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Abstract

In this article we examine the complexities of immigrant children’s role as translators and linguistic mediators between their parents and their teachers during parent-teacher conferences. In our analyses, we first examine the linguistic structure of teachers’ narratives about the children, and then look at how children construct their moral and social identities as students in their translations of these narratives, and how parents respond to their children’s translations. We found that in their translations children consistently downgraded their teachers’ praise and exaggerated their responsibility for any problems the teachers identified; parents in turn took up the problem focus and underscored children’s responsibility. Implications for the socialization of immigrant children and parents into educational institutional ideologies, as well as the impact of these practices on children’s development are discussed.
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Introduction

Narrative is one of the most ubiquitous discourse genres in everyday human social interaction (Bruner, 2002; Ochs, 2004), and everyday narrative practices are a primeval tool for the socialization of children into moral values and socio-cultural beliefs. By attending to how caregivers employ life experiences, emotions, and identities through routine narrative practices, and participating in these narrations themselves, children construct their own identities and their relationships to others and to the world (i.e. Miller et al., 1990; Ochs & Capps, 2001; Ochs & Capps, 1995).

A considerable body of literature exists on children’s story-telling interactions, but most of these studies examine talk by family members at home (i.e. Fung, 1994; Miller et al., 1996; Ochs & Taylor, 1992). (Baquedano-López (2003) and Ek (2004) are important exceptions; these authors consider identity narratives and language socialization practices within the context of religious education classes.) As a result, we know very little about the narrative practices that children encounter in other important arenas for adults’ socialization efforts, such as in schools. School narration practices may be especially important for understanding the identity construction processes of immigrant and
biculural youth, insofar as schools serve as central sites of socialization into “American” values.

In this paper we take advantage of a unique window into children’s exposure to institutional narratives, by examining teachers’ talk about children’s developing competencies and their moral agency in the context of parent-teacher conferences. This window also illuminates children’s *take-up* of these narrations, and their constructions of their own moral agency, because the youth that we study are the children of immigrants who actively participate in these parent-teacher conferences as translators, language brokers or *para-phrasers*¹ for their families. These data allow us to analyze both the discourse structures of teachers’ narrative practices, and the ways in which youth reflect and/or transform these in their renderings of this talk for their parents. We pay particular attention to how the children are positioned as moral agents and social actors in these narratives, and in turn how they position themselves.

**Background Research**

We draw on research findings and theoretical perspectives from three different lines of inquiry to frame our work: (a) studies of immigrant children’s work as socio-cultural brokers and linguistic mediators; (b) linguistic anthropological and psychological approaches to narrative practices; and (c) ethnomethodological perspectives on discourse practices in parent-teacher conferences.

¹ In the literature on children’s translating/interpreting several terminologies have been put forward to capture the different dimensions of the work that children do when translating on behalf of their families, including *language brokers, para-phrasers, interlopers, mediators, and family interpreters* (See Author et al., 2003, for a fuller discussion of these terminologies).
Immigrant Children’s Work as Cultural Brokers

In the last decade, researchers working within a number of different disciplines have begun documenting the widespread activities of children across a range of immigrant communities as socio-cultural brokers and linguistic mediators between their parents and representatives of social institutions of the host society. Whereas this is still a fairly new research enterprise, a broad range of this phenomenon has been taken up in this rapidly growing body of literature. Some work has focused on identifying immigrant children’s attitudes towards translating and the relationship between children’s work as translators, academic achievement, and other psychological outcomes, such as self-efficacy (Acoach and Webb, 2004; Buriel et al., 1998; Chao, 2006; Dorner, Orellana and Li-Grining, forthcoming; Parke and Buriel, 1995; Tse, 1995; 1996a; Weisskirch and Alba, 2002).

Other research has considered the significance of children’s contributions for the functioning of immigrant household and processes of settlement (Chu, 1999; Song, 1997; Orellana 2001; Orellana, Dorner and Pulido, 2003; Valenzuela, 1999). Educational researchers have examined the literacy demands of children’s translations of written texts (Orellana, Reynolds, Dorner and Meza 2003) and implications for the development of academic skills (Malakoff and Hakuta, 1991; Valdés, 2002).

