"They Took Out the Wrong Context": Uses of Time-Space in the Practice of Positioning

KEVIN M. LEANDER

ABSTRACT *Time-space is not merely a backdrop to social interaction; rather, individuals use particular forms of time-space to discursively position themselves and others. This article analyzes how several adolescents interpreted a previous classroom interaction, which was rife with social positioning. Responding to a videotape of this interaction, the adolescents were in general agreement that one of them ("Latayna") acted "ghetto." An analysis of the interview data reveals how participants use typified forms of time-space, or particular chronotopes, in the practice of positioning. These chronotopes index the relative changeability of the social world, the possibilities of individual agency, and the relations of social and individual development. The analysis also makes visible how individual actors, including Latayna, creatively and strategically shape subjectivities by transforming and laminating diverse chronotopes.*

While social and cultural analyses of positioning have focused upon how human activity is situated *in* space and time, they have focused much less upon how activity serves to produce different *types* of space and time (Lefebvre 1991; Soja 1989). Positions among characters in stories, among face-to-face participants in dialogue, and as described by participants in their posthoc accounts of interaction are not produced upon neutral grids or empty stages of time-space. Rather, particular types of time-space are constituted in social activity. Language, in particular, is an important resource for constituting time-space and

its relation to identity, as theorized by Mikhail Bakhtin (1981) through the concept of the "chronotope" (lit., "time-space"). As argued by other scholars (e.g., Deborah Hicks this issue), Bakhtin's literary poetics of inquiry provide a complexly textured means of understanding social–psychological relations, including the interweaving of voice, dialogue, and identity.

In this article, I build on Mikhail Bakhtin's notion of the chronotope to analyze the interactional identity practices of a group of adolescents. Positioning is a regular feature of interaction (Davies and Harré 1990); individuals are constantly in the process of vying for power and negotiating alignments and identities. Data for this article is drawn from video-based interview responses to an interaction rife with such positioning: an episode in a high school English classroom in which one student ("Latanya"[1]) was constructed by the other participants as acting "ghetto." I trace how chronotopes are produced and laminated in talk as an everyday (albeit remarkable) social practice of identity.

The chronotopic analysis of interaction that follows is premised on a relationship of the chronotope to the construct of the "figured world" as a cultural resource deployed in social practices of identity and positioning. Dorothy Holland et al. describe a figured world as a "socially and culturally constructed realm of interpretation in which particular characters and actors are recognized, significance is assigned to certain acts, and particular outcomes are valued over others" (1998:52). Thus, the figured world is not only a projected horizon of meaning but also a story with a basic level of organization in which actors, action, and associated meanings are simplified while symbolizing recognizable social positions. The chronotope is conceptually related to the figured world (and related notions) in that it further enables us to consider the how the social–psychological relations of narrative, setting, agency, positioning, and value are organized and made durable. Mikhail Bakhtin (1981) describes how particular literary genres construct and organize time and space, and how these unique constructions of time and space permit different character identities and possibilities for identity development. In this article, as I consider the figured world of the classroom as realized in discourse, I focus on the chronotopic dimensions of this figured world, including the ways in which classroom "adventure time" indexes a sharply diminished sense of individual agency and emotional attachment.

In addition to foregrounding the behind-the-scenes work of diverse chronotopes within interaction, I focus upon the relations between chronotopes. How are diverse time-spaces organized in the practice of positioning? When narrative scenes are marshaled in the interactive work of positioning, these narrative scenes carry with them forms of time-space that offer unique possibilities for identity and agency. These forms, or

represented chronotopes, come into contact with the lived time-space of the interactants (their immediate interactional chronotope).[2] Moreover, represented chronotopes and interactional chronotopes often are produced in multiples, and these forms of time-space are complexly related. While Bakhtin is chiefly concerned with describing the contact of voices, genres, and chronotopes through a language of hybridity (1981), which I have considered elsewhere (Leander 2001), the notion of lamination offers a conceptual metaphor to trace how chronotopes are deployed in interaction as recognizable and typified cultural and social resources, how these resources are reproduced and transformed in the contact zone of activity, and how they continue to circulate in social fields.

By "lamination" I intend to signal, first, the way in which interactants produce multiple, co-present "frames" or "footings" for interaction (Goffman 1981).[3] A second, more important meaning of lamination for the present analysis involves the way in which a particular represented chronotope, from a narrative or briefly invoked figured world, is overlaid, juxtaposed with, and authorized as a resource for interpretive identity work in a particular instance, that is, a particular time-space situation or interactional chronotope. A simple example of this practice is the misbehaving student in the classroom, who is asked by the teacher if he or she "acts this way at home." Thus, home time-space, identity, and activity are offered as a means (albeit little developed) through which to interpret an identity in the classroom. While the analysis shares an affinity with considering the historical production of persons (Holland and Lave 2001), I am focused here on how this production is not a linear, mechanical process, but rather a selective, creative, and strategic practice of identity. Interactants call on and laminate diverse chronotopes, marshaling them as interpretive ensembles in positioning self and other.

Just as particular laminations are significant in the interactional data, so also are "denied laminations," or rejections by interactants to permit certain time-spaces to be related and cointerpreted. Denied laminations allow us to consider how relations and boundaries of identity work involve, beyond self-other relations, self-self relations. That is, particular versions of self in time and space are articulated or separated from other versions. Further, in the following I also consider strategic and creative transformations of chronotopes, including self-other substitution, in which one places oneself in the position of another in time and space, often in order to offer a morally superior version of action. Prior to providing background information and an analysis of the data, I briefly consider theoretical perspectives informing a geographic and chronotopic approach to positioning practices.

THEORETICAL FOREGROUNDS: SPACE, POSITIONING, AND THE CHRONOTOPE

Neil Smith and Cindi Katz consider the widely popular use of spatial metaphors to interpret identity, culture, and power. Spatial metaphors are useful for understanding the politics of identity work in that they "impose some order on the seemingly chaotic mélange of social difference and social relations" (1993:69). At the same time, spatial metaphors of identity relations are problematic in that they often operate from an absolute and neutral conception of space, rather than conceiving of space as a politically charged social construction. Space is often metaphorically constructed as an inert and empty "container" or "field," a "coordinate system of discrete and mutually exclusive locations" (Smith and Katz 1993:75). Similar insights are theorized by spatial theorists such as Henri Lefebvre (1991) and Edward Soja (1989), who consider how ideology is coproduced with space-time. Naturalized, absolutist conceptions of space productively hide the consequences of space from us. The received familiarity of space "makes a spatial grammar so fertile for metaphoric appropriation," (Smith and Katz 1993:69) helping to construct what Patricia Yeager terms the "inevitability of spatial amnesia" (1996:8).

One means of moving beyond an unexamined appropriation of spatial metaphor in identity work is to closely examine how spaces are socially produced and related in discursive practice. Several decades prior to a postmodern critique of identity positioning, Bakhtin (1981) began to develop a theory of the chronotope or time-space in the novel that outlined how such presumed "backgrounds" to plots and characters are essential to interpreting the possibilities for agency and identity. For Bakhtin, literary genres have worked out in qualitatively and ideologically distinct ways the relations between people (characters) and their world. These different constructions of time-space thus offer different images of a person (also translated as the "image of man" [Morson and Emerson 1990:370]).

