A FRAMEWORK-IN-ACTION FOR RECONSTRUCTIVE ANALYSIS IN LANGUAGE AND LITERACY TEACHER EDUCATION

UMA ESTRUTURA ATIVA PARA A ANÁLISE RECONSTRUTIVA NA EDUCAÇÃO DE PROFESSORES DE LINGUAS E LITERACIDADE

Luzkarime Calle-Diaz[1], Rebecca Rogers[2]

[1] *Universidad del Norte (UNINORTE), Puerto Colombia, CO, Colombia*
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1459-8974
luzkarimec@uninorte.edu.co

[2] *University of Missouri (MU), Missouri, MS, United States of America*
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9163-8581
rogersrl@umsl.edu

Abstract: This paper aims to provide a framework-in-action, informed by Systemic Functional Linguistics, to inspire reconstructive discourse analysis in language and literacy teacher education, with illustrative examples and provocative questions. We exemplify the use of the framework through the analysis of a community mapping project. We analyze the curriculum documents, as well as a sample of a racially aware educator's community mapping project, through the ideational, interpersonal, and textual metafunctions, drawing relevant semiotic interpretations on the field, tenor, and mode. Findings highlight tensions in practice and possibilities for reconstructing curricular knowledge more deeply rooted in praxis that is intentionally transformative, context-specific, historically construed, and geopolitically sensitive. We pose a series of questions that educators can bring to bear on the discourse practices of teacher education. Whether one is studying texts, curricular documents, instructional dialogues, or policies, this framework-in-action provides tools and questions that may be useful for deconstructing whiteness and reconstructing anti-racism. It also situates teacher educators as agents of policy making and implementation who are able to reconstruct discursive practices to respond to pressing social needs in the context of literacy teacher education. The idea of a framework-in-action emphasizes the partiality of epistemological and ontological foundations and the need to connect our analyses in the social world in ways that make a difference.

Keywords: Reconstructive discourse analysis. Systemic functional linguistics. Literacy teacher education. Transformative discourse practices.

Resumo: Este artigo visa fornecer uma estrutura em ação com base na Linguística Sistêmico-funcional para inspirar a análise reconstrutiva do discurso na educação de professores de línguas e literacidade, com exemplos ilustrativos e perguntas provocativas. Exemplificamos o uso da estrutura por meio da análise de um projeto de mapeamento da comunidade. Analisamos os currículos, bem como uma amostra do projeto de mapeamento de comunidade de um educador racialmente consciente, por meio das meta-funções ideacional, interpessoal e textual, desenhando interpretações semióticas relevantes no campo, relações e modo. Os resultados destacam as tensões entre a prática e as possibilidades de reconstrução do conhecimento curricular mais profundamente enraizado na práxis, que é intencionalmente transformadora, específica ao contexto, construída historicamente e sensível geopoliticamente. Esteja alguém estudando textos, documentos curriculares, diálogos instrucionais ou políticas, colocamos uma série de questões que os educadores podem trazer para as práticas discursivas da formação de professores. Essa estrutura em ação fornece ferramentas e perguntas que podem ser úteis para desconstruir a branquitude e reconstruir o antirracismo. Ela também situa os formadores de professores como agentes de formulação e implementação de políticas capazes de reconstruir práticas discursivas para responder às necessidades sociais mais urgentes no contexto da educação de professores de literacidade. A ideia de uma "estrutura em ação" enfatiza a parcialidade das amarras epistemológicas e ontológicas e a necessidade de conectar nossas análises no mundo social de maneiras que façam a diferença.

INTRODUCTION

In this paper we provide a framework-in-action for reconstructive discourse analysis in teacher education with provocative questions and illustrative examples. We provide a conceptual and methodological foundation of reconstructive or 'positive' discourse analysis as it applies to language and literacy teacher education. In each stage of the framework-in-action, we provide examples from a reconstructive analysis we conducted of a curricular initiative (community mapping) meant to disrupt whiteness and center diverse literacies in our own teacher education classroom. We also pose a series of questions that analysts can bring to bear on the discourse practices of teacher education. We hope this framework-in-action serves as practical inspiration for teacher educators, agents of policy making and action researchers, to question teacher education discourse in practice. Whether one is studying syllabi, classroom interactions, student work in teacher education, curricular outcomes of a program, a job posting for Literacy Faculty, a DEI policy, or the Appointment, Tenure and Promotion (ATP) process for faculty, this framework-in-action provides tools and questions that may be useful for deconstructing whiteness and reconstructing anti-racism.

This framework-in-action for reconstructive analysis includes a seven-step path: 1) reflexively situating ourselves in the analysis; 2) building a theoretical framework; 3) casting our gaze as analysts: selection of materials; 4) posing the question/s; 5) analyzing discourse; 6) representing interpretations; and 7) considering uptake, new possibilities, and renovations. Each step is developed theoretically, as well as empirically, based on how we conducted the analysis of the community mapping project. Our purpose is to share our experiences as teacher educators and discourse analysts who have been part of the reconstructive 'turn' in Critical Discourse Studies (CDS). We believe this framework is equally relevant and applicable to language and literacy educators.

Reconstructive analysis – as we practice it – is rooted in Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) which has intellectual lineage associated with CDS. Section five in

this paper, particularly, provides an example of a detailed reconstructive discourse analysis. We hope that our contribution can serve as inspiration for teacher educators, helping us to exercise our agency as policy makers, with the possibility of disrupting whiteness and racism from the bottom-up.

1.   REFLEXIVELY SITUATING OURSELVES AS ANALYSTS

In 2018, we collaboratively co-taught a unit on community mapping to educators in a graduate literacy course at a public University in the Midwestern United States. Luzkarime Calle-Diaz is a researcher on the north coast of Colombia and identifies as a bilingual mestiza peace education educator. The semester of the collaboration, she was a visiting scholar at Dr. Rogers' University. Rebecca Rogers is a faculty member at the US-based University and identifies as a White, anti-racist Teacher Educator. The community mapping project asked teachers to learn about the literacy practices that exist within the community where they teach.

We rooted the project in our shared theoretical frameworks of multiliteracies (TRIGOS-CARRILLO *et al.*, 2022; ROGERS; TRIGOS-CARRILLO, 2017), critical discourse studies (BARTLETT, 2012; BLOMMAERT, 2005; MARTÍN ROJO, 2010; RESENDE, 2010), and anti-racism (LOVE, 2020; MATIAS, 2019). A systemic functional approach to language (EGGINS, 2005; HALLIDAY; HASAN, 1985; HALLIDAY; MATTHIESSEN, 1999; MARTIN; ROSE, 2003) provided a fundamental background to analyze and reconstruct teacher education discourse, based on how meanings are negotiated in everyday linguistic interactions. A central idea is that place is constituted through language and literacy practices in all of their multimodal variety (BLOMMAERT, COLLINS; SLEMBROUCK, 2005). That is, landscapes are semiotic texts presenting relationships between people, history, and context. Semiotic landscapes can be read – meanings ascribed to them – which, simultaneously (re) present new possibilities (e.g., CORRÊA, 1995).