Perhaps the most relevant perspective for the purpose of the present study is found in the work of researchers who have examined immigrant children’s contributions to their households as socio-cultural practices and important arenas for the construction and renegotiation of social identities and relationships. Song (1997) illustrated how second-generation Chinese immigrant children in England exercised agency in the construction of hybrid cultural identities through differential ways of positioning themselves with respect to expected household contributions, including as language brokers. Researchers have also examined the implications of children’s paradoxical positions in language brokering activities for their developing competencies as social actors (Hall, 2004; Reynolds and Sánchez and Orellana—Construction of Moral and Social Identity— 4
Orellana, under review) – as children, speaking to and for adults, and the children of immigrants, interfacing with authority figures from mainstream institutions. Youth’s bilingual skills allow them to exercise a certain level of power within their families, participating in decision-making processes and acting as advocates for themselves and their families; yet their status as immigrants and as children imposes significant limits on their power. The paradoxical nature of children’s positions bears exploration across a wider range of sociocultural domains and sociolinguistic contexts than has been achieved to date, however, and the present study is a contribution to that effort.

**Narrative Practices, Identity, and Socialization**

Narrative has been described as a sense-making activity that people use to imbue lived experience with meaning and coherence (Garro and Mattingly, 2000; Ochs and Capps, 1995, 2001), particularly when their experiences are perceived as contravening community assumptions about events (Bruner, 2002; Ochs, 2004). In this sense, narratives reference normative views of what constitutes moral behavior and local cultural frameworks, even as they work to maintain and create those very frames (i.e. Garro, 2003; Ochs and Capps, 1995). Previous work on the discursive shape of narratives in different social groups and speech communities has shown how the structure of narratives is not only highly group specific (Goodwin, 1990; Labov, 1972; Miller et al., 1996; Scollon, 1975), but also a primordial tool for establishing the social and collective cultural identities of groups (i.e. Baquedano-López, 2000; Ochs et al., 1989; Rymes, 1995), as well as for establishing social roles and relationships among its members (i.e. Ochs and Taylor, 1992).

Because narrative is such a pervasive discourse practice in human interaction
(Ochs and Capps, 2001), everyday narrative practices have also been studied as processes by which children and other novices are apprenticed into socio-cultural worldviews and progressively become competent speakers and members of their communities. Since the discursive shape of narratives varies across communities in that narrative logics are always organized with reference to local cultural frameworks and notions of the moral good, we can distinguish a dual, yet interrelated, dimension of the role of narrative in children’s language socialization: children are socialized into narrative practices and they are socialized through narrative practices. A classic example of the first dimension is that of Heath’s (1983) explorations of how working-class Euro-American and African-American children are socialized into family narrative practices that are not congruent with the narrative practices favored in educational settings, the latter being more aligned with the family narrative practices found among white, middle-class families. Similarly, Miller (1982) studied the implications of narrative practices in a white working-class neighborhood for children’s emerging competence to engage in personal story-telling. In terms of how narrative practices socialize children into cultural world-views and moral understandings of the self in relation to personal experience, Miller et al. (1990; 1996) and Fung’s (1994) work have shown how narratives about children’s past behavior told by American and Taiwanese adults in the presence of children cast children in moral roles consistent with cultural values and beliefs, thus providing cultural schemata for children to interpret and narratively construct their own experiences and identities. Also, Ochs and Capps’s (1995) analysis of the socialization into agoraphobia describes how children’s participation in family story-telling contributes to their apprenticeship into theories of events and experiential logics about emotions vis-à-vis life experiences in ways that undermine their sense of agency and efficacy as social actors.
**Parent-Teacher Conferences**

Parent-teacher conferences are considered the cornerstone of parent-teacher communication, and a number of ethnomethodologically-informed studies have studied these in order to establish how home and school institutions relate to each other. This research has described how adult participants, mainly parents and teachers, orient to these conferences as occasions for determining whether students’ performance requires remedial intervention and, if so, strategizing the form this remediation will take (Pillet-Shore, 2001, 2003a). Baker and Keogh (1997) have emphasized, in particular, the interactional moral work that characterizes these exchanges between parents and teachers. Because both home and school are potential spaces where the responsibility for the child’s problems and accomplishments can be located, parents and teachers may work together to delineate the boundaries of moral responsibility, while avoiding direct assignation of blame that could be implicative of improper teaching or improper parenting. Analyses of the features of talk in these interactions have also shown how, as parents and teachers offer accounts of the child’s behavior, they also construct moral and institutional identities for themselves as knowledgeable teachers and good parents (Baker and Keogh, 1995; Pillet-Shore, 2003b).