The chronotope is an artist's creation of the "ground essential" (Bakhtin 1981:250) for representing events within a literary work. Bakhtin's chronotopic analysis does not consider space-time as a given, but as a production, linking it to neo-Marxist and postmodern work in space theory (e.g., Harvey 1996; Lefebvre 1991; Soja 1989, 1996). Bakhtin's analysis of the operative chronotope of the Greek Romance (adventure time, 1981:86–110) illuminates how chronotopes involve particular figures of agency, identity, and ideology. Time-space in the Greek Romance is mere background to the activity of a hero. While there are frequently very rich descriptions of local places, such scenes of action are interchangeable: "what happens in Babylon could just as well happen in Egypt or Byzantium or vice versa" (Bakhtin 1981:100). This abstraction of activity from the particular details of individual countries, "with their

social or political structure, with their culture or history" (1981:100) is of course a significant ideological construct, instantiating an imagined independence of human action and sociocultural structure. Additionally, when the hero in the Greek Romance is tested, this testing only proves what was always true about the hero—there is no developed sense of emergence of either character or time-space, as in the modern novel. Neither social world nor hero changes from the course of events that unfold in predetermined, fatalistic fashion. Once the hero "*endures* the game fate plays," he emerges from this game ... with his *identity* absolutely unchanged" (1981:105).

As in the case of the Greek Romance, Bakhtin (1981) offers an understanding of chronotopic analysis through illustration much more than through definition. Such analysis is complex in that chronotopes are not merely obvious representations of space-time; "chronotopes are not so much visibly present in activity as they are the ground for activity" (Morson and Emerson 1990:369). Drawing on these illustrations, and upon a series of analytic questions posed in Gary Saul Morson and Caryl Emerson's interpretation of Bakhtin's chronotope essay (1990:369–370), in the following analysis I consider how the time-spaces (or space-times) of invoked discursively invoked scenes are related to human action. Are similar actions possible elsewhere, or in another time? Can space-time be shaped by action—is it open to new possibilities? I also consider what agency and ethical responsibilities are implied for characters in relation to time-space, and issues of development or "emergence" (How do characters change, or how are they projected to change, in their movements through time and across space?) Throughout, as argued by Elizabeth Hirst (2003), it is important to consider not only the production of the chronotope as a discursive process, but the social conditions under which particular chronotopes and associated ideologies come to be valued and appropriated over others.

Chronotopic analysis advances our understanding of positioning as a practice of identity by making evident how typified or generic forms of time-space are used by individuals to form subjectivities, interpret others, and construct relationships. Positions involve not merely self-other relations but, rather, self-other-figured world relations. When individuals appropriate positions in the ongoing practice of identity construction, these positions involve particular conceptions of time and space. Functioning in the background of storied worlds, chronotopes carry important and familiar meanings about the openness of the social world to change, the possibilities and limits of individual agency, and the relative separation or entanglement of social and individual development. Moreover, chronotopic analysis provides us a means of understanding how individual actors creatively and strategically shape subjectivities in relation to typified chronotopes by transforming and laminating diverse chronotopes.

BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

Background of Study

In an earlier article (Leander 2002a) I analyzed a focal classroom interaction with an eye toward understanding how group interpretations were stabilized across participants. I started the analysis with the assumption that there appeared to be general post hoc agreement among participants that Latanya acted "ghetto" within this classroom interaction. How was such uniform agreement reached? In my interpretation I considered how "identity artifacts" were produced and related by interactants in the stabilization of Latanya's identity. Data interpreted within this earlier article included a transcript based on digital video and post hoc interview data from participants. Presently, I focus directly on post hoc, video-based interview data. I unpack the notion of "agreement" about Latanya's identity, and consider how, despite similar conclusions or labeling of Latanya's behavior and self as "ghetto," that participants used different cultural resources—and especially chronotopes—to position Latanya and themselves.

Background of Focal Interaction

The focal interaction of this research was situated as part of a "Derogatory Terms Activity" in a junior-level American Studies class in a school within a school in the United States, given here the pseudonym the "Kempton Technological Academy" or KTA. The activity was connected thematically with the reading and study of *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn,* which was being approached as a problematic text. Maureen and Sid (pseudonyms for the English and History teachers, respectively) used the text to engage students in discussions of race, language, and cultural identity. Maureen's purpose in developing this activity was for the students to investigate language/power issues by listing, categorizing, and critically reflecting on derogatory terms associated with particular groups. Students were first directed to meet with a small group and to list out all of the derogatory terms they knew that could be used to "put down" a particular group. Following this listing, students were directed into another classroom and were told to recopy their group lists onto a large (approximately 18 x 3 foot) banner. The banner would serve as a master list for the classroom discussion. After the banner was completed, it was posted on the wall of the classroom. Next, after a few minutes of individual and collective reading the banner in a noticeably excited atmosphere, the teachers moved the group into a discussion of the banner.

A Description of the Focal Interaction

The focal interaction began with Ian's (European American) response to an utterance by Latanya (African American). Latanya's utterance, which was not clear enough to be transcribed, included her use of the word *honky.* My particular concern here is how Latanya's utterance became interactionally taken up. Ian began by comparing Latanya's use of *honky* with how it would be a "whole different story" if he were to use the racial slur *nigger.* Latanya denied that she was "trying to say it like that," relating her use of the term *honky* to the classroom activity with the banner. As Latanya began to be prompted to "calm down" by Tony (African American), Ian appeared to back off from critiquing Latanya directly and only claimed to be making a general point, and Maureen (teacher, European American) interjected that "no word used to describe a white person" is "as powerful as nigger."

Maureen then shifted the discussion briefly to sexuality, and several males quickly responded, with a great deal of posturing about sexual prowess. Sam (European American) next invoked a story about a boy in the hallway "last week" who called him a "Jewish bastard," and attempted to use the story as an example of his own ethnic oppression, which people didn't think about "because I'm white." After mixed and troubling reactions to Sam's story, Sam asserted that "the *black* community is the only community that seems to like really find a pattern" of racial abuse.

After some challenge to Sam's point, Benjamin (European American) picked up Ian's earlier argument about the difference between the use of *nigger* by whites and *honky* by blacks. Latanya asked Benjamin in a loud voice "Are you referring to me?" and then repeated a defense of her use of *honky* as a "slip." Latanya became increasingly upset and used a great deal of hand gesture and a loud voice, turning to face Benjamin, who was seated in the back corner, as she spoke. Several other students also immediately corrected Latanya; three African American males (Tony, Terrence, Smitty) and one African American female (Darrijah) were most audible on tape.

At this point there was a sharp transition in the interaction as Latanya faced Shameen (African American) and addressed him. (Shameen, when he watched the video of the incident, reported that he said, "Stop acting *ghetto.*") With very intense emotion and high volume Latanya told Shameen that she "ain't never been in no ghetto" and defended her family life (house, clothes, food) as nonghetto. During this defense, Shameen was injecting the word "Ye::ah!" in a kind of call-and-response style to Latanya's claims, circling his arm in the air. The emotional pitch of the entire interaction was at its height during this interchange—there was a great deal of background sound through others' comments and also a great

deal of student "shushing" of one another and of Latanya. Sid (teacher, European American) and Maureen, who were watching the interaction unfold, moved in to respond, quietly separating Latanya and Shameen with their bodies and gestures. Maureen stated, "I think we have a little problem here," and Rod (African American) fell off of his stool and onto the floor, laughing and holding his stomach.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data were collected for the study through a number of ethnographic methods, including interviewing, video recording, field notes, and the collection of material artifacts. The focal interaction (5 minutes, 50 seconds) was selected from a corpus of data that includes 85 hours of audiotaped interaction (large and small student group discussions) and 45 hours of videotaped interaction over a 10-month period. The videotape of the focal interaction was digitized, and a transcript and figures of embodied positions and practices was produced.