For this curricular initiative, teachers spend several months engaged in a cycle of inquiry where they observe, interview, and conduct archival research to learn about community literacy practices. In this way, the assignment disrupts the normative tendency of whiteness that assumes all communities have similar histories, practices or that the literacies in white communities are superior. Yet, we wondered: How does

the assignment – and its epistemological foundations – reproduce and/or disrupt whiteness and coloniality in teacher education? How can we intentionally trouble the frameworks on which it rests? We problematized the theoretical and methodological basis of the endeavor using decolonizing frameworks (e.g., PATEL, 2016; SANTOS, 2015) and reconstructive discourse analysis (BARTLETT, 2012; CALLE-DIAZ, 2019).

We begin with this background to a curricular initiative in literacy teacher education to provide context, logic, and a lived example for our proposed framework. The Appendix provides more information about the original and revised assignment.

A first step into the analysis of teacher education discursive practices is understanding where we stand and from where we approach the analysis. Questions that analysts can ask to reflexively situate ourselves include:

- What are we positioned to know?
- From where did this knowledge base come?
- What happens when we dive deeper into our own intellectual roots?
- What are the theoretical, methodological, ethical shortcomings of this knowledge base?
- Acknowledging the continued whiteness of teacher education, what are our own entanglements with white supremacy?
- Given the predominance of white Teacher Educators, how do we imagine furthering our own interrogation of the self, disrupt terrorizing forms of whiteness, and work in coalition with Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) for collective liberation?
- What work have we done to expand and trouble the epistemological and ontological foundations of our scholarship?
- What coalitions are necessary to engage in this work?
- What do we want from our analysis?

2.   BUILDING A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: FROM DECONSTRUCTIVE TO RECONSTRUCTIVE ANALYSIS

Our analysis of the community mapping project had to be informed by our shared theoretical frameworks on Critical Discourse Studies. We started by making sense of our understanding of the distinctions between critical (deconstructive) and positive (reconstructive) Discourse Analysis.

Deconstructive and reconstructive discourse analysis can both be located within the traditions of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL); however, they differ in several important ways. Analysts are often drawn to critically oriented discourse analysis because we seek to promote emancipatory possibilities to participants through our analysis, revealing the inner workings of domination and ideology. Indeed, critically oriented discourse analysis provides a way to conceptualize how local practices are connected to institutional and societal narratives of domination and/or liberation. However, it has been argued that CDA has, for too long, focused on how oppression is discursively constructed. By way of contrast, a number of scholars have called for a focus on productive uses of power (BARTLETT, 2012; CALLE-DIAZ, 2019; MOSLEY; ROGERS, 2011; JANKS, 2005; LUKE, 2004; MACGILCHRIST, 2007; MARTIN, 2004; SCOLLON; SCOLLON, 2009). Martin (1999) encourages discourse analysts to broaden their coverage of discourse practices to those that "inspire, encourage, hearten; discourses we like, that cheer us along…This means dealing with texts we admire, alongside those we dislike and try to expose" (p. 51-52).

There are several ways to distinguish reconstructive or 'positive' varieties of discourse analysis from Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). In CDA, "critical" is defined in terms of a critique of how power is wielded over people in ways that sustain and reproduce inequities. Reconstructive approaches, on the other hand, set out to understand how power is used with people to accomplish social goals that lead to making the world a better place. Thus, the epistemological goals – critique versus understanding or in Luke's (2004) terms deconstruction versus reconstruction – are quite different.

Second, emphasis is placed on the constructive and generative nature of discourse practices and the dialectic between structure and agency, liberation, and oppression. This shift in emphasis does not ignore the materialist effects of discourse practices but seeks to understand the "ground up" processes associated with alternative discourses.

Third, while both perspectives draw from diverse methodological traditions, reconstructive approaches signal an analytic shift in focus from domination to liberation. These moments are not identified on behalf of those who are oppressed – as is the case with CDA – but by participants because of the trajectories and uptake of their practices. In this sense, there is an ontological difference. That is, those working with reconstructive approaches seek to understand the participants' sense of reality as they identify moments of transformation, learning, change and becoming. Analytically, reconstructive approaches might be closely aligned with longer-term projects, especially ethnographic varieties which aim at understanding texts in context as they emerge and transform, over time (ROGERS, 2018).

Previous scholarship has made a case for a number of dimensions important in any reconstructive analysis: context, reflexivity, social action, and orientation toward inquiry (ROGERS, 2018). Likewise, Bartlett (2012) outlines the debate between CDA's focus on dominant discourses and Positive Discourse Analysis' (PDA) focus on liberatory discourses. He makes the case for a focus on *emergent discourses* that occur between the space of liberation and oppression. The discourses that construe tension and offer the possibility of wiggle room for broader social transformation. This challenges the false dichotomy of 'positive' and 'negative' discourses. This is the tension we brought to our analysis of the community mapping project.

Analysts might consider the following questions when balancing deconstructive and reconstructive analyses:

- What emergent discourses, within the community of practice, hold potential for social transformation?
- What analytic frameworks can help to unpack and deconstruct liberatory discourse?
- What are the dominant and resistant discourses within the social practice being explored?
- What are the dominant analytical and theoretical frameworks for deconstructive and reconstructive analysis and where do they come from?
- What synergistic methodological and theoretical traditions might we bring together to foreground diverse traditions of thought?

Reconstructive discourse analysis as an approach within Critical Discourse Studies is, itself, being renovated. Many of the leading scholars are from outside of the United States and the tendency is from the Global North (e.g., BARTLETT, 2012; LUKE, 2004; MACGILCHRIST, 2007). Thus, seeking out scholarship in allied fields that centers alternative epistemologies is central in the advancement of this approach.

3.   CASTING OUR GAZE AS ANALYSTS: SELECTION OF MATERIALS

One of the theoretically informed decisions we ask as critical discourse analysts is: which materials will be analyzed? There is a dilemma in the idea of choosing 'positive' discourses because of the risks in downplaying structural and systemic oppression in its celebration of the 'positive' (ROGERS; MOSLEY, 2013). Blommaert (2005) notes that participants are often pushed out of the way with CDA.

The notion of tensions between liberation and oppression is a useful starting point for a reconstructive analysis. Bartlett (2012) argues,

> "the goal, therefore, is to seek out those areas of productive tension that break down the insulation (Bernstein, 2000) between hegemonic and renovatory discourses and allow for the development of localised hybrid discourses in which seemingly antagonist participants can collaborate as a first step in a wider-reaching change: polyphony as opposed to a one true ideology; evolution as opposed to revolution" (p. 217).

Analysts might consider the following questions when gathering materials and choosing a focus for their reconstructive analysis:

- What practices (e.g., assignments, pedagogies) have literacy educators indicated are transformative in their learning and practice?
- What tensions can be identified in materials that can be the focus of reconstructive analysis?
- What materials will be included and excluded? Why?
- What are the histories, circulation, and intertextuality of these materials?
- What interactions, practices, and policies are comfortable and why? How do we trouble the practices with which we are comfortable?
- How do the materials (or policies) perpetuate and/or disrupt whiteness and racism?

