Patrolling the Borders of Otherness: Dis/placed Identity Positions for Teachers and Students in Schooled Spaces

Elizabeth Hirst

Griffith University

Jennifer A. Vadeboncoeur

The University of British Columbia

We look across two studies, conducted within the current new managerialist policy context in Australia, which capture the construction of social spaces mediated through the nexus of material, activity, and discursive space. The focus of the first study is the negotiation of identities for a second language (Indonesian) teacher and his Indigenous and non-Indigenous students. The social space of their classroom is carnivalized, parodying traditional teacher/student relationships, and stripping the teacher of his authority. The students position the teacher as Other and, in the process, map the border of "white" space, temporarily allowing Aboriginal students access to dominant discourses. The second study documents strategies for reengaging young people who are not enrolled in mainstream schools. While policy makers have not articulated processes for reengagement, the default or implicit strategy of organizations that fund programs to reconnect young people in *learning or earning* pathways emphasizes information dissemination, or *reengagement as contact*. However, some youth workers are remaking the social space of school, enacting a strategy that prioritizes *reengagement as commitment*. These studies highlight the way processes of schooling dis/place both teachers and students. Our response is to consider ways of *dis/placing school*.

INTRODUCTION

Our interest in space began with explorations of changes in material space or the physical spaces of classrooms and schools (Hirst, 2004; Vadeboncoeur, 2005a). Taking into account that material spaces may be agentive in reconstituting relations of power, as Gumperz (1982) argued, material space becomes active and actor, rather than passive décor. Teachers and students recognize, enact, and engage classroom space, prompted by the kinds of material objects, chairs, and desks that exist in a location—a school—and conform to a particular arrangement. These objects, locations, and arrangements "speak" to the participants in classroom spaces, offering relationships and identities to be taken up, transformed, or contested. In traditional classrooms, where desks are lined up facing a teacher who is positioned at the front of the room, students are invited to remake conventional or

Correspondence should be sent to Elizabeth Hirst, Convenor Graduate Certificate TESOL, School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University, PMB 50 Gold Coast Mail Centre, QLD Australia 9726. E-mail: e.hirst@griffith.edu.au

"old spaces," in which the flow of authority and knowledge follows established patterns: the teacher having acquired knowledge, obtains a position of authority and administers discipline (Sheehy, 2004). This is a top down process, a hierarchy of power, which reflects the enabling conditions of particular arrangements of material space.

In addition, however, the social spaces of classrooms and the cultures of schools are constituted and reconstituted through participation frameworks,[1] or recognised patterns of interactions and relationships embedded in and constructed through discursive and social practices. Social spaces are created and represented in the everyday discursive practices with which teachers and students engage in teaching and learning activities: for example, triadic instructional genres like Initiation-Reply-Evaluation (IRE) (Cazden, 1988; Mehan, 1979), Initiation–Reply–Follow-up (IRF) (Wells, 1999), nontraditional triadic genres (Lampert, Rittenhouse, & Crumbaugh, 1996), and the discursive practices of students, including peer talk, help, and critique (e.g., Atwell, 1998; Lewis, 1997; Schlegel, 1998). Discursive practices are both means and medium. They mediate experiences, relationships, and interactions, and offer possibilities for, and impose limitations on, the construction of meaning across social spaces. They imply participation frameworks, ways of engaging in discursive and social practices, and available identity positions within sets of relationships. Discursive practices in classrooms and schools may reflect assumptions embedded in participation frameworks, though they are also productive, establishing new patterns of relationships through talk.

Although material space may temporarily fix or stabilize social interaction—acting as a container for localizing bodies, activities, and practices—it does not have to. What we mean here is that social spaces, as lived spaces, may be created across, between, and outside of material spaces; social spaces may be multiple and contradictory, and while social spaces may be most easily defined by the movement of people, practices, and objects, they may also be defined by conversation, speech, and intention. For Bakhtin (1981, 1984), social spaces, and the discursive practices that are constitutive of social space, are fundamental for theorizing self and other, identity and alterity, as based on the relations "between." In his discussion of carnival, a theme Bakhtin (1984) frequently revisited in his writings, the idea of space is most clearly developed. For Bakhtin, the practices of carnival create a "second life," a social space outside officialdom, a place from which to counter the official, monologic discourse. The emphasis on space as both constitutive of, and constituted in, social practice—a notion that renders them both inseparable—makes visible, according to Lefebvre (1991), the ideologies at play in the construction of hegemonic practices. Once visible and understood, they may be countered, reducing their power to marginalize people.

In this article, we consider the kinds of social spaces that are constituted for teachers and students in the formation of educational policies, at a time when economic rationalist discourses have been dominant (Davies, 2003; Dennis, 1995; Grundy, 1993; Marginson, 1993; Richter & Buttery, 2004). We examine the chronotope of new managerialism, or the space–time relations in policy that create and maintain borders within educational social spaces. We explore the ways the bodies

---

[1]We use *participation frameworks* to identify patterns of interactions and relationships embedded in discursive and social practices. However, we want to acknowledge the authors whose work supported our deliberation and discussion about the dynamic set of relations to which we allude with this concept, including Philips (1972), who coined the term *participant structures,* Erickson (1977) and Erickson and Shultz (1981), who elaborated *participation structures*, and Hanks (1991), who employed the term *participation frameworks* to embed learning more fully in a theory of social practice, namely, Lave and Wenger's (1991) legitimate peripheral participation.

and voices of teachers and students inhabit and recursively construct these spaces through an examination of the identities and participation frameworks available, negotiated, and employed. We draw on aspects of two data sets, both gathered in Australia, and examine identity construction during these complex times, for example, as economic alliances are redrawn, the public good is redefined, and individuals are required to monitor both themselves and each other. Findings from both studies lead us to question how apparently well-intentioned policies afford the proliferation of strategies for the "containment of difference" and the creation, marginalization, and suppression of the Other, while preserving the status quo through boundary maintenance and a continuous reconstruction of "schooled" identities.

This article, divided into four sections or textual spaces, examines the construction of identities and the territorialization of spaces at the intersection of policies and practices. First, we examine aspects of the current policy context in Australia, in relation to both Languages Other Than English (LOTE) and the current social contract between young people and schools. Second, we describe and analyze a study that explores classroom spaces organized to facilitate the development of intercultural identities. This study highlights the way these spaces *dis/place teachers*, undermine teaching practices, and encourage students to take up and/or contest racialized identities that bestow a sense of power, however fleeting. The third section examines the constitution of social spaces of engagement constructed with *youth dis/placed* from mainstream high schools. The focus of this study is a comparison of competing notions of (dis)engagement, agency, and reengagement. Fourth, we elaborate a notion of *dis/placing schools* and exemplify it in relation to the policy context and the studies described.

IDENTITY IN TRADING SPACES: THE CHRONOTOPE OF NEW MANAGERIALISM

New managerialism was created during the Thatcher and Reagan years as a system of governing individuals. Referred to as neoliberalism in the United Kingdom, it is characterized by relocating power for the management, regulation, and surveillance of individuals, in this case professional practitioners, within the bureaucratic sector, with policy makers, auditors, and accountants (Davies, 2003; Rose, 1999). Responsible to higher authorities, administrators measure and assess the everyday lives of educators compelled by a rhetoric of efficiency, accountability, budgetary constraint, and outcomes, in ways reminiscent of the scientific management studies conducted by Frederick Taylor in the early 20th century in factories in the United States (as cited in Kliebard, 1986). Committed to increasing production while concomitantly lowering costs, or "getting more for less" from teachers and the students who will become future workers, new managerialism is marked by the surveillance/self-regulation couplet. Individuals and their contributions are not merely measured and accounted for, as under the scientific management structure. In addition, new managerialism requires that individuals adopt external surveillance measures, the gaze of the "warden on the prisoner," and internalize the gaze both to regulate their own behavior and to monitor the behavior of their peers (Davies, 2003; Foucault, 1977). Internalized surveillance renders the gaze of the warden invisible, while it multiplies the individual sets of eyes contributing to monitoring the self and the other. Under new managerialism, human relationships are reduced to economic relationships, and social spaces and practices are reduced to individual measures and their quantifiable results.