This work illuminates crucial issues in the sociology of education, but the role of the child in the context of parent-teacher conferences, and how children are portrayed in the moral universe that parents and teachers co-construct, has received little attention. Researchers of social and communicative practices in parent-teacher conferences usually refer to the child as the overhearing audience or the silent child. Indeed, children are typically silent in these encounters, either because they are not given the right to speak or because they opt for silence as interactional forms of resistance to adults’ complicity and scrutiny (Silverman et al., 1998, Pillet-Shore, 2001).

However, for immigrant children, who are the primary, and often only intermediaries between parents and teachers (Tse, 1996b), silence is simply not an option. As language Sánchez and Orellana—*Construction of Moral and Social Identity*—
brokers, not only are they given the right to speak; they are in fact positioned in a privileged role as strategic actors in the construction of moral identities (their own, their parents’, and their teachers’). Yet, as children and as students in these interactions, they are simultaneously objects of evaluation and socialization into institutional expectations by their caregivers.

Methodology

Data Collection

This study of teachers’ narratives in parent-teacher conferences, and bilingual youths’ translations of the narratives, draws from data gathered in a program of research with eighteen bilingual youth. The larger project examined the range of youths’ translating experiences, documenting these through children’s self-reports (in interviews, focus groups, and journal entries) as well as through observations and audio-taping of live translation episodes. In all, more than eighty translation episodes were recorded on tape, covering a range of situations including the translation of written texts at home, and a variety of interactional encounters outside the home (in doctors’ offices, stores, and schools). Eleven of these involved parent-teacher conferences done at different points in time over a two year period. The conferences were recorded on audiotape by the second author, who also wrote fieldnotes to describe the encounters. They were transcribed according to the system described in Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974).

Participants

The parent-teacher conferences involve four of the study participants who live in a suburban community where there are few bilingual resources and thus where children often act as translators between home and school. (The same was not true for the youth in a second site, which was reasonably well-staffed with bilingual personnel; those youth did...
not generally serve as translators for their own parent-teacher conferences.) Each of the youth was the eldest in their families, and utilized their bilingual skills to help their families with a wide range of tasks. We provide some general background information here:

Nova was in seventh grade when we recorded two parent-teacher conferences, one with his Language Arts/Social Studies teacher (Ms Johnson), and one with his science instructor (Mr. Miller). Nova had immigrated with his family from the state of Guanajuato, Mexico, when he was in fourth grade. He received bilingual support services in his middle school (in the form of a Social Studies/Language Arts block for second language learners led by Ms Johnson). Nova took Spanish for his foreign-language option (a course that he found both easy and boring), but was in all-English classrooms for the remaining school subject.

Miguel: Miguel was in the sixth grade at the time that we recorded five conferences, with his homeroom/Language Arts teacher (Ms Harrison), math teacher (Ms Conroy), science teacher (Ms Miller), and two physical education instructors (Mr. Boyd and Mr. Roper). Miguel had been in a bilingual program through third grade but was in all-English classrooms since then. Miguel’s parents had immigrated to the United States from Guanajuato, Mexico just before Miguel was born.

María, a cousin of Miguel’s, whose family was from the same farming community in Guanajuato, like Miguel had two younger siblings. We recorded three conferences involving María: two when she was in fifth grade (with Ms. Salinger), and a joint one with her middle school social studies and science teachers, Ms Barrett and Ms Roth (in sixth grade). This was María’s first year in an all-English classroom without bilingual supports; she had received “pull-out” instruction in ESL through the fourth grade.

---

2 All names are pseudonyms; the children selected their pseudonyms for themselves.
The fourth participant, Estela, was the oldest of four girls, and was considered “la mano derecha de la familia” (“the right hand of the family”) by her mother. Estela was in the fourth grade in an all-English classroom; she had never been enrolled in a bilingual program, except in preschool. Her parents were immigrants from a small town in Guanajuato, Mexico. Estela’s conference involves her teacher, Mr. Vick.

Analyses

For this study, all of the parent-teacher conference data were examined in order to identify narrative sequences. We defined narrative according to the following criteria: (a) the child is cast as a protagonist; (b) the narrative often centers around a perceived problem (in the student’s behavior or academic performance) (c) these events are recounted in temporal order. This resulted in a data corpus of seven narratives told in the context of five different parent-teacher conferences involving five teachers.

These teacher narratives, and the children’s translations of them, were then analyzed according to the narrative analysis methodological framework developed by Ochs and Capps (1995, 2001). The analyses focused on the following dimensions of teachers’ and children’s narratives, as well as the parents’ responses:

1) **Discursive and grammatical structuring**: How are teachers’ institutional narratives structured as a discourse genre? What discursive and grammatical features do teachers use to cast children as moral agents in these narratives? What moral characteristics are attributed to the children in the teacher’s narratives? What discursive features do teachers use to frame and organize children’s experiences?