Community mapping has a curricular presence in literacy teacher education in the United States (e.g., BLOOME; ENCISO, 2006; DUNSMORE; ORDOÑEZ-JASIS; HERRERA, 2013; JACKSON; BRYSON, 2018; LOPEZ, 2020; ORDOÑEZ-JASIS; JASIS, 2011). Likewise, it has become a notable assignment in our graduate program for preparing literacy educators. Indeed, in our course evaluations, the community mapping project is often mentioned as a memorable project that resulted in new learning about diverse literacies and the role of family and community in facilitating sustaining educational literacies. Consider the following feedback from two white, racially aware educators about the community mapping project.

> Quote 1: The community mapping project, I still go back to and talk about with educators. So, they know more of the background and the assets available in our community. It has been powerful in helping me to define literacy more broadly than I think systems and structures want us to do or set us up to do. (TEACHER'S FEEDBACK)

> Quote 2: I am struggling with the idea of what I am thinking of as being a tourist to poverty. I drove through a few neighborhoods where I did not feel safe stopping. More than that, I felt that it was not my place to be there. Our school has done home visits in the past and for that I felt better about going into any neighborhood because I felt I had a truer purpose to make a connection with someone living there. For this project, I am not sure. (TEACHER'S FEEDBACK)

These are representative selections of teacher feedback and highlight the problematics and possibilities of (disrupting) entitlement of mapping as a social practice as experienced by participants. Thus, a useful starting point for further analysis. It is important that the focus of the reconstructive analysis be informed by participants who experience and can shape these practices.

To explore these tensions more deeply, we gathered the following sources of data[1]: the assignment description along with a sample of a white, racially aware educator's mapping presentation and reflections recorded in an interview. We also drew on curricular renovations that we made as a result of this analysis.

4.   POSING THE QUESTIONS

---

[1] Data for this paper were part of a larger research project which received Institutional Review Board approval.

When posing the questions, we recommend that analysts locate discourse practices – at interactional, institutional, or societal levels – that hold the potential for disrupting whiteness and racism. The questions driving the analysis might embrace the tension and wiggle room in discourses that can accrue toward social transformation.

When analyzing the community mapping project, for example, we wondered:

- How does the assignment/curricular practice/policy – and its epistemological foundations – reproduce and/or disrupt whiteness and coloniality in teacher education?
- How can we intentionally trouble the frameworks on which it rests?

Posing essential questions is fundamental to guide the analysis towards a reconstructive approach. That is, moving past critiquing and unveiling the discursive contours of whiteness and coloniality, and emphasizing on transformation and change.

5.   THEORETICALLY INFORMED DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Ahmar Mahboob (2020) distinguishes between narrow and broad PDA. They both include focusing on 'discourses that inspire' but the analytic focus differs. Narrow PDA, according to Mahboob (2020), emphasizes a linguistic analysis whereas broad PDA focuses on the purpose of the discourse. In our experience, this is a false dichotomy because we - and others - have argued for a linguistic analysis within context both of which emphasize the purpose and function of discourses. Our approach to reconstructive analysis unites the broad and narrow focus.

Our study of discourse practices is rooted in systemic functional linguistics (SFL) which positions language users as agents, making choices about what they represent (e.g., MARTIN; WHITE, 2005). The analyst studies how these choices function to accomplish social work. Critical discourse analysts are interested in what people *do* with words, texts, and images and what these semiotic systems do to them. We call on the tools of Systemic Functional Linguistics which are described more in Table 1.

Table 1 - Categorization of SFL metafunctions and linguistic features analyzed

Contextual Variable	Metafunction	The Work of Language	Linguistic features analyzed
Mode/ Genre	Textual	Presenting messages as text in context	Channel of communication: mode and medium (oral, written, visual, multimodal)
Field /Discourse	Ideational	Representing experience	Content or subject matter and social action Lexical choices associated with what the text is about (theme, cohesive relation, information)
Tenor / Style	Interpersonal	Enacting social relations	Roles and relationships represented in the texts (agentive relation, social, relation, social distance) Positioning and evaluation of the people involved in the context situation (attitude, engagement, affect) (mood, modality, etc.)

Source: Elaboration of the authors, 2022.

Some questions for analysts to ask when analyzing *field, tenor and mode* are:

- What themes are intentionally included or excluded in curricular, pedagogical, or policy choices in literacy teacher education? Why?
- What is the function of discourses within curricular, pedagogical or policy practices?
- How are my students and I positioned by language in the course curriculum, assignments, assessments?
- What type of relationships or interactions are promoted in the texts we use (teacher-students, students-materials, students-students, students-sociocultural context, etc.)? What language features help to establish these relationships?

- What verbs and lexical choices are we using when creating or choosing our texts? How does this language position the people involved?
- Who is being visibilized or invisibilized / advantaged or disadvantaged by these texts?
- When and how are students' voices included in texts, curricular documents, instructional dialogues, and policy?
- What channels and modes are we favoring (written / oral / multimodal - Standard English language, bilingual, etc.)? Are these modes helping to culturally sustain and emancipate students' literacy backgrounds and histories?

We have analyzed the curriculum material looking for information about *field*, *tenor*, and *mode*. First, we looked at what is happening in the texts, that is, what processes, events or experiences are present and how language shapes those experiences. Then, we analyzed the nature of the participants, who is doing what in the context of the task, the role of language in representing speech roles, attitudes, and social identity. Here, we particularly focused on the appraisal system (MARTIN; WHITE, 2005) to look at how the interpersonal dimension unfolds through the discursive moves present in the texts. Finally, we briefly analyzed the symbolic organization of the text, and its function within the task.

The field of the community mapping project refers to the ideational dimension, the experiences, processes, and events that are represented in the texts associated with the assignment. The community mapping (CM) task presents four main curricular documents: 1) a description of the assignment, which is presented in a table that contains multimodal discourse, images on the left-side columns, and detailed instructions on the right-hand column. The instructions on the left help students walk through what they are expected to do, and includes hyperlinks to course material such as, readings, samples of community mapping, and the other curricular documents that make up the project. 2) A suggested timeline to carry out the project, in which the teacher sets up spans of time, as well as specific instructions for students to follow so that they can complete their CM throughout the course. 3) A template for recording community mapping activities, which is a two-column table with the steps of the assignment on the left and blank cells on the right for students to record specific

procedures including the # of hours spent, notes and photos taken, reflections and insights about each step. 4) An assessment rubric that contains the criteria the teacher will follow to grade the assignment.

Some of our findings in the *ideational* dimension of the assignment include:

- Verb processes found across the assignment might perpetuate colonizing practices: mapping the community, framing the community, asset-based framing.
- The task is very well structured, with step-by step procedures that students need to follow.
- Instructions are not negotiated. The teacher chooses stages, mode/channel for presentation, assessment criteria, and timeline.
- The required reading list privileges white scholars of the Global North. The reading list does not specifically address the place specific conditions of institutional racism and links to experiences of family poverty, educational disparities, and access to health care.

The interpersonal/tenor in the community mapping project refers to the interactive function of the language. It analyzes the role the participants take in the interaction through language. In this analysis, we investigated how the teacher, and the students are positioned through language in the curricular documents. We also analyzed how communities are being represented through discourse in one community mapping sample.