As part of the discourse-focused ethnography, several episodes of videotaped classroom interactions, including the present interaction, were presented to small groups or individual participants and their responses to these episodes were elicited in interviews. Responses to the videotaped interactions were elicited following discourse-based interview practices (e.g., Odell et al. 1983), consisting primarily of pausing the videotape at different points (or asking the participants to pause it) and asking the participants for an interpretation of the interaction at these different moments. Video-elicited responses were audiotaped and later transcribed. I played the videotape of the focal interaction in question and elicited responses from 20 of the 30 students involved (including Latanya), from Sid and Maureen, and from a KTA teacher of many of these students in their sophomore year. Segments from four of these video-elicited interviews were selected for this article. In this article, my purpose is to challenge analyses based on researcher interpretations alone and, secondly, to suggest the importance of participants' post hoc interpretations for the analysis of identity. I have maintained that looking more intently *at* an interaction also involves considering the space-times *around* and *after* an interaction, particularly as we conceive of identity constructions as proceeding, patchwork style, long after interactions have passed.

DATA AND ANALYSIS

In the following, I analyze segments of four different video-elicited interviews. I have selected these segments because they suggest something

of the range of interpretations of the focal event, and because they also index different practices of identity in which the participants engaged.

Segment 1. "I think This Is Right about the Time I Put My Head Down": Positioning Self and Latanya in Relation to School

In most of the interviews, participants discussed how Latanya had lost face with respect to expected norms of behavior on the classroom. The ways in which the classroom is discursively made to be a normative space of a type of institutionalized behavior is of key interest for the analysis. In the interview data, the classroom chronotope is made not simply by invoking school material spaces but also by invoking teacher authority, by a focus on texts as informational, by indexing specific and appropriate schooled practices (e.g., "giving an example") and, especially, by assuming a distant affective stance toward the activity at hand. I have written about this form of schooled time-space through activity, authority, and affect elsewhere (Leander 2001), relating it to Bakhtin's (1981) adventure time. As with chronotopes frequently evoked in school activities, adventure time(-space) makes time-space appear to be neutral and stable, non-ideological.[4] The sense, to echo one student, is that things are "not all that important." Invoking and claiming adventure-time in relation to self and other is a means of re-figuring school and casting more or less well-schooled positions. And, as indexed in the following transcript[5] segment, institutional school time-spaces are maintained and reproduced in relation to contrasting time-spaces as well.

1. Chris (European American): I think this is right about the time I put my head down.
2. ((at end, reviewing))
3. Chris: Yup, hold up—you see that, right there, where I put my head down?
4. Kevin: You put your head down right there? Why were you putting your head down?
5. Chris: Because that's when the discussion got way too out of control.
6. Kevin: It just kind of felt like it was over, or?
7. Chris: Yeah, it ain't goin anywhere else.
8. Kevin; What—I just saw for just a second, I saw you for just a second, Marie, sitting in the middle, and I'm wondering, what is she thinking?
9. Marie (European American): ((laughs)) It's like Cath, we're probably just looking at each other and started like laughing a little bit. It's like, Cath and I probably just sit back, and instead of putting our views in or whatever, we know this is too out of control, we can't even get our points in, Cath and I will kind of sit back and relate to each other.
10. Kevin: Will you talk to each other, like?
11. Catherine (European American): Not really talk, just look at each other.
12. Marie: We know what we're thinking, like, about what's going on, it's like, this is way too out of control. It almost gets to a point where it's funny, because, there's the day in and day out.

13. Kevin: What—because the general sense that this is out of control, what are you thinking now?

14. Marie: I was actually surprised, because, you know, we sat down as a group to take this, you know, in a mature way, and we're handling it fine, but then all it took was one person, to set everything off, and, you know, they took out the wrong <u>context</u>, and, it just kind of made it seem like, you know, a little kid's playground. They took out the mature ways, it just kind of.

15. Kevin: You're saying that Latanya's taking it out of the wrong context?

16. Marie: Yeah. Because she did make a mistake when she talked and when she said what she said. But, you know, Ian was trying to make a mature point about it, and Ben came in and was trying to make a mature point about it, and, you know, they weren't saying, "Hey, you know, Latanya said 'honky' and that was wrong," but he was trying to talk about, and she totally took it offensive, and, took it the wrong way.

17. Kevin: What is your sense of how she talks about it, and how she defends herself?

18. Marie: She gets in talking about like her Mom and where they live and about how they have a house and stuff, and that had nothing to do with the discussion that we were having, so she took it really personal.

The participants began the interpretation of the video segment with a focus on themselves within the scene of interaction. As they observed their non-verbal responses to the event and to Latanya, participants recreated the meanings of these responses within the interview. Chris' response as well as that of Catherine and Marie related how they created separate embodied spaces for themselves—spaces distinct from that of Latanya and those interacting with her. Chris' head-lowering appears to be a way of removing himself from the discussion and a way of demonstrating to others that he is removing himself (note how he calls attention to it in the videotape review, lines 1 and 3). Marie and Catherine, in contrast, frame a separate space through their cross-gaze at one another in the moment, which Marie described as "sit[ting] back and relat[ing] to one another" (line 9), and Catherine clarified as "just look[ing] at one another" (line 11). When the discussion got "(way) too out of control," (Chris, line 5; Marie, lines 9 and 12), the three students responded by creating embodied and (in the interview) semiotic boundaries between themselves on the one side and Latanya and those interacting with her on the other.

Thus, a "we"/"they" separation of positions, or crafting of boundaries, is clear early on in the interview. The embodied, interactional time-space of the classroom (as represented on the screen)[6] is carved up, and the different regions of it are laminated with represented chronotopes that serve to define these regions and attendant ways of being. In Marie's account, "we" signified all those who came together, as a group, "to take this in a mature way," whereas "they," prompted by "one person," "took out the mature ways" (line 14). Ian and Ben are also included as part of a mature "we." Ethnographic data support an interpretation of the fractured space in Marie's discourse as a coded racial construction, a critique of

(immature) African Americans in contrast to (mature) European Americans (Leander 2002). A repeated critical stance toward the behavior of the African American students in the class is being laminated onto the interpretation of the event. Although Latanya was suggested to be part of a "we" that started out, purposefully, to engage in a mature discussion, but essentially, she "set everything off," prompting an unnamed "they" to "take out the wrong *context*" (line 14).

Marie's reference to "a little kid's playground" (line 14) is a telling example of laminating chronotopes. The "little kids' playground" functions as what Bakhtin (1981) would term a "chronotopic motif," a briefly noted place or action that points to a larger social world. For instance, a meeting between strangers might signal the well-developed, generic time-space of the road (Bakhtin 1981:98). In this case, Marie gives some sense of the qualities of the chronotope she is invoking: it is populated by "little kids," activity within it is not "mature," with respect to this schooled interaction this form of activity is "wrong," and this kind of activity seems susceptible to one person "setting everything off" or swaying its direction (line 14). We could fruitfully extend other aspects of the playground motif: Playground activity may be generically typified as characterized by shouting, laughter, unruly behavior, physical movement, name calling, chanting, and chasing, and school grounds are rarely termed "playgrounds" beyond the elementary or early middle school years. The "little kids' playground" also suggests a scene that one occupies when one leaves school at recess or after school; the playground as a space is at least partially identified as a departure from school.