These characteristics are the basis for what we identify as "cost-effective time in places of exchange," or trading spaces: the new managerial chronotope. As the name given to "the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships" expressed in literature by Bakhtin (1981, p. 84), we employ the chronotope as an analytical tool to examine the relationships between time and space as they are implied in policy documents and lived in classrooms, schools, and life outside of school. New managerialism articulates positions for teachers and students by identifying goals, objectives, and outcomes for behavior and academic performance. Within the chronotope of new managerialism, the temporal aspects of teachers' work are managed through the over determination of curriculum content, assessment, and pedagogy. Though provided with more information, more checklists, and more teacher's guides than ever before, ostensibly as methods for making life more manageable, teachers frequently note they have too little time with which to complete day-to-day work and engage in professional life given work intensification (Smyth, 2001). Daily survival keeps teachers focused on the present and their individual concerns, rather than being afforded the time necessary to plan ahead and undertake collegial activities (Gee, Hull, & Lankshear, 1996; Hargreaves, 1994). For students, while time is split between present commitments and possible futures, the emphasis in schools is on the future role that students will play in the economic life of Australia. White (1990) argues that with the labor market orientation of the school, "its ideological functions and its preservation of social status divisions have produced potential contradictions between the economic role of the school and its presumed egalitarian role" (p. 78). At the core of new managerialism is a similar emphasis on regulating young people as they are diverted into particular economic roles, with more systems and measures for accounting and monitoring.

In terms of space, the new managerialist chronotope constructs educational spaces as trading spaces: spaces based on the production and consumption of commodities, the input and output of "value added" skills, the exchange value of teaching and learning relationships, and where performativity refers to "management modalities that regard continuous refinement of maximal input/output flows as a terminal end in itself" (Dennis, 1995, p. 4). The following discussion embeds this chronotope in the context of current policies: one set of policies addressing Languages Other Than English (LOTE) at the federal and state levels and a second set identifying a new social contract for compulsory schooling and participation advanced at the state level.

POLICIES AND PRACTICES OF DIS/PLACEMENT

In the following, we consider two policy contexts—LOTE policy and policies of educational participation and engagement. Both policy areas address what are often regarded as nonmainstream educational issues: "other" languages, "other" teachers, and "other" students. The intention of both sets of policies is to increase students' opportunities to become workers in an imagined future, and both speak to the need for students to connect productively with the world in particular ways. In terms of LOTE policy, the emphasis is on developing intercultural and linguistic competencies in order to contribute to global markets; and in the case of educational engagement policies, the emphasis is on ensuring that young people are streamed into the labor market in order to contribute in economically productive ways. Both educational policies, conceptualized solely in economic terms, abrogate the social in favor of the technical and have a tendency to construct outcomes antithetical to those articulated, displacing and Othering teachers and students.

DIS/PLACED TEACHERS: THE POLICY OF LOTE

Current heightened volatility over issues of identity increases the policing of borders of difference, both at the macro level of government immigration and security policies, and at the micro level of classroom interactions. Thus, programs that aim to develop students' intercultural understandings in order to engage in cross-cultural and multi-ethnic alliances are often hailed as progressive and productive ways of negotiating diversity. These aims underpin the implementation of the Languages Other Than English (LOTE) policies developed in the early 1990s in Australia (Department of Employment, Education and Training, 1991; Rudd, 1994). Building on a long history of teaching second languages in schools, these federal policies were articulated in Queensland (Braddy, 1991) to include three Asian languages among the six priority languages: Indonesian, Japanese and Mandarin. LOTE became a compulsory key learning area in Years 6 and 7 of primary school, and a mandatory core subject in high schools in Years 8 and 9, with plans to extend compulsory LOTE teaching from Years 4 to 10. At the time, Australia was being reimagined as part of Asia, with its economic interests tied to this region.

These policies illustrate the effects of globalization on policy making as geopolitical relations shift, and economic alliances are remade. These economic considerations construct language and culture as commodities; institutional arrangements are designed to enable the flow of these goods into Australian classrooms, constituting the classroom as a market, a trading space designed for the flow and exchange of goods and capital. Following the chronotope of new managerialism, spaces are constructed to facilitate productivity, and, as Rämö (1999) argues, "the common denominator among these management ideas is the creation of smooth, swift and thrifty flows" (p. 319). In the new managerialist chronotope, LOTE teachers are considered as "containers," vessels for knowledge transmission, the epitome of efficient and effective management. The container is prepacked, transported in, unloaded of its goods, and transported out. In a simple input-output model, students are constructed as the resource or raw material that is gathered in Australian schools and then given input to value add to the product, such as exposure to languages and cultures that improve the likelihood of future intercultural understanding. Once value added students are "schooled"—configured in ways deemed economically productive, for example, as future workers—their role is to contribute to the commodity cycle, as both producers and consumers ideally, and at the very least, in ways that will support the consumption of goods.

DIS/PLACED STUDENTS: THE POLICY OF ENGAGEMENT

Students constructed as future laborers and contributors to an imagined national workforce are also the central concern of policies of educational participation and engagement. In Queensland, they are to be accounted for with an individual number at Year 10 and credits toward the completion of what are deemed to be worthwhile learning experiences will be recorded and "banked" in each student's account. Ultimately, students and parents will have access to an electronic account system for the management of student records (Queensland Government, 2002). As noted by Dillon (1995), young people are first "configured in and as a theatre of calculable space-time populated by calculable and calculating subjects" (p. 330). Once calculated these subjects become the objects of policies geared to cement the link between education and employment. Students who exist outside the system, who occupy other spaces and are not numbered, who are untraceable and unaccounted

for, provide a challenge to the system. Students are excluded for a variety of reasons, often as a consequence of poor attendance, course failure, participating in fights or drug use, and pregnancy. Less obviously, over time, some students simply lose contact with teachers and school, they do not feel welcome or do not see the point of attending, and thus, they do not perceive a place for themselves in school. As such, *engagement*, defined as school enrolment, is reinscribed as individual compliance along one of two educational trajectories: one toward university and one toward a trade. *Disengagement* becomes a personal failure. Disengagement is defined as the condition of an individual who has not become self-regulating or self-governing (Rose, 1999), an individual who is not a responsible agent. We would argue that the view of disengagement as an individual failure denies the sociality of self and, perhaps more important here, leads to a characterization of agency as asocial, rather than as mediated (Wertsch, Tulviste, & Hagstrom, 1993).

Advanced in Queensland, the new social contract for compulsory schooling and participation reflects both optimism and concern. The optimism stems from recent reports that redefine and re-organise bankable "domains of worthwhile learning" (Pitman, 2003), along with multiple pathways for senior school completion (Years 11 and 12) with links to further education and employment (Gardner, 2002; Pitman 2003). The concern arises from recent statistics: in 2000, 16,400 young people in Queensland left school before Year 12 (Gardner, 2002). Since the 1990s, approximately 67% of young people have completed 12 years of school (Education Queensland, 2002). The continued impact of racism and racial inequity is reflected in these statistics: 45% of Indigenous students between 15 and 19 years of age were not in full time study or work (Dusseldorp Skills Forum, 2003). In addition, there have been declines by 7% in full time work available for teens and by over 15% for young adults since 1995 (Dusseldorp Skills Forum, 2003). While these statistics are typically generated to examine the plight of young people who leave school early hoping to find work, they also become fodder for economic arguments regarding wasted human capital and economic loss at both the national and state level.

A response to these statistics was to develop policy to reengage young people in the process of schooling, published as the *Youth Participation in Education and Training Act* (2003). The early school leaving age was changed from 15 to 16 years, and the Act added a compulsory participation phase*,* requiring students to attend school until they turned 17 or completed recognized certificate courses (Queensland Government, 2003). Although some schools have implemented some of the recommendations, neither infrastructure, curricula, and personnel required to implement "a major shift in the delivery of education in Queensland", nor common definitions for assessments and systems for banking credits are in place (Queensland Government, 2002). This reflects a new social contract for young people, new expectations, and new compliance procedures including prosecuting parents for their child's unexcused absences. Thus, the roles for students have been redefined, with an additional two years of compulsory schooling, without simultaneously transforming the roles and pedagogies of teachers and the institutional structure of schools and, most important, without either a deep understanding of how students become disengaged, or a process for reengagement.

Both policy contexts reveal the institutional privileging of the new managerialist chronotope, which mirrors narrow economic relationships, and patterns of dominance and subordination found in wider society (Troyna & Rizvi, 1997). New managerialist practices rest upon more than two decades of policies in Australia that emphasize deregulating the labor market: privatizing public services, expanding values such as authority and obedience, reducing state intervention designed to

increase equal opportunity, and devolving responsibilities from the state to the family for the welfare of individuals (White, 1990). The invisibility and naturalness of these practices, Davies (2003) argues, is what makes them different from visible hierarchical arrangements of power. Drawing on Schmelzer's work, Davies notes that new managerialism relies on surveillance and control through the gaze of "multiple eyes/I's" (Schmelzer, 1993, in Davies, 2003). By replacing a social and moral base for action with an economic base, schools tend to avoid examination of the complexity of the social and instead favor the technical. This economic rationality structures much of the discourse of schooling, making it difficult to accommodate differences whether cultural or political, except in certain symbolic ways. Containment, the common approach to managing difference, is underpinned by a view of the individual as singular and fixed, which denies the sociality of self, negating an understanding of the construction of Other, as well as a concomitant drive to construct and maintain the borders between what is "same" and "different."