2) **Discursive and grammatical devices that children use when recasting the teachers’ narratives**: What gets translated and how? What is left out? What Sánchez and Orellana—*Construction of Moral and Social Identity*—
is foregrounded or mitigated? How do children manage praise and criticism in the narrative translations?

3) **Parents’ responses to the teachers’ narratives and to the children’s translations of these narratives:** In what ways do parents challenge the teachers’ narratives, if at all? In what ways do they engage with the children’s translations? How do they position the child and themselves as the responsible party for the child, as moral agents?

**Teachers’ Institutional Narratives as a Discourse Genre**

Narrative practices for ordering lived experience are always framed in relation to specific socio-cultural frameworks and expectations. Because of this their shape is highly group specific and constitutive of the social and moral identities of their members. What then, was the shape of teachers’ institutional narratives that immigrant children encounter in the context of these parent-teacher conferences? Research on narrative practices in other professional contexts has underscored the fact that practitioners often turn to narrative as a mode of reasoning through and framing practical action, particularly when they need to make sense of particular problems that affect how they perform their jobs (Mattingly, 1998). Yet, as Mattingly (1998) has also pointed out, narratives are rhetorical structures told from a particular vantage point, and professionals use them not only for sense-making, but also to persuade other actors to see events in a particular way so that they become active co-participants in a future course of action. Much as in the contexts analyzed by Mattingly (1998), the narrative practices that the teachers in this study engaged in implicate this double value of narrative as a sense-making and persuasive tool.

The narratives that were deployed by teachers in the context of these parent-teacher conferences most often dealt with a central problematic event (Ochs and Capps, 1995). This was usually an academic problem or an inappropriate behavior in the

Sánchez and Orellana—*Construction of Moral and Social Identity*— 11
classroom, such as poor performance or talking in class, that was perceived as creating disequilibrium in the child’s appropriate academic and civic development. The central problematic events were framed against overall evaluations of the student in relation to his or her past performance or to an institutional criterion of assessment that was sometimes in itself cast as problematic, such as getting a “C,” an “Inconsistent,” or not meeting grade standard levels. Framing the central problematic event in institutional terms allows teachers to couch their evaluations of the students in the language of objectivity, distancing their evaluations from their personal feelings about the students, while at the same time presenting themselves as knowledgeable and responsible professionals.

The central problematic event in the narratives we examined was elaborated against a specific narrative logic, in which teachers offered a theory of events and reasons why the problem has originated in the first place. The logic underlying the teachers’ narratives were organized around institutional rationale and teachers’ beliefs about learning and students’ performance. Moreover, the institutional logic put forward by these teachers generally exculpated them of moral responsibility for the child’s problems.

Following the presentation of the problem, the teachers in this study invariably strategized possible future courses of action in order to overcome the problems or turn them in a more positive direction. Often, this formulation of possible solutions anticipated positive future consequences for the student, such as getting better grades or making the honor roll, if the suggested courses of action were followed. It is in these last two elements of the teachers’ narratives where we most clearly see the value of narrative as a persuasive tool. For a pedagogical intervention to be effective teachers need to make sure that the child and his/her parents see the reasons for the child’s academic problems in a way that is congruent with the teacher’s theory of events, but also that they will be willing participants in the proposed course of actions. Teachers attempt to ensure this by depicting optimistic and positive futures for the child. A final component of teachers’ narratives
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present in almost all the segments analyzed was a positive personal evaluation of the student that teachers offer as a conclusion or summary statement.

We can see how these narrative elements came together in Ms. Harrison’s introduction to her conference with Miguel’s mother. Ms. Harrison initiated the conference with an overall evaluation of Miguel using the institutional criterion of letter grades:

“Our, ok, now we look at social studies, the area of social studies you got a C.”

She elaborated on this problematic by noting Miguel’s trouble with tests:

“And I think that mainly that is based on test scores from the social studies tests”

She then went on to offer her interpretation for this problem – that Miguel is not studying enough – and to suggest a course of action that she believed will guarantee success:

“that you need to read through the chapter every night, because some of the material you’ll just remember it- will just- uh, you’ll just remember it because you’ve read it so much.
The assessments that you’re given at the end of each section should be completed, and you should go over those each night. just you know, to test yourself.
See if you know what dynasty is or city-state. uh, you can just make flash cards if you want to and then practice the definitions,
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and focus on the questions that are there. At the end of the unit you can go and just practice answering those questions without looking at the book and see if you can answer them correctly. That will help prepare you as well as your reading. you can’t read it just once. you have to read the same chapter several times. ok?