The separation of playground from well-schooled adventure-time is still clearer in the responses of Marie, Catherine, and Chris. The repetition of "out of control" in Chris and Marie's discourse (lines 5, 9, 12), support the value of interaction that has a normative level of control, which was associated by Marie with the practice of "mak[ing] a mature point" (line 16). Point-making practice is contrasted with Latanya's practice of "taking it the wrong way" (line 16). Latanya violated the institutional chronotope (adventure time) by taking things "really personal," including "talking about like her Mom and where they live and about how they have a house and stuff" (line 18). In Marie's estimation, the information about Latanya's life outside of school "had nothing to do with the discussion that we were having" (line 18). Latanya's use of her home time-space, including her relationship to her mother and the material reality of her house, is a denied chronotope within the response. These relations are not part of the time-space constituted by the "we" that is talking, they are claimed by Marie to be entirely irrelevant. Note that in Marie's response she directly relates the notion of "[taking] it really personal" to Latanya's use of her home chronotope. Thus, in this case "taking it really personal" is

related not only to a particular affective stance regarding the self but also to constituting particular time-spaces deemed personal (e.g., the home) and attempting to laminate this chronotope with the adventure time of schooling.

Latanya's position as ghetto was made durable by reproducing familiar and powerful chronotopes (institutional school/nonschool) and spatial identity positions (self/other and black/white). Yet durability was also achieved through assertions about repetition—claims that she was engaging in a familiar, well-worn pattern, assertions warranted by the lamination of past identities and events with those present. Chris's statement that "[the discussion] ain't goin' anywhere else (line 7), along with his withdrawal, announces an expectation, from a history of experiences, that the interaction will stop or cease to be productive. Marie's modulation of her claims about this as a single event, her use of the continuous past verb tense (e.g., "we're *probably* just looking at each other," line 9), and her eventual claim that "there's the day in and day out" (line 12) index how Marie is engaged in an interpretation not merely of one moment, but of producing a pattern across time. Marie's interpretation also involves a patterned and reflexive construction of noticing how things were in the classroom, drawing back in critical commentary, and being tempted to laugh (line 12).

Segment 2. "She's Always Been Like That": Stabilizing Latanya's Personal History and Geography

In the following interview segment, two males (Robert, African American; Billy, European American) laminate chronotopes of Latanya's past with the chronotope of the interaction to construct an argument that Latanya acts consistently across time-space. This argument is made by invoking diverse chronotopes from Latanya's social life, while denying her own dynamic relationships to them. Rather, Latanya's identity is constructed as individually practiced and static: ahistorical (without development), a-geographical (consistent across space) and therefore asocial (without dynamic relationship to the world around her).

1. Kevin: It seems to me there's a lot of things going on here, but I just wanted to get your interpretation. What's going on here?
2. Robert: That's when Latanya just went off the deep end for no apparent reason.
3. Billy: Yup.
4. Kevin: What are some of your guesses at why she went off the deep end?
5. Billy: I think she thought that Benjamin was trying to make fun of her and stuff, you know, that a black person can call a white guy honky and everything, and I think she took it the wrong way and Benjamin was just trying to state a point and she took it the wrong way and just exploded.
6. Kevin: Do you think she took it the wrong way?

7. Robert: Yeah, cause the way she came out—there was no point in all that. Just clear out the blue just started snappin for no apparent reason.

8. Kevin: Why—why are a lot of people correcting her? I mean, shouting at Tanya "thank you for the biography" and all that?

9. Robert: You know, they know how she is. She's always been like that. She'll snap real quick.

10. Kevin: She's got a quick—temper? Or just reacting?

11. Robert: Yeah, you say one little thing, and she'll go off the deep end.

12. Billy: Every time, the whole time I've known Latanya, cause I went to middle school with her for a couple of years. One little word, every time at lunchtime, I'd hear something about a fight between Latanya and somebody.

13. Robert: Mmm-hmm. There'd be a fight.

14. Billy: Cause like some other girl called her a "bitch" or a "ho" or somethin like that, and, next thing you know it, at lunch time, at recess, or after school, or in Rolling Hills where I live, there would be a fight.

15. Kevin: Really? She's jumped into it.

16. Billy: Yeah, she'd be in a lot of fights.

17. Kevin: So there's more of a temper, thing. What's—what's Shameen doing with Latanya?

18. Robert: Shameen—he know how she is, too, and he's just trying to mess with her to get her to keep talking. ((Billy laughing))

19. Kevin: Why—why is he doing that?

20. Robert: He just want to see her do something.

21. Billy: Trying to stir things up.

22. Robert: He know she'd get up off that chair and go over there and try to hit Benjamin, and he try to—he wanted to see it.

23. Kevin: What's your best guess at why Latanya talks about the ghetto, and says, "We've always had a roof over our head" and the rest?

24. Robert: I thought—I thought she started saying it because, ah, Ben said something about the ghetto, but I guess he didn't. I didn't hear it on the tape.

25. Billy: I get the impression she said it because she's black, and lives on the north side.

26. Robert: Oh, I know why she said it, because when she was snappin, Shameen was like, "Why you acting ghetto? Why you acting ghetto?" And she was like, "I'm not ghetto, I'm not from the ghetto, I've never been in the ghetto" and all that.

27. Kevin: What does it mean to act ghetto?

28. Robert: What she was doing basically—snapping for no apparent reason, going all off the deep end, acting stupid. There was no point for all that.

29. Kevin: Really? So, like having like a short fuse? That's part of it?

30. Robert: Yeah. And the she—you can have a short fuse and not be ghetto, but, you can have a short fuse and be ghetto. But she was having a short fuse and not controlling it—going all off the deep end when it really wasn't all that serious. Cause I could have snapped in the class when we was doin that too, but I knew we was just having a discussion, so what's the point in snapping? Everybody just talkin about the different derogative terms, they're not really talkin—saying "nigger" to me for real. They're just talkin about the terms.

When asked to respond to the interaction on video, Robert emphasized that the clip represents how Latanya "just went off the deep end for no apparent reason" (line 2). Robert repeated the phrase "no apparent reason" three times (lines 2, 7, 28) and the word "snap" or "snappin" to describe Latanya's response four times (lines 7, 9, 28, 30). When, prompted

by my interview question, Billy began to offer a social interpretation why Latanya responded as she did (line 5), Robert pulled back to an explanation that Latanya's response was essentially unreasonable or "clear out of the blue" (line 7). The idea of acting "out of the blue" implies that there was no socially situated rationale for acting as she was—Latanya was out of context or, rather, acontextual, acting alone. Latanya, like the hero of adventure time, is disconnected to the social milieu in which she finds herself, but as a kind of antiheroine, is presented as displaying her individual personal weaknesses no matter what (the backdrop of) social life might bring.