Engagement is one component of the interpersonal domain and in this community mapping task, it is mainly heteroglossic. Instructions are of two types: second or third person, commonly using modals ("you will identify a neighborhood"; "some questions that may guide your inquiry"; "you may submit your project earlier"; "you should begin"); and imperatives ("analyze some of your data"; "read the rubric"; "watch short video").

A set of verbs used in the assignment position communities as objects to be scrutinized. Some examples are *scout*, *observe*, *document*, *collect artifacts*, *photograph*, *video tape*, *meet and talk to community informant*s. In the assignment, only positive *judgment* towards the reading material of the course (which can be used for inspiration) is available. The rubric, on the other hand, includes some qualities that

students need to look for in their projects and presentations to earn all points needed. Adjectives such as *clear* (rationale and logic, boundaries, use of template), *sensible outline*, *thoughtful analysis*, are used to assess students' work. One particular descriptor is worth of attention: Framing of the community throughout the presentation is 'asset-based'; Community is sometimes framed in deficit language/categories. This, we understand, looks to highlight community literacies as valuable, however, the use of asset-based might also be interpreted from a colonizing point of view, as assets are usually associated with business and capitalism.

Mode refers to the channel and medium in the community mapping project. The instructions for the assignment are multimodal. They include icons for each stage of the process, as well as hyperlinks to different sources that will help students carry out each one of the stages. They favor the written language as this is an online course. Texts in curriculum materials follow a chronological organization, which serves to provide a logical structure and support for students to carry out the task. Use of imperatives and the second person singular is generalized across the task for instructions (dialogic). The task uses academic standard English.

6. SFL-INFORMED ANALYSIS OF A SAMPLE COMMUNITY MAPPING

Turning to one example of a white, racially aware educator's community mapping project, we sought to understand how *field*, *tenor*, and *mode* are at work in her presentation focused on her students' inequitable access to playgrounds. Enolla (pseudonym) is an early childhood educator who teaches in a neighborhood public school on the South side of the city which serves a diverse student population. The school includes roughly equal numbers of white students, African American students, and students from the Global Majority. A white woman, Enolla, is attuned to privilege and racism and often engaged in a critique of district policies and mandates and how they disserve Students of Color and a reorientation of creating space for best practices. For example, she worked on creating more culturally responsive writing instruction at her school. Her narrative style – both in writing and speaking – often included confident assertions of her professional wisdom rooted in rethinking, questioning, indeterminacy. We chose this teacher's sample to highlight because of the tensions she experienced with this project. Unlike other educators, she found it important to do quite a bit of

background reading and research before locating a point of inquiry for the community mapping project. Knowing her interest in the role of play in early childhood education, we recommended an article about disparities in access to playgrounds (ARROYO-JOHNSON, *et al.* 2016) and also a TED Talk by Hunter (2015) focused on "Lucky Zipcodes."

Fig. 1 Example of a community mapping project[2]

Driving Questions

What access do children have to free play opportunities in their neighborhoods including playgrounds/parks, pools, libraries, and community centers?

Is there a pattern in the quality/ use/ access to these services?

What are the perceptions of parents and students in regards to access/ quality to these services?

Access to Play and Equity

- Still Separate, Still Unequal: Social Determinants of playground Safety and Proximity Disparities in St. Louis (Johnson, et al. 2016)
- Voting For Play: The Democratic Potential of Progressive Era Playgrounds (Peterson, 2004)
- The Democratic Playground (Sutterby, 2017)
- An Illustrated History of New York City's Playgrounds (Aberg-Riger, 2019)
- What's Wrong with America's Playgrounds and How to Fix Them (Interview with Joe L Frost) (Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois, 2008)
- Unlucky Zipcodes, Ted Talk (Hunter, 2015)

Playground Rating Map (Arroyo-Johnson, et al. 2016)

This map rates playgrounds according to safety in regards to playground equipment.

If you look closely as it correlates to race, you can see that the majority of high and medium rating playgrounds are located south. You can also see there is a greater number of parks overall south. Parks north of Delmar are generally low or medium rated.

While this rating is on equipment safety, in my driving, it can generally be correlated to overall safety and use of the parks in a general sense.

Child A- North of Delmar

Fairgrounds Park and two corner parks

Child B- Central

Lafayette Park

Child C- South

Lindenwood Park

Overall Implications

- Equity is a major issue. One would think St. Louis having more than 60 parks is amazing. Most of the playground equipment I saw was in good shape. The parks themselves were somewhat different in their feeling of safety as perceived by myself in my observations and as perceived by the families I questioned.
- The issue is still a Delmar Divide issue as far as parent responses indicated as well as the research I found. This speaks to the institutional racism that we have learned about in class and is so eloquently spoken of in Hunter's Unlucky Zipcodes Ted Talk.
- Even though there is inequity when it comes to access, and quality of services, there are bright, vibrant neighborhoods that are working for change all over the city.

Reflections

- I struggled with a clear focus for awhile with this project until I found the article about the history of playgrounds in New York City.
- I am struggling with the idea of what I am thinking of as being a tourist to poverty. I drove through a few neighborhoods where I did not feel safe stopping. More than that, I felt that it was not my place to be there. Our school has done home visits in the past and for that I felt better about going into any neighborhood because I felt I had a truer purpose to make a connection with someone living there. For this project, I am not sure.
- The state of our children's access to play is something that needs to be thought of more deeply. If children do not have the opportunities to simply play, how is that impacting their whole development?
- Several students said the same thing, "I love the playground. I make new friends there." All kids need to be able to say that.

Source: Participant teacher artifact, 2018.

Figure 1 includes images taken from Enolla's community mapping project. Looking at the *field* or ideational dimension in Enolla's community mapping sample (see fig. 1), we found that she focuses her investigation on children's access to

---

[2]This figure shows samples of slides included in a sample community project by a White, Early Childhood Educator in a mid-western US university.

playground facilities. She rests her decision on scholarship that argues that "[p]laytime-especially unstructured, imaginative, exploratory play- is increasingly recognized as an essential component of wholesome child development" (FRUMKIN; LOUV, 2007. p. 2); and limiting children's outdoor play harms their cognitive, social, and language development (FROST, 2008). She poses the following question: The state of our children's access to play is something that needs to be thought of more deeply. If children do not have the opportunities to simply play, how is that impacting their whole development?

Enolla centers questions about equity. She includes three driving questions in her project: the first one focuses on children's access to free play opportunities; the second one centers on the pattern in quality, use and access to these services; and the last one inquiries about the perception of parents and students about this issue. Her photos focus on the idea of differential access to playgrounds. Key here is the idea that place - in this example, playgrounds – are constituted through semiotics (the availability, composition, location, quality) and, in turn, semiotics (how this is represented in the presentation) constitute place. She includes images of three playgrounds at different geographical locations that are known for contrasting racial outcomes. Yet, she does not engage specifically with systemic racial violence in different geographical areas (e.g., inequitable access to health care, familial income, death by gun violence, pay rate of teachers in schools).