We now turn to two studies that examine how these policies play out in the lives of teachers and students and consider how borders are constructed, policed, and patrolled, simultaneously constructing and excluding the Other. In both studies the names of programs, places, and participants have been replaced by pseudonyms.

STUDY 1: PERFORMING AND TRADING IN ON RACIALIZED IDENTITIES

Context and Participants

The data in this study were collected from interviews with teachers and from video and audiotapes of interactions in a LOTE (Indonesian) upper primary school classroom located in a low socioeconomic regional area of northern Australia; an area that is sometimes referred to as the "deep north" indicating the more conservative and racist attitudes, similar to those attributed to the "deep south" in the United States (Ray, 1982; Ray & Lovejoy, 1986). During the time of this study, discourses of nationalism were foregrounded, as well as the mobilization of political parties with agendas explicitly centred on race, for example, the extreme nationalism of the One Nation Party (Saunders & McConnel, 2000). Also, at this time, territorial conflict flared up between East Timor and Indonesia over the referendum for independence. Sympathy for the East Timorese people, resistance fighters and allies of Australian soldiers in the second world war, engendered enormous support for the Australian army's leadership of the United Nations peacekeeping force in East Timor. Relations between Indonesia and Australia and the events in East Timor dominated the public news space. The everyday space of media communications, the airwaves and newspapers, recorded this conflict, constructing the East Timorese people as the friends whom "we" (Australians) owed a debt of gratitude, and Indonesians as the aggressors (James, 1999). There was talk of conflict abroad and in the garrison town where the data were collected, many of the students were related to army personnel. For Indonesian people living in Australia, this conflict was also a space in their everyday lives, a space of tension and concern. Given the nationalistic climate, the close proximity of this conflict, as well and the role played by the Australian army in the peacekeeping force, it is not surprising that ways of grounding identity that explicitly centred "race" became significant once again in Queensland's history (Saunders & McConnel, 2000). This resurgence entailed an overtly anti-Asian agenda (Clyne, 1998) and the reclaiming of Australia as a "white space."

The space that LOTE occupies in the life of the school is precarious. LOTE classes frequently do not have a space of their own; the regular classroom is transformed into the LOTE classroom as stipulated in the timetable and on the arrival of the LOTE teacher at the classroom door. The teacher is itinerant, working both within the school and between schools, and temporary. In this study, the Indonesian teacher, an Indonesian man, was employed on contractual conditions unlike the tenured positions of most other teachers in the school. The time allocated to LOTE learning was exchanged for noncontact time for classroom teachers, thus during Indonesian lessons the classroom teacher was usually absent from the class. Noncontact time was the result of a hard won teacher union struggle that benefited classroom teachers, but institutionally placed the needs of regular classroom teachers over the needs of itinerant teachers, whose positions are shared between schools and are frequently marginalised as visitors and outsiders (Roulston, 1999). These "displaced" teachers, who have no space of their own, are observed and monitored by their permanent colleagues, regular classroom teachers, as they attempt to occupy and populate the spaces of others, spaces often filled with Australian symbols. Under surveillance, their work is scrutinized by teachers and students alike.

The Indonesian LOTE teacher, Pak Asheed, was born and trained overseas and a native speaker of the LOTE. He, like many other native speaking LOTE teachers, was employed from overseas to counter the shortfall in Australian trained LOTE teachers. This was a consequence of the curtailment of second language courses in many Universities due to low enrolments and the "uneconomic" use of University resources. Pak Asheed received little support for teaching in this location; like many other teachers in this situation he relied on local support from the school because little systemic support was available (Kato, 2001). Pak Asheed's marginal position was further compounded by perceptions that LOTE teachers and their work were of little value. These views are not uncommon among teachers, administrators, students, and the community (Rix, 1999). The space LOTE occupies in the school is under scrutiny, and the place of LOTE in the school curriculum remains controversial (Crawford, 1999). LOTE hovers on the margins. It has a life on the edge. These conditions played a key role in shaping the social space of LOTE lessons and the identities of the participants.

In the following analysis, we identify the production of classroom chronotopes by examining how different generic practices and social spaces associated with the LOTE classroom are constituted. During this analysis we highlight the conflict between these chronotopes and discuss the ways in which the practices of constituting the social spaces are privileged, included, excluded or silenced. We then consider how these conditions impact on the action and learning in an upper primary LOTE classroom, with 11 and 12 year old students, arguing that social spaces mediate the construction of identities.

Futures Trading

A significant motive for studying Indonesian is often expressed as the preparation of students for a time and space beyond the classroom. Indeed, the act of teaching calls up a chronotope of future times and spaces. "For there to be a real sense of becoming, according to Bakhtin, the future, and especially the immediate or near future in which we concretely act, must be seen as significant, valuable, and open to change" (Morson & Emerson, 1990, p. 397). The following comments from

students construct chronotopic features of the social context, namely that using the Indonesian language will be significant in an *imagined economic future*.

These comments are in response to a comprehension task. Students were required to read a promotional pamphlet, designed for parents and community members, outlining the benefits of learning another language. The discourses of new managerialism were apparent in the experiential content of the pamphlet, where the topic was students as future workers. Although Pak Asheed initially directed his questions to Bill and Will, Rachael, John and Penny who were sitting close by join in the discussion:

89	Pak A:	Do you read this? Why, why do you study Indonesian. Why?
90	Will:	Why?
91	Pak A:	Why?
92	Will:	Because if you go to Indonesia, you can, like speak to them
93	Pak A:	No, this not here
94	Will:	Why?
95	Pak A:	What is in here? (*indicating pamphlet*)
96		(*to Bill*) Your idea of learning Indonesian, is it here?
97	Bill:	Yeah
98	Pak A:	No, where is it?
99	Will:	It's not in there
100	Pak A:	Not in there
101	Bill:	Mmm
102	Pak A:	That's why I give you this so you can learn
103	Bill:	OK. Why do we learn?
104	Pak A:	(*Indicates pamphlet*) Here, but you should know.
105	Bill:	I know what … maybe (indistinct). If, if you get a big world
106		war we can go there if they are winning
107	Pak A:	(*Turns away from Ben to Rachael*) Do you get the idea why?
108	Rachael:	What?
109	Pak A:	Why we study Indonesian?
110	Rachael:	No
111	Pak A:	If you don't read this (*indicating pamphlet*) …
112	Rachael:	I know why, to learn … Indonesian
113	Pak A:	Why?
114	John:	I know why to tease you
115	Pak A:	(*to Rachael*) Why?
116	Penny:	I know, because if you go to Indonesia and you don't know anyone
117		there you know what to say to them
118	Rachael:	If you don't know what they say you've got no …
119	Pak A:	That is not the main, the mains reason (*turns to take the*
120		*pamphlet that Melissa is offering him*) thank you

In this "testing" genre, sustained through the IRE pattern of talk, Pak Asheed did not accept any reasonable answer; the answer had to be derived from reading the text. In this participation framework, the participants were not only in the business of constructing identities, they were also exchanging particular ideological versions of the world. Pak Asheed took up the position of the one who can ask questions, evaluate students' responses, and he reestablished discursive practices that involve a flow of knowledge from the text, positioning himself as the moderator of that knowledge flow. As he attempted to reconstitute authoritarian spaces by maintaining his authority as teacher, he positioned students as consumers of textual production, rather than as producers of knowledge about the text.

The students' responses suggest pragmatic reasons for their study of Indonesian. Although Pak Asheed rejected them all, the students were making propositions that were consistent with the underlying ideology of the text. Indonesian linguistic resources are goods that will help them to negotiate and achieve their needs. In Lines 92, 105–106, and 116–117, students call up future spaces embedded in the predicted, expected, assumed economic alliance between Australia and Indonesia. They are not referring to the embodied space of the classroom. Interestingly, in two of these three responses the agent is pronominalized as "you," a generalizable potential self, a self that could inhabit a future time and space. This works to maintain some distance between the student and possible action. The features of this chronotope are most evident in Bill's response; the future time is "world war" and the place is "there," Indonesia. In his response, Bill makes a move from "you" as a generalized participant to "you" as a specific participant, Pak Asheed, locating him "there" (Lines 105–106).