While Latanya was set up as acting without reason, others reactions to her were, for Robert, socially reasonable responses: "they know how she is" (line 7). Billy responsively picked up on Robert's claim that Latanya has "always been like that" (line 9). Billy next supported Robert's assertion by constructing scenes from Latanya's past: Latanya at lunchtime provoked to fight by "one little word," or at recess, or after school, or in Rolling Hills (line 14). While stories of these fights were not well developed in the discourse, Billy's discourse offers much more than a list of place names. Rather, middle school at lunch time and other space-times are populated with typified actors ("some other girl," line 14), typified provocation (name-calling, line 14), an outsider evaluation of this provocation as minimal ("one little word," line 12), and Latanya's quick response ("next thing you know it," line 14). Together, these places comprise a type of "figured world" (Holland et al. 1998) with particular temporal and spatial contours. The chronotope of this figured world is laminated with that of the focal interaction. The patterned construction of Latanya's identity across time is constructed in the discourse by using continuous past verb forms (e.g., "she'll go off the deep end", line 11; "she'd be in a lot of fights," line 16). Billy also used a number of temporal markers to suggest patterns of action (e.g., "every time, the whole time I've known Latanya," line 12; "next thing you know it," line 14).

Robert and Billy interpret Shameen's response as based on his knowledge of how Latanya acts and always will act (line 18). Billy suggested that Shameen was "trying to stir things up," (line 21), and Robert described Shameen's action as having a predictable outcome. This outcome is cast through an imagined construction of time-space in which Latanya would "get up off that chair and go over there and try to hit Benjamin" (line 22). This construction resembles the previous accounts of Latanya's fighting. Robert not only imagines it happening, he also imagines Shameen's pleasure in watching this fight. Similar to the laminations of past chronotopes with a present social interaction, in this case the present is laminated and cointerpreted with an imagined future chronotope. Latanya is constructed as acting individually

and consistently across represented time-spaces of the past, present, and future.

Billy's reference to Latanya's home geography (line 25) is a noteworthy example of a constructed chronotope that has no apparent uptake in his dialogue with Robert. Billy's reference to Latanya living on "the north side" was not overtly denied by Robert, who also lived on the north side, but it was not officially recognized either. Robert, who turned the focus to the language in the interaction, quickly dispensed with Billy's relation of acting ghetto to a particular material geography and race. While this interaction is very brief, I raise it because this type of claim about being ghetto as associated with being *from* a ghetto location was raised during the focal interaction as well as during responses to it. Latanya also claimed that it was wrong for Shameen to call her ghetto in front of "all those white people," who "already think of you as from the north side, or whatever they want to call as ghetto." Thus, the idea of place-based ghetto identity had some purchase within the interaction and in post-hoc interpretations of it, yet Robert was not going to let the discussion invoke a discursive chronotope that was embedded in a material, lived chronotope that he shared with Latanya. Robert would help stabilize Latanya's identity through her personal history, but not through a shared, racialized geography.

Finally, at the end of interview Segment 2, Robert suggested how he "could have snapped in that class when we was doin' that too" (line 30). This imagined description of a possible outcome suggests a relationship to Latanya not indexed within Segment 1 or within the laminated constructions of Latanya's "snapping" in diverse space-times. In this case, the unfolding of the classroom activity was kept stable except that Robert imagined that, like Latanya, he could have decided that the class was "saying 'nigger' to me for real" (line 30). In contrast to offering an entirely individualistic account of Latanya's response, therefore, Robert began to suggest a socially aligned relationship between Latanya and himself, presumably based on racial identity. His positioning of Latanya invoked a self-positioning in the same time and space, a self-other substitution in which Robert could assert that he acted in a morally superior way. He chose not to become upset, because he knew "[they] were just having a discussion" (line 30). These comments resonate with those of the participants in Segment 1 and what it means to not take a discussion too seriously in the adventure time of school. For Robert, however, his constructed positional relation to Latanya is more complex than that suggested by the comapped institutional (adventure time) and racial boundaries analyzed in Segment 1. He creatively substituted himself in Latanya's interactional position as a means of modeling correct behavior, interpreting the interaction as not "all that serious" (line 30). Thus, Robert identified with Latanya, by taking her position in the time-space of the interaction and also distinguished

himself from that identity, by laminating onto the interaction a response resonating with classroom adventure time.

Segment 3. "I'm Just Seeing Her as Another Person": Contradictions of Shared and Separate Chronotopes

This interview segment involves three African American males (Shameen, Rod, and Tony) and a complicated array of chronotopic maneuvers and positioning, I focus my interpretation first on a social-spatial practice evident in Segment 2: chronotopically substituting oneself in the time and space of the other as a moral illustration of how to act. Secondly, I focus on the complex, multiple positionings with Latanya that began to be evident in Segment 2. Closely following Tony's interview response, I analyze how positioning is not just arraying oneself on an empty grid of a single relationship of power and identity with another person. Neither does describing the qualities and ideology of a single time-space provide us with an account of some forms of positioning. Rather, we must consider how diverse positions are produced on maps that may be incoherent and contradictory when laminated or juxtaposed.

1. Kevin: What are you saying, Shameen? Are you saying chill?
2. Shameen: Ye::ah. Ye::ah.
3. Kevin: What do you mean you're messing with her?
4. Shameen: Cause she's snappin.
5. Kevin: So you're, you're egging her on?
6. Shameen: Yeah.
7. Kevin: But you said something about the ghetto.
8. Shameen: I said, stop acting ghetto!
9. Kevin: Stop acting ghetto?
10. Shameen: I ain't never lived in no ghetto ((nasal voice))
    [
11. Rod: I ain't never lived in no ghetto ((nasal voice))
12. Kevin: Is this acting ghetto?
13. Rod: Yes.
    [
14. Shameen: Yeah.
15. Rod: Anybody can act ghetto. Just not black people. Just acting, just, just embarrassing yourself, basically. You know how people say "you're showing your butt" so that's basically what she's doing.
16. Kevin: Is taking something personally acting ghetto?
17. Rod: When you take it that personal. I mean, now, now if somebody would just be like, if somebody would just say, like in the class "Well all the niggers are stupid" then I would take that personal. I probably wouldn't like, get mad or anything, like I wanted to beat them up, but I would be like, °dang°, he didn't have to call me that, like that, but she was acting ghetto, you know, getting riled up.
18. Kevin: She's getting too riled up? ((Rod laughs at end of episode.))
19. Kevin: Tony, when you're shouting at her and stuff, are you—is it important to you that she's—is there anything here about race here, like Latanya, being black, and being in the class and acting like that, like you want to kind of correct her and say,

"Look, don't act like that, that's a bad reflection on us" is there anything like that, or it more just like, Latanya as a friend she's embarrassing herself, or what's going on in your mind? What's important about her not doing that? Why are you shouting at her through the tube?

