for presidency; his proposal included an amnesty program for eligible undocumented migrants residing in the U.S. The younger U.S.-born citizens acquired U.S. citizenship by birth, also known as jus soli citizenship (Bloemraad, Korteweg & Yurdakal, 2008). I never heard the focal family members refer to themselves as mixed-status families; they had other ways of referring to the different citizenship statuses of their relatives. When parents referred their children they either mentioned their U.S. citizenship (mi hijo el ciudadano, my son the citizen), the child’s birthplace (el que nació en México, the one born in Mexico), or nationality (los Americanos, the Americans). While the parents could have used other descriptors such as hair color, age, or grade in school, their use of these phrases indicated that nationality and migratory status were an important part of how they perceived of and talked about their children. The use of these appositive noun phrases and defining relative clauses, constructions that are used to express the defining attributes of nouns (in this case, son or daughter), provided evidence that the importance of citizenship status was linguistically encoded in everyday talk.

The term unauthorized is used largely in the policy literature (see Passel, 2005 and reports on immigration published by the Pew Hispanic center) while the term illegal is prevalent in public debates about immigration reform. Several discourse analytic studies have explored the impact of the term illegal in public discourse, including: Mehan’s (1997) study of the term’s use by the proponents of Proposition 187 in California, Santa Ana’s (1999) analysis of the metaphors used in California to describe Mexican immigrants, and Bartolome and Macedo’s (1987) examination of the relationship between the ideological and institutional impact of the term. These studies traced the dissemination of anti-immigrant discourse by newspapers, government entities, and politicians in order to expose the ways in which representations of immigrants that are taken for granted in public discourse are socially constructed through mass media. Solis’ (2003) ethnographic study showed how the construction of Mexican illegality was a form of “societal violence” constructed through media, law and public discourse that shaped the identity development of Mexican youth and their mothers living in New York City (p. 28). She examined the ways in which local, grassroots organizations worked to counter this violence in the hope of fostering the social and emotional well being of migrant youth. The parents who participated in this dissertation study used the term los ilegales (the illegals) only when they were recounting the anti-immigrant perspectives that they encountered in their everyday lives. However, I never heard parents or siblings directly refer to particular family members as illegal or unauthorized migrants.

I use the term undocumented to refer to the Mexican-born family members who do not have legal permission to reside in the U.S. because it most closely reflects the language that the focal families used when referring to themselves. When adults talked about a group of migrants and included themselves, they said nosotros los indocumentados (we the undocumented). Parents and siblings talked about the citizenship status of specific family members by using the metaphorical adjectival phrase tener papeles (to have papers). This denoted those who were in
the U.S. with visas and legal resident status (individuals who had *papeles*) versus those who were living in the U.S. without legal permission (individuals who did not have *papeles*). The phrase foregrounds the idea that migratory status is dependent upon and describable in terms of legal documentation or paperwork and the term undocumented most accurately reflects this emphasis.

In their 1996 book, *Immigrant America: A Portrait*, Portes and Rumbaut distinguished between *migrants* who crossed the border into the U.S. by land and *immigrants* who entered the U.S. with legal documentation by land, air, or water. However, the term migrant not only describes the mode of entry into the U.S. but also refers to the temporal and spatial relationships of the individual(s) to the host country. Migrant includes people with residential impermanence who have active cultural frames of reference that cross national borders while immigrant describes those who have permanently relocated to a new country and have begun a process of cultural assimilation that entails adopting the mainstream practices of the host country at the expense of their home culture (Arzubiaga, Noguerón & Sullivan, 2009; Lukose, 2007). The Mexican-born family members in this study entered the U.S. without legal permission by crossing the Mexico-U.S. border by land, maintained active relationships with family in both Mexico and the U.S., and had family members or friends who returned to Mexico throughout the course of this study; therefore, I refer to them as migrants or undocumented migrants but not immigrants.

The use of the term *Diaspora* to describe the social contexts of migrant and immigrant communities marks a shift away from studies of minority communities that represented groups in monolithic and homogenous terms toward a more fluid conceptualization of “space, time, and classification” (Kearney, 1995, p. 549) that situates cultural groups in dynamic global and transnational contexts (Levy, 2000). Clifford (1994) claimed that communities in *Diaspora*: (1) live outside of their homeland yet have an ongoing cross-border relationship to people and cultural practices located there, (2) forge an identity through positive affiliation to or negative distancing from the homeland, and (3) are susceptible to the commodification of their cultural modes of production. While on the one hand Clifford and others have sought to outline the defining features of diasporic communities, on the other hand, they have claimed that there is not one “ideal type” (Clifford, 1994, p. 305) of Diaspora or one “generic immigrant experience” (De Genova, 2002, p. 124). The tension inherent in classification and identification is strongly felt in the literature on Diaspora, which both documents the movement of cultural groups and practices across borders while also recognizing the heterogeneity of experiences among individuals who undergo migratory processes (Kearney, 1995).

One growing area of research that brings together anthropological and educational approaches to studying Latino communities’ experiences in the U.S. is ethnography of the New Latino Diaspora (Murillo & Villenas, 1997). The studies presented in *Education in the New Latino Diaspora: Policy and the Politics of Identity* (Wortham, Murillo & Hamman, 2001) tracked that ways that Latino migration to the U.S. South and Midwest has changed the social and educational landscape of those regions. This research exemplified the shift that Levy and Clifford suggested is significant in Diaspora studies by approaching the study of Latino education in the U.S. not as a concern about a homogeneous minority group, but instead as phenomena that must be situated in a global and transnational context. Still, Villenas (2007) has called for ethnographers working in this field to identify the unifying characteristics of Spanish-speaking diasporic communities in the U.S. in order to strengthen the theoretical foundation of this emergent research paradigm. I situate this study within the New Latino Diaspora research
because it shares an ethnographic approach to the study of community formation, language and culture, and policy formation within emerging Latino communities in non-traditional settlement areas across the U.S. This study hopes to contribute ethnographic evidence that can help illuminate how Mexican- and U.S.-born family members situate themselves within local and transnational contexts of learning and development.
Chapter Three
Ethnographic Engagement in the Lives of Four Focal Families

This chapter has two foci: first, to explain the ethnographic methods used to design and implement this study; second, to introduce the focal families that participated in this research. The first section explains the methods used in participant-observation, participant selection, and audiovisual recording and Conversation Analysis. The second section introduces the four focal families and includes a discussion of some key similarities and differences between them. I conclude by exploring some of the methodological considerations that I attended to as bilingual Puerto Rican ethnographer in the homes of mixed-status Mexican families.

Ethnography

In their first programmatic statement delineating the methodological tenets of Language Socialization (LS), Ochs and Schieffelin (1984) defined ethnography as “descriptions that take into account the perspective of members of a social group, including beliefs and values that underlie and organize their activities and utterances” (p. 283). Ethnographic descriptions include fieldnotes and audiovisual recordings that capture the implicit and explicit understandings shared by members of a community as expressed through their actions and talk (Baquedano-López, Solís, & Arredondo, 2009). Sustained observation over time is needed in order to capture rich interactional data—including oral and body language as well as the physical organization of people and objects in the setting—that shows the ways in which participants learn from one another over time in multiple settings (Ochs, 2002). LS researchers track the ways in which the shared beliefs and practices of a social group are encoded and displayed through language use (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986b). As ethnographers we seek two interrelated sources of data—observations of participants’ everyday experiences and recordings of participants talking about their experiences—in order to understand the interplay between individual behavior in social context and an individual’s awareness of the cultural norms that underlie social interaction (Buroway, 1991).

Increasingly, LS researchers are conducting multi-sited ethnographic research that documents the complexity of learning and development in multilingual and multicultural settings (Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002). This study’s focus on the experiences of members of mixed-status families and the tensions they negotiate when confronting the relevance of their different citizenship statuses across multiple settings makes it a multi-sited ethnography (Marcus, 1995). In his defining statement about the method, Marcus (1995) wrote that “strategies of quite literally following connections, associations, and putative relationships are thus at the very heart of designing multi-sited ethnographic research” (p. 97). By examining mixed-status family members’ interactions in the private sphere of the home as well as public settings, this research has tracked how and when speakers evoked discourses about citizenship that indicate the relationship between macro political processes and micro everyday interactions. I have attended to the three-part research agenda that Marcus outlines by following discourse throughout the social landscape (the focal unit of analysis), by contrasting discourses from different sites as I have done with school and home conceptualizations of citizenship (the analysis of discourse from multiple social settings), and by being a participant-observer in domestic and educational institutions (conducting data collection in more than one field site).
Participant-observation

The twenty-three months of participant-observation that I conducted in the emerging Latino community in Millvalley and the homes of four mixed-status Mexican families included a “combination of modalities of being with others and observing them” (Duranti, 1997, p. 89). As a participant-observer, I was able to document the ways in which adults and children both implicitly and explicitly demonstrated the relevance of their migratory status to learning during a variety of interactions. I chose to observe recurring activities in which citizenship and education were focal topics, including: the community meetings led by Allstate County’s Department of Human Services (DHS) to develop a Latino Family Center (LFC) that provided educational and social services, community meetings on immigration reform organized by the Immigration Advocacy Network (IAN), focal families’ participation in educational activities carried out in the home, and focal families’ conversations about immigration. Table 1 depicts the timeline for fieldwork and data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Latino Community</th>
<th>Focal Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2008- June 2009</td>
<td>Monthly meetings held by Allstate County’s (DHS) to create the LFC—Latino parents, community members, DHS employees</td>
<td>Utuado-Alvarez and Castillo-Medina family members participated in LFC planning meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| November 2008 – June 2009 | Monthly meetings held by IAN to advocate for immigration reform—Latino parents, community, clergy  
Spanish church mass held at St. Martin Church—Latino community                                                   | Utuado-Alvarez, Marinero-Chavez, and Medina-Castillo family members joined IAN                                                                                     |
| August 2009- November 2009 | Meetings held by IAN to advocate for immigration reform—Latino parents, community members, clergy  
Spanish church mass held at St. Martin Church—Latino community                                                 | Family Recruitment                                                                                                                                                 |
|                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Weekly visit to the homes—parents, children, extended family members, caregivers                                                                                 |
|                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Schools—parents, children, teachers                                                                                                                                  |
|                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Public Space—parents, children                                                                                                                                       |
|                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Social service agencies—parents, children, public employees                                                                                                           |
| December 2009- April 2010 | Follow-up interviews and meetings with community members                                                                                               | Homes—parents, children, extended family members, caregivers                                                                                                         |
|                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Schools—parents, children, teachers                                                                                                                                  |
|                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Follow-up interviews and meetings with focal family members, the focal children’s teachers, and school administrators                                                        |

Table 1. Fieldwork Timeline
As a participant-observer in Millvalley’s emerging Latino community, I detailed the complex ways in which individuals and organizations shaped one another’s ideas and practices. Throughout the yearlong planning process to develop the LFC, Allstate County’s DHS employees and Latino parents met to determine which educational and social services would be offered by the center, to select a location, and to hire staff. In most meetings, the DHS employees acted as experts—they initiated the process for creating the center and elicited parental input on certain decisions. In one planning meeting, the DHS employees presented the intake form that the LFC staff would be required to use when registering families who received services. The form included a place for the LFC staff to record the family member’s social security number. Upon seeing the form, Marta Alvarez (the mother in one of the focal families) and other parents explained that this form would deter families with undocumented migrant members from using the LFC because of their fear of being deported. The parents insisted that the LFC staff could not require families to provide a social security number. After much discussion, the DHS employees revised the intake forms and procedures in order to protect the anonymity of the undocumented migrant families. In this instance, the parents assumed the role of experts who could attest to the experiences of other mixed-status Latino families while the DHS employees were repositioned as novices who had not considered this reality. This illustrates the ways in which expert/novice roles shifted over a series of interactions between two constituencies, resulting in learning and development in both individuals and organizations.

During participant-observation carried out in the homes of the focal families, I observed the dynamic processes of socialization that occurred as family members assumed multiple roles during routine educational activities. As Chapter Five will show, homework completion routines were instances in which the typical expert-parent and novice-child positions were reversed. During these daily interactions in which parents and children collaborated to complete homework, children assumed expert roles by displaying their ability to read and write in English while parents relinquished their expert roles by demonstrating that they did not understand the language of the assignment. The focal parents and children experienced shifting familial dynamics that coincided with significant educational transitions in the families’ lives—daily transitions from school to home and student promotion from one grade to the next (García & Cuéllar, 2006; Lucas, 1997; Solís, 2009). During these routine interactions, parents and children illustrated the relevance of their migratory status to present and future educational transitions.

Participant Selection

I decided to recruit four focal families to participate in this study in order to be able to collect rich interactional data over a sustained period of time in each of the homes. This is consistent with the LS approach to recruiting a relatively small participant pool that permits the researcher to spend more time with each participant and gather a larger amount of interactional data. As Schieffelin and Ochs (1986b) explained, “most of us carrying out research on young children’s speech behavior have limited ourselves to a handful of subjects because of the intense effort required to collect, transcribe, and analyze the data” (p. 10-11). In order to answer my research questions on how and when families talked about and negotiated the differences between Mexican migrant and U.S. citizen members in everyday life, I recruited a select group of families who generously permitted me to observe them often and for long periods of time.

I first met the families in June 2008, when I began attending a series of immigration reform meetings organized by IAN. Although I didn’t know it at the time, my role in these
meetings facilitated my ability to establish trusting and enduring relationships with the families who would become the focal participants of this study. On several occasions, I volunteered as a simultaneous translator for Spanish-speaking Latino families and English-speaking Millvalley public officials during the public forum that IAN organized. During these meetings, Latino family members gave testimonio (testimony) about the ways that immigration and law enforcement policies negatively impacted their families in order to encourage the public officials to agree to institute policy reforms in the region (see Chapter Two for a brief discussion on testimonio as a form of political participation in undocumented Latino communities across the U.S.). By August I had become a familiar face within the organization and I noticed that IAN members would refer to me as la traductora (the translator) when I saw them in church and at public events. I began to ask IAN leaders, families, and youth if they knew of mixed-status families who might be interested in participating in this study.

I recruited the families through the “snowball method” of asking one person to introduce me to a family who in turn recommended other families, and so on (Ritchie, Lewis & Elam, 2003). I began the recruitment process by asking trusted community leaders in IAN to share families’ contact information with me, talking to parents in mixed-status families, and asking them for recommendations of other families who might be interested in participating. I met three of the focal families through IAN and one of them referred me to another focal family who was not a member of the organization. The political participation of migrant parents in grassroots efforts to promote immigration reform became an important aspect of understanding the emerging Latino community of Millvalley; however, because this was not an initial focus for the study, I was intentional about recruiting a group of families who were and were not active in IAN. While I met and talked to other mixed-status families in Millvalley about the project, the focal families were the first four that I formally asked to join the project. They all agreed to participate during my first visit to their homes.

Sister Elise, a member of IAN and the director of social services at St. Martin Catholic Church, suggested that I contact two families who regularly attended the IAN meetings. She gave me the Medina-Castillo and Utuado-Alvarez families’ phone numbers. In November of 2008, I made arrangements to visit their homes and invited them to participate in the study. Both families agreed immediately, and the Medina-Castillo parents also referred me to the Mendez-Castro family, another mixed-status family that lived in their neighborhood. By December 2008, all three of these families had agreed to participate in the study and in January 2009 I initiated participant-observation in each of their homes. That same month, Sister Elise asked if I would translate during a meeting that IAN had arranged between local law enforcement agents and a mother of three whose husband had just been deported. I agreed and translated for Inés Chavez as she spoke with the police officers about the consequences that her husband’s recent deportation had had on herself and her children. After the meeting, I asked Inés if she would be willing to speak with me about this study. She invited me to call her and after we talked about my research questions and methodology, she agreed to participate in the research. By the end of January 2009, all of the focal families had decided to join the project and I was conducting observations in each of the four homes.

**Video Recording and Conversation Analysis**

LS researchers employ audiovisual recordings in order to capture learning and development (Baquedano-López, Solís, & Arredondo, 2009). I visited each family a minimum of
ten times. The families agreed that I would visit their homes on a weekly basis. During the spring of 2009 I visited a different family each afternoon of the week, spending four days a week with families in their homes, in their neighborhoods, or at community meetings. The visits typically lasted between three and five hours, starting when I met the parents or children at school and ending around dinnertime. I did not predetermine which activities I would observe; I documented the families’ participation in whichever activities the parents and children routinely conducted after school. While our meetings often took place in the home, the parents would sometimes ask me to join them as they ran errands or attended appointments at school, medical clinics, or social service centers. I accompanied the Medina-Castillo, Marinero-Chavez, and Utuado-Alvarez families when they attended the IAN meetings. I accompanied the Utuado-Alvarez family to the LFC planning meetings.

I gathered over fifteen hours of video footage in three of the homes, totaling over forty-five hours of recorded interactions. They capture routine afterschool activities carried out in the home. One family, the Medina-Castillo family, preferred that I did not record our interactions. The recordings in the homes of the Marinero-Chavez, Utuado-Alvarez, and Mendez-Castro families were made between January and June 2009. I also collected artifacts present in the home such as school documents and children’s drawings and I wrote fieldnotes for each visit that recorded ethnographic details of talk and interaction. My observations in schools and public settings were recorded through extensive field notes. During July and August 2009, I catalogued all of the video footage by date and created a detailed log of each videotape that identified the topics mentioned and behaviors recorded. In addition, I coded all of the fieldnotes and created a library, in chronological order, of the firsthand artifacts that I collected. These artifacts included the first fifteen issues of Millvalley’s Spanish-language newspaper which began publication in February 2009, leaflets and pamphlets collected at IAN and LFC meetings or events, and school documents such as report cards and homework materials brought home by the focal children.

I coded all of the fieldnotes and video logs using the qualitative software program TAMS Analyzer (Weinsten, 2006). This software facilitated a method of analytic induction known as “grounded theory” in which I scanned the data for grammatical patterns in the participants’ speech and recurring topics and themes (Corbin & Strauss, 1990; Ochs, 1996). I specifically focused on the multiple ways in which families referenced macro categories of citizenship status through micro instances of talk. I began transcribing sections of recorded data using the Conversation Analysis transcription system (see Appendix E for the transcription key used in Chapters Five and Six). I developed a series of theoretical constructs about how citizenship was understood and enacted in everyday life. In the fall of 2009, I began to triangulate these constructs with other data sources (Goetze & LeCompte, 1981) including formal and informal interviews with family members, and informal interviews with the school staff at the local public schools that the children attended (see Appendices A, B, and C for interview protocols). As I continued to gather this qualitative data, I returned to my ethnographic fieldnotes and recordings in order to expand and revise my initial coding system.

Video and audio recordings allow LS researchers to revisit interactions that have been identified during the coding process in order to capture the nuances of language use over extended periods of time. Conversation Analysis focuses attention on the ways in which the beliefs and understandings referenced through talk are developed over the course of unfolding social interactions (Heritage & Atkinson, 1984; Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, 2007). However, audiovisual recordings are not objective artifacts of social situations because the researcher makes decisions that shape the perspective portrayed in the footage, including
when to record and who to include in the recording (Goodwin, 1994). Furthermore, audiovisual recordings can be as misleading as they are elucidating by making ongoing processes seem like isolated occurrences. LS researchers with an interest in culturally specific renderings of time in educational discourse have fused insights from cultural psychology (Cole, 1996) and ethnomethodological orientations (Garfinkel, 1967) to show that learning is a recursive process that cannot be captured in one filming session or within one sequence of transcribed utterances (Baquedano-López, Solís & Kattan, 2005).

I translated the recordings from Spanish into English in a way that indicates the speakers’ fluency in the moment of utterance. For instance, in the first example presented in Chapter Five, I provided an idiomatic translation of Marta Alvarez’s utterance “¿Cómo lo ves?,” rendering it “What do you think of it?” The literal translation, “How do you see it?” would not convey that Marta had used an idiomatic expression in Spanish. On the other hand, when participants made errors in their speech, I also tried to capture that in my translation. For instance, in the third example analyzed in Chapter Five, Pedro Rios exclaimed, “No! cuando me dí el report card ahora dijo que ahora estoy subiendo mi maestra.” I translated this, “No! when I gave the report card to me now she said that I’m going up my teacher,” in order to retain the errors in subject-verb agreement and inverted syntax that Pedro made in Spanish. There may be multiple reasons why Pedro didn’t speak grammatically correct Spanish in that moment: maybe he did not know the correct form or was too flustered to employ it. This is important distinction because the way that the family members express themselves in Spanish and English formed part of their identity as a speaker in that context. In this case, Inés Chavez, Pedro’s mother, had expressed concerns about the relationship between Pedro’s ability to speak Spanish and English and his identity as a Mexican migrant growing up in the U.S. I have tried to convey the participants’ speech and fluency as accurately as possible because these formal elements of the exchanges are themselves semantically rich.

No matter how exactly an observer attempts to transcribe interactions, she will never achieve pure objectivity. The “participant-observer paradox” is unavoidable because ethnographers make subjective decisions about what to record and when, and they inevitably shape the interactions that they are observing (Duranti, 1997, p. 118). In addition, the organization of text and the layout of a transcript reflect the ethnographer’s biases about which communicative behaviors she has chosen to represent (Duranti, 1997; Goodwin, 1994; Ochs, 1979). Throughout the writing process I have attempted to address my “participant-observer paradox” by accounting for my presence in the social scenes described, and by presenting both textual and pictorial representations (for example, transcripts and video stills) that depict the multiple dimensions of talk and interaction that transpired during those exchanges. Moreover, instead of treating translations as objective depictions of talk, I have attempted to account for my specific selections and methods of transcription.

The Focal Families

In this section, I will introduce the four focal families in detail. First, I will discuss the genealogical method that I used to learn about the families throughout my research and the genealogical diagrams that I include in this chapter. Then, I will describe several characteristics of the immediate family members, including: migratory status, kinship relations, educational and employment experiences, as well as the living arrangements and languages spoken in the home. Finally, I will discuss some of the important similarities among and differences between the four
families. This discussion will highlight the ways in which the communicative resources that the families employed varied across the lifespan (according to the ages of the focal siblings) and were inextricably linked to the kinds of routine activities in which family members participated. I will also contextualize the families’ social and economic characteristics within national trends in Latino and Mexican immigration to the U.S. This provides an important backdrop for understanding the interactional data presented in Chapters Five and Six.

The genealogical method in mixed-status families

Theoretical and methodological attention to the study of kinship relations has its roots in early British anthropology (Firth, 1930; Malinowski, 1930; Rivers, 1900). The debates over the efficacy and limitations of this method are just as old (see Malinowski’s critique of Rivers, 1930). My concern with the ways in which members’ juridical status impacts routine activities within the family can also be expressed as an interest in how kinship relations are shaped by macro classifications about who belongs in the U.S. and who doesn’t. Throughout this study, I listened as genealogies were recounted in multiple social situations ranging from casual conversations to formal explanations. In my most formal elicitations, I often sat at a kitchen table with the mother or children and asked that they draw or talk about their family as I took notes and diagramed their account. I was particularly interested in understanding who was related and how, which family members were born or lived in the U.S. and Mexico, the patterns of migration among family members, and the way that migratory status shaped familial interactions.

Recent studies in social and cultural anthropology continue to employ the genealogical method to study the social organization of particular cultural groups. These recent studies indicate that ethnographers can learn important lessons using this approach—lessons about how social life is organized as well as about the ways in which people talk about their social relationships. The genealogical method can teach us more than an abstracted or idealized set of kinship terms; it can be used to elicit culturally specific ways of remembering (Irvine, 1978) as well as the migratory, demographic, and social characteristics of the community being studied (Quinlan & Hagen, 2008). By using an “etic genealogy to understand emic models” (Quinlan & Hagen, 2008, p. 130), Quinlan and Hagen deepened their knowledge of local practices and acquired a metalanguage for talking about the way those practices were described. For example, during their study of migration and drinking patterns in Dominica, West Indies, they found that:

Some of the constructs were more difficult to pin down than others…the poverty construct required relatively extensive discussion. Our informants remarked that, with one or two exceptions, all of the villagers were poor. In the end, an impoverished person was defined as one “a little bit lower or below normal” for Bwa Mawego regarding possession of land, housing, household goods, or cash (p. 146).