Oddly, this was the first and only occasion in data collected in the classroom over an eight month period that the subject of military conflict had been broached, whereas in the broader arena, relations between Indonesia and Australia and events in East Timor dominated the public news space. During one LOTE lesson, a television news broadcast in the neighboring class was easily overheard as the conflict and acts of aggression were documented in East Timor. Yet, other than in the preceeding interaction, Pak Asheed did not raise the topic. He explained he was fearful that this conflict would spill over into the classroom, creating dangerous spaces, the chronotope of conflict, characterized by violence both material and symbolic. The students did not raise the topic either because, according to their classroom teacher, "they don't really care about him." As a purely instrumental relationship for an imagined future, time with Pak Asheed is reduced to an economic contribution, albeit a dubious one, and dialogic encounters, the creation and sharing of space and time, are precluded. Borders are erected to prevent a relational dialogue.

Three of the responses in the preceeding transcript, which answer the question "why do you study Indonesian," constitute possible futures. However, in Line 114, John not only identifies himself as the agent, but also pronominalizes the teacher as the recipient of the action. By naming specific participants, rather than generalizable ones, he reconstitutes a chronotope that has become customary in this classroom. Suggesting that these linguistic resources can be used to "tease" the teacher, he conjures up a chronotope that is in conflict with the "old space" of the Indonesian lesson, which Pak Asheed privileges. The teasing genre is a characteristic of the counterspace or carnival that sometimes spills out of this classroom, and is further reflected in students' descriptions of LOTE time as "down-time," "play-time," "not serious-time," and "fun-time."

LOTE: Strange(r) Spaces

Despite the privileging of the new managerial chronotope, second language classrooms are often idealized as opportunities to construct "third spaces," spaces created by and for the play of difference (Gutiérrez, Rymes & Larson, 1995; Kamberelis, 2000). The space and time of LOTE provides the possibility of the interanimation of diverse cultural resources and the negotiation of the spaces in-between with opportunities for students to develop not only linguistic, but also intercultural competence regarded as critical for successful engagement with a new global world order (Education Queensland, 2001). They can also be "strange spaces" where students are asked

to "suspend disbelief" as they participate in activities that do not seem to have any relevance to their current everyday worlds (Macaro, 1997). From our analysis, what transpired in the main was the construction of racialized spaces and social identities antithetical to the "intercultural" identities articulated in policy documents.

Student interactions in the LOTE classroom were commonly characterized by the teasing genres: students made fun of the teacher, the way he dressed, behaved, spoke and conducted himself in the class (Hirst, 2003). This process of displacing and Othering him served to build group identity and solidarity against the teacher, while at the same time being instrumental in the social production of a racialized Other (Arber, 2000). The production of the space of whiteness emerged in relation to the construction of the Other, usually a "dark" Other (Morrison, 1992; Weis & Lombardy, 2002). White space is not an empty or homogenous space that transcends diversity, neither is it synonymous with skin color. It is a racially, historically privileged space, "a morally significant set of contexts that are the most important sites of the practices of a racializing hegemony, in which whites are invisibly normal, and in which racialized populations are visibly marginal and the objects of monitoring" (Hill, 1999, p. 682).

White individuals who engaged in these practices of Othering were not alone. Opportunities were afforded for students, who may have been marginalized in other school spaces, to claim solidarity with white classmates as they united to other the teacher. One student, Lily, took enormous risks as she constructed a theatrical space; she parodied, teased, and goaded the Indonesian teacher, calling him a "bloody bastard" several times, in a heavy imitated accent. Trusting that he would not understand, and that her classmates would not inform on her, she created a subaltern space where she had enormous power, albeit temporary, as she played to her audience (Hirst, 2004). Lily's attempt to reconstitute this "white" space is problematic. She is an Indigenous student, and although she is briefly able to wield power, it is at enormous cost. Stepping out of a subordinate role and amusing her peers, she is making a bid for a legitimate place in "white" space. However, she acts in ways that are dangerous, may ultimately limit her opportunities to succeed and, indeed, may be reinscribing a space of Otherness for Aboriginal students like herself.

Meanwhile, another Indigenous student, Nancy, drew on her home based discourses, taking up the gendered role of "big sister" as she attempted to take care of the teacher (Hirst, 2005), watching out for him, giving him advice, pre-empting possible difficulties, for example, indicating the information that could be erased from the blackboard without provoking the indignation of the classroom teacher. However, by collaborating with Pak Asheed in order to allow him access to the authority obtained as teacher, her identity as a student was eroded, in effect isolating her from her peers who positioned her as "collaborator."

Border Patrols: The Surveillance and Monitoring of "White" Space

Pak Asheed's access to the role of teacher in this classroom was under constant inspection: can he "pass"? Teachers and students judged his credentials, pedagogies, resources, and interactions alike. The classroom teacher complained about the problems that occurred in the class due to his perceived lack of behavior management practices, criticisms shared with the students when, prior to an Indonesian lesson, she noted, "Promise me, I will not need to come back and mop up the mess after your LOTE lesson." On another occasion, the comment was directed to the students regarding Pak Asheed's time keeping practices when, after a LOTE lesson, finding that Pak Asheed had al-

ready departed, the teacher asked, "Why has he gone already? It is not time. He's a few minutes early." The initial rhetorical question does not require an answer, but is used for effect. It draws attention to Pak Asheed's attributes as a teacher and a manager of a scarce resource: teaching time.

Students also engaged in these practices. It was not uncommon in this classroom for students to monitor the teacher's behavior, undermining his legitimacy to take up the authoritative subject position of "teacher" in this space; they displaced him as their teacher, exposing him as a "pretender." Hill (1999) claims that white public space is regulated by monitoring the "disorderly" speech of racialized populations, whilst simultaneously making invisible the similar "linguistic disorderliness" of members of the "in group." Students monitored the teacher's language by drawing attention to and correcting his usage or pronunciation. For example, they corrected his choice of words or his pronunciation by repeating, using increased volume, and emphasizing the "correct" phonemic pattern. On one occasion, when Pak Asheed, referring to a female character in a narrative, said "his," Amelia quickly corrected him "her … *her* name …. ***her*** name!" On another occasion, he pronounced the phrase "*et cetera*" with equal emphasis on each syllable, and Nancy swiftly corrected him: "**ex-**cetra," over-emphasising the initial sound. When Pak Asheed noted, "If you are not sure, you can finish tomorrow … you can bring it home," Amelia again corrected him, "take it home, **take** it." At other times, students did not correct him but drew attention to his pronunciation of English words by mimicking or using homophones. For example, Steven, playing with the sounds of the teacher's name, declared, "Pak Asheed, and in English, that means … pack o' shit," and repeated this loudly several times to both his classmates and the teacher.

Other than the last example described, the subtleties of linguistic racism, where it does not take the form of name-calling or insults, is as Hill (1993, 1999) argues, often overlooked. It is subtle, covert, and insidious, rather than overt and violent. Students draw attention to Pak Asheed's "misbehavior" through such means as mimicry, parody, and burlesque, just as they might sanction a peer on the playground. The micro politics of scrutiny and surveillance in the classroom play out politics on the macro level. The changing face of racism and ethnic domination, Teo (2000) posits, is evident in modern and increasingly cosmopolitan societies, where people appear to uphold the basic values of a democratic society but speak or act in ways that distance themselves from ethnic minorities. What is key is not only to identify racist discourses, but also to show how these are embedded in and sanctioned by much larger but less transparent structures of power that disguise dominance as naturalized practices. The insidious practices of new managerialsm offer a fertile environment for the proliferation of these ways of doing and being.

STUDY 2: RE-ENGAGING YOUTH: IMAGES AND INFOMERCIALS

Context and Participants

This study also considered the impact on education of a policy context characterized by the practices of new managerialism coupled with a reduction in employment in general, as well as a decrease in employment for young people. The "new vocationalism" of the 1980s, which emphasized the necessity of skill development for young people to ready them for the workforce, magnified the attention placed on youth as well as on the control of youth, while erasing the attention to structural problems, such as changes in the nature of work and the lack of jobs (White, 1990). Given this context, the central questions informing this research were: (a) What do youth say are the reasons for

their disengagement? (b) What kinds of education and training activities would reengage them? (c) Where and how can young people reengage? Under what conditions? Case studies were conducted over an 18 month period with six reengagement programs for education and employment in Queensland. In addition, a spatial mapping of one area was conducted. The corridor between East Town and West Town in Southeast Queensland, an area identified as having a high number of disengaged youth along with a paradoxically high number of reengagement programs, was mapped to mark the geographical location of reengagement programs in relation to educational institutions. Formal and informal interviews were conducted with young people (64), outreach workers (8), program leaders (6), and program representatives (14). Data from one case study are used, along with results of the spatial mapping, to highlight the social spaces that are constructed as young people and adults negotiate processes of reengagement.