20. Tony: I was like, just giving her a 'hey ho'!
21. Rod: ((laughing)) He was like calm down!
22. Tony: All I said was I told her to calm down. She was talkin crazy and everything, and I was like, calm down Latanya, and she didn't calm down. Hey—just because she's black doesn't mean I'm rollin with her or nothin.
23. Rod: Hey, I was laughin
24. Tony: Just because the way she acts and everything, it don't manner.
25. Kevin: It's more the way she acts and everything. Is she a friend of yours?
26. Tony: I mean, she's cool, but I don't roll with her. I mean, like, she did this, and I don't think it reflects on me because I'm black. I'm just seeing her as another person.
27. Kevin: Right.
28. Tony: She was acting up and class, and she didn't have to, and I told her to calm down. And she didn't listen, so I started talking about something else.
29. Kevin: Oh, you mean, in the back there, you were talking about something else?
30. Tony: Yeah.
31. Kevin: But for awhile there you were shouting at her through the tube.
32. Tony: I was like, "Calm down, Tasha" I don't know what all I said, though, but I was like calm down
    [
33. Rod: Thank you for your biography! Thank you for your biography!
34. Kevin: Thank you for your biography?
35. Tony: Yeah, yeah, cause you see that wasn't necessary. Shameen said, stop acting ghetto. "Well I ain't from the ghetto. I got clothes on my back. I got!" We didn't need to know all that. All she had to say was "Shut up, Shameen" or cuss him out. That was all she had to do.
36. Shameen: Bye, Mr. Leander
37. Kevin: See you. So she, so she should calm down for herself or for the class.
38. Rod: Herself.
    [
39. Tony: For herself. Because see, she's making herself look worse in front of the class, and then that gives them a bad perception of black people, that we don't—we can't stay focused. That we always gotta snap on somebody. We can't stay to the topic or whatever.

Prompted by the use of the word "ghetto," which I invoked in the video-elicited interview, Shameen recalled telling Latanya to "stop acting ghetto!" Shameen and Rod simultaneously mocked Latanya with nasal voices, which led to Rod's clarification of the definition of *ghetto.* Rod asserted, "Anybody can act ghetto. Not just black people" (line 15). Rod's denial of the association of black with ghetto seems an important construction of meaning and identity in the interview in that is addressed by him to me (a European American). While the remark is fleeting, it invoked and critiqued an imagined relation of "black," a derogatory way of acting ("ghetto"), and a particular social geography, as suggested by the

term *ghetto.* Rod attempted to strip "acting ghetto" from a racial–spatial interpretation and redefine "acting ghetto" at the level of the individual. In this point, Rod's interpretive move is similar to that of Billy and Robert in Segment 2, who construct activity and moral responsibility at the level of the individual, at least partially removing Latanya from the social relations around her.

Rod then invokes an imagined scene, the time-space dimensions of which highlight the creative and strategic work of positioning. On the one hand, Rod's scene is a substitution of himself into Latanya's position, akin to the substitution cast by Robert in Segment 2, and as a substitution signals both an alignment with her and also models a response that is morally superior. Yet Rod's narrated scene is not a mere substitution, as it imagines a more egregious racial offense than in the classroom interaction involving Latanya. In Rod's scene, somebody just appears to blurt out that "Well, all the niggers are stupid" (line 17), and Rod still represents himself as controlled. The contrast with Latanya and the interactional chronotope of the videotaped event is explicit: Rob "wouldn't like, get *mad* or anything . . . but she was acting ghetto, you know, getting riled up." Rod appears to invoke institutional adventure time in representing himself as calm, even given great reason to be angry. This form of time-space, its associated positions and identities, is laminated with a chronotope of the interaction involving character substitution and heightened emotional offense. Given even the worst-case scenario, the message seems to be, Rod can still create an image of himself as acting in a manner appropriate to the classroom.

Prompted by Rod's claim that "anybody can act ghetto," as well as by hunches from other interviews and observations, I directly asked Tony about his policing of Latanya and whether or not his reactions had anything to do with their shared racial identity (line 19). Of course, in my interviewing I am collapsing and laminating multiple time-spaces, pushing for coherence, possibly passing by many contradictions, and engaged in the same sort of activity that I am arguing the classroom participants to be engaged in. Tony responded in three ways that I find remarkable. First, he suggested that he was relating to the interaction just as an activity, without any investment in their social relations: he was "just giving her a 'hey ho' (line 20). Secondly, (line 22), Tony rejected my question and the suggestion that being black involved a social relation between he and Latanya: "just because she's black doesn't mean I'm rollin' with her or nothin" (line 22). Tony repeated again that he didn't "roll with Latanya" (line 26). Tony's choice of expression "roll(in') with" is interesting in that it is a kind of traveling metaphor that suggests being and acting together across time-space, and is contrasted by Tony to a more fixed form of identification—being

black. Tony's discourse in his denial of racial association with Latanya is suggestive: "I'm just seeing her as another person." While he affirmed in this claim that Latanya is an individual, separate from him and others, "I'm just seeing her" also suggested that Tony is deliberate about choosing to "see" Latanya in this manner. Tony then asserted how Latanya should have acted in the classroom space: She could have told Shameen to "shut up" or "cuss[ed] him out" (line 35). Unlike Robert and Rod, Tony does not imagine an alternate scene or situate himself in this one. Rather, he simply gives information about how Latanya should have acted. In giving this information, Tony further separated himself from Latanya by asserting that he was part of a "we" who "didn't need to know all that" (line 35). Like Marie (Segment 1), Tony denies the lamination of Latanya's narrated home time-spaces with the interactional chronotope of the classroom.

Tony's third form of response invokes the gaze of the (white) class and forms an earlier denied racial alignment between the two of them: "she's making herself look worse in front of the class, and that gives them a bad perception of black people" (line 39). Tony's identification with Latanya is produced not around race alone, but through the ongoing production of racial identity by white class members. Moreover, Tony's language for a white critique of black people is not just about inappropriate behavior, but about the perceived inability of blacks to act in academic ways: "stay[ing] focused" and "stay[ing] to the topic." Thus, the array of positions that Tony constructs at the end of the interview segment involves not just self-other positioning (his relation to Latanya), but also the self-other relation vis-à-vis an onlooking other. Further, this racial–spatial alignment is coconstituted with a set of academic values and practices in the classroom.

We could imagine Tony to be developing an increasingly coherent interpretation of the interaction and identities—that he is developing a more singular story as the interview proceeds, but I would posit rather that the interview underscores the contradictions between divergent time-spaces. In one set of time-space and identity relations, he is not "rollin' with Latanya," in another, he is simply another student, prompting her to good behavior in the classroom, and in a third, he is imagining (white) others producing links between black identity, Latanya, himself, and the idea of being nonacademic. This production of multiple and contradictory positions indexes a more complex practice of identification than the creation of identity boundaries analyzed earlier. Unlike Marie (Segment 1), Tony did not parse space and construct simple binaries in describing his relationship with Latanya. Rather, he shifted among alternate and contradictory time-spaces in coconstructing the relations among her position and his own.

Segment 4. "I Just Didn't Want Them to Think That I Was Like That": Latanya's Construction of the Interactional Time-Space

The final transcript segment is taken from an interview with Latanya. In an earlier article (Leander 2002a), I considered how Latanya considered herself to be positioned "as ghetto" by Shameen's remarks, particularly with respect to the white students in the classroom. The earlier interpretation focused, in part, on the production and maintenance of racialized social spaces. In analyzing the following interview segment, I consider how Latanya's interpretation focuses on the construction of racial identity only in relation to her social relationships with the two teachers: Sid and Maureen. Latanya's conception of the time-space of the classroom interaction as somewhat of an individualized teacher-student relationship surprised me. I had approached my research and this interaction analysis with an eye toward student–student relations, perhaps to a fault, and was taken aback by Latanya's emphasis on her relationship to the teachers, accompanied by her claimed lack of concern about student-student positioning. What are the temporal and spatial boundaries of a given interaction, and its related consequences for positioning? While I had largely bracketed the teachers out of my initial analysis because they were not actively involved during this part of the interaction, from Latanya's perspective in the interview segment the teachers were highly present, and in fact were the key present members. While Latanya and I watched the same videotape of the interaction, she appears to have attended primarily to participants who were, for the most part, off camera. She constituted the interactional chronotope much differently than I did, and seemingly different than the other students. Thus, from Latanya's perspective as represented here, a large part of her task within the interaction was to repair the social relations between her and the two teachers.