In much the same way that Quinlan and Hagen acquired a local fluency for talking about poverty, I learned a tremendous amount about how family members talked about demographic characteristics such as migratory status as we discussed their family relationships. For example, after many conversations with my participants, I learned that term ciudadao (citizen) implied American citizen and that family members rarely, if ever, talked about being Mexican citizens. A person who was a Mexican citizen was almost always referred to as someone who lacked U.S. citizenship, who did not have papers, or who was not legal. This is strikingly similar to Quinlan
and Hagen’s realization that poverty was defined as below normal; for my participants, Mexican citizenship was described as less than U.S. citizenship. Through the genealogical method, I learned much more than abstracted kinship terminology; I learned about the local ways of talking about family, place, and identity.

I use the following symbols in the genealogical diagrams presented below: a triangle represents a female relative and a circle represents a male relative. Two horizontal lines indicate a marriage bond while a single vertical line denotes a descent bond (the line between parents and children). A single, solid horizontal line indicates a co-descent bond (siblings). These symbols resemble the icons used in anthropological studies of kinship such as those cited above. In addition to these traditional genealogical notations, I have added two symbols relevant to my study: first, a dotted vertical line signifies that the child still lives in Mexico while the parents live in the U.S. Second, I have used shading to indicate citizenship: the shaded geometric symbols denote U.S.-born children while the unshaded symbols indicate undocumented migrant family members born in Mexico.

The families

I will now introduce each of the four focal families in turn. I provide a genealogical diagram for each family that visually depicts the immediate family member’s name, birthplace, and migratory status, as well as kinship relationships and the children’s educational level at the time of the study. I describe the living arrangements, patterns of language use in the home, parental employment, and the social services that the families accessed on a regular basis. I have chosen to detail these characteristics because the participants repeatedly referenced them during my visits; in Chapters Five and Six we will see that family members referred to these aspects of their experience when talking about their citizenship status during routine activities carried out in their homes.

The Utuado-Alvarez family

![Figure 2. Utuado-Alvarez Family](image)

Marta Alvarez, Carlos Utuado, José Utuado, and Igor Utuado lived in a one-bedroom apartment on the second floor of a house that had been divided into three apartments. Marta Alvarez’s eldest child, Amaris, lived in Chiapas with Marta’s parents, and although Marta talked about bringing Amaris to Millvalley, she also expressed concerns about whether Amaris would be able to pursue studies after graduating from high school as an undocumented migrant in the U.S. While I never met the family’s downstairs neighbors, I often interacted with the upstairs neighbors because they provided daily childcare for José and Igor. These neighbors and caregivers, Alba Durán and Cruz Peña, were a Honduran couple who had also migrated to the U.S. and had a two-year-old daughter who was born in Millvalley.

The adults in the Utuado-Alvarez home spoke to one another in Spanish. José and Igor spoke in Spanish with their parents and they were reprimanded if they tried to respond to Marta or Carlos in English. As we will see in Chapter Five, the only exception to this rule occurred when Marta and José worked to complete his homework; during this activity he was permitted to speak to her in English. The children tended to speak with one another in English and Marta told me that she worried they would forget their Spanish if they continued to interact with their siblings and peers in English. The household television was in the bedroom and José and Igor spoke in English as they played English-language videogames while Marta and Alba used it to watch noticias (news) and other programs together in Spanish. The print matter in the house was mostly written in English, and included bills, paystubs, the Millvalley Public School District parent newsletter, and school documents that José brought home from Clearview Elementary School, the primary school where José was enrolled in the English as a Second Language (ESL) program.

Marta and Carlos both worked in the service industry\(^3\) of Millvalley. Carlos worked at an industrial facility cleaning linens from local hospitals and hotels. He worked from around 8 a.m. to 3 p.m. and arrived home around 4 p.m. I usually saw Carlos at the beginning of my visits, when he returned from work and Marta, José, Igor, and I arrived from school. By around 4:30 p.m., Carlos would go into the bedroom and sleep. As Carlos slept, Marta would feed the children and work with José to complete his homework assignments. When Carlos awoke at around 6:30 p.m., he and Marta would have dinner together. At around 8 p.m., Marta would put José and Igor to sleep; she and Carlos would then leave for their nighttime work cleaning movie theatres from about 10 p.m. to 5 a.m. At night, Alba and Cruz looked after José and Igor. Marta and Carlos would return home in the morning in time to wake their sons and get them ready for school. Marta would sleep during the day while Carlos worked and the children were at school.

The Utuado-Alvarez parents accessed both federal and local services in order to provide nutritional and medical care for themselves and their children. They received federal assistance in two ways. First, they participated in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)\(^4\), colloquially referred to as estampillas (food stamps). The family was eligible to receive $200 a month in food stamps because Igor was a U.S. citizen and Marta and Carlos’s combined income was less than $2,400 a month. As a U.S. citizen, Igor also participated in the federal Children’s

\(^3\) For a description of which types of employment are considered part of the US Service Industry, see http://www.bls.gov/OCO/.

\(^4\) For information about the Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program (SNAP) and eligibility requirements, visit http://www.fns.usda.gov/fsp/applicant_recipients/eligibility.htm#immigrant.
Health Insurance Program (CHIP)\(^5\) that provided him with healthcare that he received at the local Children’s Hospital. Marta, Carlos, and José received medical care at the free bilingual Community Clinic that opened on a bimonthly basis to serve uninsured families. If they needed urgent medical care in between the two Saturdays a month when the Community Clinic was open, they visited the emergency room at one of the nearby hospitals.

At the time of the study, Marta and Carlos were undertaking two activities that they hoped would benefit them if and when Obama passed legislation granting amnesty to undocumented migrants: filing their income taxes and learning English. Through more experienced friends and advocates at St. Martin’s Church, Marta and Carlos were learning about how to apply for their Individual Taxpayer Identification Number (ITIN)\(^6\), a number issued by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) for individuals who are not eligible for a social security number but want to declare their income taxes. In addition, Marta participated in the LFC planning meetings and continued her involvement in the center once it opened by attending free weekly English classes for adults.

**The Marinero-Chavez Family**

![Figure 3. Marinero-Chavez Family](image)

The immediate members of the Marinero-Chavez family included: Inés Chavez (mother), Ignacio Marinero (father), Inés’ eldest son Pedro Rios (whose biological father lived in Mexico and who Inés was no longer in contact with), Fani Marinero and Ignacio (Junior) Marinero. In my visits to the Marinero-Chavez home, Pedro always referred to Ignacio as papi (father) and Inés explained that she never told him that Fani and Junior were his half sister and brother. Inés and Ignacio first migrated from Mexico to Florida and then to Millvalley in order to live closer to Ignacio’s family because they offered the couple support such as housing. The couple lived in a one-bedroom apartment on the third floor of a two-family house that was owned by Ignacio’s uncle. Ignacio’s father, wife, and their three children occupied the first and second stories of the

\(^5\) For information about Pennsylvania’s Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP) and eligibility requirements, go to http://www.chipcoverspakids.com/.

\(^6\) For information about the Individual Taxpayer Identification Number (ITIN) and eligibility requirements, visit http://www.irs.gov/individuals/article/0,,id=96287,00.html#what.
house. Inés would often comment to me that the siblings and cousins tended to speak to each other in English.

During the course of the study, Inés took English classes run by a local nonprofit organization. Inés studied English in the hopes of improving her chances of being eligible for la reforma (Obama’s proposed immigration reform). Though they never explicitly stated the reason why Ignacio did not join Inés in taking English classes, the parents implied that it was not a priority because Ignacio had very little chance of qualifying for la reforma. It was common knowledge that migrants like Ignacio who had crossed the border more than once without legal permission would not be able to receive amnesty. Therefore, the Marinero-Chavez parents prioritized Inés’ studies and Ignacio stayed home and cared for the children while she went to class in the evening. During my visits, I listened as Inés practiced her English with Pedro. Inés and Ignacio spoke to one another in Spanish and both parents spoke to Fani and Junior in Spanish. There were two televisions in the house, one located in the bedroom and one in the living room, and the family negotiated which programs would be watched in Spanish or English on a case-by-case basis.

Pedro attended the same elementary school as José Utuado and was in third grade when I first began visiting his home. Pedro was not enrolled in the ESL program; Inés claimed this was due to the fact that Pedro received bilingual education services in Florida that had helped him to learn English faster. Fani and Junior were four and two years old, respectively, at the time of data collection. They attended a preschool program and Ignacio dropped them off and picked them up on his way to and from work. Inés usually left for work before 7 a.m., and Ignacio would wait until Pedro was on the school bus before he left to drop Fani and Junior off at their preschool before continuing on to work. Inés arrived home by 2 p.m. and I would often meet her at her home around 3 p.m. We would talk for about an hour before Pedro arrived from school at 4 p.m. and Ignacio and the younger children arrived around 5:30 p.m.

Inés often talked with me about her life in Mexico. She told me that she enjoyed studying and had aspirations to become a teacher, but had felt obliged to leave la secundaria (the equivalent to middle school in the U.S.) in order to find work and help her mother financially. Ignacio was not able to finish primary school and began working at the age of ten. When I first met Inés and Ignacio, they worked in the same place—a chocolate factory in Millvalley where Ignacio prepared the chocolate and Inés packaged it for sale. In May 2009, they were fired from those jobs for not having legal proof of employment and they took jobs in the cleaning sector of the service industry: Inés worked at a nearby mall in a national department store chain and Ignacio worked in a local branch of a national chain hotel.

After failing to produce identification when stopped by local police officers after a routine traffic violation, Ignacio was deported from Millvalley to Mexico in December 2008. Within a month and a half, he crossed the border from Mexico to the U.S. without legal permission for a second time in order to reunite with his family in Millvalley. As a result of the deportation, Inés was afraid to continue receiving governmental assistance for fear of being discovered and deported as well. She discontinued her participation in SNAP, even though she was eligible to apply for nutritional assistance because of her low income and because Fani and Junior were U.S. citizens. The two young children did continue to receive medical coverage through CHIP, and Inés, Ignacio, and Pedro visited the Community Clinic when they needed medical attention.

When Ignacio was deported, Inés began to participate in a program organized through St. Martin Catholic Church called the motivadoras (motivators). This program was run by nuns who
paired U.S.-born women in Millvalley with Latina women who they thought would benefit from additional forms of social and emotional support. Sister Elise, the nun who had introduced me to Inés, invited Inés to participate shortly after Ignacio’s deportation. Inés met with her motivadora for an hour each week over the course of two months. She explained to me that she greatly valued the opportunity to have someone to talk with her, especially when she felt tremendous stress due to Ignacio’s deportation.

The Medina-Castillo Family

Alberto Medina and Marilu Castillo met in Mexico and had their first child, Luis, in Toluca. When they decided to migrate to the U.S., Alberto and Marilu left Luis in Mexico with his maternal grandparents for one year. After settling in Millvalley, Marilu returned to Mexico alone to reunite with Luis and bring him to the U.S. Luis was eleven years old when he migrated to the U.S. with his mother. Once the family was together in Millvalley, Alberto and Marilu had a second child, a U.S.-born daughter named Xotchil. The Mendoza-Castillo family lived in a two-bedroom apartment on the first floor of a three-story house. When I first began visiting their home, Geraldo, an undocumented student who had migrated to the U.S. by himself and who attended Adams High School with Luis, lived with the family. On my third visit, Marilu explained that she had asked Geraldo to leave the house because he was not obeying her rules; he had been drinking in the house and coming and going at all hours. Although Marilu hesitated to ask him to leave, she worried that he was becoming a bad influence for Luis.

The family spoke in Spanish when they were together and, unlike the siblings in the other focal families, Luis and Xotchil spoke to one another in Spanish. The family’s television was located in the living room and when I arrived for my visits around 4 p.m., Marilu usually had the television on as she cleaned and cooked while Luis was typically using the family’s computer to communicate with his friends in Spanish and English through his MySpace page. Luis and Xotchil were both enrolled in the ESL programs at their schools at the start of the study. In April 2009, Luis took his annual language proficiency exam and was reclassified as English proficient. By the start of his eleventh grade school year, he was no longer enrolled in the Adams High School ESL program. Xotchil continued to take ESL classes when she entered first grade at Clearview Elementary School in the fall of 2009.

Alberto worked as a cook in a Mexican restaurant in a nearby suburb and Marilu cleaned houses in the Marblehill neighborhood of Millvalley. Both parents worked on the weekends,
cleaning office spaces in downtown Millvalley. During the spring of 2009, Luis spent many afternoons seeking part-time after-school employment as a cook or waiter in one of the local fast food restaurants. Before he was able to find work on his own, Luis spent most weekends working with his parents. By fall 2009, Luis had found work at a local chain restaurant. On afternoons when he wasn’t working, he cared for Xotchil while his parents worked, or he attended football practice at Adams High School.

In addition to taking Luis to the Community Clinic and Xotchil to the Children’s Hospital (through CHIP), Marilu and Alberto visited the Hillside Family Center located in the neighborhood where she worked because it provided free bilingual medical services to migrant families. She and Alberto were also active participants in St. Martin Catholic Church. When I first met Marilu in the summer of 2008, she participated regularly in the IAN meetings. Later that fall, she explained that she was frustrated because while the IAN leaders wanted full participation from mixed-status families in public events and meetings, they were rarely available when family members were facing deportation and needed them the most. By winter 2009, Marilu and Alberto had stopped attending the IAN meetings altogether.

The Mendez-Castro Family

![Diagram of the Mendez-Castro Family]

Laura Castro and Oscar Mendez were the only two parents among the four focal families who met after they migrated to Millvalley. Laura was from Toluca and Oscar was from Acapulco, Mexico. When Laura came to the U.S., she left her two-year-old daughter Dulce in her parents’ care. After Laura and Oscar met in Millvalley, they were married and had four U.S.-born children: Nancy (ten years old), Felipe (eight years old), Julissa (six years old), and Oscar who was two years old at the time of the study. Laura and Oscar were also the only focal family who had many extended family members living in Millvalley; Laura’s three sisters and two brothers lived in the same Clearwater neighborhood as she. One of Laura’s older sisters had obtained legal U.S. resident status, and four years ago during a visit to Mexico, she arranged for Dulce to enter the U.S. in her custody. Although Oscar was not Dulce’s biological father, I always heard her refer to him as papi and I noticed that when Dulce wrote her name on school documents she used the last name Mendez.
The Mendez-Castro family was unique in another significant way—they owned their home in Millvalley. Laura explained to me that several years ago they participated in a first-time homeowners program organized by a local bank that allowed them to begin purchasing their home despite their undocumented status. In order to qualify for the program, Laura and Oscar had to apply for their ITIN and began to file their income taxes on a regular basis. Chapter Six explores Dulce Mendez’s understanding about the importance of homeownership as a pathway to U.S. citizenship (a view which I heard her parents and other family members express on multiple occasions). While the family had more material resources than the other three focal families, they still accessed some of the same social services as the other families. The four U.S.-born children in the Mendez-Castro family were enrolled in CHIP and received their medical care at the Children’s Hospital. Laura, Oscar, and Dulce visited the Hillside Family Center for their medical needs.

During the spring of 2009, Oscar worked at two different restaurants that were both local branches of national chains. He was often home in the afternoons when I was visiting, but only for the brief time between his daytime shift at one restaurant and his nighttime shift at the other. Laura worked with one of her sisters cleaning houses in the Marblehill neighborhood of Millvalley and she was always home by 3:30 p.m. By that time, Felipe, Julissa, and I would have met and walked home from Clearview Elementary School. Dulce and Nancy both attended East End Middle School and were dropped off in front of their house by the school bus. All of the children except for Julissa were enrolled in their school’s ESL program at the time of the study.

Laura and Oscar insisted that their children speak to them in Spanish at home. On multiple occasions I heard Laura and Oscar say to their children that they would lose their Mexican identity if they did not speak Spanish. While the children spoke mostly in English to one another and to their cousins, I observed that they spoke in Spanish with their parents. If they did address their parents in English, Oscar and Laura would use different strategies to elicit their talk in Spanish including: repeating ¿mande? (a polite form of saying excuse me used among Spanish-speakers of Mexican heritage), and explicitly reprimanding them until they responded in Spanish. The adults tended to use the larger television and during my visits they used it not to watch cable programs but to broadcast Spanish-language music through satellite radio stations. The siblings used the smaller television to watch music videos in English and Spanish and to watch animated movies in English. Dulce, Nancy, and Felipe had MySpace pages, and they spent time in the afternoons using the computer to personalize their pages with images and text in English.

**Similarities and differences among the focal families**

During family recruitment and participant observation key similarities and differences between the households emerged. I’ll first detail the similarities, some that were immediately apparent and others that surfaced after I began to visit the families. They include: family composition, level of parental English proficiency and educational attainment, and occupation and socioeconomic status. The differences, which seemed to correlate to the ages of the undocumented children, include: the physical layout of the families’ homes, computer and Internet use at home, and the kinds of routine activities that the siblings participated in during after school hours.
When I began to recruit families for this study, I knew that I wanted to invite mixed-status families to participate. However, mixed-status families can include a number of different combinations of members who are U.S.-born, undocumented migrant, or in the process of applying for and obtaining legal resident status in the U.S. (Fix & Zimmerman, 2001). When I contacted the first two families who agreed to participate, the Medina-Castillo family and the Utuado-Alvarez family, I noticed that they shared the same combination of migrant and U.S.-born family members. In both cases, the parents and eldest child had migrated from Mexico without legal permission and the younger siblings were U.S.-born citizens. The eldest undocumented sibling had been in the U.S. for less than five years. I decided that this would be an ideal profile for the participating families because I would be able to observe the ways in which migratory status shaped the experiences of the siblings within one family unit. As a result, I continued to recruit mixed-status families who fit this description. I hypothesized that because the eldest sibling had been in the U.S. for a relatively short amount of time, the families would still be grappling with the particular realities that these undocumented migrant children faced. Throughout the course of my study I learned about the ways in which parents and children alike, despite their ages or length of time spent in the U.S., continually confronted the material and psychological ramifications of being undocumented migrants living in Millvalley.

The families in this study shared five commonalities that mirrored the characteristics of the broader Mexican and Latino population living in the U.S. These similarities include: family composition, parental language proficiency and educational level, and employment and socioeconomic status. The focal families typified national trends in which more than half of the Mexican population lived in two-parent households (Ramirez, 2004). This is also true of foreign-born Latino families; 60.1% reside in the home of a married couple (Pew Hispanic Center, 2008). The focal parents shared a similar level of language proficiency and educational attainment: they reported not speaking English very well. I observed that they were unable to read and write in English and they could use, but to a lesser degree understand, common conversational phrases. When the parents did speak in English, they would comment on where they had learned the terms; they were usually words or phrases that they had acquired at work. They were all hesitant to speak English when called upon to do so in public or at school; instead, they asked their children or me to translate on their behalf. This is consistent with reports that 43.1% of Mexican migrants living in the U.S. speak English less than “very well” (Ramirez, 2004). All of the focal parents had completed the first few years of primary schooling in Mexico but had been unable to continue their studies because of their family’s need for them to work. Mexicans are the least likely of all Hispanic groups in the U.S. to have a high school diploma (Ramirez & de la Cruz, 2003).

The focal parents and Luis Medina (the only sibling in the four families who also worked) were all employed in the service industry sector of the Millvalley labor market. The majority of Mexican workers in the U.S. are employed in one of three sectors (from highest to lowest percent): (1) production, transportation, and material moving, (2) construction, extraction, and maintenance, and (3) service (Pew Hispanic Center, 2008; Ramirez, 2004). Of the nine working members of the focal families, three of them formed part of the over 1.2 million foreign-born Latino workers in the food preparation sector and six others belonged to the over 1.5 million foreign-born Latinos working in the cleaning and maintenance sector of the service industry (Pew Hispanic Center, 2008). Mexicans are one of the Hispanic groups most likely to
live in poverty, second only to Puerto Ricans (Ramirez & de la Cruz, 2003). All of the focal families qualified as low-income households and were eligible to receive food stamps (SNAP) and medical insurance (CHIP); they were able to apply for these benefits because their U.S.-born children had valid social security numbers. Only U.S.-born children under eighteen years of age could receive CHIP benefits. The undocumented family members frequented one of the two health clinics in the city of Millvalley that offered free bilingual care for uninsured patients.

These familial characteristics affect the social and cognitive development of young children living in Latino families in the U.S. (Fuller et.al., 2009). In addition, parental circumstances such as earning low wages, being undocumented migrants, and having low levels of English language proficiency shape the families’ ability to access social and educational services for their Mexican- and U.S.-born children (Hernandez, Denton & Macartney, 2008). The characteristics shared by the focal families highlight the incredible sacrifices that Mexican migrant parents make to provide for their children and indicate the socioeconomic barriers that make this a formidable task.

**Differences**

Two families had older undocumented children enrolled in grades eight (Dulce Mendez) and ten (Luis Medina) at the start of the project. I’ll refer to Dulce and Luis as undocumented adolescents. The other two families had younger undocumented children enrolled at Clearview Elementary School: Pedro Rios (a third grader) and José Utuado (a second grader). The families with undocumented adolescents and undocumented children differed in two important ways that seemed to correlate with the ages of these focal children: the physical layout of their homes and the kinds of routine activities that the undocumented siblings participated in after school.

The Marinero-Chavez family and the Utuado-Alvarez family, the two families with undocumented children, lived in one-bedroom apartments. The parents and children all slept in one room with multiple mattresses, one for the children and one for the parents. In both homes, there was a television and videogame system located in the bedroom. In the Marinero-Chavez home, there was also a television in the living room. The living room in both homes was used by all of the family members throughout the afternoon and evening and contained a large table that served multiple purposes, including eating, completing homework, and relaxing. I spent all of my visits in the common space with the family members and only saw glimpses of the bedrooms as family members exited or entered them.

During my visits to both families’ homes, the mothers and children engaged in routine activities in the living room space. These activities typically involved the mothers cleaning and cooking and the children playing or eating. In addition, I observed the homework completion routine (HCR)—an activity that was unique to the two focal families with undocumented children. I will examine this collaborative literacy activity in detail in Chapter Five. As they engaged in the HCR, the mothers and their sons demonstrated the relevance of their migratory status to their learning and development at home and at school. I was able to observe this routine in the Marinero-Chavez and Utuado-Alvarez homes for two reasons: first, because the spatial constraints meant that eating, play, and homework had to occur in the common room during my visits and second, because the mothers with undocumented children initiated this activity in my presence on a recurrent basis.

The Medina-Castillo and Mendez-Castro families both had undocumented adolescents and both lived in houses with two or more bedrooms. In these homes, the parents and children
slept in separate bedrooms. In the Medina-Castillo home, Luis and Xotchil shared one bedroom and in the Mendez-Castro home Dulce and Julissa shared a room, Felipe and Junior shared a room, and Nancy had her own room. In both homes there was at least one television and a desktop computer in the living room. While I sat with both sets of parents as they watched television, I never saw the parents use the computers. Parents in both families told me that they had bought the computers for educational reasons—they thought they would help their adolescent children to learn valuable skills and to complete their school assignments. Neither family with an undocumented adolescent owned a videogame system although the siblings did play games on the computer.