This narrative was directed to Miguel, using the first person. However, Ms. Harrison added a coda at the end, with the message that she wanted to emphasize to Miguel’s mother – a message of promise that if Miguel works harder he will be able to meet the institutional criteria for success of making the school’s honor roll:

Ok I’d also like you to let her know that I feel that you’re very smart. You’re very capable of making the honor roll. That you have to put forth more effort to make sure that your work is complete, to make sure the work comes in on time and that you’re studying for the test.

As a variance on this basic narrative structure, two of the teachers in this study (the two elementary school teachers, Ms. Salinger and Mr. Vick) engaged in a second narrative practice that underscores the value of narrative as a sense-making activity (Mattingly, 1998; Ochs and Capps, 2001). In this second narrative form, the teachers enlisted the child in identifying the problems. They also oriented to students’ past performance in the classroom with a more uncertain and tentative stance in terms of the level of responsibility that is ascribed to the child. We see this in Ms. Salinger’s narrative about fifth-grade Sánchez and Orellana—*Construction of Moral and Social Identity*— 14
María. Ms. Salinger began by talking about María, to María’s mother, using the third person:

Um? María’s report card is really good.
She—she’s really doing a great job in fifth grade.
All of her marks are meeting grade level standards.
Um, She—she’s done much better on, most of her tests
this, this quarter?
Social Studies tests—
the only thi—reason that I put an inconsistent, is
sometimes María’s math tests aren’t—
they don’t show me as much as=
=what I know that she knows.

At this point, Ms. Salinger interrupted her narrative to invite María to take up the role of translator:

Can you translate that for me? (...)

She continued talking to María, using the first person, to explain the problem::

Um, this, this “I” inconsistent means that
Sometimes on your math tests, you get—
you do all your homework and you—
and you participate in class, and you do everything
=you’re supposed to do,
but when it comes to taking the test,
you don’t— you don’t— get as good of a grade on your=
=test as you do in the classroom.

Ms. Salinger then directly enlisted María in her identification and interpretation of this problem by asking: “Now why do you think that is, María?” In response, María let out a small giggle and answered that she didn’t know. Ms. Salinger tries again:
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You don’t know? Do you–, when you stu– when you study: um, for your tests, is it that you sometimes forget what– what you’ve studied? um, on your math test? or is it more, that, um, when you’re taking the test, you don’t– (1.5) you go kind of quickly?: or you know, what– what do you think it is?

In this case, María took up her teacher’s framing of the problem, agreeing (“I go kind of quickly”), but adding, in her own defense: “But I check it over.”

The discursive structure of this second narrative practice is similar to the first in that it begins with an overall performance of the student in terms of past performance, and an institutional criterion of assessment that anticipates the central problematic event. Following this, the teachers elaborated the problematic event, but instead of offering reasons for the student’s problem and subsequently strategizing possible courses of action to remediate the problem, teachers engaged the children in figuring out why the problem has originated in the first place. As with the first structure, Ms. Salinger brought the narrative to close with a positive evaluation of the student offered as a summary statement:

Uh, but that would be the only thing.

In, in every other way, María has been, doing, marvelous.
Table 1 presents another example of this narrative form, from Nova’s conference with Mr. Nolan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative Components</th>
<th>Nova’s Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation of the student in relation to his performance</td>
<td>T: I mean it—it’s really beautiful things that he can put together and in you-know in a way part of science is modeling= what’s going on in nature and I think he has a great deal of appreciation for tha::t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problematic event (Nova is getting poor grades on his tests) Teacher offers a reason for the student’s academic problem (Nova’s limited English proficiency) + possible solution and teacher anticipates future positive consequences (Nova’s performance will improve as his English improves and he will get good grades).</td>
<td>T: So when he gets his (0.6) English skills (.) Uhm to be more proficient he should be getting A’s and B’s in science So he’s- you-know he’s meeting standards obviously because I am not gonna (.) downgrade him on standards uhm based upon his (.) English proficiency? uhm so he will do better on the test as his English improves=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation of student’s behavior and performance</td>
<td>T: =I think you know he has already shown great improvement over the year (.) cuz last year you were last year you were in all ESL classes Uhm so he’s coming around very nice and he’s very well behaved he’s- he’s a gentleman uhm he’s very much respected and liked by his peers and the other students (.) uhm he seems attentive in class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers’ Casting of Children as Moral Agents