1. Kevin: That was, I wanted to get your response on that first part because I was interested in how you were-understanding—what is Ian, saying here? When he says that comment, what is he actually saying?
2. Latanya: I don't know, I figured he was like saying that I said it on purpose, and I just said, no, I wasn't saying that on purpose. I wasn't trying to say it, I was looking at the banner, at all them words, and then when I started talking, you know what I'm saying, that word just came out, but he dogging me, he was like ((deep voice)) "Well, if I was, if I was to say the word nigger, and then, everybody jumped on me," and I was like, no, I wasn't trying to say it like that. And then I got mad.
3. Kevin: Do you think he, um, he was criticizing you?
4. Latanya: Yup. That's why I got mad.
5. Kevin: What point was he trying to make?
6. Latanya: What point was he trying to make?
7. Kevin: Yeah.

8. Latanya: I don't know, I guess, I thought he was just trying to criticize cause I was saying, (18) when he said, he couldn't turn around and say the word nigger, which is true, everybody would jump on him but, then that's not what I was trying to say. I don't know. I don't know what point he was trying to make. Cause I didn't mean it that way.

9. Kevin: Mean it—like in an offensive way? Do you remember when you said honky?

10. Latanya: Yeah.

11. Kevin: What were you saying?

12. Latanya: I sa::id—oh, I can't remember what I was saying. I just know I said "honk" and I was like, I mean "white person" I know I said it like that but I can't remember exactly what I was saying.

13. Kevin: Why did you correct yourself?

14. Latanya: Cause that wasn't right—Mr. Bartoli [Sid] and Ms. Tsekos [Maureen] was in there, I mean, I normally don't say that word anyway, but I was sitting in there, I mean when I was talkin I was sitting there looking at the word up there, and I was like (21) I mean, I didn't want Ms. Tsekos or Mr.—I mean, I didn't care about none of the other students, in that class, but I just didn't want them to think that I was like that, cause, you know, they helped me out a whole lot.

15. Kevin: Mr. Bartoli and Ms. Tsekos?

16. Latanya: Yeah, and I didn't want them to think that I was—like that.

17. Kevin: But the other students in there, you didn't feel like you didn't have a relationship with them? Like Ian or whatever?

18. Latanya: Mmm-hmm.

19. Kevin: But you have some pretty close—some good friends in there.

20. Latanya: Yeah, they're black though. ((slight laugh))

21. Kevin: They're black.

22. Latanya: The black kids, but I didn't even talk to the white, because it seemed like, whenever we got in groups? All the blacks would sit together, and all the whites would sit together. I never talked to Nicole and all them, even though, she's mixed but I never talked to any of them.

23. Kevin: Did you feel like it was a pretty segregated class, that you couldn't talk to them?

24. Latanya: Really, I wasn't <u>trying</u> to talk to them.

After Latanya was prompted to offer an explanation of why she corrected herself (from "honk" to "white person"), she compared two sets of social relations (line 14). She perceived these social groups and her relations to them as relatively distinct. While she didn't "care about none of the other students, in that class," she did not want her teachers to think she was "like that" (line 14). Latanya made reference to the "onlooking" status of Sid and Maureen in the interaction. While her interaction appeared to be directed toward Ian and other classmates, in the interview account she was primarily concerned that the teachers were "in there," or present in the classroom. Moreover, Latanya's relationship to these teachers, and the threat of it by this incident, was suggested to be much more complicated than simply choosing to act as a good student, as suggested by the European American students in Segment 1. Rather, the danger of being "like that" includes not only failing as a student but also acting in a (racial) derogatory manner toward her teachers. This is yet another

instance visible throughout the interview data in which racialized, socially produced spaces are cointerpreted with the institution as a space of academic success.

Latanya only obliquely referenced her relationship with Sid and Maureen: "they helped me out a whole lot" (line 14). In this brief reference, Latanya suggested the importance of reciprocating, of continuing the historical, care-based relations with her teachers. Not only did Latanya structure the face-to-face, interactional time-space differently than other participants, she also drew on and laminated with the interaction a chronotope and of caring and personal student–teacher relations, as suggested in this brief motif of repeated help and attention. At the same time, Latanya also constructed her distinct separation from European American students in the class (lines 20–24). Latanya seemed to accept and not to be particularly disturbed by the racial segregation in the classroom. In this segment, she took a matter-of-fact view, considering this structuring of racial identity and space as relatively fixed, and not something that she was going to make an effort to change (line 24). Importantly, Latanya conceived of the segregated student–student relations and the (racially integrated) teacher–student relations as somewhat distinct. Interpreting Latanya's response to the interaction and positioning within it as uniquely concerned with racial identity omits the significance of her care-based and academically motivated relations to her teachers. Just as importantly, a critical racial interpretation might omit the significance of Latanya's strategic work in attempting to repair the interaction. Latanya's attempt at reshaping the interaction was not directed toward the general problem of race relations, with its familiar narrated worlds of black/white struggle, and binaries of identity and position. At the same time, she laminated the familiar figured world of racial strife, and its embedded chronotope of time-space division and tension, in shaping the particular and complex social relationships to her teachers.

FURTHER DISCUSSION

A postmodern preoccupation with spatial metaphors and spatial analysis is related, among other issues, to reconceiving of social identities and culture as traveling rather than isomorphically fixed in place (Clifford 1992), as translocal or "glocal" rather than local (Appadurai 1996; Yeager 1996). Social interaction and meanings are not stripped from the local (deterritorialized), making space irrelevant but are, rather, reterritorialized, not conforming to our experiences of space in high modernity (Gupta and Ferguson 1992:9). Identity is produced in a world of flows that is, simultaneously, a world of places (McDowell 1997). In contrast to an

abstract, essentialized view of identity, and in contrast to strong constructivist perspectives that isolate identities within particular contexts, a practice theory of identity can trace the ways in which time-spaces are knit, patched, cut up, laminated, and folded together—how more or less distant localities and temporalities are produced and related. Toward this end, this article analyzes the particularities of chronotopes constructed within interaction, and some of the diverse ways in which multiple represented and interactional time-spaces are related. It offers a partial interpretation of taking agency for one's own and others' identities that involves simultaneously acting on the stage, writing the drama, and being in the audience.

Through the analysis above my intent is to expand and complicate the spatial metaphor of positioning, to better understand how it is that individuals are simultaneously authors of and actors within time-space. While desiring to retain a focus on positioning as an interactional, social practice (e.g., Davies and Harré 1990) I move outward from the local, embedded scene of interaction and consider how positions are stabilized through the ongoing construction of the social/individual matrix:

> Identity is best conceived as a process of continually weaving together fragments of discourse and images, enactions, spaces and times, things and people into a vast matrix, in which complex systems of relationality between elements constellate around common-sense themes—one such being the national (Edensor 2002:29–30).