Latino families, particularly those in which parents do not have a high school diploma and earn low wages, tend not to have computers and Internet access at home (Cheeseman, Janus & Davis, 2005). Mexican families are the least likely to have these technologies in their homes and language barriers compound the digital divide between ethnic groups; Mexicans that speak primarily Spanish at home are least likely to own a computer or have Internet access (Fairlie, 2003). However, families are more likely to have these technologies at home if they have school-aged children. Still, the digital divide persists—80% of white school-aged children own a computer compared to 48% of black and Latino school-aged children (Cheeseman, Janus & Davis, 2005). This is interesting in light of the fact that the two focal families with undocumented adolescents owned computers and had Internet access while the parents of undocumented children enrolled in elementary school did not. Perhaps the focal parents believed that the educational relevance of this technology did not begin upon entering Kindergarten but instead became more immediate in middle or secondary school. Another possibility may be that the parents of undocumented adolescents trusted that the youth knew how to use the technology, while parents of undocumented children were concerned that neither they nor their children would know how to take advantage of that resource.

As undocumented adolescents enrolled in middle and high school, Dulce and Luis engaged in very different activities than the undocumented children in the other two families. Both Dulce and Luis participated in extracurricular activities at their school; Luis played on Adams High School’s football team and Dulce was a cheerleader at East End Middle School. They were both responsible for household chores that had to be completed each afternoon. They also completed their homework assignments in their bedrooms without their parents’ assistance. Both the Medina-Castillo and Mendez-Castro parents told me that they didn’t feel comfortable helping the adolescents with homework and cited their lack of English fluency, formal schooling beyond elementary school and subject matter knowledge as the reasons. As a result of having private space and parents who felt under-qualified to help, the undocumented adolescents did not participate in the same kind of homework completion routine that I observed in the families with undocumented children. The undocumented adolescents did participate in explicit conversations with their parents about the ways in which their undocumented status would impact their educational and employment opportunities in the future. In Chapter Six, I will examine Dulce’s narrative, part of the planning for the future routine, in greater detail.

Conclusion

I occupied both insider and outsider roles in the cultural spaces of the families’ homes. The families and I shared an interest in their children’s educational experiences and an awareness of our minority status as members of a small but growing Latino community in Millvalley. These
commonalities were helpful as we developed relationships based upon trust and camaraderie. At the same time, the families and I differed in at least two significant ways: first, they shared an experience of crossing the U.S.-Mexican border without legal permission while I was born into a Puerto Rican family with U.S. citizenship. Second, the migrant parents and children were linguistic and cultural strangers who held tenuous social and economic positions in the U.S. while I was a comparatively socially and economically privileged individual who was fluent in the language and customs of U.S. civic life. There are three ways in which I worked to be both a responsible participant and unobtrusive observer, all of which center on language use: first, learning the norms of competent language use in the families’ homes; second, limiting my direct influence on the families’ lives to serving as an occasional translator; and third, writing about the families using their emic perspectives whenever possible.

Each interaction provided an opportunity for me to become a more competent researcher by learning the family-specific norms for competent language use. Building on Briggs’ (1984) careful attention to “learning how to ask” the appropriate questions in order to elicit participants talk through culturally acceptable interview formats, I realized that I also had to learn how to talk. As I discussed above, each family had its own norms for language use in the home, and most of them strongly preferred that their children spoke in Spanish. In almost all of the homes, the parents spoke to me in Spanish but the children tended to speak to me in English. I had to be very disciplined in order to not respond to the children in English and I tried my best to do so in order to respect the parents’ cultural and linguistic preferences. This was especially important because I did not want to alienate Spanish-speaking parents from participating in my English interactions with their children. When I did speak English with the children, I made sure to translate or prompt the children to translate our conversation into Spanish so that their parents could have access to our interaction. In addition, I learned that key differences in Puerto Rican and Mexican dialects of Spanish could change my intended meaning and cause offense. There are certain commonly used words in Puerto Rican Spanish (such as the verb coger, which means to take) that have vastly different meanings in Mexican Spanish (where coger, for example, is a vulgar term for intercourse). I had to be mindful of these differences and adapt my Spanish in order to avoid disrespecting any focal family members.

I quickly learned that the parents viewed me as resource because I could help them to advocate for educational or material needs for themselves or their children. As I began to conduct participant-observation, the families began to ask me if I would accompany them to the school, welfare office, income tax office, and other locations in order to help them access the goods and services they needed. I had to find a balance between being a detached observer while also taking seriously participants appeals for me to participate in their lives as an advocate (Delgado-Gaitán, 1993). I decided that, because this was a study of language use and because the families had first met me in my role as traductora, I would agree to translate for them in interactions that they had arranged but that I would not facilitate any new interactions or bring in any new resources into the homes. This process provided me with interesting insights into the role of children as cultural brokers and translators in their families’ lives. While my research builds upon recent findings of the ways in which children develop rich linguistic and cultural skills when serving as translators for their families (Gutierrez & Arzubiaga, in press; Orellana, Reynolds, Dorner, & Meza, 2003), I also found that parents did not always feel that they could rely on their children for accurate translation and that they sometimes sought out older and more experienced translators like myself.
Throughout the writing process, I have attempted to represent the families and community members in ways that avoid imposing discourses of disenfranchisement or deficiency that they themselves had not expressed (Villenas, 1996). In order to do so, I have chosen to integrate their own language and perspectives whenever possible. For example, in Chapter Four, I provide emic accounts (Pike, 1954) of the setting in the participants’ own words in order to avoid depicting the setting using only my etic grid (Hymes, 1964). I will continue this pattern of writing throughout the empirical analyses provided in Chapters Five and Six. I also acknowledge the enduring tension of using the multiple terms that I defined previously in Chapter Two, terms like mixed-status or migrant, which the families themselves do not use. My goal has been to develop a responsible framework for engaging the complex experiences of the focal families without forcing their diverse experiences to conform to preconceived notions about their identities or practices.
Chapter Four
Mixed-Status Families in Millvalley: The New Latino Diaspora of the Rust Belt

Within the last decade, Millvalley, Pennsylvania has become home to an emergent, mixed-status community from Mexico. While this Spanish-speaking migrant community continues to grow, it remains relatively invisible within local media, public space, and scholarly investigations of Latino immigration and education in the U.S. I hope to address the following questions in this chapter: how does the emergent community in Millvalley fit into the broader context of Mexican immigration in the U.S.? How have local institutions and educational settings adapted to this new population? How do the focal families who participated in this study situate themselves within the Latino Diaspora in the U.S.?

These complex questions require interdisciplinary and multidimensional answers. In order to address them I will draw from government and research reports, print and digital media, artifacts from community meetings, and ethnographic field notes and recordings of conversations with the focal families. This chapter is organized into two sections: first, I situate Millvalley and the Rust Belt within the New Latino Diaspora; second, I describe the local changes taking place in the Clearwater and Hilltop neighborhoods of Millvalley where this study took place. I conclude with some hypotheses about the ways in which the focal families’ current experiences, coupled with continued demographic and policy changes in Millvalley, may shape their language socialization in the future.

The New Latino Diaspora in the Rust Belt

There were over 45 million Latinos living in the U.S. by 2007 and of these, over 29 million were Mexican or of Mexican descent (Passel & Cohn, 2009). There is only one country with a larger Spanish-speaking population than the U.S. and that is Mexico itself (Rumbaut, 2006). Mexican migrants and their children are defying traditional immigration patterns by moving from urban settings into rural and suburban areas within the U.S., engaging in democratic and grassroots forms of political participation, and developing transnational identities facilitated by new forms of communication and travel (Bloemraad & Trost, 2007; Singer, 2008; Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco, & Qin, 2005).

Three characteristics of the recent Mexican migrant population are particularly relevant to this study of mixed-status families living in the New Latino Diaspora. First, Mexican migrants make up the largest share of the undocumented foreign-born population, in addition to being the largest group of Latinos in the U.S. (Passel, 2005). Second, mixed-status families whose members include both U.S. citizens and undocumented Mexican migrants make up a significant number of the undocumented population (Fix, Zimmerman & Passel, 2001; Passel & Cohn, 2009). About a quarter of all children who have undocumented parents live in mixed-status families (Passel, 2006). Third, Mexican migrants have begun to leave traditional receiving states like California and New York to move to non-traditional settlement areas across the U.S. (Fix, Zimmerman & Passel, 2001). Within the last two decades, undocumented migrant populations have grown in states such as North Carolina that have historically had small numbers of foreign-born residents (Passel, 2005).

In their introduction to the volume, Education in the New Latino Diaspora: Policy and the Politics of Identity, Wortham, Murillo, and Hamman (2001) delineated three features of the New Latino Diaspora: first, it is located in non-traditional settlement areas of the Southern and
Midwestern U.S.; second, Latino immigrants settling in these areas face “novel challenges to their sense of identity, status, and community” in unique contexts of reception (p. 1); and third, a range of formal and informal policy changes have been implemented on a state, county, or citywide level with varying degrees of success in meeting the social and academic needs of the growing Latino population. The research included in this volume examined the relationship between social and demographic changes and the educational experiences of recent migrants in the New Latino Diaspora through ethnographic accounts of bilingual programming, teacher education initiatives, community education programs, and high school curricula and pedagogy.

New Latino Diaspora studies have focused on the Sun Belt region of the South and Southwestern U.S. which experienced steady immigrant growth since the middle of the twentieth century due to its flourishing technology, construction, and service industries (Frey, 2004). Educational scholars have not yet studied the emerging Latino communities of the Rust Belt region. The Rust Belt, in contrast with the Sun Belt, is known as a “former gateway” for U.S. immigration (Singer, 2008, p. 9) that currently has a declining native-born population, relatively low numbers of new immigrants, and a weak post-industrial economy (Ritzer, 2007). There are data, however, that indicate that the Latino population in the Rust Belt is growing. I contend that this demographic shift warrants our attention and that we should use the lessons learned in the first round of New Latino Diaspora studies to document and inform the educational experiences of Latino immigrants in the Rust Belt region of the Diaspora.

According to a recent study by the Pew Hispanic Center, many new Latino migrants are settling in counties that were considered “slow-growing” in the 1990’s but have become “fast-growing Hispanic counties” within this decade (Fry, 2008, p. 18). Figure 6 pinpoints the fast growing Latino communities of the Rust Belt, which are highlighted in burgundy.
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*Figure 6. Fast Growing Hispanic Counties 2000-2007*

The slow growing counties are filled in yellow and counties with fewer that 1,000 Latinos are indicated in white. I added the red oval to Figure 6 in order to demarcate the Rust Belt region that includes parts of Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, western Pennsylvania, and northern New York as well as the northern tips of Kentucky and West Virginia. Allstate County, where Millvalley is located, is situated within the red oval in western Pennsylvania. Allstate County, along with other counties in the Rust Belt that contain cities like Columbus, Ohio and Detroit, Michigan, is now considered one of the fast-growing Latino counties. They have seen a 41% increase in the Latino population since the year 2000 and most of this increase is due to growth in the Mexican population. As a result, these cities now constitute an emergent part of the New Latino Diaspora.

Within Millvalley, there are ongoing efforts to clarify how many Latinos comprise the emerging community. The 2006 American Community Survey reported that Latinos total 1.8% of Millvalley’s population and that Mexicans make up 1,537 of the reported 5,466 Latino residents. Service providers in the Latino community have estimated that the numbers are much higher. Doctor Daniel, a Columbian pediatrician who founded the first bilingual health clinic in Millvalley, estimated that there are closer to ten or fifteen thousand Latino residents. He also claimed that the Latino community is growing rapidly due to high fertility rates in Mexican families (D. Correa, personal communication) that are consistent with the national trends in Mexican population growth (Durand, Telles & Flashman, 2006). There are local organizing efforts taking place to encourage Latino residents to participate in the upcoming 2010 census. Sister Elise, a Catholic nun who is an outspoken and trusted advocate of many members of the Mexican community, has conducted outreach for the Census Bureau in order to assuage undocumented migrants’ fear of being reported to Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) by explaining that their responses to the questionnaire are anonymous (E. Smith, personal communication). This mirrors a national phenomenon in which church leaders of Spanish-speaking congregations worked to encourage undocumented migrants’ participation in the census (Preston, 2009).

Let us now examine the focal parents’ accounts of how they crossed the border from Mexico into the U.S., the cities they visited on their way to Millvalley, and the social networks they established in those places. I have visually represented these narratives in Figure 7, which represents the places where the focal families had lived, visited, or made contacts. This map illustrates two things: the topography, or characteristics of locations within the Latino Diaspora; and the trámites, or the kinds of social and material exchanges that the focal families had with people in other parts of the U.S. The focal families did not use terms like Diaspora or (non) traditional settlement areas, when accounting for their migratory experiences, and yet they talked about how Millvalley was unique because of its relatively small and emergent Latino population. In that way, they described the city in terms of some of the characteristics that make it unique to the New Latino Diaspora.

---

7 In order to protect the anonymity of the participants, I will cite personal communications without including the month, date, and year. All personal communication between the participants and I took place during the fieldwork timeline detailed in Chapter Three.
The green dotted lines indicate some of the routes that the families took from the Mexican-American border to Millvalley, Pennsylvania. The green diamonds pinpoint places in the traditional settlement areas and the solid red lines identify places in the New Latino Diaspora that the focal families mentioned throughout the course of this study.

The border crossing stories that the focal families shared with me, indicated by the green dotted lines on the map, are rich narratives that I have distilled for the purposes of demonstrating how they moved through the various parts of the Latino Diaspora before settling in Millvalley (see Appendix D for a table that reintroduces the four focal families). In all of the families except for the Mendez-Castro family, the parents met in Mexico and decided that the father would be the first to cross the border into the U.S. The mother or another adult female relative subsequently crossed the border with the eldest undocumented child (also the focal child in this study). All of the families said that they chose their U.S. destination according to where they had family and could find employment.

Three of the four families lived in parts of the Diaspora for short periods of time before moving to Millvalley. The only exception were the Medina-Castillo parents, who traveled directly from the border to Millvalley to reunite with family members already living there. The father in the Utuado-Alvarez family, Carlos, crossed the border into California and went to Atlanta, Georgia to stay with a cousin who had promised to help him find work there. After several months working as a day laborer, Carlos was recruited by a Korean factory owner to move to Millvalley to work in his clothing factory. Shortly after Carlos moved to Millvalley, his wife Marta and her eldest son José crossed the border into Arizona and traveled directly to Millvalley to reunite with him. The Marinero-Chavez father, Ignacio, moved to Millvalley from Mexico to live near his father. Subsequently, his wife Inés crossed the border into the U.S. with
her eldest son, Pedro, and moved to Orlando to join her father. Ignacio and Inés reunited in Orlando and, after several months of working there, decided to move to Millvalley together.

Laura Castro and Oscar Mendez were the only two parents who met in Millvalley. Oscar first settled in Texas where one of his brothers lived. The brother worked at a Chinese restaurant, and when the owner recruited him to move to Millvalley to work in a new restaurant, he left for Millvalley and Oscar followed soon thereafter. Laura first lived in Los Angeles with her uncles and moved to Millvalley with them when they relocated in search of work. Once Laura and Oscar met and started a family, they sent for Laura’s eldest daughter who migrated to Millvalley under the care of an aunt. As we can see, the points of entry to the U.S. were located in traditional Mexican settlement areas along the border and each family took a different path through the Latino Diaspora on their way to Millvalley.

Once in Millvalley, the families sought out services and goods in traditional or new parts of the Diaspora depending on the relationships they had established with people living in those locations. As the green diamonds in Figure 7 show, the families made contact with people in areas where both Mexican and Puerto Rican migrants traditionally settled. The focal families had connections to trusted individuals who had experience in preparing the types of documents that undocumented family members needed to survive in the U.S.: false social security cards and visas and Individual Taxpayer Identification Numbers (ITINs). The Mendez-Castro family would drive several hours to a town outside of Philadelphia to meet with a Puerto Rican accountant who knew how to file income taxes using ITINs for the undocumented family members. The Utuado family would send their tax documents to a Mexican woman near Los Angeles who they trusted to declare their income using their ITINs. When the father in the Marinero family was deported and subsequently returned to Millvalley without legal documentation, he sent a money order and photograph to his cousin in Dallas, Texas, who arranged to have a new false social security number and identification card made for him.

This topography of trámites reveals two things about the focal families: first, because of the emergent nature of the Latino community in Millvalley, they did not know anyone locally with the skills or trust to handle their financial and personal transactions. As a result, they contacted individuals living in the traditional settlement communities to help them. Second, they lived with the contradiction of being active participants in U.S. civic life who worked and paid taxes but were nevertheless banned from full membership and inclusion due to their undocumented migratory status.

The focal family members tended to visit family members, take short family trips, and buy durable goods in nearby cities in the Southeast and Midwest. The parents and older siblings in the focal families were constrained by the fact that they, as undocumented family members, could not travel by plane. Since these locations were accessible by car, they had easier access to them. The Mendez-Castro Family, for example, would visit extended family in North Carolina and Tenessee on special occasions like quinceañeras (the Latin American version of a Sweet Sixteen celebration which takes place on a girl’s fifteenth birthday) and weddings. The Medina-Castillo and Utuado-Alvarez families would drive to Columbus, Ohio to buy cars because the laws for purchasing a car were less strict and there were more Spanish-speaking car dealers in Ohio than in Pennsylvania. On those trips, they would often stop at a large, well-known Mexican store called La Mexicana for food and household items from Mexico. These kinds of trámites show that the focal families found ways to access the familial, cultural, and material connections that they needed. Despite the emergent nature of the Latino community in the Rust Belt, they
established relationships with family members living there and discovered places to purchase the goods that they used on a daily basis.

The Emerging Latino Community in Millvalley

This section is organized according to the three characteristics of New Latino Diaspora locations identified by Wortham, Murillo, and Hamann (2001) and noted above. I will begin by examining the suburban characteristics of the adjacent Clearwater and Hilltop neighborhoods where the four focal families lived. I’ll then discuss some of the challenges that the families faced in the local contexts of reception. Finally, I’ll chronicle some of the formal policy shifts and informal changes taking place in Millvalley that have directly impacted the focal families.

Suburban Millvalley

The Clearwater and Hilltop neighborhoods are located at the southernmost edge of the Millvalley city limits. They resemble the adjacent suburbs much more than other urban Millvalley neighborhoods in three important ways: their distance from the urban center, the public transportation systems, and the neighborhood layout. The Clearwater and Hilltop neighborhoods are the only two neighborhoods that are geographically separated from the rest of the city of Millvalley by a river. These “streetcar suburbs” were named after the electric streetcars that were built in the latter part of the twentieth century (Hardwick, 2008, p. 32). In the 1920’s they became “automobile suburbs” as roadways, bridges, and tunnels were built to facilitate driving into and back from downtown Millvalley (Hoffman, 1992, p. 15). The residential patterns of the Clearwater and Hilltop neighborhoods also resemble the nearby suburbs much more than the rest of the city’s urban core. Most of the houses were located on large single lots with front and backyards that often have to be reached by steep flights of stairs. The neighborhoods were built along the trolley line and have one central, yet blighted, commercial district that is located near the most frequented trolley stops (Scarpaci & Patrick, 2006).

The Latino community settlement in Clearwater and Hilltop shares an important characteristic with other suburban areas of the New Latino Diaspora. The “residential integration” with non-Latino whites (Alba & Nee, 2005, p. 60) that is taking place in suburban Millvalley has led to novel points of cultural contact between White and Latino adults and children in ethnically and racially integrated schools and neighborhoods. The new Latino community in Clearwater and Hilltop differs from the “buy up” model of suburbanization (Alba & Nee, 2005, p. 59) in which immigrant groups who become more socially, linguistically, and economically integrated after a generation of living in the U.S. moved out of urban centers into the suburbs. In Millvalley, like in other Rust Belt cities, there is a declining native-born population and ample housing stock available for lower prices (Housing Authority of the City of Millvalley, 2008). This may be one reason why Latino immigrants have been able to settle in suburban parts of Millvalley within the first generation.

The four focal families lived within four miles of each other in the Clearwater and Hilltop neighborhoods. Clearwater, Hilltop, and one other neighborhood called Marblehill, have a Latino residential population of 10% (Briem, n.d). The K-12 public schools that the focal children attended were located less than half a mile of one another. Central Avenue is the largely blighted business district that runs through Clearwater and houses the Mexican grocery store called La
Tienda as well as a GroceryLand Supermarket, convenience store, and laundromat. The commercial district of Hilltop houses a gas station and post office as well as several abandoned storefronts.

Two different parents, from the Marinero-Chavez and Mendez-Castro families, explained to me why they chose to live in the Clearwater and Hilltop neighborhoods instead of the Marblehill neighborhood. One day as Inés Marinero and I walked through her neighborhood, I asked her why she thought Mexican families were moving to Clearwater. She explained:

_Fíjate que hay varios factores que yo he visto, que hacen que yo personalmente me mude para ya. Uno es la renta. Bueno la renta se va dando entre Marblehill y los demás partes porque hay... es buscándole y uno encuentra. Pero otra es la escuela, el nivel de estudios que tienen allí._

You see there are various factors that I’ve seen, that made me personally move over there. One is the rent. Well the rent you find between Marblehill and other areas because there is…it’s a matter of looking and one finds it. But the other is the school, the level of Studies that they have there.

When I pressed her for a bit more information about the schools she added: “_Sí es una de las mejores escuela que yo sé que hay aquí en Millvalley. Y la transportación también. Tú tomas el trolley y..._” (Yes, it is one of the best schools that there is here in Millvalley. And the transportation too. You take the trolley and…) Inés cut herself off to give me directions to her house, but her response indicated that the cost of renting an apartment, the quality of the schools, and the public transportation were the key factors in her decision to move to Hilltop. Although Clearwater and Hilltop are different neighborhoods, most families that I met considered them part of the same area and their children attended the same schools.

Oscar Mendez compared living in Marblehill and Clearwater in the following way:

_La diferencia es que en Marblehill hay un parque más grande y hay una alberca donde uno puede ir. Y podia ir, mi esposa para caminar, y todo eso. ... Y está más céntrico para autobuses para todo. Pero al mismo tiempo es más peligroso porque hay más tránsito de gente y de todo. Hay más autobús y más carro. Y aquí no. Aparentemente como que aquí es más calmdo. La gente camina más lento, los carros igualmente. Pero tampoco hay mucha diversión para los niños._

The difference is that in Marblehill there is a bigger park and there’s a pool where you can go. I could go, my wife could, and all of that…and it’s more central for buses and for everything. But at the same time it’s more dangerous because there is more people traffic and everything. There are more buses and cars. And here no. Apparently, here it’s like more calm. The people walk more slowly, the cars too. But there also isn’t that much entertainment for the children.

When compared to Marblehill, Oscar claimed that Clearwater had worse public transportation. Unlike Inés, he used a car to get to and from work in order to avoid depending on the public transportation system. The safety and tranquility of Clearwater made it a more desirable place to live. One of the drawbacks of living in Clearwater, however, was the lack of public space and
entertainment that he and his family enjoyed when they lived in Marblehill. We will now turn to some of the local realities of residential integration and cultural contact, as described by the focal families living in Clearwater and Hilltop.

Responses to undocumented Latinos in suburban Millvalley

The focal families faced challenges particular to undocumented migrants living in the suburb-like neighborhoods of Clearwater and Hilltop. They recounted two particular difficulties: finding landlords who would rent apartments to undocumented migrants and enrolling undocumented youth in the local public schools. These challenges illustrate the types of reactions that the families encountered in nontraditional receiving communities and they are consistent with the experiences of migrants in other New Latino Diaspora and emerging immigrant communities in the state of Pennsylvania (see the Lozano v. Hazelton case brought against discriminatory landlords by the American Civil Liberties Union and settlements reached by the Education Law Center in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh in 2006).