Watch This Space: Disappearing Programs and "Moving Targets"

The community assets in the East Town-West Town corridor, an area 53 by 23 kilometers, included 101 programs with educational or employment goals: 83 primary and secondary schools, 14 education and training programs, and four Job Placement, Employment and Training Programs (JPETS) specifically designed to link young people with earning opportunities. With a dense concentration around East Town, and fewer options toward West Town, 18% of the 101 programs identified were available to reengage young people in educational or employment pathways.

Although this percentage may seem reasonable, these programs were continually undergoing transition. For example, two of the four programs identified in West Town did not exist two years before and by the next year only three would exist, due to a lack of funding. Of the 14 programs available in East Town, three were scheduled to close their doors, and a new program was scheduled to begin further north and closer to the city. Program Representatives noted the beginning and ending of funding cycles, averaging 22 months, and the endless stream of new funding initiatives that seemed to drive the direction of their applications. One program representative volunteered that her program had probably lasted longer than others—32 months thus far—because a colleague was quite good at shifting the program description in order to be eligible to apply for different types of funding, and then writing grant applications to match initiatives, regardless of program goals and sometimes in spite of inconsistencies. Reflecting the spirit of new managerialsm, professional practitioners were called on to become grant writers, ultimately responsible for finding funding, then auditing and accounting for their programs. The most important outcome measure, for the vast majority of funding agencies, was the number of young people enrolled in schools, reengagement programs, or participating in full time work. The alternative—not patching together multiple sources of funding due to limited funding options or poor outcomes—meant the "disappearance" of the program.

Funding and resource issues surfaced across interviews with all of the program representatives as the major limitation for providing services to young people, and were identified as the most difficult aspect of their jobs. Ultimately, one message was clear: youth education and employment programs designed to reengage youth were limited to a short term and narrow impact, given the difficulty of sustainability, and the tendency of funding organizations to focus on program content and duration, without provision for follow-up support for young people once the program was completed. The government priority of finding "better ways" to help young people reengage was

not reflected in the procedures created for funding programs attempting to do just that (Queensland Government, 2002).

Program representatives identified the young people for whom their programs were designed as "moving targets," noting conditions of unemployment, unstable living accommodations, and transportation issues. While many of the youth transitioned through their centers were not technically homeless, some moved around, sleeping on the couches of extended family members and friends. Given a lack of services, young people who were homeless were frequently required to travel long distances for emergency accommodation, thus placing them out of their local area and far from friends, school, and local support services. Indeed, the demand for organizations that provided emergency accommodation far outstripped the capacity of local providers (Ainsworth, 2005). One result of the current trend to move public schools away from the centers of towns, typically explained as a method to safeguard students attending schools, has been the growing distance between schools and education and employment programs. The physical distance between reengagement programs and schools made transportation an issue for many young people. The majority of the programs studied were located in town centers and, though most were close to train lines, others were more accessible to bus lines. Time constraints, such as coordinating train and bus schedules with program schedules, made transportation an issue as well. Even students engaged in school internship programs needed transportation. While some programs offered a limited shuttle service between programs and train stations, some youth walked up to two kilometers from train or bus lines to reach programs each day.

Strategies for Reengagement: "Socializing" Space

Program leaders and youth workers struggled to create strategies within the constraints of their funding. Given limited resources and time, youth workers developed ways to reach the greatest numbers of young people possible by: gathering referrals from completed programs, youth justice centres, and Technical and Further Education (TAFE) institutions that counselled young people out of TAFE due to a "lack of preparedness"; conducting visits to current programs to tap into friendship networks and peer groups to locate youth disengaged from education and employment; offering activities organised for the public at flexible learning centres, and; contacting former students to ask them for referrals for young people in their friendship groups who might be interested in reengaging. From the start, two issues were apparent: first, the difficulty of locating youth who had left the education system; second, the difficulty of operating within a system that values efficiency and "maximum returns" over the time it takes to establish human relationships.

The case study programs dealt with the push to emphasise efficiency over relationships with young people in multiple ways. One program in particular, The Learning Centre, redefined its methods of operation after several attempts to organize activities for young people failed. With youth workers, young people negotiated flexible social spaces, extending the borders of "school" in ways that allowed them to begin processes of reengagement. Here the participation frameworks changed for both the adults and the young people, remaking school space as well as "what school meant." This joint activity mediated the agency (Wertsch et al., 1993) of two young people—Carrie, a 16-year-old female, and Joe, a 14-year-old male—in ways that, we argue, were important for their access to, and knowledge about, the educational system, regardless of whether these events can be measured and calculated. Their stories are briefly described next.

Networked social spaces.   For Carrie, life was anything but quiet. Each day, she helped her mother take care of her younger brother, including making and cleaning up after meals, preparing for school, providing homework help, and completing laundry and housecleaning. Carrie admitted that keeping the house clean was not her forte, though she appeared to dote on her brother. Carrie's mother was taking care of Carrie's aging grandmother in a nearby town, including overnight trips after a recent surgery. During the time that Carrie's mother was at her grandmother's, they stayed in touch using a mobile phone to check in regularly. Carrie had not attended school since her grandmother became ill two years before.

Maggie, a teacher from The Learning Centre, learned about Carrie from several of her friends who had recently been enrolled at The Learning Centre, and called Carrie to ask if she could visit. Maggie's visit led to an invitation to attend The Learning Centre, for Carrie to reengage in the senior school curriculum, and have access to TAFE courses in hospitality and work place safety as well. However, given her grandmother's health and her role in the day-to-day operations of her family, Carrie could not begin at The Learning Centre for several months. Rather than wait until Carrie could formally participate by attending school at The Learning Centre, Maggie regularly dropped workbooks and work sheets off at Carrie's house at the beginning of the week, returning at the end of the week to pick up Carrie's work and review it over the weekend. Several months later, when her grandmother passed away, Carrie began at The Learning Centre.

When asked to reflect on the reasons for her disengagement from mainstream high school, Carrie first described her teachers and experiences at Claredon High, then talked about her teacher at The Learning Centre and the ways her teaching was different. The pronouns underlined in the section of the following interview transcript, marking the pronominalization of positions for teachers and students, help to juxtapose the participation framework for Carrie in relation to her former teachers with the new participation framework in relation to Maggie, her new teacher.

266	Carrie:	… But high school, it was just so boring and there was nothing interesting to do, you know.
267	Jen:	Yeah
268	Carrie:	Because it was just all school work, that's it … You know, if <u>you</u> did something wrong, that's it, <u>you're</u> punished, you know, <u>you</u> don't get any, you know, <u>they</u> just punish <u>you</u>. So it wasn't …
269	Jen:	Right
270	Carrie:	It wasn't too good … The teachers were horrible at mainstream too.
271	Jen:	Yeah
272	Carrie:	Yeah, <u>they</u> used to just, like, <u>they'd</u> be overpowering. Like, you know, like, <u>they</u> wouldn't, <u>they</u> don't care about <u>you</u>, <u>they</u> just, you know, if <u>you</u> don't do <u>your</u> schoolwork, well then <u>you're</u> wrong, <u>you're</u> in trouble, <u>you</u> get punished. It was never, you know, trying to help <u>you</u> or anything.
273	Jen:	Mmm hmm
274	Carrie:	And if <u>you</u> needed help, <u>you</u> could never ask <u>them</u>, <u>they</u> would just … I mean, some of <u>them</u> were ok but <u>you'd</u> get the ones that were really horrible and <u>you</u> were just too scared to ask <u>them</u>.
275	Jen:	Mmm hmm
276	Carrie:	So I think that's where a lot of kids, unless <u>you're</u> really, a really strong person and <u>you</u> want to finish school no matter what, <u>you'll</u> do it but, other than that, there's just no point …
277	Jen:	Mmm hmm
278	Carrie:	Well that's what it's like, it used to be like at Claredon High, I don't know about now.
***		Lines 279-284 deleted
285	Jen:	Mmm hmm
286	Carrie:	Like in Maggie's class [at The Learning Centre] <u>we</u>, <u>we</u> have fun, <u>we</u> talk and <u>we</u>, like, <u>she</u> teaches us in a good way … You know, in a way that <u>we</u> want to listen and learn …
287	Jen:	Tell me more about Maggie's teaching