The "fragments" or "cultural ingredients" in the matrix are "increasingly mediated, polysemic, contested and subject to change" (Edensor 2002:17). Among them, we might assume that time-spaces or chronotopes are not inherent to a given social situation but, rather, that the meanings of social spaces must be continually reaffirmed relationally. Such practices within and among social spaces serve to dynamically (re)create identity "stability."

In analyzing the video-response data based on the classroom interaction with Latanya, I was struck by how participants reached the "same" conclusion that Latanya acted "ghetto," and, yet, on closer examination, how they arrived at this conclusion through markedly different constructions and connections in the identity matrix. Being or acting "ghetto," in Edensor's terms, functions as a kind of common-sense "theme" that, while little disputed, is maintained or stabilized. Edensor's argument concerning national identity is useful here in that "being ghetto" seems to function as a highly distributed and polysemic psychological/social category or loosely sketched story line that is continually recomposed with different resources. The meaning of ghetto and ghetto identity is not entirely stripped from material and semiotic space or place ("deterritorialized")

but is, rather, "reterritorialized"—shaped through produced, dynamic relations to multiple time-spaces. Latanya is recruited to the category "ghetto," while the figured world of ghetto, and its attendant time-space are reterritorialized to include her and the classroom event.

In addition to the constructed relations among social spaces forming a matrix of a ghetto identity, the role of adventure time as a particular quality of space-time and identity is especially evident in the data. Bakhtin's (1981) development of adventure time, based on an analysis of the Greek romance, stresses how an identity corresponds to a particular, durable self. This data and other analyses (Leander 2002a, 2002b) posit that adventure time is supported by institutional practices in conducting school-based discussions, which often appear to be located in no-space and no-time, abstracted from the situations of individual and collective social life. In this manner, the adventure time of the institutional classroom also serves as a hierarchically organizing social space against which other time-spaces are interpreted in the institutionally affirming practice of identity.

Finally, I believe it is important to recall that the notion of positioning is not simply a tool used to interpret other discursive practices, but is itself a discursive product. Critiquing and expanding the usefulness of the metaphor will come in part by recognizing that positions and locations (center, margin, periphery, etc.) are geographical constructs, and as such are held together not only be metaphorical/semiotic relations but also by material relations. There are obvious differences of power and agency between being in a material space (e.g., a classroom) and constructing a time-space or chronotope in language (Smith and Katz 1993). If social spaces are produced and laminated in practice, with particular consequences for identity and power, and if power is distributed unevenly across the matrix of social spaces, then more complete critiques and expansions of the positioning metaphor will by necessity depend on tracing and traversing material and metaphorical spaces.

KEVIN LEANDER is Assistant Professor in the Department of Teaching and Learning at Vanderbilt University.

NOTES

1. All personal and place names are pseudonyms. In order to further protect the anonymity of the participants, I have omitted details by which they could easily be identified as well as the name of the school and city where the research was conducted. Participants gave research consent and were active in reviewing and interpreting videotaped interactions. Data was collected several years ago. I spent a total of 1.5 academic years in the academy

as a researcher, one year of which was with this class, and also served as a classroom helper and occasional substitute teacher.

2. "However forcefully the real and the represented world resist fusion, however immutable the presence of that categorical boundary-line between them, they are nevertheless indissolubly tied up with each other and find themselves in mutual interaction; uninterrupted exchange goes on between them, similar to the uninterrupted exchange of matter between living organisms and the environment that surrounds them. . . . The work and the world represented in it enter into the real world and enrich it, and the real world enters into the work and its world as part of a continual process of its creation, as well as part of its subsequent life, in a continual renewing of the work through the creative perception of listeners and readers." (Bakhtin 1981:253–254)

3. See endnote 4, Holland and Leander this issue.

4. For convenience, I use "adventure time" in the remainder of the article to describe a similar sort of chronotope evoked in school activities.

5. Transcription Conventions:

( ) inaudible speech, relative to length of space

((laughs)) additional detail

[ ] overlapping speech of two or more speakers

(talk) questionable transcription

because stressed word

"sorry" de-emphasized speech, spoken softly

ha::rd lengthened sound or syllable

6. Of course, the classroom interaction is itself a represented chronotope, embedded in and laminated with the interaction I am having with the students as we watch the videotape together, yet another example of the multiple embeddings of represented and interactional chronotopes. There are a number of questions, beyond the scope of this article, that a video-elicited response methodology needs to address, including how participating in viewing, pausing, and rewinding a videotape is different than participating in an interaction, the time-space status of video-response texts with respect to transcripts of classroom interaction, and the participation of the researcher across these events.

REFERENCES CITED

Appadurai, Arjun
    1996 Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich
    1981 Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel. *In* The Dialogic Imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin. M. Holquist, ed. Pp. 84–258. Austin: University of Texas Press.
Clifford, James
    1992 Traveling Cultures. *In* Cultural Studies. L. Grossberg, C. Nelson, and P. A. Treichler, eds. Pp. 96–116. London: Routledge.
Davies, Bronwyn, and Rom Harré
    1990 Positioning: The Discursive Production of Selves. Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior 20(1):43–63.
Edensor, Tim
    2002 National Identity, Popular Culture, and Everyday Life. New York: Berg.
Goffman, Erving
    1981 Forms of Talk. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Gupta, Akhil, and James Ferguson
  1992   Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference. Cultural Anthropology 7(1):6–23.
Harvey, David
  1996   Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
Hirst, Elizabeth
  2003   Diverse Voices in a Second Language Classroom: Burlesque, Parody and Mimicry. Language and Education: An International Journal 17(3):174–191.
Holland, Dorothy, et al.
  1998   Identity and Agency in Cultural Worlds. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Holland, Dorothy, and Jean Lave
  2001   Introduction. *In* History in Person: Enduring Struggles and the Practice of Identity. Dorothy Holland and Jean Lave, eds. Pp. 3–33. Albuquerque, NM: School of American Research Press.
Leander, Kevin M.
  2001   "This Is Our Freedom Bus Going Home Right Now": Producing and Hybridizing Space-Time Contexts in Pedagogical Discourse. Journal of Literacy Research 33:637–679.
  2002a Locating Latanya: The Situated Production of Identity Artifacts in Classroom Interaction. Research in the Teaching of English 37:198–250.
  2002b Silencing in Classroom Interaction: Producing and Relating Social Spaces. Discourse Processes 34(2):193–235.
Lefebvre, H.
  1991[1974]   The Production of Space. D. Nicholson-Smith, trans. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
McDowell, Linda, ed.
  1997   Undoing Place? A Geographical Reader. New York: Arnold.
Morson, Gary Saul, and Caryl Emerson
  1990   Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Odell, Lee, Dixie Goswami, and Anne Herrington
  1983   The Discourse-Based Interview: A Procedure for Exploring the Tacit Knowledge of Writers in Non-Academic Settings. *In* Research on Writing. P. Mosenthal, L. Tamor, and S. A. Walmsley, eds. Pp. 221–236. New York: Longman.
Smith, Neil, and Cindi Katz
  1993   Grounding Metaphor: Toward a Spatialized Politics. *In* Place and the Politics of Identity. M. Keith and S. Pile, eds. Pp. 67–83. New York: Routledge.
Soja, Edward W.
  1989   Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory. London: Verso.
  1996   Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
Yeager, Patricia, ed.
  1996   The Geography of Identity. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.