The Utuado-Alvarez and Medina-Castillo families both talked with me about the difficulty of finding landlords who would rent to undocumented immigrants in Clearwater. One afternoon, I asked Marta to recount the ways that Clearwater had changed in the last five years. She explained that a couple of years ago, rumors had circulated about Latinos selling and using drugs in the neighborhood and this led long-time residents of Clearwater to discourage Latinos from living there. We had the following exchange, presented below in Example One.

Example One:

1 Marta: Pero acá se anduvo rumorando, y hubo reunión de citizens, querían
but there was a rumor here, and there was a citizens meeting, they wanted
2 expulsar todos los Latinos de Clearwater
   to force all of the Latinos out of Clearwater
   ...
3 Marta: y todos se habían puesto de acuerdo que no les iban a rentar a los
and everyone had agreed that they wouldn’t rent to the
4 Hispanos
   Hispanics
5 Ariana: hm
6 Marta: hubo tiempo en que nos pedían hasta numero de seguro social
   there was a time when they even asked us for social security numbers
7 Ariana: para no dejar que entraran al vecindario
   so that they could prevent you from entering the neighborhood
8 Marta: hmmm exactamente
   exactly

In lines 1 and 2 Marta implied that Latinos were rumored to have exacerbated the drug problem which led to the citizens meeting where it was decided that Latino residents should be forced out of Clearwater. Marta was probably referring to the Clearwater Area Concerned Citizens organization that meets on the first Thursday of every month. In lines 3 through 6, she explained that the citizens made a concerted effort not to rent to Latinos, and specifically Mexicans, and
accomplished this by requiring social security numbers that they knew the migrants could not provide.

The second area of concern that families repeatedly shared was the fact that undocumented children were being denied enrollment in public schools due to their citizenship status. Maria Castillo and Laura Mendez told me stories about families who had experienced trouble enrolling in public schools if their children did not have social security numbers. They explained that as recently as a few years ago, the local high school in Clearwater where their children were enrolled would not admit Latino students unless they could prove that they were U.S. citizens. Laura claimed that while schools in surrounding towns were more open to enrolling undocumented students in elementary school, high school youth were still being denied access to schooling if they were undocumented migrants.

This phenomenon was confirmed through personal communication that I had with a local organizer named Andrés, who worked at a non-profit legal advocacy organization in Millvalley. In September 2008, while I was volunteering as a translator within the Latino community, Andrés sent the following email to various community members and leaders. The suburb that he mentions below, Riverview, is located within three miles of the Clearwater neighborhood. The organizer wrote (in his original grammar and syntax):

I also would like to share with you another case that we have. The family that moved to Riverview and the public school district is denying to accept their children there to study since they are "illegal aliens" as well. The father has a A# and his process is going on on USICE. They are really worried that the director of the school there, threatened them to call ICE if they would go to see a Lawyer and said NO ILLEGAL ALIEN CHILDREN would be able to get school at her district.

This email suggests that the local school districts were attempting to deny undocumented Latino students access to a public education despite the U.S. Supreme Court’s 1982 ruling that granted all students access to U.S. public schools regardless of citizenship status (Petrinocolos & New, 1999). The organizer indicated that the father of the family being denied admission had an A#, referring to his Alien Registration Number, a number is assigned to non-citizens living in the U.S. by ICE. An A# is also assigned to undocumented migrants who have applied for a visa or a green card, and this is the type of process that Andrés referred to when he stated that the father’s “process is going on on USICE” [sic]. This email indicates the type of discrimination that undocumented Mexicans encountered in the Millvalley area and the fear that they felt at the possibility of being deported for attempting to enroll their children in school.

**Formal policy shifts and informal changes in Millvalley**

The focal families have also witnessed new policy reforms and informal changes in various areas, including social services, education, healthcare, and law enforcement. Members of the families often discussed the direct effects of these reforms on their lives, and many participated in advocating for specific types of change. I will review the changes in each sector by including a brief description of the new formal policy as well as the informal changes that have taken place.
Social services for children and families

In June 2008, the Allstate County Department of Human Services (DHS) initiated the planning for the first Latino Family Center (LFC) in the region. That summer, DHS employees visited local churches that offered a Spanish-speaking mass in order to invite parents and families to join the planning committee for the LSC. For a year I attended the monthly FSC planning meetings, often accompanied by Marta Utuado or Maria Castillo. The county’s initiative to open and fund the LFC is an indication that the Latino community in Millvalley is growing, that the population increase is in large part due to high birth rates, and that there is a growing social service need to serve families with young children (D. Correa, personal communication). The LFC opened in July 2009 (Sherman, 2009) and currently has a waitlist of over sixty families (E. Smith, personal communication).

While the formal planning for the Latino FSC was taking place, grassroots organizations developed to meet the needs of Latino adolescents not served by the early childhood center. While the inauguration of the Latino FSC was widely celebrated in the Latino community, it also highlighted the void in services for adolescent Latino youth. A university student, community organizer, and a core group of four Latino youth largely comprised of undocumented migrants from Mexico, founded the Juventud en la Sombra (Youth in the Shadows) group. Juventud en la Sombra was founded in the spring of 2009 and was regularly attended by the eldest son in the Medina-Castillo family and the eldest daughter in the Mendez-Castro family. The group continues to meet and their primary goal is to create a safe space for the youth to express themselves and mutually support one another. One of the group’s first projects was for the youth to design a mural depicting their Latino identities that they will paint on the interior walls of the Latino FSC.

Education

Several formal and informal policy changes have also taken place within the Millvalley Public School (MPS) District. In 2004-5 there were 273 ESL students, in 2007-8 the number rose to 485, and it’s projected to reach 1,085 students by 2010-11 (Smydo, 2008). As this population grew, the English as a Second Language (ESL) services provided by itinerant teachers proved insufficient and the MPS District was legally mandated to expand the ESL programs and house them within particular schools. According to Ned Tieran, the director of ESL for MPS, after a year of contentious debate between community members and district leadership, it was decided that the two ESL programs for Spanish-speaking students would be housed in the Clearwater schools of Clearview Elementary School, East End Middle School, and Adams High School (N. Tieran, personal communication). This reform was implemented in the 2008-2009 school year. Students are placed in the ESL program based upon their score on a standardized assessment that is used statewide and they are assigned one or more periods of ESL classes depending on their English proficiency level.

During this 2009-2010 school year, Ned Tieran recruited a Spanish-speaking ESL teacher who worked at an ESL program in another Millvalley neighborhood to teach at the Clearview Elementary School. While there is no formal policy in place on the district level to hire teachers who speak the same home languages as their ESL students, Tieran did so in order to facilitate communication between the ESL students, parents, and teachers (N. Tieran, personal communication). In recent conversations with Tieran, he noted that the placement of the ESL
programs for Spanish speakers in Clearwater schools has meant that more Latinos are moving to that neighborhood.

**Healthcare**

The local reforms taking place in the public health arena are also extremely important for the focal families in caring for their undocumented and U.S. born children. Doctor Daniel founded Community Clinic in 2002, the first bilingual and bicultural clinic for uninsured patients in Allstate County, in collaboration with the local public hospital. He also offers bilingual care to insured (U.S.-born) children at the local Children’s Hospital. The federal Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP) covers these U.S.-born children. The Hillside Family Center, housed in the neighborhood where Laura Castro and Marilu Castillo work cleaning houses, also provides free bilingual healthcare to uninsured patients. This study takes place against the backdrop of historic changes to the healthcare system in the U.S., reforms ripe with debates about whether undocumented migrants should be eligible for insurance; further research is needed to understand how these new policies will impact undocumented communities’ access to medical care both locally and nationally.

In addition to the institutional changes taking place, there are ongoing grassroots efforts to provide quality healthcare for the Latino community. The mothers in the focal families have, to varying degrees, participated in a weekly program that provides pre and post-natal support to Spanish-speaking women in Millvalley. The volunteers attend hospital visits with uninsured, Spanish-speaking mothers to translate on their behalf and to ensure that they receive proper prenatal and early childhood medical care. This group started meeting in the basement of one of the local Catholic churches; as it has grown and become more formalized, it has secured a meeting space in the Women’s Hospital located in Marblehill.

**Law enforcement**

Finally, grassroots efforts to change local law enforcement policies towards undocumented immigrants have intensified over the last two years. One of the longstanding local debates has been whether or not the Millvalley Police Department (MPD) should collaborate with ICE to identify and deport undocumented migrants. During the winter of last year, there was growing fear in the Mexican community because undocumented migrants stopped by the MPD for traffic violations such as running a stop sign or driving a car without proper registration were being asked for a state license and identification that they could not produce (Sherman, 2008). The MPD would then call ICE and detention and deportation proceedings would immediately begin. The grassroots efforts have been led by a local organization called the Immigrant Advocacy Network (IAN) and have been supported by many Latino community members. Their goal was for the MPD to institute a “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy for immigrants in the region. The results of these grassroots efforts, announced by the Chief of Police at a series of public meetings in 2008, include: instructing officers to not ask about migratory status in non-criminal situations, appointing Spanish-speaking police officers to be liaisons to the Latino community, and working to hire more Latino police officers (Sherman, 2008). Deportation or police harassment have impacted all of the focal families and the Utuado-Alvarez, Medina-Castillo, and Marinero-Chavez families all participated in these local organizing efforts at least once during this study.
In the fall of 2008 I attended and served as a simultaneous translator for several community events and I met Inés Marinero when I was asked to translate her *testimonio* (testimony) about her husband’s deportation. In a conversation that we had in the spring of 2009, she told me that she gave *testimonio* because:

*Sí a alguien le sirve lo que me pasó a mí, mi experiencia, para que no-o manejen menos ó se cuiden más ó que se yo, tomen precauciones, adelante. Con que a una persona le ayude, así solo sea una … porque yo sé que esto que pasó no es en vano.*

If what happened to me, my experience, makes a difference for someone else, so that they drive less or are more careful, or I don’t know, take precautions, onward. If it only helps one person, even if its only one…then I’ll know that what happened to me wasn’t in vain.

Inés, like many other mothers and fathers who participated in local organizing and took the risk of giving *testimonio* about their undocumented status in public places, felt a responsibility to the larger Latino community to explain the negative effects of deportations and family separations. At the same time, the Utuado-Alvarez, Marinero-Chavez, and Medina-Castillo families did not always choose to participate in local grassroots efforts and give *testimonio*. By the winter of 2009, these families had stopped participating regularly in these political events. One afternoon, Marilu Castillo explained that, “*la gente esta desilusionada, [nombres del liderazgo de IAN] no responden cuando es necesario*” (the people are disillusioned, [IAN leaders names] don’t respond when they’re needed). While these families felt a responsibility to advocate for the rights of a larger collective, they were frustrated when they felt IAN leaders were unresponsive to their community’s needs.

The parents’ experiences as undocumented migrants directly impacted their children’s educational experiences. When Ignacio was deported to Mexico, Inés seriously considered returning to Acapulco with her children to reunite with him. She explained that the primary factor in deciding whether to stay or return to Mexico was her children’s education, specifically their ability to acquire English, which she saw as a gateway to a better life:

*Yo lo que, fíjate, lo que me pasaba mucho en la mente cuando decía, cuando estaba entre que si me iba a México ó me quedaba era la educación de mis hijos. Sobre todo de Pedro. Y yo digo él ya habla inglés. Él habla inglés, él está yendo a la escuela en inglés, y si yo lo llevo allá todo está en español pero él va entender el inglés. Si yo no lo meto a estudiar él se va olvidar, entonces, y cómo que todo eso me dolía, y cómo que tanto que habíamos sufrido y tanto que habíamos ganado ya, para que por nada nada más….*

What I, you see, what crossed my mind a lot when I said, when I was deciding between going to Mexico or staying was my children’s education. Mostly Pedro’s. And I said, he already speaks English. He speaks English, he’s going to school in English, and if I take him over there everything is in Spanish but he’s going to understand English. And if I don’t send him to study he is going to forget, so, and like all of that hurt me, and it was as if all that we’ve suffered and all that we’ve gained would be lost, for what, nothing, nothing more…. 
Inés talked about the importance of education and the progress that she and her family had made, signified by Pedro’s learning English. She was concerned about his adjustment to learning in Spanish, and related his language proficiency to her fear of returning to Mexico and nullifying the sacrifices and suffering that she and he had withstood to come to the U.S. together. Even though she stayed and Ignacio returned to Millvalley within three months of his deportation, the children’s education was still affected by this experience. Inés was evicted from the apartment where they lived in Hilltop and had to move in with Ignacio’s relatives in a neighborhood that was thirty minutes away. As a result, Inés took her youngest children out of preschool and Pedro had to leave the house very early and arrive very late in order to get a ride across the entire city of Millvalley to and from school. Although the teachers at Pedro’s school did not know about Ignacio’s deportation, at the parent/teacher conferences that we attended a few months later, they reported that Pedro’s behavior changed and that he had begun acting withdrawn and apathetic during the same period when his father was deported.

Conclusion

This chapter has shown that the Rust Belt region constitutes a part of the New Latino Diaspora and has highlighted some of the social and institutional changes taking place in Millvalley. The data provided showed how this emergent community is understood and experienced by the focal families who participated in this dissertation study. Two themes can be seen throughout this chapter: first, the interplay between foreign- and U.S.-born individuals who are adapting to local demographic changes; and second, the tension that mixed-status families face between the advantages and disadvantages of being visible—wanting social services, but fearing deportation.

The emergence of a new Latino community has implications for both the newly arriving foreign-born population and the long-term US-born residents of the Clearwater and Marblehill neighborhoods. Local landlords and school officials’ xenophobic responses of not renting apartments to families and not admitting Latino students to neighborhood schools was immediately felt by the focal families. They talked openly about how these events affected them during conversations in the safety of their own homes. The fear and anxiety that these interactions produced in the families was largely invisible to anyone in the majority, mainstream community of Clearwater.

At the same time, the relocation of the ESL program for Spanish-speakers to the Clearwater schools may be having the unintended consequence of encouraging more Latino families to settle in the neighborhood so that their children can gain access to that educational program. As of now, it is unclear what effect this educational policy will have on the social and academic experiences of mixed-status families living in the neighborhood, or whether the policy will contribute to more integration or segregation of Latino students in the MPS schools. While a longitudinal study of this community is needed to see the long-term effects of these changes, it is clear that native-born and immigrant community socialization is bidirectional (Garcia & Cuellar, 2006): migrants are pressing for new changes in Millvalley while Millvalley’s native-born

---

8 This is a recurrent trope in focal mother’s talk about language and status which will be briefly discussed in the case of the Utuado-Alvarez Family in Chapter Five and elaborated in more depth in future analyses of this data.
residents and public institutions are shaping the immigrants’ experiences in and understandings of Millvalley.

There is a particular dilemma in the mixed-status Mexican community of Millvalley that I repeatedly observed in the daily lives of the focal families. This is the irreconcilable tension between wanting their presence in the U.S. to be recognized so that local and national leaders could hear their needs and desires and the fear of being seen because detention and deportation could jeopardize their family cohesion and their future opportunities. I have seen this tension played out in the LFC meetings, where the heads of mixed-status households applauded the efforts of DHS in the same breath as they asked for assurances that no identification numbers or social security numbers would be required of the LFC’s participants. I have also witnessed parents struggling with the contradictory feelings of being hopeful that a new Spanish-speaking teacher at Clearview Elementary School would permit more parent-teacher communication while remaining fearful of visiting the public school because it represents a state institution with the potential authority to identify and deport undocumented family members like themselves. We will continue to see this tension in subsequent chapters as we track the discourses of citizenship in various educational settings and activities.
This chapter examines the linguistic, perceptual, and semiotic resources that family members in two mixed-status Mexican families use during homework completion routines (HCRs) at home. Specifically, it focuses on the moments when family members make reference to their migratory status during HCRs. This chapter will show that routine conversations between mothers and children during HCRs are an integral part of how they co-construct beliefs about the relationship between citizenship status and behavior.

The HCR was a routine activity in the homes of the Utuado-Alvarez family and the Marinero-Chavez family, where I was present as a participant observer during weekly visits in the spring of 2009. The HCRs presented here took place on two occasions: during a visit to the Utuado-Alvarez family home on April 23, 2009 and during a visit to the Marinero-Chavez family home on April 21, 2009. In addition to meeting the families at school, social services offices, and community meetings, I made between ten and fifteen visits to their homes. Of the twelve visits that I made to the Utuado-Alvarez home, the HCR occurred seven times; of the ten visits that I made to the Marinero-Chavez home, I witnessed three HCRs. I have chosen to explore these particular instances in great detail because they are typical examples of HCRs that recurred throughout the duration of this study. Table 2 briefly reintroduces the Utuado-Alvarez and Marinero-Chavez parents and children by name, kinship relationship, age, and migratory status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utuado-Alvarez Family</th>
<th>Marinero-Chavez Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlos, father</td>
<td>Ignacio, father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 years old</td>
<td>28 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undocumented migrant</td>
<td>undocumented migrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta, mother</td>
<td>Inés, mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(focal parent)</td>
<td>(focal parent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 years old</td>
<td>27 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undocumented migrant</td>
<td>undocumented migrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaya Utuado</td>
<td>Pedro, eldest son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lives in Chiapas, Mexico</td>
<td>(focal child)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 years old</td>
<td>9 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José Utuado (focal child)</td>
<td>Fani Marinero, middle child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 years old</td>
<td>4 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undocumented migrant</td>
<td>U.S. citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igor Utuado, youngest son</td>
<td>Hernán Marinero, youngest son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years old</td>
<td>2 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S citizen</td>
<td>U.S citizen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. The Utuado-Alvarez and Marinero-Chavez Families

The Utuado-Alvarez and Marinero-Chavez families lived within two and a half miles of each other on the southern side of the city of Millvalley and the sons both attended Clearview Elementary School in the Clearwater neighborhood. José was eight years old and in second grade and Pedro was nine years old and in third grade. José and Pedro shared the same academic calendar and, as we will see, their mothers both had concerns about report cards and parent/teacher conferences. These topics were embedded within the HCRs that occurred in April and May 2009.

I hope to answer two questions in this chapter: first, how did parents and children in mixed-status families accomplish educational activities that occurred at home?; second, how did they demonstrate the relevance of their citizenship status during their participation in the HCR? This chapter is organized into the following four sections. In the second section, I identify the
communicative resources used by participants to both accomplish the homework task and construct a social identity based upon migratory status during the HCR. Section three examines how and when the Utuado-Alvarez and Marinero-Chavez families refer to citizenship during HCRs. Section four includes a discussion of the data and the last section offers concluding remarks about the relationship between children’s language socialization in mixed-status families’ homes and literacy and learning in school.

Communicative Resources in the Social Context of the HCR

Family members in both the Utuado-Alvarez and Marinero-Chavez homes used linguistic, perceptual, and semiotic resources to express the relevance of migratory status to their learning when participating in the HCR. The parents’ migratory status limited their financial and geographic flexibility and shaped the perceptual resources available to the family by delimiting where they could live. Family members creatively used their perceptual resources, or the physical space of their homes, by redefining the space depending on the activity at hand. Throughout the course of an afternoon, family members used the rooms of their apartments for different purposes; the objects and materials contained in each room also took on distinct meanings. The semiotic resources included the material objects present in the home and the symbolic meanings that they were assigned. For example, the central table in the common room in both homes was a key resource that functioned in multiple ways during activities such as eating (when it functioned as a dining room table) and studying (when it functioned as a desk). The school documents themselves also served multiple functions, including: homework assignments for the children, English lessons for the parents, reports of academic and social progress, and sometimes paper airplanes for the siblings to play with. In section three, I will explore the linguistic resources by analyzing the participants’ talk in detail; in the following paragraphs, I will examine the perceptual and semiotic resources present in the focal families’ homes.

Both families lived in one-bedroom apartments where there was one common space and one shared bedroom. The mothers in both families told me that while they preferred to live in bigger spaces, their options were limited due to their migratory status. Marta Utuado explained that many landlords would not rent to her since she could not provide a social security number. She and her family had lived in their current residence for two years despite its being poorly maintained and its lack of sufficient heat in the winter because as Marta put it, “el dueño es un Mexicano” (the owner is Mexican), implying that he didn’t care about her migratory status as he was also a Mexican migrant. Inés Marinero explained to me that before her husband was deported in December 2009, she rented an apartment that she liked because it had plenty of space and a beautiful view of downtown Millvalley. When Ignacio was deported, she and her children were evicted and they had to move in with his extended family. Although Ignacio had returned to the U.S. (without a visa), they continued to rent a third-floor apartment in a building that his uncle owned. While Inés desperately wanted to move, they were scared to look for a new place because they didn’t want to risk revealing their undocumented status.

Migratory status didn’t just help determine where the families lived, but it also played a determining role in how much time they spent at home. Inés’ fear of being discovered and deported, shared to a lesser degree by Marta, meant that the families tended to engage in most non-school activities in the home because they were reluctant to enter the public space, including places like libraries. As a result, the physical arrangement of a small domestic space, and the
ways in which it was transformed to fulfill the domestic and academic needs of both parents and children, is integral to understanding the ways that family members interacted within the social context and accomplished the HCRs that took place there. In sum, migratory status not only arose during the interactions, but also played a significant role in determining the material context in which they took place.

The prior schooling experiences and language proficiency of both children and parents were also relevant to the HCR. Marta and Inés talked about the challenges of helping their children with their homework due to their limited English proficiency and their lack of familiarity with the schools’ expectations about how homework should be completed. The mothers also explained that certain academic tasks, such as the mathematical functions of addition and subtraction, were taught differently in U.S. schools than in Mexico; because parents had different prior knowledge and skills than their children, it was difficult for them to know how to help their children with assignments.

Homework assignments evoked a set of normative expectations about how parents and children needed to collaborate in order to successfully complete it. Although there was no stated district- or school-wide policy mandating that teachers provide instruction in English, teachers taught and assigned homework exclusively in English. They reinforced this de facto English-only policy during meetings with parents by relating the importance of language acquisition to national identity and belonging. For example, during a parent/teacher conference that I translated between Ms. L (José Utuado’s teacher) and Marta, Ms. L explained that in order to improve his academic standing José would have to improve record of homework completion and behavior. At the end of the conference, Ms. L asked José if he wanted to learn to read. José answered “yes” and explained, “I don’t know how to read Spanish or English. The ESL teacher doesn’t teach me Spanish.” Ms. L responded, “You’re not here to learn Spanish…[inaudible] English. You’re in America.” Messages like this, coupled with the assignment of homework in English, meant that mothers and children who typically spoke in Spanish had to negotiate new ways of communicating in order to finish the assignments. These assignments became semiotic resources that influenced which language family members spoke during the HCR, how they worked to co-construct the meaning of the tasks and the texts, and how they perceived themselves as constituents of the U.S. educational system.

**Citizenship and Education in the HCR**

In both the Utuado-Alvarez and Marinero-Chavez homes, the HCR took place in the common room that functioned as both the dining room and study area. Figures 8 and 9 depict the Utuado-Alvarez and Marinero-Chavez homes, respectively.
In both homes, the central perceptual space where I spent most of my visits with the families consisted of a central table (illustrated by a checkered rectangle) that served as both a dining room table and a desk. Figure 8 shows that the other rooms in the Utuado-Alvarez home included a kitchen and shared bedroom located on one side of the apartment. Figure 9 indicates that the Marinero-Chavez family’s common space was divided into two sections: one side had a television and sofa and the other side, divided only slightly by a partial wall, contained a small table and kitchen appliances.