Images of maps highlight the central concentration of the city parks, in contrast to the peripheral location of schools' students. The playground rating map particularly demonstrates that playground safety correlates to race. Parks located in zones traditionally inhabited by African Americans communities are medium or low rated. By focusing her research on access and equity in the use of city parks, she is making relevant connections to larger social, historical, and material conditions that impact the quality of life of her students.

She included students' and parents' voices in her research, using a questionnaire. Poverty, access to resources, unsafety and violence are some of the patterns found in their responses, especially in the cases of families living in vulnerable areas of the city. There is also a de-emphasis on linear narratives in her mapping project. She does not make grand claims, nor does she consider the historicity of each of the playgrounds in relation to racial violence encoded in systems.

Turning to the *tenor i*n Enolla's community mapping, we see how the community mapping project of this teacher contains different cues for the interpersonal discursive dimension. We hear the teacher's stance as an educator in the slide called "Driving questions" and "Methodology." She makes decisions in terms of the questions that will guide her inquiry, including what she considers is relevant to her students (free play opportunities, access and quality to these services). The methodology chosen also speaks of her interest in including students and parents' voices in her search. This can be later connected to the struggles she faces as an "outsider" to the community.

Judgment is evident in how parents perceive playgrounds and parks in the north part of the city. They are associated with danger. Parents say, "*bad stuff* happens there." Teacher supports this with her own research acknowledging that "equity is a *major* issue." She perceives access to playgrounds in a very positive way (St. Louis having 60 parks is *amazing)* and there is also positive appraisal towards communities who are working for change (there are *bright*, *vibrant* neighborhoods).

She ends with significant reflections on her role as an outsider of the community (see Figure 1). She positions herself as "a tourist to poverty," a *tourist*, which is loaded with entitlement and outsider status; to *poverty*, deficit framing the community, even though the assignment called for a positive (asset-based) approach. We can hear her struggle for finding a justification, "a truer purpose" for this project. She felt it was "not my place to be there." This speaks of the tensions brought about by this assignment. Even though it aims at disrupting white-washed understandings of community literacies, the teacher still feels she has no purpose for going into the community, as an outsider, and making connections to their essence.

Here, we hear her entanglements with entitlement at the expense of the respect and dignity of People of Color who live in the community she maps. She writes, "I drove through a few neighborhoods where *I did not feel safe* stopping." She falls into the racially loaded language of not feeling safe which is, in part, because she is not from the community. She falls back into binaries (safe/unsafe), even though one of the purposes of the assignment is to demystify stereotypes about print-rich/lack of print, safe/unsafe, wealthy/poor. Reconstructive analysis of this kind of discourse should inform decisions about curriculum and pedagogy changes in teacher education practice, as described in the Uptake section of this paper.

In terms of *mode* in Enolla's community mapping, we see a combination of text and image, following the stages and structure suggested by the assignment. The text is dialogic as it includes the reader in some statements (if you look closely…). The channel includes orality when the student presents her project through a VoiceThread video (not included in this analysis).

7.   REPRESENTING THE INTERPRETATIONS AND SITUATING THEM WITHIN THE FIELD

Our analysis of the mode, field, and tenor of the community mapping assignment and the uptake by a teacher provided us with the vantage point to positively praise the disruption of normative schooled literacies and to reasonably describe the stronghold of whiteness in well-intentioned curricular initiatives. We know semiotic landscapes provide a dynamic way of understanding how semiotics represent and reflect places (CORRÊA, 1995). Yet, the landscape that has been constructed has been truncated in its possibility. In part, because it has failed to keep pace with BIPOC scholars who have offered counter-narratives of this activity.

Scholars have pointed out the problematics of mapping as colonizing practice. Kinloch (2009) offers 'storying' communities as an alternative metaphor. Recognizing the power stories have when they are told by communities, San Pedro and Kinloch (2017) have urged scholars to humanize and decolonize research approaches so that they do not sustain *otherness* and oppression towards people but, on the contrary, "value stories, dialogic listening, and self-determination" (p. 4). In analyzing a sample of community mapping, we have been able to observe the repeated practice of retelling a story from an extractive approach to educational research (SAN PEDRO; KINLOCH, 2017). How can this assignment be infused with elements that break the cycle of coloniality of literacy and culture? How can we counter the dominant trend of retelling BIPOC community stories as our own?

When facing a similar carrefour in conducting Participatory Action Research, Tuck (2009) turned to Indigenous epistemologies for an answer and proposed four vantage points to revision action and change: sovereignty, contention, balance, and relationship. In a similar vein, Watson and Marciano (2015) invited literacy researchers to reconsider research methodologies that focus on the researcher and turn to social

participatory methods that emphasize on culturally relevant ways of reimagining literacy product and practice, as well as on possibilities of complicating notions that favor the educational status quo. In an assignment like community mapping, are there spaces for the inclusion of literacy epistemologies that can result from storying and dialoguing with community members? Can we make room for different understandings of literacy practices; different modes, media, and channels for organizing and presenting discourse? Could we challenge static notions of curriculum, assignment, assessment, literacy?

All in all, there is a push-pull, wiggle room, tension in the field of literacy teacher education about the practice of community mapping itself. At the same time, it is being used in some courses at some universities, a similar initiative is being critiqued and restoried at other universities.

Questions analysts might ask are:

- What role have the researchers, dominant ideas in the field, and academic conventions played in the process?
- Have these considerations silenced or dismissed other ways of making sense?
- Whose voices have been included or ignored?
- What dominant ways of thinking have been sustained, challenged, questioned, or extended?
- Does the scholarship present global knowledge and how?
- How does this (re)presentation help scholars or practitioners to understand that was formerly invisible, ignored, or unexamined?
- How is representation itself an example of hegemonic versus global perspectives (e.g., linear versus circular representations; print-centric versus visual centric findings, etc.)?

8.   UPTAKE, DESIGNING NEW POSSIBILITIES, AND SOCIAL ACTION

How might discourse analysis contribute to social action, intervention, and uptake? These are ongoing questions for CDA practitioners. Particularly in light of criticisms about the non-intervention stance of critically oriented discourse analysis

(e.g., TOOLAN, 1997; KUBOTA, 2015). There are several possibilities for social action ranging from the view of studying discourse practices as an action to integrating intervention into the life of the inquiry, to putting the findings to work in the public sphere. Indeed, context is an important dimension of understanding uptake and social action.

Bartlett (2012) criticizes both PDA and CDA that are conducted out of context. He writes,

> "[i]n other words whereas CDA and PDA view power as unitary and oppositional phenomenon, each focusing on different poles of this opposition, the view taken here is that the workings of power as a diverse and multifaceted phenomenon reveal tensions that can be productive in providing the wiggle room within which a collaborative practice can be mapped out as spaces of resistance open up within the dominant order, third spaces where dominated and dominated come together" (p. 217).

Questions for the analyst to ask about the role of uptake, designing of new possibilities, and social action might be:

- What changes are needed in course materials (curriculum, assignment instructions, assessment tools, etc.) to center the knowledge of BIPOC scholars?
- What might the transfer from teacher education to practice tell us about the uptake of the assignment in ways that can lead to more authentic engagement with children, youth, and families in communities?
- What complementary analytical frameworks may be useful for participants in these social practices?