288	Carrie:	Yeah, if <u>you</u> need help, <u>you</u> can just ask Maggie, so <u>you</u> never feel pressured in having to know the answers or … and <u>you</u> don't have to hide stuff from <u>her</u> …
289	Jen:	Mmm hmm
290	Carrie:	The teachers at the school are nice. <u>They're</u> like your friends. On different days of the week, <u>we</u> go out and do stuff, <u>you</u> have options, like, it's not all school …
291	Jen:	Yeah
292	Carrie:	And Maggie misses <u>me</u> when <u>I'm</u> away, <u>she's</u> calls looking for <u>me</u> if <u>I</u> miss a few days, maybe <u>I</u> get sick or something … <u>she</u> notices and … <u>she</u> calls …
293	Jen:	Yes, that makes a difference …
294	Carrie:	But, the way they teach at Claredon was just, <u>they</u> teach <u>you</u>, <u>you</u> listen and learn or <u>you</u> don't and miss out …

Carrie's interview provides a narrative that highlights the central role played by participation frameworks that ground relationships between students and teachers. The participation framework developed in relation to previous teachers is similar to stories told by youth about former teachers to explain reasons for dropping out (e.g., Rymes, 2001), for example, highlighting the lack of care and support from her mainstream teachers, their punitive focus, and their no-nonsense style: "… <u>you</u> listen and learn or <u>you</u> don't and miss out" (Line 294). An identity position carved discursively for students surfaced in Carrie's use of the pronoun "you," as in the following, "<u>you</u> did something," "<u>you're</u> punished," "<u>you</u> don't get any" (Line 268) and "if <u>you</u> don't do <u>your</u> homework," "<u>you're</u> wrong" (Line 272). Previous teachers were rendered homogenously as well, using the pronoun "they" and "them," for example, "<u>they</u> used to just," "<u>they'd</u> be overpowering," (Line 272) and "too scared to ask <u>them</u>" (Line 274). Teachers and students were directly related in an uncaring social space defined by the punitive: "<u>they</u> just punish <u>you</u>," "<u>they</u> don't care about <u>you</u>" (Lines 268, 272). Ultimately, Carrie felt that teachers were scary and that school was "stacked up" against her (Line 280).

Carrie's experience with Maggie at The Learning Centre was different in terms of what Carrie identified was important to her: "if <u>you</u> need help, <u>you</u> can just ask Maggie," she did not pressure her students "to know the answer," and they didn't need to "hide stuff from <u>her</u>" (Line 288). Carrie's use of pronouns to refer to identity positions for teachers and students is more varied in Lines 286–294 than in Lines 266–278. References to teachers as "they" and students as "you" continued to surface when Carrie referred to the participation framework she developed with Maggie. However, she used "we" to refer to students in Maggie's class, a pronoun that marked her identification with the students, as in "<u>we</u> have fun" and "<u>we</u> want to listen" (Line 286). And importantly, Carrie herself emerged as a student in relation to her teacher given Maggie's actions: "Maggie misses <u>me</u> when <u>I'm</u> away, <u>she's</u> [sic] calls looking for <u>me</u> if <u>I</u> miss a few days" (Line 292). Carrie's role as an engaged participant was established in relation to Maggie's actions. Phone calls from Maggie when Carrie missed school formed a thread of discourse - an auditory strand - that maintained their connection across social space.

Carrie and Maggie constructed the space of reengagement in their ongoing relationship by remaking their positions as student and teacher. The social space of school began while Carrie was not attending, with a phone call and a visit from Maggie, and then regular car trips to drop off and pick up school work over the course of several months. Over time, through relationship, the process of reengagement was marked by the construction of a spatial network that included the material spaces of Carrie's house and The Learning Centre, and movement between these two places. However, the process of reconstructing "what school means" cannot be laid over the top of a phys-

ical geography of reengagement; it may be roughly coincident, but we would argue that "what school means" for Carrie began as the social space was constructed through phone lines, through Maggie's voice and words, and through Carrie's engagement in activities that represented school work in her own home. The social space of school, the transformation of the meaning of school, and the process of reengagement included networked material spaces, and the pathways in between them. In addition, and perhaps more interestingly, it also included the social spaces constituted through utterances over the telephone, activities that were uprooted from one context and replanted in another, as well as Maggie and Carrie's identity positions in a new participation framework: a frame that had some of the qualities of a teacher and student relationship, but was also remarkably different from the teacher–student relationships in Carrie's past.

Space brokers: Uncertain social spaces.   Like Carrie, Joe had neither completed the level of schooling commensurate with his age, nor had he participated in work programs; two aspects of their "résumés" that were likely perceived as obstacles. In addition, Joe was only 14 years old. He was identified by a youth worker, David, from the waiting list for entry into The Learning Centre. He had made several drop-in visits to the school, and spoken with staff members about joining, but never quite had. What we know of David's developing relationship with Joe surfaces through David's account of their interactions at the Kensworth train station, a place where they sometimes met when David caught the train to work.

39	Jen:	So how many times have you met up with him do you think?
40	David:	Oh, probably 6 or 7 times, couple of times here, 3 or 4 times down the station. It's spasmodic. These kids have got no routine at all, at all. If you turn around and try to predict it. These kids are spasmodic. It's on the spot, the moment. Bang.
41	Jen:	How long did "meeting up" last?
42	David:	Yeh, it started brief, but now some of them are longer. One day I caught a train from Kensworth to a couple of stations up. **He** came and sat next to **me** and talked to me while he was there. If he gets on a train and sees me on a train with his mates, he'll come up and sit with me on the train. …
43	Jen:	Right
44	David:	But if he sees me in the street, he'll still sit and talk to me.

David's approach to reengagement included spending about half his time making phone calls, setting up meetings with young people, meeting them where they felt comfortable, and engaging them in conversation about their lives, current needs, and interests. When queried, and sometimes when it just "seemed to fit" the conversation, he shared information about education and employment opportunities. He drove to the homes of young people and provided transportation to some of the meetings as well. When Joe missed scheduled appointments, David stated, "But I don't give up. If I see him in the street, it's not like, 'I'll, well, I'll diss you …' because that's just wrong" (Line 60). The social space that David and Joe negotiated was uncertain and contingent. It tended to be based on chance rather than on planned and scheduled meetings. So rather than a networked school space, built between home and The Learning Centre and constituted discursively through phone conversations and classroom dialogues, like Carrie's, the space of Joe's reengagement was mediated by David's brokerage, and was sometimes based on happenstance. David noted, "And it's ... it's been a really good contact. He still knows, to this day, that we're from [The Learning Centre] ... so with this young person, it's just a matter of hanging in there and hoping ..." (Line 34).

While Joe may never enrol in The Learning Centre, and indeed he may never be given the opportunity, given the number of youth on the waiting list, we see this strengthening link with David as providing him access to both a relationship and knowledge of the system, and perhaps even the foundation for remaking what school means. For David, the process of Joe's reengagement is a joint activity, one that he can mediate for Joe over time and outside the material space of school:

> I can't emphasise the change from when I first met this young person. It's completely ... you can tell by the body language, the speech, everything. This kid was really hesitant, to start with, but now ... he'll talk to me **until I go**. Not until **he goes**. Until **I say**, 'Look I've got to go catch the train and go to work.'

Competing Notions of Reengagement, Agency, and Other

Government funding supports an organizational approach to reengagement on the basis of a "reengagement as contact" strategy, grounded on an assumption that making contact with young people who are dis/placed, and providing them with information about educational and employment programs, is all that is needed to reengage them. This strategy assumes that specific information is what the youth lack and that, with key information, young people become agents. The remedy is the transmission of information in a single, efficient contact, a univocal proposition that assumes that *if* an adult gives information about programs to a young person, *then* the young person will have the necessary information to act agentively toward enrolment or not. If they "choose" the latter, their continued disengagement, then their position as Other outside the educational system is reified as their own individual failure.

Indeed, several programs identified in the spatial mapping had taken up the position that their main role was as peddlers of information, and that their main concern was packaging information in ways that would be interesting to youth as consumers. Colorful cartoons describing new programs were printed on leaflets like two-dimensional "infomercials." From brochures to leaflets to packets of information, some programs attempted to sell images of program graduates as possible identities for youth to "purchase" through their participation in free "get ready to work" programs. A pervasive view, noted by Wyn and White (1997), concedes that although typically no jobs are waiting for participants at the end of these programs, over the duration of the program youth are occupied and located both safe from harm and safe from their own tendency to get into trouble. Some programs spent the majority of their time, energy, and resources on disseminating information, rather than on developing relationships and constructing, with young people, strategies for working within the constraints of their lives.

A competing strategy for reengagement was constructed by the teachers and youth workers at The Learning Centre, encouraged and guided by the principal. Maggie redefined her identity as teacher in relation to Carrie, remaking the social space of school long before Carrie could participate at the physical school building. David reconstructed his identity as a youth worker in relation to Joe, ensuring that Joe had continued access to information and programming. Together, their work reflected a new participation framework for adults and youth, one that extended beyond the school walls into the social spaces delineated by communication rather than by place. Maggie and David created a reengagement strategy, "reengagement as commitment," based on joint activity and the recognition that dedication, time, and energy are required to develop relationships that mediate agency for youth. Rather than simply working with students *at* school and performing

schooled identities, their work challenges traditional notions of school as synonymous with mate-
rial space, in effect *dis/placing schools*.