The afterschool routines in the Utuado-Alvarez and Marinero-Chavez homes were quite similar and consisted of the children being picked up at school or returning home on the school bus, the fathers arriving home from work, and the family members congregating in the common space near the table or sofa. In the Utuado-Alvarez family, Marta would first meet her youngest son Igor at the bus stop and then pick up José from Clearview Elementary School at 2:45 pm. Her husband, Carlos, would arrive home from his day job at an industrial cleaning facility shortly after she returned with the boys. Marta and Carlos would converse while she prepared José’s snack in the kitchen and Carlos sat at the common table. Once José sat down at the table to have snack, Carlos would leave the common room, go into the bedroom and shut the door, and sleep until the HCR was completed and Marta served dinner. In the Marinero-Chavez family, Inés would pick up her younger children, Fani and Hernán, from daycare and arrive at their apartment shortly before Pedro’s bus dropped him off there at 3:30 pm. Her husband, Ignacio, would arrive from his job at a hotel and talk with Inés in the kitchen/dining room area while she prepared Pedro’s typical snack of tortilla and frijoles (beans). Once the snack was prepared, Ignacio would go into the bedroom and would often take the two younger children with him to watch television.

Both Marta and Inés gave their sons a snack right after they arrived home from school and before they started their homework. Marta and Inés would signal the shift from snack time to homework time by performing the following three actions in order. First, they would ask their sons if they were done eating and then they would clear the plates and wipe off the surfaces of
the table. Second, they would either instruct their sons to open their bookbags and take out their homework or remove the homework from the bags themselves. Third, they would begin to talk about school by commenting on the school documents that had been sent home in the bookbag or directly mentioning that it was time to do homework.

These actions initiated a perceptual and semiotic shift: the physical space transformed from a space for eating and relaxing to studying and concentrating, and the table and the objects resting on it (such as papers, pens, notebooks) took on new meaning for the family members. Marta and Inés expected their sons to act differently once the shift from snack time to homework time occurred. For example, José and Pedro were no longer allowed to use pens and paper for drawing or playing because these materials became essential resources used for writing and reading. In addition, while the boys were expected to speak only in Spanish during informal parent-child interactions, they were allowed to speak English once their actions shifted from snack to the HCR.

Before turning to specific examples from each family, let’s examine one more characteristic of the HCR in the Utuado-Alvarez and Marinero-Chavez homes. The HCRs had a predictable sequence. We’ve discussed the pre-HCR exchange, which included arrival from school and snack. Once the HCR began, it had three segments that I will call: the opening, homework completion, and the closing. The opening, signaled by unzipping a book bag and taking out its contents, lasted anywhere from five to twenty minutes. This segment lasted so long because Marta and Inés always took the time to read any non-homework documents before moving to the homework tasks. Sometimes the mother would discuss the documents in Spanish with the father or a neighbor who was present; on other days, she might ask me to translate the documents from English to Spanish. As we’ll see, Examples Two, Four, and Five all occurred during the opening.

Once the opening was completed, the homework completion segment would begin, and it would typically last between thirty to fifty minutes. This entailed an exchange between the mother and son in which they worked to complete the homework assignment. The mothers spoke in Spanish. They would try to sound out the written words in English; however, they could not read and understand the text and would subsequently turn to their children or me to translate it for them. Although the children could explain general information about the assignment in Spanish, including what class it was for and when it needed to be turned in to their teacher, they were unable to translate the directions and text from English into Spanish. They completed the written assignments in English. I often sat in a chair slightly removed from the table and filmed, although my help was elicited occasionally and I participated to varying degrees depending on the cues I got from the family members. After the homework was completed, the closing would mark the ending of the HCR. Here, the mother would usually refer back to the document examined in the opening, and comment on it in Spanish with me or with the family members present. She would then instruct her son in Spanish to put his materials back in his bookbag. This brief exchange lasted no more than ten minutes. Example Three is part of the closing segment of an HCR.

The HCR in the Utuado-Alvarez family

Example Two occurred at the opening on an HCR in which Marta was talking about José’s most recent report card. She explained to me that José had gotten “puros S, dos N nada más” (pure S, only two N). The letter grades that Marta listed belonged to the category of grades
labeled *citizenship*. The Millvalley Public School District handbook for parents and students offered the following explanation of the citizenship grade:

> The report card is the most familiar way of communicating student progress. … The letter grades A, B, C, D and E are used to indicate academic progress. A citizenship mark is also given for the students’ behavior in each class. Citizenship marks are represented by the letters O for outstanding; S for satisfactory; and N for needs improvement (p. 23-4).

The letters, O, S, and N, were the letter grades that Marta referred to when she handed me the report card. She seemed less concerned with the grades that José received for academic progress, as she did not mention them in our interaction, but she focused on the marks that he received for citizenship. The Clearview Elementary School handbook also stated that, “Children must complete 90% of assigned homework or the grade will be lowered one letter grade in that subject. Lack of science homework in grades K-3 will result in an unsatisfactory citizenship grade” (p. 2). Example Two ends when Marta explained that José did not get an S in science was because he did not turn in his homework. In this way, she indicates her understanding of the relationship between citizenship and homework stipulated in the Clearview handbook.

**Example Two:**

1 Marta: ((hands me the report card))
2 Ariana: Ahh oka:::y
3 Marta: Cómo lo ves? *What do you think of it?*
4 Igor: Adiana, [Adiana]
5 Marta: [Igor]
6 Ariana: Espera, espera. Okay, so. Las S sí son buenas. Ah ok. Este es una marca se
7 Ma llamada ciudadania. La marca. Citizenship. Y a mi me han dicho otros niños que
called citizenship. The grade. Citizenship. And other children have told me that
8 significa comportamiento.
it means behavior.
9 Marta: ((nods))
10 Ariana: Tú qué sabes de esto, José? What is citizenship?
11 Marta: ((takes a bite of José’s snack))
12 José: Ah Mami
13 Marta: ((chuckles)) Dile pues dile
14 in your class
15 José: Ummm
16 Igor: What? What? José? ((stops walking in circles flying the paper plane))
17 José: Citizenship. Um. It’s a game that you call citizenship bingo?
18 Ariana: Oh, and you play in your class?
19 José: ((shakes head no))
Ariana: In your class, does your teacher? She gives you a grade for citizenship. What does that mean?

José: I don’t go on the citizenship line

Ariana: Oh

Igor: Adiana, Adiana, Adiana

Marta: Cállate

Ariana: Significa su comportamiento, sobresaliente, satisfactorio, o necesita mejorar. Así que el sacó todo satisfactorio then he got all satisfactory

Marta: Nada [más]

José: [Igor] [can I have yours?] ((referring to his paper plane))

Marta: [en ciencia no] que lo lleva, el homework es el problema in science, he doesn’t take, his homework that’s the problem

In Example Two, multiple actions simultaneously occurred in the perceptual space: José was eating a snack, Igor was playing with a paper airplane made from an old progress report, and Marta was showing me José’s report card. The excerpt begins when Marta handed me the report card (line 1) and invited me to assess José’s performance by asking, “¿cómo lo ves?” (what do you think of it?), in line 3. I began by using the key on the report card to interpret the meaning of the S. At this point, there was a transition in the perceptual space from informal snack time to the formal event of the HCR signaled by the report card document. Accordingly, the family members’ actions and the semiotic resources at their disposal began to shift as well. On the one hand, snack time behaviors such as Igor’s use of school documents as toys and Marta’s participation in snack (line 11) were still permitted. On the other hand, Marta’s insistence that Igor be quiet (lines 5 and 25) indicated that playtime was ending and Marta directed her attention toward the report card. The report card became the central semiotic resource, and co-constructing the meaning of this report card required the participants’ use of their linguistic and perceptual resources.

The family members’ stances also shifted throughout Example Two. The intensity of the exchange increased as we awaited José’s explanation of the term citizenship because he was seen as the expert participant who could furnish a definition for the term. Marta enlisted my participation in interpreting the report card by taking an epistemological stance that positioned me as a knowledgeable interlocutor with authority (line 3). I took up that role in line 6 when I began to read the report card. I offered a gloss for citizenship, claiming that it meant behavior, and I reinforced my claim by stating that other children had told me so (thereby constructing children as experts once again). Due to my research interests in José’s understanding of the category of citizenship, I then turned the position of epistemological authority over to him in line 10 when I asked him to explain what the term meant. Marta, after stealing a bite of José’s snack and providing a brief comic interlude (lines 11 -13), folded her arms and looked at him sternly, shifting to a serious affective stance by urging him to answer my question (line 13). José’s “ummm” conveyed uncertainty (line 15). Even Igor, who was always present but rarely, if ever, participated in the HCR conversations between Marta, José, and I, stopped playing and pressed José for an answer (line 16), by echoing the what of “what do you know about this?” that I had
posed in line 10. The still image above shows how all of the perceptual resources in the room were oriented towards José as we awaited his interpretation of the term citizenship.

José and I continued talking, and I asked him more questions to elicit his ideas about the word citizenship. José responded to my query (line 17) by repeating the word citizenship, pausing with uncertainty (“ummm”), and tentatively stating that it was a game (see his rising intonation, indicating his uncertainty). In my next two statements (lines 18 and 20), I tried to relate this concept of a “game” to José’s participation in class but he shook his head in disagreement (line 19). In line 22, José emphatically asserted, “I don’t go on the citizenship line!” His epistemic stance, conveyed in his use of the declarative tense, “I don’t go,” indicated his certainty. His affective stance conveyed frustration and he raised his voice and furrowed his brow as he slumped into his chair. In lines 17 and 22, José took an abstract concept, citizenship, and related it to concrete activities that he is familiar with at his age, such as playing games and getting in line. While he was not able to offer up a clear explanation of citizenship, he demonstrated his understanding in negative terms (I do not go) related to his membership within a group (symbolized by forming a line). José concluded by claiming that he did not go on the citizenship line, which, in his own terms meant that he did not belong to that social category.

José’s correlation between citizenship and standing in a line is consistent with other moments in which he experienced a difference between himself and Igor, who is a U.S. citizen. According to stories that Marta told me, José’s awareness of social distinctions surfaced in other social contexts in which he had to form a line. For example, when they went to doctor’s visits, he and his younger brother always had to stand on two different lines—Igor waited in one line for insured patients (as a U.S. citizen he received Medicaid coverage) and José stood on a different line for patients without medical insurance (as an undocumented migrant he was not eligible for health insurance). Marta recounted to me that José would often ask her why that was the case. Marta told me that she explained it to him in terms of birthplace: Igor stood on one line because he was born in the U.S. and José stood on another line because he was born in Mexico. This suggests that the way that the State differentiated between the siblings impacted the way in which the children made sense of the world and their place within it. José had come to understand the relationship between certain actions and social identities, and he expressed them here in terms of group membership and line formation based upon his experiences.

After line 23, the interaction continued and Marta, Igor, and I returned to the stances and actions that we had performed prior to the exchange about citizenship. I continued to interpret the report card along with Marta who came and sat next to me (lines 26-30), Igor continued playing with his paper airplane, and José took his last bite of snack and joined Igor (line 29). In line 30, Marta mentioned that José’s poor grade in science was a result of not completing his homework and she then transitioned into the homework completion segment of the HCR by telling the boys to stop playing and by clearing the table.

The perceptual and semiotic resources were reconfigured: Igor sat quietly on the floor playing, José washed his hands and returned to the table and Marta sat next to him while I set up the camera in a new position. As this shift occurred, Marta mentioned to me that she wanted to make an appointment for a conference with José’s teacher in the following month of May. Instead of pursuing that comment, however, Marta then turned her attention to working with José to complete a homework assignment from José’s weekly English Language Arts packet. Together, they spent the next half-hour completing an assignment about contractions in which they had to combine two words into a contraction and write them in the designated spaces on the worksheet.
Once they were done with the worksheet, Marta again mentioned to me that she wanted to make an appointment to see José’s teacher. I responded by taking out a notebook that I had brought with me and saying in Spanish that I could write a note to the teacher (in English) on her behalf. In Example Three, we see an exchange that occurred between Marta and José as I took my notebook out of my bag. Marta explained to José what might have happened as a result of the meeting.

Example Three:

1 Marta: *Quiero hablar con tu maestra (.) y si no le voy a tener que decir que te mande*  
I want to speak to your teacher and if not I’m going to have to tell her to send you
2 *a México (.) si no logras entender (0.3) Ya ésta es la definitiva*  
to Mexico if you’re not able to understand. Now this is for real.
3 José: ((looks down and shakes head no))
4 Marta: *Sí. (0.2) Si tú ↑ no logras entender (0.3) que cuando te digan siéntate, no hables,*  
Yes. If you’re not able to understand that when they tell you sit, don’t talk,
5 *que te manden a México (.) definitivamente*  
that they send you to Mexico definitively. That I’m going to tell the teacher.
6 *Yo le voy a mandar el dinero a la maestra para que te compré el boleto de*  
I am going to send the money to the teacher so that she can buy you the plane
7 *avión. Y te vas.*  
ticket. And you go.

In line 1, Marta began by stating that when she spoke to José’s teacher she would have no choice but to tell her to send him to Mexico (line 1). Throughout her explanation, Marta related two actions: José’s “lograr entender” (be able to understand) with her “mandarte a México” (send you to Mexico) in lines 2-3 and 5-6. In so doing, she also portrayed José as the link between two public domains: school (José’s behavior in class) and immigration policy (José’s undocumented status). Marta aligned with the teacher as an authority figure by insinuating that she would instruct the teacher to deport José and stating that she would aid the teacher by giving her the money to buy a plane ticket (lines 2, 6, and 7). Marta granted the utmost authority to the teacher by depicting her as the intermediary between the U.S. and Mexico and by asserting that the teacher could and in fact would buy José’s plane ticket to Mexico at Marta’s request.

Marta’s epistemic stance conveyed certainty—she claimed that this was the defining moment for José’s future (“esta es la definitiva,” this is for real, line 3 and “definitivamente,” definitely, line 6). This stance also implied permanence, consistent with the claim Marta often made about resigning herself to stay in Mexico if she were to be deported. José was silent during this explanation and he only communicated using his body language. In line 4 he conveyed an affective stance of shame (lowering his head) and epistemic stance of disapproval (shaking his head no) at the prospect of his mother initiating his deportation.

Through the use of linguistic resources, Marta constructed José’s identity as an undocumented child by marking his deportability. She constructed her own identity as an authority figure by harnessing the power of the public sphere (the teacher who was a city employee and immigration law) within the domestic sphere. By conflating the juridical category of citizenship and the metaphorical behavioral category defined by the school, Marta portrayed learning activities as high-stakes events during which José’s behavior could lead to his own
deportation from the U.S. to Mexico. As Marta spoke, José moved around the table, until he stood across from her. As he listened, he used the perceptual resources in the room to place some physical distance between himself and her and her threats.

This wasn’t the only time Marta made this grave threat. At the end of one parent/teacher conference in which I acted as translator, the teacher brought José into the room and Marta mentioned the possibility of his deportation. In Spanish, Marta asked José for confirmation of the statement: “no quieres ir a México con tu abuela y abuelo” (you don’t want to go to Mexico with your grandmother and grandfather). As José began to cry and shook his head no, Marta explained, “sabes que quiero traer a tu hermana y vas a enseñar a tu hermana inglés porque tú sabes inglés” (you know I want to bring your sister and you’re going to teach her English because you know English). She ended by explaining that “los niños que no se portan bien no se pueden quedar aquí” (the children that don’t behave well can’t stay here). José’s crying prompted Marta to reassure him that everything would be fine as long as he behaved and listened well. Marta referred to the fact that her eldest daughter was still in Chiapas living with her parents and elicited José’s confirmation of the fact that he did not want to go back to living there. Marta positioned José as an expert sibling who could help Amaris to learn English (if and when Marta achieved her goal of bringing her to the U.S.) but only if he earned the privilege of staying in the U.S. by being on his best behavior.

In Examples Two and Three, we have seen how the participants constructed José’s identity as a non-citizen, deportable, student from Mexico. The examples outlined here both took place in the course of the same HCR in the Utuado-Alvarez family home, but their significance and their relevance extended beyond this social context. I have shown that they extended into parent/teacher conferences and doctor’s visits. I witnessed other moments when José’s undocumented status was evoked during visits to an accountant’s office and community meetings on education and immigration. These events all constituted points of contact between the domestic and public sphere. In these moments, members of the Utuado-Alvarez family referred to their migratory status as they tried to understand the appropriate, context-specific norms for their participation, behavior, and membership.

We can see that there are homologies between the school and home in the way that linguistic and semiotic resources are used to generate discourses that equate behavior and citizenship (Bourdieu, 1983). These homologies are evidenced in the semiotic resource of the report card itself (the citizenship grade correlated to student behavior) and in Marta’s talk about the report card and parent teacher conferences (José’s misbehavior could result in his deportation). Marta reinforced that homology by threatening to cooperate with the teacher to facilitate José’s deportation, thereby aligning two authority structures, one from the public sphere (teacher) and one in the domestic sphere (mother). When the homework artifact entered the domestic space during the HCR, a space largely determined by the family’s mixed migratory status, the behavioral norm of citizenship was literalized into a juridical category by the participants.

**The HCR in the Marinero-Chavez family**

In the Marinero-Chavez family, the members’ migratory status was referenced far more indirectly than in the Utuado-Alvarez family. Inés strongly believed that Pedro and his younger siblings should not be exposed to the stresses associated with being an undocumented migrant. However, the following examples illustrate that the Marinero children do not remain insulated
from the concept of citizenship and its attendant realities. Examples Four and Five were part of one extended HCR, and both took place during the opening segment. Example Three contains Inés and Pedro’s discussion about his report card and the potential consequences of getting bad grades. While Pedro also received grades for citizenship, they are not mentioned in this exchange. Instead, the focus is on the letter grades that Pedro received for academic progress. In Example Three, Inés’ husband, Ignacio, looked on as she interpreted the report card but remained silent throughout the exchange. I was a silent onlooker in both Examples Three and Four.

**Example Four:**

1 Pedro: *La otra vez era d,d,d,d. Y ahora d,c,c,c. No? Es muy duro allí science class*. The last time it was d,d,d,d. And now d,c,c,c. No? Science class is very hard there

2 También no, no le van a entender: Also you’re not going to understand it.

3 Inés: *la tarea de ciencia* the science homework

4 Pedro: come on

5 Inés: *en matemáticas va peor* in mathematics he’s doing worse

6 Pedro: *yah right. Tenía como seis d’s la otra vez…* yah right. I had like six d’s the other time

7 Inés: *Vas a reprobar año y no te va dar vergüenza que* You’re going to repeat the grade and won’t you feel embarrassed that

8 *tus demas amigos pasen año y tú vas a estar allí en ese lugar?* the rest of your friends pass the grade and you’re there in that position?

9 Pedro: *No cuando me di el report card ahora dijo que ahora estoy subiendo mi maestra*. Solo cuando empezamos cuando nos dió, después como dos días, teacher. Only when we started when she gave us, like two days later

10 Inés: *No Pedro* No Pedro

11 Pedro: *te estoy diciendo algo* I’m telling you something

12 Inés: *vergüenza te va dar* you’re going to feel embarrassed

13 Pedro: *Lo que me da vergüenza porque tú no me dejas terminar nada, como la otra vez* What embarrasses me is that you don’t let me finish anything, like the other time

14 Inés: *No te voy a dejar salir a jugar, te vas a quedar a estudiar* I’m not going to let you go out to play, you’ll stay to study

In Example Four, Pedro and Inés took up oppositional actions and stances as they offered up competing interpretations of his report card. The still image provided above indicates that Pedro was physically positioned in opposition to his parents within the perceptual space. They
had their backs to each other and were engaged in two different actions: his parents were oriented towards his report card while Pedro was heating up a tortilla to eat with his snack. As the interaction unfolded, they remained positioned on opposite sides of the table, reinforcing the fact that they were in disagreement. One of the sources of tension had to do with their interpretation of the significance of the key semiotic resource, the report card. In line 7, Inés concluded that because of this report card, Pedro was going to have to repeat the third grade (“vas a reprobar año,” you’re going to repeat the grade). In lines 9 and 10, Pedro argued that his grades had improved since this report card was issued and that this was not a final evaluation of his academic progress (“¡No!...ahora estoy subiendo,” No!...now I’m going up).

Pedro offered his positive interpretation of this report card, claiming that his grades had improved since the last marking period and attributing them to the difficult nature of his science class (line 1). He took up two kinds of stances in this initial statement: first, he conveyed his epistemological stance toward the science class by stating that it was difficult for him and implied that there were things he didn’t understand. He also conveyed an epistemological stance towards his parents when he stated that they didn’t understand the content of his science class or the report card. His tone of voice conveyed an affective stance of frustration towards both the science content and his parent’s inability to help him (lines 1-2). Inés expressed a different stance in lines 7 and 8. She introduced an affective stance of shame by stating that Pedro should feel embarrassed about having poor grades. She phrased this as a question, expressing an uncertain epistemological stance, and leaving it open to Pedro’s interpretation. Pedro countered in lines 9 and 10, rejecting the assertion that he should feel shame.

In line 11, Inés tried to regain her position of authority within the exchange, and simply stated “No, Pedro.” Pedro continued to try to defend himself and his grades, expressing increasing frustration with his mother by raising the tone and pitch of his voice (line 12). Inés reiterated that he ought to feel ashamed, and this second time she stated it with certainty, foregrounding the concept of shame and following it with a verb in the future declarative tense (“vergüenza te va dar,” you will feel shame, line 13). In line 14, Pedro stated that he did feel shame, not because of his own grades but instead because of his mother’s behavior because she never let him finish anything (although it is not clear whether he is referring to finishing his utterance or finishing his homework). Inés ended the exchange authoritatively, punishing Pedro by not letting him play with his friends and insisting that he study at home.

In Example Four, Pedro and Inés co-constructed identities for one another within the unfolding activity of interpreting Pedro’s grades and assigning responsibility for his poor performance in school. Inés positioned Pedro as a failing student who should be ashamed for his low achievement. Pedro portrayed Inés’ identity as a mother who couldn’t help him with his assignments and who constrained his ability to accomplish the tasks that he needed to (whether they be finishing his thought or the homework itself). Let’s turn now to Example Five, where Inés drew on multiple linguistic resources to connect the shame that she thought Pedro should feel as a student to the shame that she felt as an undocumented migrant working in menial service industry jobs.

**Example Five:**

1 Inés: *Son novelas interesantes, son programas que te hacen ver. Hay aves-prog hay* They’re interesting programs, programs that make you see. There some-prog are

2 *avaces programas fuertes, fuertes en cuestión de contenido, que son (0.4) por*
sometimes programs that are harsh, harsh in the sense of content, that are for

example noticias fuertes? Que me parecen interesante. Yo les digo ((pointing to
the children)) mira, pongan atención eso es lo que puede pasar. A él sobre todo
look, pay attention this is what can happen to you. To him most of all

((pointing to Pedro and addressing him)) Métete a bañar, no te hablo más.
Get in the bath. I’m not telling you again.

6 Pedro: Why do you have to be mean to me?
7 Inés: Por ejemplo, ahorita?, no le hecha ganas a la escuela. El no sé si el día de
For example, right now, he’s not putting effort into school. He I don’t know if
mañana va irse querer a lavar baños? Eso es lo que vas
tomorrow he’s going to want to go clean bathrooms? That’s what he’s going to
hacer si no le hechas ganas a la escuela. ((looks at Pablo)) No te va dar pena?
do if he doesn’t put effort into school. Won’t you be ashamed?

8 Inés: Ya sé pone a pensar así. ((to me, and chuckles)) Yo me digo, si yo tuviera
Now he starts thinking like that. I tell myself, if I would have had
la mitad de las oportunidades hace tiempo, qué cosa me hubiera sido yo?. Y esta
half the opportunities a long time ago. What would I have become? And these
gente que tiene, por ejemplo Pedro que tiene la oportunidad ahorita y no la
people that have, for example Pedro that has the opportunity now and doesn’t
aprovecha.
take advantage of it.