As a result of these analyses on the community mapping project, we infused criticality and globality into the readings and assignments throughout the course. This included: a demonstration of a Podcast conversation between the Authors of this paper, where we discussed multilingualism and global literacies; the integration of readings from Scholars of Color that break open the idea of learning about/with communities; and a revision of the assignment materials. The Appendix shows some of the renovations made to the assignment. These, too, are open for continual critique and reconstruction. Looking now, for example, we see the omission of scholars from

the Global South and an exclusion of Indigenous perspectives and knowledge with regard to the concept of place (e.g., TUCK; YANG, 2012). Ultimately, we learned that many of the graduate students in the courses had a firm foundation of culturally responsive and sustaining pedagogies grounded in values of diversity, inquiry, and voice. This praxis could be extended with a more nuanced approach to storying the literacies within communities (e.g., KINLOCH, 2009; WATSON; BEYMER, 2019).

In recent years, teachers share their community mapping projects online in an asynchronous mode through VoiceThread. Everyone in class is meant to view each other's presentation and give comments. Yet, this engagement falls flat with regard to truly unpack what knowledge gets centered in this process. Next renovations will include small group presentations where teachers can dialogue about the projects. Comments to the teachers often include an invitation for them to share and co-construct communities with their students. This is a missing requirement of the assignment and also pertains to the question of uptake: that is, what are the impacts of the community mapping on the students who live and go to school within the communities being explored?

Uptake and social action can be a curricular intervention as the one presented in this paper. It might also include intervention throughout the life of a study whereas new learnings about discourse practices are made part of the ongoing life of learning. Uptake continues after the project is completed as we heard in the quote from the teacher above who stated,

> "[t]he community mapping project, I still go back to and talk about with educators. So, they know more of the background and the assets available in our community. It has been really powerful in helping me to define literacy more broadly than I think systems and structures want us to do or set us up to do." (PARTICIPANT TEACHER)

We should not overlook the idea that findings of discourse analysis can also be used to change policies (PRICE, 2009).

DISCUSSION

We offer this community mapping example as a way to make some headway in our theorizing and practice of reconstructive discourse analysis. On the one hand, it is

a 'positive' example of practice in teacher education that seeks to make visible community literacies and locating learning in the communities in which educators teach. On the other hand, mapping itself might be considered a colonizing practice and dangers exist to create reductionist narratives of historically complex traditions and practices.

By historicizing a curricular project in teacher education and examining its purpose, goals, revisions, and functions, we have reflexively considered the importance of reconstructing anti-racism in literacy teacher education. There are other examples of well-intentioned assignments, projects, readings in language and literacy teacher education that might warrant a similar reconstructive analysis. For example, literacy autobiographies have become routine curricular practices meant to situate literacy acquisition and learning within sociocultural, racial, and historical contexts. Yet, to what extent do they continue to center whiteness and perpetuate colonial tropes about knowledge, experience, and representation?

At every stage in the research process, we consider the reconstructive lens.

- Reflexively Situating ourselves in the Analysis
- Building a Theoretical Framework
- Casting our Gaze as Analysts: Selection of Materials
- Posing the Question/s
- Conducting a Theoretically Informed Discourse Analysis
- Representing Interpretations
- Uptake, Designing New Possibilities, and Social Action

The cycle of reconstructive discourse analysis includes a description of the discursive features, an interpretation of how these features construe social practices, learning from and with community members about why and how, and intervention or uptake. At the heart of an SFL-inspired reconstructive analysis is a commitment to examining the social practices through the *field, mode*, and *tenor* of discourse by which the participants construct activities, engage in interpersonal relationships, and represent information and ideas. We have demonstrated the stronghold of whiteness and entitlement within a community mapping project that intended to disrupt narrow

conceptualizations of literacies. Even in well-intentioned processes, we see how whiteness pokes through the field/ideas, tenor/interpersonal relationships, and mode/genre of the activity.

This moves toward the imperative of acting with discourse analysis in ways that recognize the continual reproduction (and thus, need for rebuilding) of ideas, stances, and modes that reach toward humanizing and liberation. At the heart of this work is making space for inquiry within Teacher Education with the larger goals of opening pathways for flows of knowledge between communities and universities. Both, language, and literacy educators can benefit from such work. In the end, literacy education is language education and language educators are also literacy educators.

In this paper, we share some of our findings which highlight the tensions in practice and possibilities for reconstructing curricular knowledge more deeply rooted in disrupting whiteness that is context specific, historically construed, and geopolitically sensitive. As we examine previous scholarship focused on disrupting whiteness in teacher education, we reflect on the tensions in PDA work, the missing stories, the methodological quagmires.

We have often been in the position of feeling overwhelmed with questions of: how do we begin this analysis? We offer this 'framework in action' with hesitation knowing it offers a place to start based on our own work in reconstructive analysis. We offer this framework not to crystalize the process but to provide a vantage point that both grounds in and troubles theoretical and methodological foundations. The idea of a 'framework in action' emphasizes the partiality of epistemological and ontological moorings and the imperative of connecting our analyses in the social world in ways that make a difference. All of this can lead to a kind of longitudinal curricular inquiry in Teacher Education that is subject to critique, renovation, and perhaps that, too, is the work of disrupting whiteness.

REFERENCES

ARROYO-JOHNSON, C. *et al.* Still separate, still unequal: Social determinants of playground safety and proximity disparities in St. Louis. **Journal of Urban Health,** [*s. l.*], v. 93 n. 4, 627-638, aug. 2016. Disponível em: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27393083/. Acesso em: 15 jul. 2017.

BARTLETT, T. **Hybrid voices and collaborative change:** Contextualising positive discourse analysis. New York: Routledge, 2012.

BERNSTEIN, B. **Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity:** Theory, Research, Critique*.* Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2000

BLOMMAERT, J. **Discourse:** A critical introduction**.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

BLOMMAERT, J.; COLLINS, J.; SLEMBROUCK, S. Spaces of multilingualism. **Language and Communication**, [*s. l.*], v. 25, 197–216, jul. 2005. Disponível em: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S027153090500025X. Acesso em: 23 fev. 2022.

BLOOME, D.; ENCISO, P. Looking out across Columbus: What We Mean by "Multiple Literacies." **Theory Into Practice,** [*s. l.*], v. 45 n. 4, 296-303, 2006. Disponível em: https://www.jstor.org/stable/40071613. Acesso em: 23 fev. 2022.

CALLE-DIAZ, L. Possibilities of Building Peace through Classroom Discourse: A Positive Discourse Analysis. **Linguistics and Education,** [*s. l.*], v. 54, p. 1-10, dec. 2019. Disponível em: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0898589818304327. Acesso em: 15 mar. 2022.

CORRÊA, R. A dimensão cultural do espaço: alguns temas. **Espaço e Cultura**, [*s. l.*], v. 1, n. 1, p. 1-22, out. 1995. Disponível em: https://www.e-publicacoes.uerj.br/index.php/espacoecultura/article/view/3479. Acesso em: 24 fev. 2022.