PLACES FOR TEACHERS AND STUDENTS: DIS/PLACING SCHOOLS

In order for teachers and students to locate themselves in schools, the social spaces of schools need
to be transformed from the economic spaces they have become—the trading of spaces based on ex-
change and short-term infomercials selling futures that are im/possible for some—to social spaces
that privilege the contributions of-human-beings for-human-beings over and above the values
placed on actions, attitudes, and products in the marketplace. To identify education as solely an
economic pursuit reduces the process of schooling to its lowest common denominator, when, ulti-
mately, economic returns are one component of a larger formula for designing schools' purposes.
Under the chronotope of new managerialism, teacher space and teacher time have become fully
commodified, categorizing types of teachers and setting them against each other for the limited re-
sources of contact time and control of students. Students, the raw material for the production of hu-
man capital, are accounted for and accountable, measured and assessed, and ultimately streamed
along two pathways that look much like the two pathways that have existed since the beginning of
secondary schools: one leads to university and the other to trade. Students who exist outside this
model are Othered, their disengagement defined as individual failure due to noncompliance and a
lack of self-regulation (Foucault, 1977).

   The current process of schooling dis/places teachers and students. Marginalized teachers like
Pak Asheed must conduct their work in alienating conditions, in borrowed spaces and during un-
supported times, with students who understand completely that this is the case. Students under-
stand both the marginalization of disrespected teachers and their own, and they understand what
marginalization means for Others through their own experiences. Lily knows deeply, through her
body and bones, what racist behavior is and how it feels because she has been in situations similar
to Pak Asheed's. She knows the value of having access to "white space" because she has looked at
it from the border and longed to be a part. Schooling dis/places students, from exclusions for
"misbehaviors" to the alienation that occurs over time in contexts that are unwelcoming.
Marginalized young people, like Carrie and Joe must continue to conduct their lives outside an ed-
ucational system that has deemed them unworthy and blamed them for their disengagement.
Teachers like Maggie, and youth workers like David, redefine their positions in an educational
system that was not built to extend beyond the material space of the school. Carrie was *invited* to
engage in coursework and she was *allowed* to complete it at home. Joe may stay on the waiting list
to attend The Learning Centre for the next four years, yet his relationship with David—their warm
yet uncertain meetings—form the foundation for reengagement. In reality, there is just not enough
room for all the students who would choose to participate in places like The Learning Centre.

   Schools as institutions must be dis/placed, challenged, and reconstructed both in terms of the
territorializing effects of economic rationalism, and as sets of educational processes and proce-
dures that are placed in bounded material spaces. Schools are founded on principles of increasing
identity and decreasing alterity. Historically, identity has been privileged; becoming "one of us"
has been the goal and, for many young people, the painful outcome. The lines of similarity and dif-
ference make, and remake, borders between people that are etched into relationships over time:
teacher and teacher, teacher and student, and adult and youth relationships. Dis/placing school is

ineluctably bound up with a repositioning of difference as valuable and generative, such that "other" languages, "other" teachers, and "other" students are respected and sought out as both contributions and contributors to the educational experience and reflections of the wider community. Defining LOTE on economic terms, and as relief for regular classroom teachers, diminishes the value of learning languages and participating in the world as a bilingual or multilingual speaker. Defining "reengagement as contact" diminishes the nature of mediated agency and the value of human relationships in the process of education. These perspectives are antithetical to the pursuit of education, and to the value of time, commitment, and human relationships for learning the knowledge and skills necessary for full participation in society.

CHALLENGING THE POWER OF NEW MANAGERIALISM TO TERRITORIALIZE EDUCATIONAL SPACES

Our analysis has moved beyond a focus on the local, and considered how programs designed in and for neoliberal market places neglect the economic and material dimensions of difference. This can lead to the presumption that difference, as an individual or cultural trait, can be negotiated at local discursive levels and not at institutional or systemic levels. In this way, institutional and structural marginalizing practices become invisible, endorsing explanations of failure that locate struggle and contestation only at the local level, in particular linked with characteristics and qualities of individuals and cultural groups (Scatamburlo-D'Annibale & McLaren, 2004).

In the foregoing we considered how an Indonesian teacher born, educated, and trained in Indonesia, found himself in a classroom in northern Australia teaching Indonesian language to Year 7 elementary students. We examined how the classroom was transformed in the dialectic between the global and the local, and how the classroom was both constitutive of, and constituted as, a competition for the space of a nation. The chronotope of the LOTE lesson was established institutionally as a management device, following a principle that enabled the flow of goods, which not only reduced the likelihood of developing sustained pedagogic relationships, but also backfired, leading to outcomes antithetical to curriculum goals. The neoliberal appeal that diversity be "celebrated" provided a smokescreen for the relations of power and struggle over meaning in heterogeneous environments. The celebration of diversity obscured the issue of how those who are made different are often marginalized and exploited, as well as how the politics of difference contributes to enabling differences to be "on offer" and "available" in the market place.

Although locally negotiated efforts enabled the construction of spaces for schooling, we also noted, in the second study, the dominance of neoliberal discourses. Indeed, the transitory nature of typical reengagement programs—their short-term funding cycles, and narrow focus on information dissemination—limits their effectiveness. In the current climate, young people are identified as "the problem," as they are undereducated and under prepared in terms of work skills. This idea is being used as the basis for an exacting policy focus of increased schooling and additional surveillance (Wyn & White, 1997). The intensified focus on youth occurs at the expense of a broad structural focus that explores shifts in the economic market place and changes in workforce requirements. Young people today are facing discrimination as a group, alongside of the discrimination they may also face as members of marginalized groups (Lesko, 2001; Vadeboncoeur, 2005b; White, 1990).

The mantra of increased productivity, which entails the logic of getting more for less, mitigates an investigation of the social, locates "problems" produced by the process of schooling in individual teachers and students, and reduces opportunities to organize learning at moments when and where it is relevant. Each of these characteristics of new managerialism works to contain difference, and to segregate difference in time and space in an attempt to maintain homogeneity: for example, relegating LOTE classrooms to specialized places and regimented times within the school day in order to contain linguistic and ethnic differences and containing young people in reengagement programs or in undefined places outside the system to "disinfect" schools, maintaining socially constructed notions of individual failure. The agency of students and teachers is constrained by the new managerial chronotope, in contrast to what Rämö (1999) identifies as "kairotopos … the ability to act judiciously and wisely at a concrete and opportune occasion" (p. 322). Failure to achieve in the world, shaped by the rationalities of new managerialism, is located in the family or the individual, but not in the complexity of the spaces in between young people, families, teachers, the process of schooling, and the social structure. While policy articulations of imagined futures may offer progressive dreams of a bilingual workforce built from engaged and reengaged students who define their educational pathways for themselves, the implementation of policy at the everyday level of practice is mediated by the social commitments embedded in economic rationalism. Without an understanding of the impact of this ideology, and the chronotope of new managerialism, well-intentioned policies will always fall short of their intended goals.

REFERENCES

Ainsworth, P. (2005). *Staying out but staying on: Homeless students in Logan's secondary schools.* Brisbane, Australia: Education Queensland.

Arber, R. (2000). Defining positioning within politics of difference: Negotiating spaces "in-between." *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 3*(1), 45–64.

Atwell, N. (1998). *In the middle: New understandings about writing, reading and learning* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). Discourse in the novel (C. Emerson, Trans.). In M. Holquist (Ed.), *The dialogic imagination* (pp. 259–422). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). *Rabelais and his world* (H. Iswolsky, Trans.). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Braddy, P. (1991). *A statement from the Minister: Languages other than English.* Brisbane, Australia: Queensland Department of Education.

Cazden, C. B. (1988). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Clyne, M. (1998). The language of exclusion and inclusion. *Australian Language Matters, 6*(4), 3–10.

Crawford, J. (1999). Should we be talking languages up or talking them down? *Australian Language Matters, 7*(4), 9–10.

Davies, M. (2000). Commercialisation and the "new universities," Part 2. *Journal of Contemporary Analysis, 72*(1), 47–52.

Davies, B. (1993). Death to critique and dissent? The policies and practices of new managerialism and of "evidence-based practice." *Gender and Education, 15*(1), 89-101.