In Example Five, Inés continued to build on the idea that if Pedro did not get good grades
in school and excel academically then he would feel avergonzado (embarrassed), if he failed to
advance to the next grade. In Example Four, line 7, she predicted that he would feel pena
(shame) if he were to be forced to clean bathrooms for a living because he failed in school. She
used the same grammatical construction, “¿no te va dar [vergüenza/pena]?” (won’t you feel
[embarrassed/ashamed?]) as she talked about his future throughout this afternoon. This repetition
placed these two possibilities into parallel future frames that linked Pedro’s academic success to
the opportunities he would have as an undocumented migrant living in the U.S. On multiple
other occasions, Inés talked to me about the shame and failure that she felt about the kind of
work that she had to do in the U.S. Here, she only implied this, concluding that her own life
experiences stem from not having access to the educational opportunities that Pedro is fortunate
enough to have (Example Five, lines 12 and 13).

Inés communicated her disappointment in Pedro with a mixture of certainty
and doubt. She was certain that he was not trying hard enough in school (line 7), and certain that would lead
to a negative future (line 8-9), but uncertain about whether Pedro would be able to improve his
present and future behaviors (line 8). After Inés initial command (“métete a bañar, no te hablo
más,” get in the bath, I’m not telling you again, line 5), Pedro asked about why she was stern
with him and his tone implied a sense of unfairness and resignation. In Example Five, Pedro
didn’t respond to her prompts or argue back like he did in Example Four. His silence indicated a
thoughtful stance as Inés portrayed an identity for Pedro that mirrored hers and Ignacio’s. Her
words seemed to have the illocutionary force that she intended them to have (Austin, 1975), causing him to think (line 11).

Inés drew on three linguistic resources to link Examples Four and Five: (1) syntactic parallelism that predicted Pedro’s future and cumulatively built from repeating a grade, to being stuck without choices, to working in a menial job (Example Four, line 7, “vas a reprobar año,” you’re going to repeat the grade; Example Four, line 8, “vas a estar allí en ese lugar,” you’re going to be there in that place; and Example Five, line 8, “va irse quere a lavar baños,” you will want to go clean bathrooms); (2) using similar syntax characterized by declarative statements and repeated terms for affect (in Example Four, lines 7 and 13 and Example Five, line 9, “te va dar vergüenza/pena,” you will feel shame/ pity); and (3) linking this all to Pedro’s performance in school (Example Four, line 7, “vas a reprobar año,” you’re going to repeat the grade and Example Five, lines 7 and 9, “no le hecha ganas a la escuela,” not putting effort into school).

Across the examples, Inés created two parallel frames: being left back in school and becoming a custodian. She correlated bad grades in school to being left back in third grade and correlated being left back to washing bathrooms. For Inés, cleaning bathrooms indexed her identity as an undocumented migrant in the U.S. since she and her husband worked as custodial staff in a national chain department store and hotel, respectively. During our conversations she often contrasted her experience to that of U.S.-born workers, asserting that Americans didn’t want to do the work that she and her husband had no choice but to do given their undocumented status. She correlated being an undocumented migrant with working in the service industry and having limited educational opportunities to study. In these examples, Inés aligned Pedro with her and Ignacio, as he was also an undocumented migrant. She reinforced that his identity was more like hers than his U.S.-born siblings in Example Five, line 4, when she claimed that the disturbing newscasts about violence in Mexico and raids and deportations in the U.S. was more relevant to herself and Pedro than to the U.S.-born siblings.

Simultaneously, and yet in a somewhat contradictory fashion, Inés differentiated between her experience as an undocumented migrant in the U.S. and Pedro’s (lines 12 and 13). She placed him in a distinct but proximal class that she did not belong to, referred to as “esta gente” (these people)—her mixed-status children who had educational opportunities to access the U.S. mainstream. This indicated the tensions at the heart of Pedro’s position in the family. He was constrained by his status as an undocumented migrant and yet privileged to be in the U.S. where he was expected to take advantage of schooling opportunities and the social mobility that such opportunities were thought to provide.

Discussion

The preceding analysis examined explicit references to and implicit indexes of citizenship status during HCRs in the Utuado-Alvarez and Marinero-Chavez homes. Many other stances, actions, identities, and activities were demonstrated by the family members, but I have closely analyzed those that construct the parents and eldest sons as undocumented migrants during educational activities. Ochs’ and Hanks’ frameworks provided us with a heuristic for understanding how family members’ identities as undocumented migrants were referred to and made relevant during the HCRs. The mothers and sons in the two families drew upon their linguistic, semiotic, and perceptual resources as they performed actions and stances that co-constructed their social identities within the homework activity.
As we have seen, the following aspects of cultural competence were displayed during the HCR in the Utuado-Alvarez and Marinero-Chavez homes: (1) who could use the common space for particular purposes at designated times, (2) which materials were appropriate for use within different activities, (3) who was capable of completing the HCR, (4) what languages were spoken during the HCR and outside of the HCR, and (5) what it meant to be an undocumented son and student. Taken together, these aspects of cultural competence were the defining aspects of how José and Pedro were socialized to their identities as undocumented children within educational activities that they participated in at home with their mothers.

These tacitly agreed upon aspects of competent behavior were rendered explicit during the HCR because the routine created a “confrontation of systems of competency” (Hymes, 1986/2001, p. 68). This educational event constituted a point of contact between various systems such as immigration policy (evidenced by mentions of migratory status), local education policy (revealed in discussions about report cards during HCRs), and domestic rules (solidified in home routines). During the HCR, family members demonstrated their understanding of the relationship between these different systems and their relevance to the social and academic experiences of the undocumented children. Furthermore, parents and children displayed their assumptions about what constituted competent behavior during the HCR by imagining what the teacher expected of them, determining who had the authority to participate in the HCR, and evaluating their own behavior and learning.

As household members engaged in the HCR, other frames of reference in addition to migratory status were laminated onto the activity (Goffman, 1974). These frames included multiple temporalities (past, present, future), various locations (Mexico/U.S. and home/school), and social positions (student/laborer, student/child, parent/teacher, parent/immigration officer, teacher/immigration officer). I have found that the frames of reference that were evoked during the homework activity depended in part on the parenting style of the mothers. Marta was a mother who talked very openly with her children about citizenship status. We saw that she quite explicitly evoked these other frames of reference particularly as they related to José’s behavior in school. Inés, on the other hand, did not explicitly address the topic of citizenship status with her children even when it was explicitly stated on Pedro’s report card, but still indirectly referenced her and her children’s status when she talked about academic achievement and effort. In both cases, the temporal, geographic, and social frames carried indexical meaning that pointed to the connection between education and migratory status.

The ethnographic methods used to collect the data presented here, characterized by participant-observation in two languages and audio/video recordings of naturalistic interactions, were required to capture the nuances of these HCRs. If I hadn’t attended to the linguistic, semiotic, and perceptual resources that the Utuado-Alvarez and Marinero-Chavez families used over time, I might have overlooked the specific ways in which they referred to and indexed citizenship status. The family members used their perceptual, semiotic, and linguistic resources in patterned ways over many visits while also adapting to the particular, emergent details of the interaction within each visit. They used these manifold resources to refer to citizenship status within the context of academic tasks in heterogeneous ways that socialized one another to their undocumented status. Even when asked explicitly, participants were often unable to metalinguistically reflect on the ways that they made meaning and communicated their identities as undocumented migrants in their daily routine interactions (Briggs, 1984; Silverstein, 1981). Through ethnographic accounts of daily, routine interaction, we can take a holistic view of the
resources that family members draw upon when participating in educational activities. This allows us to capture the norms for cultural competence implied in their talk and actions.

Conclusion

The juridical category of citizenship status entered the homes of mixed-status Mexican families in various ways: via the artifact of the report card where citizenship and behavior were correlated and in discussions among family members when they related migratory status to future outcomes for undocumented children in school and society. Families evoked their citizenship status during moments of contact between the domestic and public spheres. These moments occurred during activities such as: HCRs, visits to schools for parent/teacher conferences, appointments with accountants to file income taxes, and visits to the doctor. The citizenship status of family members was mentioned in these moments because they called into question the different kinds of participation and membership that undocumented migrants and U.S. citizens can have in the U.S. mainstream. In other words, these moments indexed the families’ broader struggle to integrate themselves into the U.S. by attaining educational success, economic and social mobility, and political participation.

This study of the communicative resources that mixed-status families employ when engaging in the HCR helps us to understand the ways that undocumented parents perceive their role in helping their children to complete homework assignments and the ways that citizenship status shapes their interactions during educational activities. We know that the learning experiences that children have at home shape the ways that they approach academic tasks in school (González, Moll & Amanti, 2005; Gregory, Long & Volk, 2004). The analysis presented here can begin to shed light on the schemas that the undocumented siblings develop as they accomplish educational tasks at home, and can inform future studies of how students’ bring those schemas to bear on the academic activities that they engage in at school. This research is important in light of the challenges that many immigrant children experience in school—the double bind of learning academic content and academic English (Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007). In addition, undocumented students experience an even greater burden. They are in a triple bind when it comes to academic learning and participation in school—they are language learners who are encountering unfamiliar academic content while bearing their undocumented migratory status. It is my hope that this research can document the ways in which these children are socialized both in and out of school, and the systematic ways in which they are offered or denied membership and participation in U.S. civic life through schooling, in order to inform educational pedagogies and policies that can support undocumented students.
Chapter Six
Citizenship and Kinship in the Planning for the Future Routine

This chapter examines the communicative resources used by members of the Mendez-Castro family to convey their beliefs about the value of U.S. citizenship during the Planning for the Future Routine (PFtFR). The PFtFR is a recurrent type of exchange in which speakers talked about the family’s upcoming plans and indexed members’ migratory status when offering explanations for their ability or inability to participate in the anticipated activities. This routine took multiple forms, ranging from minimal two-turn sequences in dyadic exchanges to extended multiparty and multi-turn discussions, and included family members of all ages. This chapter will show that during the PFtFR, interlocutors communicated two key understandings: first, the relevance of citizenship status to their day-to-day experiences and second, the family’s shared conventions for talking about citizenship status in the home. These shared understandings formed the basis for family-specific norms of cultural competence, defined by the role and status that each member assumed within the family (Ochs, 2002).

In this chapter I will address the following two questions: (1) how and when do the Mendez-Castro siblings specify the ways in which citizenship status shapes their participation in various activities? (2) How do siblings of different ages demonstrate that they have learned to talk about the relationship between citizenship and participation according to their family’s conventions? In the next section, I describe the PFtFR and examine three examples in detail. Examples Six and Seven were recorded in my field notes as the interactions unfolded and Example Eight is an excerpt from a videotaped informal interview. In section three I provide a discussion of the data. I conclude by relating the Mendez-Castro family’s experiences to broader discussions about the impact of citizenship status on the language socialization and learning experiences of Latino children and adolescents.

The PFtFR occurred during every weekly visit that I made to the Mendez-Castro family home in the spring of 2009. I compiled numerous recordings of the PFtFRs in the Mendez-Castro family home and I will present three examples that took place on different occasions between January and May of that year. While both adults and children participated in these routines, I have chosen to focus on interactions that illustrate how siblings of all ages—ranging from the six-year-old US-born sibling to the thirteen-year-old undocumented Mexican sibling—express their beliefs about citizenship. Table 3 briefly reintroduces the parents and siblings by name, age, kinship relationship, and migratory status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mendez-Castro Family Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oscar, father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undocumented migrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulce, sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undocumented migrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felipe, brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar, brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. citizen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. The Mendez-Castro Family
Once a week, I would meet Julissa and Felipe at Clearview Elementary School at dismissal time and walk home with them. During our walks, the siblings talked about various topics, including what happened at school, what they did during the weekend, and what they planned to do when they got home. In the months leading up to summer vacation, the siblings often speculated about the trip to Mexico that they anticipated taking to see their grandparents. As we will see in Example Six, this prompted them to engage in the PFtFR as they tried to make sense of who in their family would be able to join them and why. The topics that the siblings mentioned on our walks were often revisited during the afternoon through imaginary play and conversations with other family members.

I would usually visit with the Mendez-Castro family until around 6:30 p.m. At 3:30 p.m., Laura would arrive home from work and Oscar would drop Junior off at home and leave shortly thereafter for his evening shift at work. Felipe, Julissa, and Junior would snack and play throughout the afternoon. When the school bus dropped Dulce and Nancy off at home around 4:00 p.m., the older sisters would also have a snack before doing their chores and completing their homework. These chores included washing the dishes, folding laundry, and cleaning up the living room. They would then either go to Dulce’s room or use the computer in the living room to complete their homework assignments. Between 4:00 and 6:00 p.m., extended family members (including uncles, aunts, or cousins) would stop by the Mendez-Castro house to converse, pick up mail, or play.

Communicative Resources in the Social Context of the PFtFR

The use of linguistic, perceptual, and semiotic resources allowed family members who occupied different social roles (for example, siblings of multiple ages who had different migratory statuses) to achieve common ground during this routine interaction (Hanks, 2006). The most stable features of the PFtFR were linguistically encoded; in other words, siblings used predictable pragmatic and syntactic constructions to talk about citizenship status. One striking feature of the PFtFR is that family members talked about how migratory status shaped their participation in upcoming activities without ever uttering the terms *citizenship* or *migratory status*. Instead, as siblings talked about their participation in public systems such as education, healthcare, and travel, they used metaphorical language to refer to individuals who “did or did not have papers” (immigration papers). As we will see, they relied heavily on indexical language to establish the relationship between citizenship and behavior.

There were three syntactic features of the siblings’ talk that characterized the PFtFR: verb tense and mood, conjunctions that established causal relationships between migratory status and behavior, and locative, temporal, and pronominal deictic terms. These features were present in PFtFRs of different lengths; the routine sometimes entailed a brief statement indexing a members’ migratory status and other times included a long conversation on the subject. The siblings tended to use auxiliary verbs in the present tense (*can* + *go*) or simple future tense (*will* + *graduate*) to communicate their confidence in the subject’s ability to perform the action described. The siblings’ use of conjunctions (*because* and *so*) established causal relationships between having or not having *papers* and being able to participate in particular activities. During the PFtFR, speakers situated the subject of the sentence (for example, *I* or *my parents*) within a particular time (*now* and *then*) or place (*here* or *there*). Depending on the subject’s citizenship status, this “deictic field” (Hanks, 2005, p. 193) was imbued with a different social significance.
The perceptual and semiotic resources used by the Mendez-Castro family members during the PFtFR were inextricably linked. Family members tended to use their perceptual resources (built space) in patterned ways, and both the content of and interactions that took place within the PFtFR changed depending upon which family members congregated in particular rooms of the house. Furthermore, family members used different semiotic resources to make sense of citizenship status and interpret the significance of the PFtFR itself. For example, the PFtFRs that I observed in Dulce and Nancy’s bedrooms occurred as they were doing their chores or completing their homework. Male family members never participated in that version of the routine because brothers, uncles, or male cousins did not enter the girls’ bedrooms. In these instances, references to migratory status came up in conversations about television shows they had watched together on the Spanish-language cable channel, Univision, or when discussing topics that they were studying in school. In contrast, many of the PFtFRs that I observed took place in the kitchen and often included the Mendez-Castro parents and siblings as well as uncles and extended family members. These were almost always multi-party conversations about current events, family plans, or finances. As we will see in Example Seven, children participated in these routines by affirming or challenging the adults’ assertions.

**Siblings’ talk in the PFtFR**

In the following pages I will examine how young U.S.-born Mendez siblings displayed their understandings about the role of citizenship status in their family’s life. The brief utterances made by six-year-old Julissa and nine-year-old Felipe were embedded within longer PFtFRs that occurred in the Mendez-Castro home after school. The images that accompany each example illustrate the configurations and spaces in which the PFtFR took place; in each one, a different perceptual and semiotic field is depicted.

![Figure 12. Playing and Talking After School in the Mendez-Castro Family Living Room](image)

In Figure 12, Dulce is standing in the doorway to the kitchen, talking to Nancy who is in the foreground. Their younger siblings and cousin are pictured on the right side, playing in the living room. When the photograph was taken, Laura and I were standing in the kitchen. As I talked with Laura in Spanish, I occasionally peeked into the living room to watch the children
playing and talking. As they played in English, Julissa, Felipe, and a cousin reenacted scenes in which adult family members traveled to and from Mexico. At one point, Julissa stepped out of the play sequence to tell me about the trip to Mexico that she anticipated taking during her summer vacation from school. As Julissa shared her perspective on the travel plans, Laura chimed in to elaborate on the details of who would be able to go on the trip and why.

**Example Six:**

1 Julissa: I’m going to Mexico this summer. I’m scared to go on a plane.

Laura explained to me in Spanish that Julissa, Felipe, and Junior would all go to Mexico and that she, Dulce, and Oscar would stay in the U.S.

2 Julissa: I’m going to Mexico this summer but my sister can’t go ((pointing at Dulce and shaking her head no)) because she was born there.

Laura continued to tell me, in Spanish, that they might go to Florida instead of Mexico because they could drive there instead of flying.

3 Julissa: I’m going to Mexico this summer but my sister can’t go ((pointing at Dulce and shaking her head no)) because she was born there.

Laura continued to tell me, in Spanish, that they might go to Florida instead of Mexico because they could drive there instead of flying.

4 Laura: No podemos ir en avión porque no tenemos... ((Laura turned to wash dishes)) We can’t go on a plane because we don’t have...

Julissa used the simple future tense to indicate her certainty about traveling to Mexico during her summer vacation from school. She immediately juxtaposed her ability to go with Dulce’s inability to travel to Mexico using the conjunction but to contrast their experiences (line 1). Julissa punctuated this statement in two ways: (1) by pointing to Dulce, indicating that she was the only family member in the room who could not go and (2) by shaking her head no, emphasizing the word not and the idea that Dulce could not go on the trip. Julissa’s use of the subordinating conjunction because communicated her understanding that Dulce’s being born there (a locative deictic referring to Mexico) was the direct cause of her inability to travel to that country.

While Julissa did not use the metaphorical language of having or not having papers, she communicated that being or not being from the U.S. or Mexico shaped her siblings’ ability to participate in certain activities. Her omission of the term citizenship suggests that she had been socialized into a way of talking about the difference between U.S.- or Mexican-born family members without explicitly mentioning their migratory status. In this PFtFR, Julissa tried to reconcile her excitement about an upcoming family reunion and the fact that some family members were not allowed to participate. In so doing, she demonstrated her understanding of how birthplace shaped her siblings’ role in activities such as travel across national borders.

We can see from Laura’s responses that she understood Julissa’s mention of plane travel to Mexico even though Julissa was speaking in English. Laura’s explanations not only confirmed that these travel plans were underway but also affirmed that the family had been considering alternate summer vacation possibilities for those undocumented members who could not cross the border into Mexico by plane. While it is true that it would be a risk for her, Oscar, and Dulce to cross the U.S.-Mexico border via any mode of transportation, her focus on airplanes confirmed that she was responding to Julissa’s specific comments about being scared to fly to
Mexico. In line 4, Laura began to explain that she and the others could not travel by plane because they didn’t have U.S. citizenship or papers. Although her sentence trailed off as she turned to wash the dishes, it is likely that would have ended the sentence with the word papeles (papers)—the family’s way of indexing their migratory status. Her statement parallels Julissa’s claim that Dulce can’t go because she was born in Mexico by explaining that they can’t travel by plane because they don’t have papers.

Laura’s affirmation of Julissa’s position provided her and the other children with a model for how to talk about family members’ future plans. We can see how and when the siblings employed those linguistic resources in their talk. Moreover, while acknowledging the constraints that she and Dulce face as undocumented migrants, Laura also envisioned alternative opportunities that they shared (such as visiting Florida instead of Mexico). She demonstrated that not having papers was not simply a hindrance to be overcome but was also an opportunity to find creative solutions to the particular challenges faced by the undocumented family members.

On another visit to the Mendez-Castro home, pictured in Figure 13, I stood in the kitchen conversing with Laura while the younger children snacked and an uncle stood in the background listening. As we talked Dulce arrived from school and stood in the kitchen briefly before going up to her bedroom. After I recounted a story about a recent visit I made to a physical therapist, Laura talked about the kinds of medical care that she, Oscar, and Dulce had access to in Millvalley. As she explained which clinics they were able to visit without medical insurance, Dulce shared her perspective and Felipe chimed in about how having U.S. citizenship influenced his ability to access medical care.

Example Seven:

1 Ariana:  Adónde van ustedes? Where do you (pl.) go?
2 Laura:    Yo voy a la Hillside, como yo no tengo aseguranza I go to Hillside, since I don’t have insurance
3 Ariana:  Algunos tienen ((pointing towards the children seated at the table))
Some have

4 Laura:  *Todos menos Dulce. Yo la llevo a la clínica.*
All of them except Dulce. I take her to the clinic.

5 Dulce:  *Yah. I go to the doctor and they speak Spanish!*

6 Laura:  *Dulce va a la clínica del doctor Daniel*
Dulce goes to doctor Daniel’s clinic

7 Felipe:  *I have papers so I can go anywhere* ((gesturing firmly with his hand and moving his head from left to right)).

8 Laura:  *Mm hmm.*

This interaction began with my question about where Laura and her family went for their medical care. As was the case with most PftFRs, conversations about family activities began without any mention of migratory status. However, within just a few exchanges, speakers referenced their own or others’ citizenship as an explanation for why family members had to make distinct plans for participation in a given activity. Laura first explained that she and Dulce go to certain clinics because they do not have healthcare insurance like the rest of the U.S.-born children who were sitting at the table (lines 2 and 4). Laura’s reference to Dulce’s being uninsured (line 4) established that Dulce was different than her U.S.-born siblings and cousins and that being uninsured was an index of being a person who does not have papers. Dulce, who was in the kitchen during this brief exchange, chimed in excitedly to tell me that her doctor speaks Spanish (line 5). Offering an explanation for why Dulce’s doctor speaks Spanish (a rare experience in Millvalley), Laura added that Dulce attends the clinic run by a well-known Colombian doctor named Daniel (line 6).

Felipe responded by using the metaphorical language of *having papers* that other family members typically used to index citizenship status during the PftFR (line 7). By using the conjunction *so*, he connected being a U.S. citizen to his ability (*can* + *go*) to obtain healthcare services at any location (*anywhere*). Felipe’s words and actions conveyed a stance of privilege and entitlement—his emphasis on the word *I* and on the first syllable of the word *anywhere* created a phonological parallelism that implied that those sounds (and their corresponding meanings) were linked. He communicated the idea that as a person with papers, he had the freedom to go anywhere and perhaps, to get anything. Felipe’s delivery resembled the taunting tone of voice used by siblings who, when competing about which one is better than the other, claim that “I’m better than you…so *there.*” His response had a competitive edge—if Dulce’s excitement implied that there was any positive social capital associated with having a Spanish-speaking doctor, Felipe trumped that by announcing that he had papers and could therefore visit any doctor at any location. By denoting his legal status in English, Felipe distanced himself from his undocumented mother and older sister (and perhaps even their native language Spanish) and he conveyed that his entitlement to rights or services, a privilege that his older sister and mother did not have, was attributable to his being a U.S. citizen.

These examples indicate that the Mendez-Castro siblings understood that there were differences among them that correlated to their birthplace and citizenship status. Felipe’s statement mirrored Julissa’s utterance by equating two terms: having papers with the ability to go any doctor (while she equated being from Mexico with the inability to travel). His statement built on Julissa’s claim by adding another layer of nuance. While she demonstrated that participation in certain activities was linked to birthplace, Felipe extended this idea by indexing the relationship between birthplace and a complex system of immigration policy and legal
documentation that frees or restricts an individual’s actions. They both imbued national identity with a social significance that they conveyed through affective stances: Julissa seemed to pity Dulce for not being born here and Felipe equated having papers with entitlement and superiority.