DUNSMORE, K.; ORDOÑEZ-JASIS, R.; HERRERA, G. Welcoming their worlds: Rethinking literacy instruction through community mapping. **Language Arts,** v. 90 n. 5, 327-338, may 2013. Disponível em: https://www.jstor.org/stable/24574991. Acesso em: 10 mar. 2022.

EGGINS, S. **An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics.** 2. ed. New York: Continuum, 2005.

FROST, J. L. What's wrong with America's playgrounds and how to fix them: An interview with Joe L. Frost. **American Journal of Play,** [*s. l.*], v. 1, n. 2, p. 139-156, 2008. Disponível em: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1068968. Acesso em: 10 mar. 2022.

FRUMKIN, H.; LOUV, R. The Powerful Link Between Conserving Land and Preserving Health. **Land Trust Alliance Special Anniversary Report**, [*s. l.*], 2007. Disponível em: https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=f3e924704a6f62a9 5b3afe5b67661f23bdc537fe. Acesso em: 10 abr. 2022.

HALLIDAY, M. A. K.; HASAN, R. **Language, Context and Text:** Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective. 1. ed. Geelong: Deakin University Press, 1985.

HALLIDAY, M. A. K.; MATTHIESSEN, C. **Construing experience through meaning:** A language-based approach to cognition. 1. ed. London: Continuum,1999.

HUNTER, A. **Lucky Zip codes | Amy Hunter | TEDxGatewayArch.** [*S. l.: s. n.*], June 3, 2015. 1 video (18 min 23 s). Posted by the channel TEDxGatewayArch. Disponível em: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gdX8uN6VbUE&t=216s. Acesso em: 1 jul. 2017.

JACKSON, T. O.; BRYSON, B. S. Community mapping as a tool for developing culturally relevant pedagogy. **The New Educator**, [*s. l.*], v. 14 n. 2, 109-128, mar. 2018. Disponível em: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1547688X.2018.1426323. Acesso em: 12 mar. 2022.

JANKS, H. Deconstruction and reconstruction: Diversity as a productive resource. **Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education**, [*s. l.*], v. 26, n. 1, p. 31–43, mar. 2005. Disponível em: https://hilaryjanks.files.wordpress.com/2015/01/deconstructreconstruct.pdf. Acesso em: 17 mar. 2022.

KINLOCH, V. Literacy, community, and youth acts of place-making. **English Education,** [*s. l.*], v. 41, n. 4, p. 316-336, jul. 2009. Disponível em: https://www.jstor.org/stable/40607888. Acesso em: 20 abr. 2022.

KUBOTA, R. Race and language learning in multicultural Canada: towards critical antiracism. **Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development,** [*s. l.*], v. 36, n. 1, p. 3-12, 2015. Disponível em: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01434632.2014.892497. Acesso em: 10 mar. 2022.

LÓPEZ, M. M. Linking community literacies to critical literacies through community language and literacy mapping. **Teaching and Teacher Education**, [*s. l.*], v. 87, p. 1-8, jan. 2020. Disponível em: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0742051X19307954. Acesso em: 12 mar. 2022.

LOVE, B. L. **We want to do more than survive:** Abolitionist teaching and the pursuit of educational freedom. 1. ed. Boston: Beacon Press, 2019.

LUKE, A. Debate and correspondence: notes on the future of critical discourse studies. **Critical Discourse Studies**, [*s. l.*], v. 1, n.1, p. 149-152, 2004. Disponível em: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17405900410001674551. Acesso em: 3 fev. 2022.

MACGILCHRIST, F. Positive discourse analysis: Contesting dominant discourses by reframing the issue. **Critical Approaches to Discourse Across the Disciplines,** [*s. l.*], v. 1, n.1, p. 74-94, 2007. Disponível em: https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/journals/cadaad/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Volume-1_Macgilchrist.pdf. Acesso em: January 15, 2022.

MAHBOOB, A. **Doing broad positive discourse analysis**, november 20, 2020. 1 vídeo (60 min 5s). Posted by the channel JALT Japan Association for Language Teaching. Disponível em: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KrzxrnD7uWQ. Acesso em: 15 jan. 2022.

MARTIN, J. R. Positive discourse analysis: Solidarity and change. **Revista canaria de estudios ingleses**, [*s. l.*], v. 49, n.1, p. 179-202, 2004. Disponível em: https://riull.ull.es/xmlui/handle/915/29390. Acesso em: 15 jan. 2022.

MARTIN, J. R. Grace: The Logogenesis of Freedom. **Discourse Studies,** [*s. l.*], v. 1, n. 1, p. 29-56, 1999. Disponível em: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461445699001001003. Acesso em: 15 jan. 2022.

MARTIN, J. R.; ROSE, D. **Working with Discourse:** meaning beyond the clause. 1. ed. New York: Continuum, 2003.

MARTIN, J. R.; WHITE, P. R. R. **The Language of Evaluation:** appraisal in English. 1. ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

MARTÍN ROJO, L. **Constructing inequality in multilingual classrooms.** New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2010.

MATIAS, C. E. (ed.). **Surviving Becky(s):** Pedagogies for deconstructing whiteness and gender. 1. ed. Washington: Lexington Books, 2019.

MOSLEY, M.; ROGERS, R. Inhabiting the "tragic gap": Preservice teachers practicing racial literacy. **Teaching Education**, [*s. l.*], v. 22, n. 3, p. 303-324, aug. 2011. Disponível em: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10476210.2010.518704. Acesso em: 11 abr. 2022.

ORDOÑEZ-JASIS. R.; JASIS, P. Mapping literacy, mapping lives: Teachers exploring the sociopolitical context of literacy and learning. **Multicultural Perspectives,** [*s. l.*], v. 13, n. 4, p. 189-196, 2011. Disponível em: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15210960.2011.616824?journalCode= hmcp20. Acesso em: 14 mar. 2022.

PATEL, L. **Decolonizing educational research:** from ownership to answerability. 1. ed. New York: Routledge, 2016.

PRICE, M. Access imagined: The construction of disability in policy documents. **Disability Studies Quarterly**, [*s. l.*], v. 29, n. 1, 2009. Disponível em: https://dsq-sds.org/article/view/174/174. Acesso em: 11 abr. 2022.

RESENDE, V. de M. Between the European legacy and critical daring: epistemological reflections for critical discourse analysis. **Journal of Multicultural Discourses,** [*s. l.*], v. 5, n. 3, p. 193-212, nov. 2010. Disponível em: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17447140903443801. Acesso em: 15 ago. 2022.

ROGERS, R. **Reclaiming Powerful Literacy Practices:** new horizons for critical discourse analysis. New York: Routledge, 2018.

ROGERS, R.; TRIGOS-CARRILLO, L. Critical Discourse Analysis and New Literacy Studies: intersecting Intellectual Histories. *In*: SERAFINI, F.; GEE, E. (ed.). Remixing Multiliteracies: Theory and Practice from New London to New Times. New York: Teachers College Press, 2017.p. 91-105

ROGERS, R.; WETZEL, M. M. Studying agency in teacher education: A layered approach to positive discourse analysis. **Critical Inquiry in Language Studies**, [*s. l.*], v. 10, n. 1, p. 62-92, feb. 2013. Disponível em: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15427587.2013.753845. Acesso em: 24 jan. 2022.