Because a central feature in teachers’ institutional narratives was evaluation of students’ problematic actions and behaviors in terms of institutional expectations, we wanted to look at how teachers cast children as moral agents (Taylor, 1996) and at the identities that teachers construct for children through their representations of these Sánchez and Orellana—Construction of Moral and Social Identity—17
problems. As we have already shown, despite the fact that these narratives focused on problematic actions and events, they consistently contained positive evaluations and affirming attributes about the child and his/her present and future potential. Teachers’ efforts to portray students in a positive light is underscored by the sequentially-prominent position that these positive castings occupy. They are found at the beginning or end of the narratives and, often in both places, as the narrative in Table 1 illustrates. The tendency for adults’ narratives about children to acknowledge, yet mitigate children’s problematic behaviors has already been documented as characteristic of Euro-American family narrative practices, and has been analyzed in relation to mainstream American cultural beliefs about the need to protect and enhance the child’s self-esteem (Miller et al., 1996).

Grammatical Resources in the Construction of Moral and Social Identities

In order to understand how teachers construct these portraits of the children, it is crucial to look also at the linguistic and grammatical structures teachers draw on, since the narrators’ language creates identities and shapes narrators’ and audiences’ perceptions of events (Ochs and Capps, 1995, 2001). In their efforts to avoid direct assignation of blame and to mitigate children’s moral responsibility teachers utilized a variety of linguistic resources: the use of the passive voice, the first person plural pronoun (to include themselves in a shared sense of responsibility with the students), verbs that connote unintententionality, and nominalizations. (See Table 2.) They also intensified positive attributions by adding intensifiers like “really” and “very,” and by using the progressive aspect to depict children’s positive behavior as ongoing, repetitive, and part of a successful developmental trajectory; and they used de-intensifying words to accompany negative attributes (See Table 3).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic Resources</th>
<th>Data Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children cast in semantic roles other than agents</td>
<td>María’s Conference with Ms Salinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Role of Possessor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: Maria’s math tests aren’t—they don’t show me as much as what I know that she knows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>María’s Conference with Ms Salinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Role of experiencer/receiver)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: you don’t–get as good of a grade on your test as you do in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nova’s Conference with Ms Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Role of experiencer/receiver)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: So: when he gets his (0.6) English skills (.). Uhm to be more proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive voice to mitigate children’s moral responsibility</td>
<td>Miguel’s Conference with Ms Conroy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: The assessments that you’re given at the end of each section should be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miguel’s Conference with Ms Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: making sure all assignments are turned in on time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominalizations to mitigate children’s moral responsibility</td>
<td>Miguel’s Conference with Ms Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: ok, and in reading it’s the um, the need to elaborate and the completing of your reports. the need to give as much information as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miguel’s Conference with Ms Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: so the rush to finish so quickly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miguel’s Conference with Ms Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: I see a little bit of a struggle with understanding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Verbs that connot e unintentionality to mitigate children’s moral responsibility | María’s Conference with Ms Salinger  
T: when you study: um, for your tests, is it that you sometimes forget what- what you’ve studied? |
| --- | --- |
| Personifications to mitigate children’s agency | Nova’s Conference with Mr Nolan  
T: So: when he gets his (0.6) English skills (.) Uhm to be more proficient |
| First person plural (“we) used to emphasize teachers’ shared responsibilities with the child | Miguel’s Conference with Ms Conroy  
T: I would say that these test scores need to come up.  
Miguel’s conference with Mr. Miller  
T: We need to work on studying for tests  
Miguel’s conference with Ms Conroy  
T: So we need to improve the tests and quizzes. |
Table 3: Linguistic Resources for Emphasizing Children’s Positive Attributes and for Highlighting Children’s Good Past Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic Resources</th>
<th>Data Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Intensifiers accompanying positive assessments                                       | María’s Conference with Ms Salinger  
  T: She-She-she’s really doing a great job in fifth grade.                     |
|                                                                                     | Nova’s Conference with Mr Miller  
  T: he’s very well behaved                                                         |
|                                                                                     | María’s Conference with Ms Barrett  
  T: Uh Maria is doing quite well                                                      |
|                                                                                     | Nova’s Conference with Ms Johnson  
  T: he’s very much respected And liked by his peers and the other students       |
| Use of absolute adverbs of frequency like “always” and “never” and superlatives to  | Miguel’s Conference with Ms Conroy  
  emphasize positive qualities                                                         
  T: your homework has been getting a lot better=  
  =You’ve been a lot more consistent with your homework which is really helping,     |
|                                                                                     | Estela’s conference with Mr. Vick  
  T: She always does her best and always tries her hardest...You never rush things, 
  you take your time. You always try your hardest.                                   |
| Deintensifiers accompanying negative assessments                                     | María’s Conference with Ms Salinger  
  T: she has to talk a little bit                                                     |
| Ing- Progressive Aspect to depict children’s positive behavior as ongoing and        | María’s Conference with Ms Salinger  
  repetitive. The progressive aspect also indexes speakers’ positive emotional affect to the |
  repetitive. The progressive aspect also indexes speakers’ positive emotional affect to the |
  great job in fifth grade.                                                          |
|                                                                                     | Miguel’s Conference with Mr Roper  
  T: You have to be a little more                                                       |