Furthermore, these examples demonstrate that Julissa and Felipe were learning their family’s conventions for referring to family member’s citizenship status by talking about papers (and therefore not mentioning migratory status explicitly) during the PFTFR routine. In Example Six, we saw that Laura’s expansion of Julissa’s talk about Dulce’s birthplace modeled an appropriate way of talking about migratory status (having or not having papers). Felipe’s talk in Example Seven shows that he employed a set of linguistic resources that he shared with his mother (most notably using the phrase I have papers) for indexing citizenship and relating it to his ability to participate in certain activities.

**Dulce plans for the future**

![Figure 14. Dulce Being Interviewed in her Bedroom](image)

After many months of listening to and observing the PFTFRs among the Mendez-Castro family members, I recorded an informal interview that I conducted with Dulce about her experiences as an undocumented migrant teenager living in the U.S. As I noted earlier, many of the PFTFRs were multi-party interactions that took place when other family members were present, making it hard to document long sequences of utterances by one interlocutor. I chose to conduct a one-on-one interview with Dulce in order to elicit the kinds of utterances that she expressed during naturally occurring PFTFRs, to more clearly record her ideas, and to ask her follow-up questions about her beliefs about citizenship (see Appendix A for the interview protocol). As I stated above, family members entered rooms of the house in patterned ways; in all of my visits, I only saw Laura and her daughters inhabit Dulce’s bedroom. By this point in the study, after several months of visits and with Laura’s permission, I was allowed to spend time in Dulce’s room as she and her sister completed their chores or homework. This interaction took place in May 2009 in Dulce’s bedroom (pictured above), right after she arrived home from school. I will examine two and a half minutes of sequential talk. I have divided the transcript into three sections in order to show how Dulce’s actions and stances encoded increasingly complex identities and activities as our conversation unfolded.
There are three ways in which the transcript presented below resembles or differs from the kinds of PFtFR exchanges that I have described above. One similarity is that the linguistic resources that Dulce utilized are typical of the pragmatic and syntactic constructions that her siblings used during the PFtFR. Second, this conversation took place entirely in English, thereby resembling sibling talk during the PFtFR while differing from adult—child interactions that usually took place in Spanish. In previous one-on-one conversations, Dulce spoke to me in English; this was true on this day as well. However, this dyadic interaction was markedly different from other PFtFRs because I mostly listened; I did not participate in the informal conversational manner that I observed between family members.

**Example Eight:**

**Sequence A:**

1. Ariana: Do you **think** that um (0.2) you will have all the same opportunities in the future.
2. Dulce: like as your brothers and sisters?
3. Ariana: Hopefully I will ((smiles and nods as she looks down))
4. Dulce: What do you want to do then, in the future?
5. Ariana: If I’m like, if I’m like, uh, if I get like papeles before I like graduate I’ll probably
6. just be like um, um, what are they called ((looks up)) If I’m not uh a like
7. computer, ‘cause I wanna be a comp- ‘cause I love computers, and I know
8. everything about them? and I wanna be like one of those persons that works with
9. computers. or if I don’t. I wanna…what are those people that like do hair and
10. everything called?
11. Ariana: Oh::: like um, I think they’re called estheticians=
13. Ariana: =beauty uh huh
14. Dulce: =cause there’s this like, there’s this school that you can go there and they give you
15. scholarships for that

I initiated this exchange by asking Dulce a question that I had heard her, her parents, and other adult family members discuss before—whether she would have the same opportunities as her brothers and sisters (lines 1 and 2). While the question presupposed that there were differences between Dulce and her siblings, it did not specify that they were the result of their citizenship status. In line 3, Dulce stated that she hoped to have the same opportunities as her younger siblings without specifying why she was uncertain she would encounter the same opportunities. It is worth noting that Dulce’s Obama t-shirt (see Figure 14) could be construed as a material sign of the Mendez-Castro family’s hopes that immigration reform was imminent; they often discussed *la reforma* (the reform) and their desire to gain amnesty under an Obama presidency. When I asked her what she wanted to do in the future (line 4), she began to explain that her future plans depended upon whether or not she got *papeles* before graduating from high school (line 5). Like other PFtFRs, this interactional sequence began without an explicit mention of migratory status, and yet the speaker quickly indexed her migratory status when talking about her ability or inability to participate in future activities.

In lines 5-9, Dulce explained that obtaining *papeles* before she graduated from high school would afford her multiple opportunities for postsecondary study in the U.S. At first, she hesitated and tried out two different ways of framing her response. She started with the
conjunction *if*, expressing uncertainty, coupled with the verb *to be*, communicating that this uncertainty was linked to her juridical state and identity (*If I am*, implying *If I am a citizen* in line 5). Dulce then completed the sentence with the phrase “if I get *papeles*…I’ll probably be.” She expressed her urgency using the temporal deictic *before* and indicating that she would have to obtain legal U.S. status soon (in the next four years) in order to pursue her educational and professional plans (line 5).

Dulce’s gestures and voice became increasingly animated as she described her possible career goals. She conveyed a positive affective stance as she talked about her desire to work with computers, stating, “I love computers” (line 7). However, her epistemic stance began to waver as she stopped referring to herself in the first person and began talking about “one of those persons who works with computers” or “those people that do hair” (lines 8 and 9). She also used vague language to describe the process of receiving a scholarship to go to a local cosmetology school, which would be necessary to enable her to attend (she would become an esthetician “cause” of the scholarships, in line 13). The pronouns *there*, *you*, *they* and the demonstrative adjective *this* communicated her uncertainty about two things: (1) the details of the process and (2) the idea that this course of study was actually a possibility for *her* (lines 13 and 14). As an undocumented student who needed to obtain legal resident status prior to high school graduation, Dulce could not take her participation in activities like studying and pursuing a career for granted.

**Example Eight:**
**Sequence B:**

16 Ariana: Um hm. So you said right now, that would be things you’d want to do if you got
17 papeles before you graduate. So what do you think will happen if you don’t?
18 Nancy: Dulce mom’s here ((calls from downstairs))
19 Dulce: I’ll just like work ((looks away and then back at me, shrugs her shoulders, frowns))
20 Ariana: Uh huh
21 Dulce: And then like, I just like. Like. Like. This is my plan ((wipes the left side of her face)), I’ll just like work and get money and then go to Mexico and live my life there and make a family ((rocks away from me))
22 Ariana: Uh huh
23 Dulce: If I don’t get married here ((rocks toward me)). That’s gonna be with a Mexican guy. That’s what I said I’m not gonna marry no one else. I’m not tryin’ to be racist? but ((rocks left and right)) Mexico=
24 Ariana: uh huh
25 Dulce: =like hh ya°.
26 Ariana: Why? What do you think- Why is it important to you?
27 Dulce: It’s important for me ((raising her eyebrows and looking into camera)) to marry a Mexican guy because like. I don’t know hhh because I come from Mexico?
28 ((shrugs her shoulders and laughs)) and I like Mexican people ((rocks back and towards me and wipes her right eye)).
29 Ariana: Ok, fair enough, fair enough ((laughing with Dulce))
Dulce’s stance and actions shifted as I asked her about what would happen if she did not get *papeles* before graduating from high school (lines 15 and 16). Her initial response in the simple future tense (“I’ll just work”) indicated with certainty that the only post-secondary option for an undocumented migrant adolescent in the US was to seek employment (line 19). Her body language (looking down and shrugging her shoulders) communicated Dulce’s resignation to this fact. For a moment, Dulce seemed to regain the confident stance that she had in lines 5 through 9 as she sat up straight and stated, “this is my plan” (line 22). But even here, her voice (lowered pitch and quiet tone) and actions (wiping her face and looking down), communicated that this was not her ideal plan. Her words and actions conveyed resignation and possibly shame at the idea of returning to Mexico without realizing her educational and professional goals.

Throughout this sequence, Dulce once again spoke in the first person (*I* and *my*). She seemed confident about the fact that this was her plan, indicating that she had previously talked and thought about these ideas. On afternoon and weekend visits to the Mendez-Castro home, I had the opportunity to listen to and observe similar planning conversations that Dulce participated in with her parents and uncles. She situated her plan within two deictic frames: (1) using *then* to signal a future of working, returning to Mexico, and starting a family and (2) using *there* to signal Mexico, where she would live her life in the aforementioned ways. Dulce described two very different plans depending on whether she got *papeles* in the near future: obtaining U.S. citizenship and pursuing a career (Sequence A, lines 5-10) or remaining a Mexican citizen and starting a family (Sequence B, lines 22-24). She portrayed these as mutually exclusive alternatives that depended upon her citizenship status. In line 26, Dulce communicated her understanding that one possible path for staying in the U.S. and gaining legal status would be to marry someone in this country. She imagined marrying a “Mexican guy” in the U.S. because of their shared cultural and national identity (lines 26-34). While she was wanted to maintain her identity as a member of a Mexican community living in the U.S. because is “from Mexico” and likes “Mexican people,” she did not want to return to Mexico to live.

**Example Eight:**

**Sequence C:**

37 Ariana: What do you think you have to do in order to get papeles before::: you graduate?
38 ((Dulce bites her nails))
39 Dulce: They ((furrows brow)) were gonna do this thing? like if you live here like more
40 than. like my ((points to herself)) parents like live like fourteen years? already
41 here. And they don’t have like. ((crosses her arm)) they never been in jai::l, they
42 always like pay the re::nt. And like now ((gestures with open hand)) we own a
43 hou::::se.
44 Ariana: Mm hmm
45 Dulce: And like that’s like ((rocks away from me)) the things they’re looking for ((rocks
46 toward me and sits up straighter)) for like people that actually deserve it=
47 Ariana: Mm hmm
48 Dulce: = and are d- doing good. That’s what they’re ((furrows brow)) saying
49 Ariana: Mm hmm. And is that the like thing that like, that people keep talking about like,
50 la reforma, reforma?
51 Daisy: Ah ha, mm hhm=
52 Ariana: Uh huh
Daisy: = like. like. they check ((glances left and right)) on all your records and if
you’re good and you’re actually doing good in here ((nods head)) they’ll give ‘em
to you =
Ariana: Mm hmm
Daisy: = and like my parents. Like been like. really good ((shakes head))
Ariana: Yah yah
Daisy: ((shakes head yes)) And so like now we own a house so that means like we’re
good and everything.

In the final section of this sequence, Dulce’s actions and stances conveyed her increasing
anxiety about getting papeles before her high school graduation. Dulce bit her nails (line 38) as
she listened to my question about how she would go about obtaining U.S. citizenship (line 37).
As she answered the question, she furrowed her brow, crossed her arms in defiance, and gestured
with an open hand as though she were firmly stating her case in an argument (lines 39-43). She
explained that “they” (possibly the government or politicians) were “gonna do this thing,”
indicating that the process of obtaining U.S. citizenship was out of her control and that the
process itself was quite ambiguous (line 39). Dulce’s use of temporal and locative deictics to
describe her family (“live here more than” in lines 39 and 40) qualified by number of years
(“fourteen years already” in line 40) indicated her understanding that obtaining legal resident
status is linked to one’s participation in US civic life. According to Dulce, when she and her
parents apply for US citizenship, they will be evaluated according to the amount and also the
kind of time that they had spent in the U.S. She explained why her parents, and by extension she
(pointing to herself in line 40), deserved consideration in the migratory reform. Since they have
“never” been in jail (line 41) and they “always” pay their rent (line 42) they have proven
themselves to be eligible for U.S. citizenship. Dulce summarized her justification by bringing us
back to the present; “now” that her parents owned a house they had proven that they deserved to
be granted citizenship (line 42).
In line 48, Dulce said “that they’re looking…” for “people that actually deserve it”
(where they is the government and it is getting papeles). Owning a house was the ultimate
indication of the Mendez-Castro family’s merit. The implication, of course, was that
undocumented migrants who do not own a home do not deserve to stay in the U.S. (and should
be deported). This was something that I heard Laura say when talking about immigration reform
on other occasions. As she finished making the case for why she and her parents deserve it, she
sat up straight as if someone were judging her posture (line 46). Dulce’s use of “they” (for the
government) and “my” and “they” (for her parents) erased her from the narration and rendered
her powerless in a situation that would determine her future.
In lines 49 and 50 I confirmed that the “thing” that Dulce is talking about was “la
reforma.” She affirmed my use of the phrase using a Spanish language affirmative “ah ha, mm
hmm” (as opposed to the English “uh huh”). This is an indication of the fact that she often talked
about these topics in Spanish with the adults in her family. In the final lines of the sequence,
Dulce explained the process of “la reforma” a bit further. As she reiterated that “they” will
“check on your records,” she glanced to her right and left perhaps as if someone were watching
her (line 53). Dulce explained that your records must indicate that you are “good” and “actually
doing good in here”—equating moral superiority (being good) with individual behavior (not
being incarcerated, having good credit, and most importantly, owning a home). Once an
undocumented migrant proved that they were good, they were eligible to receive “‘em”
(referring to the papeles, in lines 53-54). Dulce continued using pronouns that erased her from the narrative, until she concluded by stating that because her parents owned a house, it "means that we’re good" (line 60). She became part of the undocumented “we” that included her parents and, more importantly, she included herself in the “we” of good, property-owning migrants. This final statement reinforced Dulce’s identity as an undocumented migrant who, like her parents, was under strict surveillance within U.S. immigration and social policy but was also on the path towards citizenship because of her good behavior.

Our conversation marked Dulce’s identity within her family—on the one hand she was an undocumented migrant like her parents and on the other hand she was a student like her siblings. And yet, as the only undocumented student in her family, she had to have a contingency plan for what would happen if she didn’t get papeles in time to apply for college and financial aid in the state of Pennsylvania. Furthermore, she understood that getting or not getting papeles was a high stakes activity on which her entire future rested. Dulce’s actions and stances shifted dramatically as she considered her goals as a student in light of the uncertain reality that she faced as an undocumented migrant. These stances of excitement, uncertainty, and shame were encoded in Dulce’s talk. Dulce correlated citizenship to good behavior and the possibility of staying in the U.S. as something that had to be earned. She specifically stated that this privilege could be obtained based upon the one’s length of time in the U.S., a clean criminal record, good credit, and owning a home. She indicated that returning to Mexico was a backup plan that would happen if her ideal plan of obtaining U.S. citizenship did not occur (depending upon her behavior, her parents’ behavior, and government policy).

Discussion

During the PFtFR, the Mendez-Castro siblings demonstrated two things: (1) their awareness of the ways in which family member’s citizenship status shaped their daily lives and (2) their uptake of the family’s norms for competently talking about citizenship. Becoming a competent member of a social group involves the individuals’ acquisition of and adherence to the grammatical and social conventions for language use in a particular cultural milieu (Hymes, 1972; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984). Julissa, Felipe, and Dulce’s patterned use of verb tense, conjunctions, and deictic terms indicated that they learned a grammatical template for talking about the relationship between citizenship and behavior. Their talk about birthplace and papeles as an index of migratory status (as opposed to making literal reference to being a U.S. citizen or undocumented migrant) demonstrated that they adhered to a set of norms encoded in the family’s language use. Laura’s participation in the conversations accomplished at least two things: one, modeling the linguistic resources that her children learned and used; and two, ratifying her children’s responses thereby indicating that they were successfully participating in the PFtFR.

The Mendez-Castro siblings were being apprenticed into moral life-worlds (Ochs & Kremer-Sadlick, 2007) that were co-constructed by members of their family and that were also

---

9 There are currently ten states that allow undocumented students to qualify to pay in-state tuition for college if they meet certain criteria. The ten states include: Washington, California, Utah, New Mexico, Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, Illinois, and New York (Russell, 2007). Pennsylvania is not one of these states, making it prohibitively expensive for many undocumented migrant youth to attend college after graduating from high school (http://www.paimmigrant.org/programs/immigration-reform/dream-act).
shaped by immigration policies and juridical labels that originated far beyond the domestic sphere of the home. They were learning to be part of a “moral universe” that was actively being constructed through narratives that both organized and constituted their experiences (Ochs & Kremer-Sadlick, 2007, p. 8). The social landscape of the Mendez-Castro family was created as family members, like Dulce, moralized the juridical categories of citizen and non-citizen in day-to-day conversations that take place at home. García Sánchez and Orellana (2006) have shown how teachers socialize students and parents to future moral selves through institutional narratives shared during parent-teacher conferences. Drawing on Cole’s (2002) notion of prolepsis, they explained how teachers project an idealized image of the students’ future in order to encourage the kinds of behaviors that that students must demonstrate in the present if they hope to be successful.

Cole (2007) explained that throughout their child’s development, parents recount “information derived from their cultural past and, assuming cultural continuity (e.g., that the world will be very much for their daughter as it has been for them), parents project a probable future for the child” (p. 239). Through talk and narrative, parents project their own past experiences onto their child’s imagined future by expressing their plans for what their child’s experiences will be like. This socializes children into a family-specific worldview during the course of daily activities that unfold in the present. The PFtFR is an example of prolepsis in mixed-status families where undocumented parents and relatives’ everyday talk foreshadowed the ways in which their children’s distant and proximal futures would be shaped by their migratory status. Moreover, the PFtFRs presented here reveal the ways in which undocumented migrant and U.S.-born siblings took up this familial narrative and used it to imagine their own and each other’s futures.

As we have seen, each sibling conveyed his or her belief about the social status associated with being a U.S. citizen or undocumented migrant. Taken alone, each example only conveys the beliefs of one sibling, but examined together, they present a complex picture of a way of perceptions and discourses about citizenship were co-constructed by members of the Mendez-Castro family. In Example Six, Julissa expressed her understanding of the relationship between being born there (in Mexico) and not being able to travel there on a summer vacation. She understood that within her family, birthplace was correlated to a person’s ability to participate in certain activities. In Example Seven, we saw Felipe express a similar stance in converse terms. He asserted that because he had papers he had the right to go anywhere that he wanted. His words and actions communicated a sense of entitlement and privilege that was inherent in being a U.S. citizen. The family conversation about healthcare underscored the embodied risks faced by undocumented migrants; U.S.-born siblings were assured medical care and the ability to stay in the U.S. while undocumented family members were at risk not only of deportation, but also of falling ill without access to medical care. Dulce grappled with feeling proud of her Mexican identity while experiencing anxiety about whether she would be able to have the same future opportunities as her siblings and whether her parents’ behavior (and by extension hers) were good enough to earn them amnesty and grant them the permission to continue living in the U.S.

During the PFtFRs, siblings reconciled the tension between the experiences of undocumented migrant and U.S.-born family members. This constituted a “confrontation of systems of competency” (Hymes, 1986/2001, p. 68) between the family members’ schemas for conceptualizing kinship relations and individual agency and the immigration policies that directly shaped their realities. The systems of competency that were activated during the PFtFR
included: (1) the stable family unit versus the uncertainty of individual family members’ futures due to immigration policy and (2) an individual’s nationality or citizenship as it related to participation in the ongoing and future events in the family and in the larger society. The PFtFR was one of the times during which parents and older children talked about what was at stake in being an undocumented migrant or U.S. citizen.

Conclusion

There is a growing body of scholarship concerned with documenting the educational limitations placed on undocumented migrant youth living in the U.S. (Solorzano, 2009) and the formal policy changes needed to support local attempts to advocate for more equitable opportunities (Gonzalez & Kohli, u.d.; Rabin, Combs, & González, 2008). This chapter suggests that restrictive educational and immigration policies impact not only undocumented migrant students but also the family members they interact with on a daily basis. As we have seen here, the experiences of one undocumented student living in a mixed-status family actually impacts the identity formation of all of the siblings. And yet much of the research on the language and learning experiences of migrant and immigrant Mexican youth overlooks their role in familial settings (Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco & Todorova, 2008). Research that considers migrant children and youth in a complex sociocultural context has the potential to deepen our understanding of the learning experiences of that child as well as those of their family members.

In order to capture the richness of language use within a sociocultural milieu, Language Socialization (LS) scholars situate the individuals they study within a social context and the communities they observe within a historical framework. This chapter has shown how siblings’ language use provides insight into their understandings about their mixed-status family experiences and social status. As Hanks explained, “…deixis, both as a linguistic subsystem and as a kind of social act, is a social construction, central to the organization of communicative practice and intelligible only in relation to a sociocultural system” (1990, p. 5). The siblings’ use of deictic reference and other linguistic resources revealed how they positioned themselves within a complex social context defined in large part by kinship relations and immigration policy.

LS researchers have recently called for increasing attention to the historical factors that engender particular social and cultural practices as well as the ways that contemporary social policies shape language use and interaction in immigrant communities (Baquedano-López & Kattan, 2007). The ethnographic findings presented here document the material and discursive effects of immigration and education policies on language use and interaction among mixed-status siblings. This study hopes to offer insights into the ways in which daily interactions in mixed-status families are infused with members’ awareness of and concerns about their migratory status. The perspectives gained here may help us to become better prepared to document the impacts of macro policies on the situated cultural practices within Latino immigrant families and communities in the future.
CHAPTER SEVEN
Conclusion

This language socialization study has examined the experiences of four mixed-status Mexican families living in an emerging Latino community in Millvalley, Pennsylvania. This research has two units of analysis that are integral to language socialization: the process of language acquisition and the social and cultural context of learning (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008). The research questions posed in Chapter One focused our attention on two interrelated phenomena: first, the ways that a participants’ migratory status shapes his or her everyday experiences and second, the ways in which participants learn to index their own and others’ migratory status through talk.

In Chapters Two and Three, I outlined a theoretical and methodological approach to the ethnographic investigation of mixed-status Mexican families’ routine activities carried out in the domestic and public spheres. While there is a rich and growing literature on the educational, social, and linguistic experiences of Latino immigrants in the U.S., this is the first study to foreground participants’ perspectives on their own migratory status as the primary lens for understanding the language and cultural practices in Mexican families. Chapter Three outlined the genealogical approach that I employed to elicit and document parents’ and children’s relationships to family members living within and outside of U.S. borders. The data obtained using this approach rendered a portrait of the focal participants that closely resembles national trends in Mexican migration to the U.S. The four mixed-status families in this study shared key characteristics with the broader migrant and first-generation Mexican population, including: family composition, level of parental English proficiency and educational attainment, and occupation and socioeconomic status. These demographic qualities influence the social and educational development of children in mixed-status families (Gándara & Contreras, 2009; Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco & Todorova, 2008).

Chapter Four argued that Millvalley forms part of the New Latino Diaspora of the Rust Belt by showing that the city shares the same defining features of Southeastern and Midwestern parts of the Diaspora. The three characteristics explored in detail included the location of migrant communities in non-traditional settlement areas, the unique context of reception that migrants faced in those areas, and the range of formal and informal policy changes that have been implemented as a result of the shifting demographics (Hamann, Wortham & Murillo, 2002). Moreover, I showed that mixed-status families living in Millvalley retain and cultivate their connections to people and resources that are available in traditional settlement areas of the U.S. as well as in Mexico. The topography of trámites that I developed was informed by the focal parents’ narratives of migrating from Mexico to the U.S. and their accounts of where they found and continue to find economic and social support in a region that has not historically been home to a Latino community.

Chapters Five and Six closely examined two types of activities that occurred regularly in the homes of mixed-status families with undocumented children and adolescents. Using an analytical focus derived from the work of Elinor Ochs and William F. Hanks, I examined the linguistic, perceptual, and semiotic resources that the family members used to socialize one another to identities as Mexican migrants and U.S. citizens through everyday talk and interaction. Attending to these three resources was particularly important in the homes of mixed-status families where their language use, physical space, and meaning-making processes were shaped by the members’ varying migratory status.
Chapter Five explored the exchanges that took place in the Utuado-Alvarez and Marinero-Chavez families as the undocumented mothers and sons worked together to complete homework assignments. I found that homework completion routines (HCRs) were extended interactional sequences that included references not only to the homework document, but also to official correspondence sent home from school. The HCRs examined in this chapter took place in the spring, when the son’s report card was mailed home from the local elementary school, and included explicit discussions of the citizenship grade contained in the report card as well as implicit indexes of the son’s migratory status. In both families, the report card constituted an evaluation of their son’s behavior sanctioned by the public school. The arrival of the report card, and the attention it garnered within the HCR, prompted exchanges in which undocumented members evoked their migratory status as the focal lens through which their actions were assessed in school, home, and work settings.