SAN PEDRO, T.; KINLOCH, V. Toward Projects in Humanization: Research on Co-Creating and Sustaining Dialogic Relationships. **American Educational Research Journal**, [*s. l.*], v. 54, n. 1, p. 373-394, apr. 2017. Disponível em: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.3102/0002831216671210. Acesso em: 13 maio 2022.

SANTOS, B. de S. **Epistemologies of the South:** Justice against epistemicide. 1. ed. New York: Routledge, 2015.

SCOLLON, R.; SCOLLON, S. W. Breakthrough into action. **Text & Talk,** [*s. l.*], v. 29, n. 3, p. 277-294, may 2009. Disponível em: https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/TEXT.2009.015/html. Acesso em: 18 may 2022.

TOOLAN, M. What is critical discourse analysis and why are people saying such horrible things about it? **Language and Literature: International Journal of Stylistics**, [*s. l.*], v. 6, n. 2, p. 84-102, may 1997. Disponível em: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/096394709700600201. Acesso em: 24 jan. 2022.

TRIGOS-CARRILLO, L. *et al*. Literacy, colonialism, and resistance in Latin America. *In*: TIERNEY, R.; RIZVI, F.; ERCIKAN, K. (ed.). **International Encyclopedia of Education**. 4. ed. [*S. l.*]: Elsevier, 2022.

TUCK, E. Re-visioning Action: Participatory Action Research and Indigenous Theories of Change. **Urban Review: Issues and Ideas in Public Education**, [*s. l.*], v. 41, n. 1, p. 47-65, mar. 2009. Disponível em: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ828811. Acesso em: 23 maio 2022.

TUCK, E.; YANG, K. W. Decolonization is not a metaphor. **Decolonization: Indigenity, Education & Society,** [*s. l.*], v. 1, n. 1, p. 1-40, 2012. Disponível em: https://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/des/article/view/18630. Acesso em: 27 maio 2022.

WATSON, V. W. M.; BEYMER, A. Praisesongs of place: Youth envisioning space and place in a literacy and songwriting initiative. **Research in the Teaching of English**, [*s. l.*], v. 53, n. 4, p. 297-319, may 2019. Disponível em: https://www.jstor.org/stable/26802753. Acesso em: 20 abr. 2022.

WATSON, V. W. M.; MARCIANO, JE. Examining a social-participatory youth co-researcher methodology: a cross-case analysis extending possibilities of literacy and research. **Literacy,** v. 49, n. 1, p. 37-44, jan. 2015. Disponível em: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1050010. Acesso em: 23 maio 2022.

APPENDIX A: PARTIAL REVISIONS OF COMMUNITY MAPPING ASSIGNMEN

o Read this article during Module 1 to give you an overview of Community Mapping. LA0905Welcoming. pdf

Read 2 articles from this list:

o Moll, et. al [1992] Funds of Knowledge
o Zipin [2013] The Dark Side of Funds of Knowledge
o Jasis and Jasis [2011] Community Mapping
o Taylor & Hall [2013]. Counter-mapping the neighborhood on bicycles.

Read at least 2 articles from this list. This set of readings explore the concept of 'glocalization' which is a process describing the intersection of local and global flows of language and literacy practices.

Edward W. Soja, University of California, Los Angeles, USA, "The city and spatial justice", [«La ville et la justice spatiale», traduction : Sophie Didier, Frédéric Dufaux], *justice spatiale | spatial justice | n° 01 septembre | september 2009 |* http://www.jssj.org

Campano, Honeyford, Sanchez & Vander Zanden (2010). Theorizing the practice of university-school partnering through horizontalidad. Language Arts.

Sarroub, L. (2008). Living "glocally" with literacy success in the Midwest. Theory into Practice.

Template for Data. You will use this template to guide your data collection. You

---

Microsoft Office User
Deleted: Please read

Unknown
Field Code Changed

Unknown
Field Code Changed

Microsoft Office User
Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Unknown
Field Code Changed

Microsoft Office User
Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Microsoft Office User
Deleted: <#>Monahan (2003) Language Detectives¶

Unknown
Field Code Changed

Microsoft Office User
Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Microsoft Office User
Deleted: <#>Orellana and Hernandez (1999) ¶ Endrizzi - Families' Funds of Knowledge¶

Unknown
Field Code Changed

---

should begin with a community "walk" or "drive" during Module 2.

Example Presentation. The attached presentations are examples of the expected content for your presentation. You will note that the presentations follow the outline an attends to the ways in which community literacies are both local and global. Your presentation will be created in VT and will be multimodal (e.g. a voice narration, images, effects, text, etc.).

Rubric. Read this rubric as you work on your project so you have a sense of the expectations for the final VoiceThread presentation.

The final product will be represented in approximately 20 slides in a narrated 15 minute VoiceThread presentation. Your VoiceThread presentation should include the following slides:
1. Introduction to the Community you Explored (include map, photos, demographic data, etc.)
2. Community Mapping Methodology (describe how you mapped the language and literacy practices within the community)
3. Findings - Present your findings with text, photos, graphs, etc. Integrate specific references to at least 5 of the readings from our class
4. Pedagogical Implications
5. Reflections on the Assignment
Be sure to consult the rubric (above) before you begin the VoiceThread Presentation.
You will also find two samples presentations that may serve as "mentor texts" for you. One is set in North America (St. Louis) and the other in the country of Colombia (Córdoba).

Presentation Details

Microsoft Office User
Deleted: Template for Recording Community Mapping Activities.docx

Microsoft Office User
Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Microsoft Office User
Deleted: The attached presentation

Unknown
Field Code Changed

Microsoft Office User
Deleted: is an ex

Microsoft Office User
Deleted:

Microsoft Office User
Deleted: s

Microsoft Office User
Deleted: .

Microsoft Office User
Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Microsoft Office User
Deleted: Read this rubric

About the authors

Luzkarime Calle-Diaz

Luzkarime Calle-Diaz is an educational researcher with an academic background in English Language Teaching (ELT). She holds a PhD in Education from Universidad del Norte, Colombia. She is currently working as a Pedagogy Specialist at ELL technologies, a Canadian-based language learning technologies company. She is also a researcher affiliated to Universidad del Norte. Her current research interests situate at the intersection of Discourse Studies and Peace Education, with a special interest in critical and positive discourse analysis, critical literacies, and children's literature for peacebuilding.

Rebecca Rogers

Rebecca Rogers is the E. Des Lee Endowed Professor of Tutorial Education and a Curators' Distinguished Research Professor of Literacy Studies. She earned her PhD in Reading/Literacy from the School of Education at the University of Albany (SUNY) in 2000. Her scholarship focuses on learning ecologies where teachers, students, families, and community/place based knowledges intersect and create meaningful opportunities for expansive literacies to flourish across the lifespan. She is a Fulbright Scholar having worked at the Universidad de San Martín in Buenos Aires, Argentina in the field of Critical Discourse Studies.