Dennis, D. (1995). Brave new reductionism: TQM as ethnocentrism. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 3*(9), Retrieved September 15, 2005 from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v3n9.html

Department of Employment Education and Training. (1991). *Australia's language: The Australia language and literacy policy.* Canberra, Australia: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Dillon, M. (1995). Sovereignty and governmentality: From the problematics of the "new world order" to the ethical problematic of the world order. *Alternatives, 20,* 323–368.

Dusseldorp Skills Forum. (2003). *How young people are faring: Key indicators 2003.* Glebe, Australia: Author.

Education Queensland. (2001). *Queensland State Education 2010: A future strategy.* Retrieved September 7, 2001, from http://education.qld.gov.au/corporate/qse2010

Education Queensland. (2002). *Destination 2010.* Brisbane, Australia: Author.

Erickson, F. (1977). Some approaches to inquiry in school–community ethnography. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 8*(2), 58–69.

Erickson, F., & Shultz, J. (1981). When is a context? Some issues and methods in the analysis of social competence. In J. L. Green & C. Wallat (Eds.), *Ethnography and language in educational settings* (pp. 147–160). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Vintage.

Gardner, M. (2002). *The review of pathways articulation: Through the post compulsory years of school to further education, training and labour market participation.* Brisbane, Australia: Queensland Government.

Gee, J. P., Hull, G., & Lankshear, C. (1996). *The new work order: Behind the language of the new capitalism.* St. Leonards, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Grundy, S. (1993). Educational leadership as emancipatory praxis. In J. Blackmore & J. Kenway (Eds.), *Matters in educational administration and policy.* London: Falmer.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies.* London: Cambridge University Press.

Gutiérrez, K., Rymes, B., & Larson, J. (1995). Script, counterscript, and underlife in the classroom: James Brown versus Brown v. Board of Education. *Harvard Educational Review, 65*(3), 445–471.

Hanks, W. F. (1991). Foreword. In J. Lave & E. Wenger, *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation* (pp. 13–24). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age.* London: Cassell.

Hill, J. (1993). Hasta la vista, baby: Anglo Spanish in the American South-West. *Critique of Anthropology, 13*(2), 145–176.

Hill, J. (1999). Language, race and white public space. *American Anthropologist, 100*(3), 680–689.

Hirst, E. W. (2003). Diverse voices in a second language classroom: Burlesque, parody and mimicry. *Language and Education: An International Journal, 17*(3), 174–191.

Hirst, E. W. (2004). The diverse social contexts of a second language classroom and the construction of identity. In K. M. Leander & M. Sheehy (Eds.), *Spatializing literacy research and practice* (pp. 39–66). New York: Peter Lang.

Hirst, E. W. (2005). *Big sister goes to school: Home competence in the classroom.* Paper presented at the LED2003: Refereed Conference Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Language, Education and Diversity, Wilf Malcolm Institute of Educational Research, University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.

James, D. (1999, September 17). *A blood debt.* Townsville Bulletin, p. 8.

Kamberelis, G. (2000). Producing heteroglossic classroom (micro)cultures through hybrid discourse practices. *Linguistics and Education, 12*(1), 85–125.

Kato, K. (2001). Cultural aspects of classroom effectiveness: Overseas-educated teachers in Australian classrooms. *Babel, 36*(2), 30–36.

Kliebard, H. M. (1986). *The struggle for the American curriculum, 1893–1958. New* York: Routledge.

Lampert, M., Rittenhouse, P., & Crumbaugh, C. (1996). Agreeing to disagree: Developing sociable mathematical discourse. In D. Olson & N. Torrrance (Eds.), *The handbook of education and human development: New models of learning, teaching and schooling* (pp. 731–764). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Lesko, N. (2001). *Act your age!: A cultural construction of adolescence.* New York: Routledge.

Lewis, C. (1997). The social drama of literature discussions in a fifth/sixth grade classroom. *Research in the Teaching of English, 31,* 163–204.

Macaro, E. (1997). *Target language, collaborative learning and autonomy* (Vol. 5). Clevedon, England. Multilingual Matters.

Marginson, S. (1993). *Education and public policy in Australia.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Morrison, T. (1992). *Playing in the dark: Whiteness and the literacy imagination.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Morson, G. S., & Emerson, C. (1990). *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a prosaics.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Philips, S. U. (1972). Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classroom. In C. Cazden, V. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom* (pp. 370–394). New York: Teachers College Press.

Pitman, J. A. (2003). *The Senior Certificate: A new deal.* Brisbane, Australia: Queensland Government.

Queensland Government. (2002). *Education and training reforms for the future: A white paper.* Brisbane, Australia: Author.

Queensland Government. (2003). *Youth participation in education and training act, No. 62.* Brisbane, Australia: Author.

Rämö, H. (1999). An Aristotelian human time–space manifold: From chronochora to kairotopos. *Time and Society, 8*(2), 309–328.

Ray, J. J. (1982). Australia's deep north and America's deep south: Effects of climate on conservatism, authoritarianism and attitude to love. *Tableaus, 169,* 4–7.

Ray, J. J., & Lovejoy, F. H. (1986). The generality of racial prejudice. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 126*(4), 563–564.

Richter, E. M., & Buttery, E. A. (2004). Economic rationalism: Serving tertiary business education needs? *The Australian case. Quality Assurance in Education, 12*(3).

Rix, A. (1999). *Review of the languages other than English (LOTE) program implementation.* Brisbane: Education Queensland.

Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of freedom.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Roulston, K. (1999). *Costing the "worldy riches of extra time." Paper* presented at the conference Educational Research in New Times: Imagining Communities for Diversity and Inclusiveness, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia.

Rudd, K. (Chair). (1994). *Asian languages and Australia's economic future: A report prepared for the Council of Australian Governments on a proposed national Asian languages/studies strategy for Australian schools.* Brisbane, Australia: Queensland Government Printer.

Rymes, B. (2001). *Conversational borderlands: Language and identity in an alternative urban high school.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Saunders, K., & McConnel, K. (2000). "The question of the day": The maintenance of racial rhetoric in Queensland, Australia: William Lane and Pauline Hanson as racial ideologues. *Immigrants and Minorities, 19*(3), 45–66.

Scatamburlo-D'Annibale, V., & McLaren, P. L. (2004). Class dismissed? Historical materialism and the politics of difference. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 36*(2), 183–199.

Schlegel, J. (1998). Finding words, finding meanings: Collaborative learning and distributed cognition. In S. M. Hoyle & C. T. Ager (Eds.), *Kids talk: Strategic language use in later childhood* (pp. 187–204). New York: Oxford University Press.

Schmelzer, M. (1993). Panopticism and postmodern pedagogy. In J. Caputo & M. Yount (Eds.), *Foucault and the critique of institutions* (pp. 127–136). University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Sheehy, M. (2004). Between a thick and a thin place: Changing literacy practices. In K. Leander & M. Sheehy (Eds.), *Spatializing literacy research and practice* (pp. 91–114). New York: Peter Lang.

Smyth, J. (2001). *Critical politics of teachers' work: An Australian perspective.* New York: Peter Lang.

Teo, P. (2000). Racism in the news: A critical discourse analysis of news reporting in two Australian newspapers. *Discourse and Society, 11*(1), 7–40.

Troyna, B., & Rizvi, F. (1997). Racialisation of difference and the cultural politics of teaching. In B. J. Biddle, I. Goodson, & T. L. Good (Eds.), *International handbook of teachers and teaching* (Vol. 1, pp. 237–265). Boston: Kluwer Academic.

Vadeboncoeur, J. A. (2005a). The difference that time and space make: An analysis of institutional and narrative landscapes. In J. A. Vadeboncoeur & L. Patel Stevens (Eds.), *Re/Constructing "the adolescent": Sign, symbol, and body* (pp. 123–152). New York: Peter Lang.

Vadeboncoeur, J. A. (2005b). Naturalized, restricted, packaged and sold: Reifying the fictions of "adolescent" and "adolescence." In J. A. Vadeboncoeur & L. Patel Stevens (Eds.), *Re/Constructing "the adolescent": Sign, symbol, and body* (pp. 1–24). New York: Peter Lang.

Weis, L., & Lombardy, S. L. (2002). Producing whiteness: An exploration of working-class white men in two contexts. *Discourse, 23*(1), 5–26.

Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: Towards a sociocultural practice and theory of education.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Wertsch, J. V., Tulviste, P., & Hagstrom, F. (1993). A sociocultural approach to agency. In A. Forman, N. Minick, & C. Addison (Eds.), *Contexts for learning* (pp. 336–356). New York: Oxford University Press.

White, R. (1990). *No space of their own: Young people and social control in Australia.* Melbourne, Australia: Cambridge University Press.

Wyn, J., & White, R. (1997). *Rethinking youth.* London: Sage.