Chapter Six presented the planning for the future routine (PFtFR) that routinely occurred in the Mendez-Castro family. This discursive event took place when family members and siblings talked about upcoming family activities and evoked their relatives’ migratory status in order to explain why they would or would not be able to participate in the plans. While the semiotic and perceptual resources employed in this routine varied, the linguistic resources employed by the parents and siblings were patterned and predictable. In fact, the siblings’ talk indicated that they had all learned a grammatical template for referencing the migratory status of their family members. The status that they ascribed to being a U.S. citizen or Mexican migrant was encoded in this grammatical template and was communicated in each instance of the PFtFR.

As Hymes’ (1986/2001) stated, and as my findings indicate, in order to understand a marginalized group’s culturally specific norms for appropriate behavior and language use within a particular social context, researchers must attend to participants’ experiences during a “confrontation between different systems of competency” (p. 68). During points of contact between the private (domestic) and public (schooling, travel, or healthcare) systems, mixed-status family members confronted varying norms about competence related to their experiences as U.S.-born or undocumented individuals. In these moments, parents and children demonstrated their understandings of the specific behaviors expected of citizens, the forms of participation available to those who have citizenship, and the appropriate ways for talking about citizenship status.

Chapter Five illustrated how the HCR created a point of contact between the school and the home definitions of citizenship. During this routine activity the mothers not only judged their son’s behavior, but they also imagined a series of potential consequences that could result from bad conduct. These consequences—being deported or relegated to working in low-skilled and low-status jobs—were not unlike the kind that the parents feared for themselves; they were quite different, however, than the consequences actually envisioned by the school authorities. These mothers literalized what the school intended to be metaphorical, conflating juridical status with behavioral norms. The PFtFR analyzed in Chapter Six occurred during points of contact between the rules governing who could participate in recurrent domestic activities and those activities that occurred in the public sphere. Dulce, like the mothers in the Utuado-Alvarez and Marinero-Chavez families, asserted that U.S. citizenship could be earned through good conduct; she also merged the juridical category of national citizenship with a set of normative expectations about how a good citizen should behave.

I’ll conclude this dissertation by sharing two examples of the ways in which documents that school staff sent home to parents created a confrontation between the different
understandings of citizenship, resulting in a communicative breakdown between adults in both spheres. These examples include a required form that parents must complete in order to volunteer in their children’s classroom and a letter sent home alerting parents to their child’s repeated absence from school. In discussions with school administrators and staff, I was told that these documents were intended to open up communication between teachers, guidance counselors, and parents in order to support students’ academic success, and in order to further parental participation in the child’s education. However, in observations and conversations at home with the parents, I witnessed how those documents had the adverse effect of deterring undocumented parents from participating in their child’s education in the specific ways sanctioned by the school. The better we understand the way such misunderstandings arise, the better researchers, policymakers, and practitioners can foster and document educational opportunities for undocumented students and their families.

The first example took place one afternoon in March 2009 when Laura Castro asked if I would translate the forms that she needed to complete in order to enroll her three-year-old son, Oscar, in the preschool program housed at Clearview Elementary School. She told me that she had asked her eldest daughters, Dulce and Nancy, to translate for her but they didn’t know how to correctly complete the form. Among the many forms that Clearview Elementary School mailed home in the school enrollment packet there was a letter addressed to parents describing the academic and extracurricular activities in which they were invited to participate. Enclosed with the letter was a Pennsylvania Child Abuse History Clearance form that the Millvalley Public School (MPS) District requires parents to complete prior to volunteering. While the letter explained that parental participation in school was optional, it was strongly encouraged. We read through the enrollment documents together, including the form reproduced in Figure 15.

![Image of PA Child Abuse History Clearance form]

Figure 15. PA Child Abuse History Clearance
I explained to Laura that she would have to submit this form if she wanted to volunteer in Oscar’s classroom. As I translated the form, Laura looked increasingly alarmed. I have circled in red the areas of the form that were possible sources of concern for Laura: the space for the social security number, the request for a processed criminal background check, and the need to list her previous addresses and household members. Laura was afraid of completing any forms that required a social security number because she had a false one; completing the form would risk exposing her undocumented status. The criminal background check required by this form would have to be conducted by the Pennsylvania State Police and out-of-state residents would have to be fingerprinted in addition to submitting to a background check processed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This was a scary prospect to Laura who knew that her migratory status would be immediately revealed and she would be susceptible to detention by law enforcement officials as well as deportation. Even something as seemingly mundane as listing all of her addresses and the people she’d lived with since 1975 would require Laura to name, and possibly implicate, the undocumented family members who had lived with her. When I was finished translating these items, Laura said “este no lo voy a llenar” (I’m not going to fill this one out) and set it aside.

While this Child Abuse History Clearance form and the friendly letter accompanying it was meant to encourage parental participation in school while protecting the safety of the children enrolled there, it had a very different effect on Laura. Instead of welcoming her into the school, the form scared her by aligning the school with law enforcement agencies that could jeopardize her ability to remain in the U.S. Laura wanted to be involved in her children’s education and came to the U.S. in large part to ensure that they had access to a high quality education, and yet the official mechanisms for enlisting her participation in their schooling actually undermined her ability to do so. There is no disputing the need to ensure the safety of children participating in extracurricular activities, but if educators and administrators want to enlist mixed-status families, they will have to identify other methods of establishing relationships with parents. At the very least, the incident with Laura calls into question accounts of immigrant parental involvement that assert Latino parents decline to participate in their children’s education because of a lack of interest in academic advancement (Valencia, 2002).

The second example was brought to my attention in January 2010 when I received an anxious voicemail message from Inés Chavez who had received a letter from the school. The letter was a document that is routinely sent home by school guidance counselors in the MPS District when a student has been repeatedly absent and the parents have not provided a note excusing the absence. Inés had received the letter because her eldest undocumented son, Pedro, had been absent from school on several occasions that winter. When I returned Inés’ call, I did not have a copy of the letter in front of me; however, I later requested a copy of the letter from Clearview Elementary School. The opening paragraph of the letter is reproduced in Figure 16.
Inés and I spoke on the phone at length as we tried to make sense of the letter together. I have circled and underlined key words in the letter that we talked about that afternoon. Inés’ main concern was the word illegal, and she couldn’t understand why the school had sent a letter referring to Pedro’s absences as illegal events. She also told me that the letter claimed that she might have to go to court and complete community service, penalties the letter states as possible consequences for parents who do not attend the “truancy elimination plan conference” mentioned in the first paragraph. I asked Inés to tell me if there was any other meaning that she could glean from the letter; instead, she passed the phone to Pedro and asked him to read it to me aloud in English. Once Pedro began reading the letter, I understood that it concerned his frequent absences from fourth grade. By the time he reached the end of the letter, I learned that the Clearview guidance counselor had sent it. Inés took the phone again and I summarized the letter in Spanish; she explained that she didn’t want to go to Pedro’s school for the meeting because she was scared that the guidance counselor would confront her about their undocumented migratory status.

Afraid to contact the school, and unable to have complicated conversations in English, Inés asked me to call the Clearview guidance counselor on her behalf to find out what the letter meant and what she needed to do. I reached the counselor and he explained that the letter was “no big deal”—it was just a formality that he was mandated to send out when students had missed school on multiple occasions. He told me to tell Inés that she didn’t have to come to school for a meeting; instead, all she had to do was send a note to school with Pedro explaining why he’d been absent. The guidance counselor asked me to encourage Inés to send Pedro to school regularly but reminded me that she should not worry about the letter. When I recounted this message to Inés, she told me how relieved she was. She assumed that the letter threatened to initiate a legal process that could have resulted in their being sent back to Mexico.

This example, like the previous one, indicates the disconnect between the way that school staff and undocumented parents interpret school documents sent home. This Official Notice of Illegal Absence contained language about legality and legal proceedings that scared Inés because it aligned school officials with law enforcement and immigration agents that she feared. The severe punitive language in the document, coupled with Inés’ fears about begin detained and/or deported, undermined the guidance counselor’s goal of ensuring that Pedro attended school. While Inés shared this goal, the truancy letter designed to lessen the gap between school and
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home only exacerbated it. The guidance counselor’s inability to foresee the fate of a document bearing the term *illegal* in a household saturated with anxieties about citizenship rendered his effort counterproductive. And Inés’ failure to contact the counselor could have exacerbated the counselor or teacher’s perception that she was an uninterested parent who did not value Pedro’s education.

Both of these examples illustrate how the language of citizenship was evoked in parents’ regular interactions with the school via documents sent home with their children or in the mail. As I implied above, the school guidance counselor and other school administrators and staff were entirely unaware of the connotation of citizenship in their correspondence. The teachers and the guidance counselor wanted to increase, not discourage, parental participation from migrant families, but, unaware of how these documents code within the home, their efforts were worse than ineffective. These micro interactions between home and school, and the communication breakdowns that ensue, can lead to deficit perceptions when teachers assume that low parental participation means that Mexican families don’t value education (Diaz Soto, 1997; Zentella, 2002).

I recently conducted an interview with the English as a Second Language (ESL) director for the MPS District where I mentioned the documents that I knew caused the most confusion in the homes of the families that I worked with. He responded in the following way:

> That’s good for me to know so that, as we look at beginning the school year next September, that the letter could be translated with the homework policy. … I’m going to um try and do some additional translations of things like that, explanatory wise...because it would, it would really be confusing for all the groups, not just the Latinos. Maybe it rings home there a little more because of the situation in a lot of the homes…

As his comments indicate, Ned Tieran was unaware of whether the language of the documents was even intelligible when they were sent home in English, let alone how the language was interpreted given the discourses of citizenship evoked therein. His response focused mainly on translating the documents from one language to another, overlooking the power that the documents have to convey particular social meanings in the context of migrant families’ homes.

In the previous examples, the merging of schooling and legal processes prevented undocumented parents from participating in their children’s education regardless of their language proficiency in English or Spanish. Tieran’s focus on the language in which the document is written, despite his admission that “the situation in a lot of the homes” of the Mexican students might shape the parent’s interpretation of the documents, further indicates that he attributes the miscommunication to an issue of language and not social context.

According to the 1982 U.S. Supreme Court decision, *Plyler v. Doe*, undocumented students have the right to a public education despite their parents’ decisions to enter the U.S. without legal permission (Petrinocolos & New, 1999). The decision, which intends to protect the anonymity of the families, also creates the condition for misunderstanding. Since public schools cannot inquire about a students’ migratory status, educators know very little about the experiences of undocumented students or their U.S.-born siblings. Without understanding the out-of-school contexts in which learning and socialization take place for students in mixed-status families, it is difficult to anticipate how parents and family members will interpret school practices.

With the recent passage of the SB 1070 in Arizona, educators will have to be even more careful about how their actions further marginalize undocumented parents and children from
participating in public institutions like schools. This policy has already resulted in such intense anxiety that Latino student enrollment has decreased dramatically as undocumented parents have moved out of the state for fear of being deported (Kossan, 2010). This fear has reverberated through New Latino Diaspora locations like Millvalley, causing mixed-status families to question whether they can trust public employees like teachers and school counselors. The recently televised conversation between a second grader and the First Lady, Michelle Obama (Condon, 2010), underscores a key finding in this study—the effects of migratory status resonate within families and children are aware of and talk about the realities of having or not having papeles. I have attempted to provide a more robust picture of how family members of all ages make sense of identities and spaces that are saturated with discourses of citizenship. I believe such research is essential if we are to understand how larger political and juridical processes influence individual experience, an understanding indispensable for educators and policy makers committed to identifying and addressing the needs of students in mixed-status families.
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Appendix A
Interview Protocol for Focal Undocumented Adolescents

I used the following interview protocol to interview the undocumented adolescents who participated in this study. I did not use this kind of protocol with the undocumented children or young U.S.-born siblings; instead, I elicited their ideas through conversations, play, and drawing.

I. Introduction
1. What do you think my project is about and why I come visit your family?

II. From Mexico to Millvalley
2. How old were you when you came?
3. How did you come? Do you remember crossing the border? Was all of that really hard?
4. When you were in Mexico, before you came, were you in touch with your mom? What was that like?
5. Why did she say that she had to leave you when she came?

III. Transitions and Schooling
6. What was it like when you first came, in terms of your relationship with your family members living in Millvalley?
7. What grade were you in when you came? Do you remember what that was like?
8. Were the teachers teaching all in English? Where there opportunities for you to speak Spanish?
9. In terms of your experience in school and socially have you ever been treated differently?

IV. Papeles
10. Part of what I’ve been observing when I visit your family is whether all of your family members know about papeles, specifically who has them or who doesn’t and why. Do you think everyone understands what that means?
11. If you had to explain to someone what the difference was between a person with papeles or without papeles, what it means to have them or not to have them, how would you do it?

V. Thoughts about Mexico and migration
12. Are there things that you watch on television, listen to in music, or see the computer that you feel represents Mexican-ness?
13. Do you miss Mexico?
14. Do you think it was worth it to come to the U.S.?
15. Why do you think people come to the U.S. and make such a difficult trip?

VI. The future
16. Do you think you’ll have the same opportunities in the future like as your brothers and sisters?
17. What will you do in the future?
18. What is the program that people keep talking about, la reforma?
19. Is there anything else you want to tell me about regarding the things I’ve been thinking about during this project?
Appendix B
Interview Protocol for Focal Parents

I. Demográfica General
1. ¿Cuál es su fecha de nacimiento?
2. ¿Cuál es tu estado civil? ¿Adónde vive su esposo/pareja?
3. ¿Cuántos hijos tienes? ¿Cuándo nacieron y cuántos años tienen? ¿Adónde viven?

I. General Demographics
1. What is your date of birth?
2. What is your relationship status? Does your husband/spouse live here?
3. How many children do you have? When were they born and how old are they? Do they live here?

II. Historia Pre-migratoria
5. ¿Dónde en México vivió antes de mudarse a los EE.UU.?
6. Porfavor, describe (nombre del lugar).
7. ¿Siempre vivió allí? ¿Dónde más ha vivido?
8. ¿Cuál fue el nivel de educación que completó antes de venirse a los EE.UU.?

II. Pre-migratory history
5. Where in Mexico did you live before moving to the U.S.?
6. Please describe the (name of place).
7. Did you always live there? Where else have you lived?
8. What level of education did you complete before coming to the U.S.?

III. Migración
9. ¿Puede describir su migración a los EE.UU.? ¿Cómo llegó a Millvalley?
10. ¿Qué la/lo motivó mudarse a los EE.UU.? ¿Y a Millvalley específicamente?
11. ¿Qué supo sobre los EE.UU. o sobre Millvalley antes de venir?
12. ¿Es lo que esperaba? Tiene acceso a las oportunidades que esperaba?
13. ¿Usted lo haría otra vez?

III. Migration
9. Can you describe your move to the U.S.? How did you arrive in Millvalley?
10. What motivated you to come to the U.S.? And to Millvalley specifically?
11. What did you know about the US before coming?
12. Is it what you expected? Have you had access to the opportunities that you hoped?
13. Would you do it again?

IV. Trabajo
14. Porfavor, describe su trabajo.
15. Porfavor, dime cómo se siente sobre su trabajo.
16. ¿Cuántos años ha trabajado en este lugar?
17. ¿Dónde ha trabajado en el pasado?
18. En el último año, ¿qué fue su ingreso total de su hogar antes de los impuestos?
19. ¿Ha calificado para recibir servicios sociales para mantener a su familia? ¿Cuáles? ¿Tenía acceso a ese tipo de servicio en México?

IV. Work
14. Please, describe your work
15. Please, tell me how you feel about your work.
16. How many years have you worked in this place?
17. Where else have you worked in the past?
18. Within the last year, how much did you earn, pre-taxes?
19. Have you been eligible to receive social services to support your family? Which ones? Did you have access to those kinds of services in Mexico?

V. Idiomas en Casa
20. ¿Qué idioma (s) se habla en su casa?
21. ¿Cambian entre español e inglés? ¿Cuándo?
22. ¿Qué observas sobre cómo los niños aprenden los idiomas?
23. ¿Usted habla o quisiera aprender inglés? ¿Porqué? ¿Cómo lo harías?

V. Languages at home
20. What language is spoken in your home?
21. Do you switch between Spanish and English? When?
22. What do you observe about how children learn languages?
23. Would you like to learn English? Why? How would you do it?

VI. Ciudadania en el hogar
25. ¿Cuál es la diferencia más grande entre sus hijos, los que nacieron en los EE.UU. y los que nacieron en México?
26. ¿Crees que usted trata a sus hijos (as) diferente por su ciudadanía?
27. ¿Usted quisiera ser un ciudadano estadounidense? ¿Usted quisiera que todos sus hijos fueran ciudadanos estadounidense? ¿Porqué o porqué no?
28. ¿Crees que sus hijos tienen conocimiento sobre el concepto de ciudadanía? ¿Porqué y cómo lo sabes?

VI. Citizenship at home
25. What is the biggest difference between your U.S.-born children and your Mexican-born children?
26. Do you think you treat your children differently as a result of their citizenship status?
27. Would you like to be a U.S. citizen? Would you like your children to be U.S. citizens? Why or why not?
28. Do you think your children are aware of the concept of citizenship? Why and how do you know?

VII. Actividades académicas y educacionales en el hogar
29. ¿Hay algunas actividades educacionales que hacen en el hogar?
30. ¿Cómo es la rutina de completar la tarea? Describir cuando ocurre y como. ¿Qué observa sobre el proceso de completar la tarea?
31. ¿Hay cosas que se llevan a cabo en el distrito escolar, la escuela o salon de su hijo (a) que los afecta en casa? Cuáles y cómo?
32. ¿Hay una relacion entre la escuela de su hijo y su decision de vivir en este vecindario? ¿Cuáles otras consideraciones tuvo acerca de la educacion de su hijo (a)?

VII. Academic and educational activities at home
29. Are there educational activities that you do at home?
30. How does the homework Soutine take place? Describe when it happens and how. What do you observe about the homework completion process?
31. Are there things that take place in the school district, school, or your child’s classroom that affect you at home? Which ones and how?
32. Is there a relationship between the schools and your decision to live in this neighborhood? What other decisions have you had to make about your child’s education?

VII. Communicación entre Padre y Escuela
33. ¿Cómo ha sido la experiencia suya y de su hijo (a) en la escuela?
34. ¿Usted participa en las actividades de la escuela? ¿Porqué o porque no?
35. ¿Usted asiste a las conferencias entre padres y maestros? ¿Porqué o porque no?
36. Porfavor, describa el tipo de comunicación que ha tenido usted con (los) maestro(s) de su hijo(a)?
37. ¿Ha escuchado que padres no han podido inscribir a sus hijos (as) en las escuela por ser indocumentados? ¿Qué piensa de esto?

VII. Parent and school communication
33. How has your and your child’s experience been at this school?
34. Do you participate in the school’s activities? Why or why not?
35. Do you go to parent/teacher conferences? Why or why not?
36. Please, describe the kind of communication that you’ve had with your child’s teacher.
37. Have you heard that parents have been having trouble enrolling their children in school because they’re undocumented? What do you think about that?

VIII. Terminos claves
38. He escuchado que usted habla sobre “tener papeles” y “tener un numero de seguro social”. ¿Cuándo habla de uno o la otra?
39. ¿Cómo se habla sobre ciudadania en México- se usa el termino de papeles? ¿O legal/ilegal?
40. ¿El termino ciudadania surge en su vida diaria? ¿Cuándo y cómo?
41. ¿Qué significa ser Mexicano o ser Americano?

VIII. Key Terms
38. I’ve heard you talk about “having papers” and “having a social security number.” When do you talk about one or the other?
39. When you talk about citizenship in Mexico- do you use the term papers? Or leal/illegal?
40. Does the term citizenship come up in your daily life? When and how?
41. What does it mean to Mexican or American?
Appendix C
Interview Protocol for Millvalley Public School (MPS) Teachers and Administrators

I. Introduction
1. What is your position at this school/in the district?
2. How long have you worked in this district?

II. Demographics
3. Tell me about the demographic changes you’ve seen in MPS.
4. Who are the ELL students at this school/in the district?
5. How is the social landscape changing in this historically immigrant city? How do you see this playing out in the schools?

III. Education- RIGHTS
6. Have issues related to undocumented migrants’ rights to enroll in school come up in the district?
7. Do you think parents have a sense of what their rights are?

IV. Education- EXPERIENCES
8. Do you think Mexican ELL students have the same educational opportunities as native English-speakers?
9. Are there issues/needs/strengths that are particular to the Latino/Mexican/immigrant population?
10. One of the big discussions in education is the concern that there is a mismatch between home and school learning and that this disconnect impacts students learning. Can you tell me how you see home/school relationships in your school/the district?

V. Education- POLICY
11. Tell me about the ESL restructuring that happened last year. How did the native-born and immigrant communities respond?
12. What consequences has this restructuring had?
13. Have there been other formal policy changes in ESL programming at your school/in the district?

VI. Language
14. Does anyone else besides you speak Spanish at this school/ in the central office?
15. How has that shaped your role?

VIII. Artifacts
The following school documents have puzzled the families that have participated in my study: report card, truancy letter, parent volunteer form, and homework. Can you tell me about the purpose of these documents and how they are shared with the parents? Have if you’ve ever talked to parents about these documents and gotten a sense of how they make sense of them at home?
### Appendix D
Focal Family Members Living in the U.S. at the Time of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Names and Relations</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medina-Castillo</td>
<td>Antonio Medina, father</td>
<td>near Cuernavaca, Mexico</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marilu Castillo, mother</td>
<td>near Cuernavaca, Mexico</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juan Medina, eldest son</td>
<td>near Cuernavaca, Mexico</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xotchil Medina, youngest daughter</td>
<td>Millvalley, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marinero-Chavez</td>
<td>Ignacio Marinero, father</td>
<td>Acapulco, Mexico</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inés Chavez, mother</td>
<td>Acapulco, Mexico</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedro Rios, eldest son</td>
<td>Acapulco, Mexico</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fani Marinero, middle child, sister</td>
<td>Millvalley, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hernán Marinero, youngest son</td>
<td>Millvalley, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendez-Castro</td>
<td>Oscar Mendez, father</td>
<td>Acapulco, Mexico</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laura Castro, mother</td>
<td>near Cuernavaca, Mexico</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dulce Mendez, eldest daughter</td>
<td>near Cuernavaca, Mexico</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy Mendez, daughter</td>
<td>Millvalley, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Felipe Mendez, son</td>
<td>Millvalley, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julissa Mendez, daughter</td>
<td>Millvalley, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oscar Mendez, youngest son</td>
<td>Millvalley, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utuado-Alvarez</td>
<td>Carlos Utuado, father</td>
<td>Chiapas, Mexico</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marta Alvarez, mother</td>
<td>Chiapas, Mexico</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>José Utuado, eldest son</td>
<td>Chiapas, Mexico</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Igor Utuado, youngest son</td>
<td>Millvalley, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E
Transcription Conventions

The convention system used in Chapter Five and Chapter Six includes the following codes that form part of the transcription system used in Conversation Analysis. The system was developed by Gail Jefferson in the 1970’s and has been adapted and expanded since that time (Schegloff, 2007).

( . ) “micropause”

, falling, or final intonation contour

? rising intonation

:: prolongation or stretching of the sound preceding them

_ stress or emphasis

[ a point of overlap onset

] a point at which two overlapping utterances end

CAPS especially loud talk

° talk following it was markedly quiet or soft

↑↓ sharper intonation rises or falls

(( ))) transcriber’s description of events

- cut off prior word or sound