Sánchez and Orellana—Construction of Moral and Social Identity—21
In addition to these grammatical resources, in the course of their narratives, teachers also emphasized certain positive qualities about the children as students. Some examples of the attributes that these teachers singled out are: participating in class, doing all homework, turning in assignments on time, and being well-behaved, gentlemanly, respected and liked by peers, organized, and hard-working. These characterizations contribute to teachers’ constructions of the children as students, not defined solely by their academic deficiencies or problematic behaviors. It has been documented that in family narratives about children, Euro-American adults refer to the principle of “self-
maximization,” that is, they describe qualities that they want children to have in the future (Miller et al., 1997). Teachers seem to be doing something similar in that they do not simply formulate children’s identities as students in the present, but they orient to the identities they want the children to have in the future. The specific attributes that teachers chose to highlight about the children are important because these communicate institutional expectations and ideologies of what constitutes a good student. The named positive attributes, along with the concerns raised by the teachers in the narration of the central problematic events, discursively instantiate the value systems of the teachers and, in turn, of the institution.

**Teachers’ Institutional Narratives and the Organization of Children’s Experiences**

A final aspect of the teachers’ narratives that we will consider is how they arranged children’s experiences along temporal lines of development. An important notion that has been put forward in the literature on child development is that of prolepsis, or representation of the child’s future development in the present (Cole, 2002). Language-mediated routines have been described as crucial to the way prolepsis works in providing an immediate environment for the child’s development in the future. Cole (2002), for example, has pointed out how adults’ talk about children and interpretations of children’s behavior regularly involve recollections of the past that are related to adults’ present views and treatment of the children. This, in turn, is related to culturally-appropriate imagined futures for the children. Many of the teachers’ narratives in these parent-teacher conferences have a proleptic quality in the ways in which they establish relationships between the past, present, and future of the children according to institutional expectations of development. First of all, children’s past performance was generally only invoked in these teachers’ narratives to highlight their academic improvement:

   Sánchez and Orellana—*Construction of Moral and Social Identity*—23
María’s Conference with Ms Salinger

T: She-she’s done much better on, most of her tests this, this quarter?

Nova’s Conference with Ms Johnson

T: he has already shown great improvement over the year (. ) cuz last year you were- last year you were in all ESL classes

Miguel’s Conference with Ms Conroy

T: Lately since you have been in the after school homework program your homework has been getting a lot better You’ve been a lot more consistent with your homework

These commentaries framed children’s present problems and linked their resolution with optimistic imagined futures for the children. The projected futures were often expressed with a high degree of certainty, which shaped the children’s current experiences and provided an immediate context for the children’s development:

Nova’s Conference with Mr. Miller

T: So: when he gets his (0.6) English skills (. ) Uhm to be more proficient he should be get-getting A’s and B’s in science (...) so he will do better on the test as his English improves=

Miguel’s Conference with Ms Harrison

T: you’re very capable of making the honor roll

Miguel’s Conference with Ms Conroy

T: I know you can do better than that

Estela’s Conference with Mr. Vick

T: If you just, if you stick (with it), you will be a perfect English reader, English writer, English speaker at the rate you’re going.

Thus, while addressing problematic issues or behaviors by the children (i.e. talking in class, not working hard enough, having limited English proficiency), teachers still structured their narratives as vehicles for affirmation of the child. Most of the teachers in Sánchez and Orellana—Construction of Moral and Social Identity—24
this study went to great lengths to highlight the positive; they avoided dwelling on the children’s problems and making direct charges against the child through mitigation of agency and children’s moral responsibility. (The two physical education teachers that Miguel translate for utilized a more direct and unmitigated style, telling Miguel that he needed to be more responsible to bring his uniform every day and that his scores on activity tests needed to improve in no unclear terms; but they did end the conference with an optimistic projection of how Miguel can improve his scores gradually through practice.) Furthermore, because teachers' narratives referred to what children could do and toward optimistic views of the child’s performance in the future, children's present problems and misbehaviors were depicted as something that could be overcome.

**Children’s Narratives-in-Translation**

As we have discussed, immigrant child para-phrasers occupy paradoxical social positions. In the context of parent-teacher conferences, they occupy at least three positions simultaneously: the privileged role of translator, which accords them some powers over how the teachers’ narratives are conveyed; that of present interlocutor being talked about, with the presumed right to challenge the teacher’s representation of events and actions; and the position of co-narrator-in-translation, with the opportunity to recast his or her own identity as well as that of others. Conceivably, translators could recast these in a manner that renders themselves morally superior to the initial narrator, following the “looking good principle.” (See Ochs et al., 1989.) At the same time, children’s actions are delimited by their social status as novices, subject to the surveillance of caregivers and the object of their evaluations. They are also constrained by implicit ethical responsibilities as translators to ensure that messages are delivered faithfully. How do children manage these paradoxical positionalities interactionally? What identities do they construct for
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themselves as they recast their teachers’ narratives in translation? How do they present themselves as moral agents and as social actors?

Now here is the exploration of children’s ethical dilemmas more fruitful than in the children’s handling of praise and criticism in the teachers’ narratives, not only because praise and criticism are fairly delicate activities in everyday human interaction, but also because how teachers organize praise and criticism within their narratives is inextricably linked to the moral and ethical identities they construct about the children. Thus, we turn now to a close examination of how the children handled praise and criticism in their translations of teachers’ narratives.

**Translations of Praise**

Analyses of the children’s translations show that the vast majority of teachers’ positive assessments were either not translated or significantly downgraded. Given their relatively powerful role as para-phrasers, it is particularly significant that what all three children mitigate and/or choose not to translate in these encounters was precisely their teachers’ positive descriptions of their academic skills and good behaviors and attitudes as students. Table 4 contains examples of teachers’ praise that was not translated by the children.

In similar ways, children draw on grammatical resources to downgrade their teachers’ positive evaluations. They did this by reducing praise to the general gloss “voy bien” (“I’m doing well”), downgrading superlatives, eliminating intensifiers like really and very, and substituting neutral verbs for affect laden ones. This is illustrated in Table 5.
### Table 4: Non-translated Teachers Praise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>María’s Conference with Ms. Salinger</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: you do all your homework and you- and you participate in class, and you do everything you’re supposed to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nova’s Conference with Mr Nolan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: it’s really beautiful things that he can put together and in you-know in a way part of science is modeling= what’s going on in nature and I think he has a great deal of appreciation for that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miguel’s Conference with Ms Harrison</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: I’d also like you to let her know= that I feel that you’re very smart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miguel’s Conference with Ms Conroy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: your homework has been getting a lot better= You’ve been a lot more consistent with your homework which is really helping,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miguel’s Conference with Ms Harrison</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: language arts you had a B, that’s in my class, which means that in language arts you are doing well,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>María’s Conference with Ms Salinger</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: she reads, she reads a lot= she’s a very good student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estela’s Conference with Mr. Vick</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: You are doing wonderfully. You’re doing wonderfully.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estela’s Conference with Mr. Vick</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: Your daughter’s a very bright girl. She can do all of the work, and do it well. She does all of the work well. Everything that I give her. Everything that she’s asked to do.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5: Downgrading Praise in Translation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical Resources</th>
<th>Teachers’ Praise</th>
<th>Child’s Downgraded Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elimination of Intensifiers</strong></td>
<td>María’s Conference with Ms Salinger T: She—she—she’s really doing a great job in fifth grade.</td>
<td>V: Dice que voy bien en las clases (She says that I am doing well in class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nova's Conference with Mr Nolan T: he’s very well behaved</td>
<td>N: que me porto bien en la clase (That I behave well in class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>María’s Conference with Ms Barrett T: Uh Maria is doing quite well</td>
<td>M: que estoy haciendo bien (That I am doing well)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>María’s Conference with Ms Barrett 1) T: She’s a hard worker</td>
<td>M: que soy una trabajadora (That I am a worker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substitution of neutral verbs for positive affect-loaded verbs</strong></td>
<td>Nova’s Conference with Ms Johnson T: he’s very much respected And liked by his peers and the other students</td>
<td>N: me llevo bien con los estudiantes =y ellos se llevan bien conmigo (I get along with the students and they get along with me)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substitution of deintensifiers for superlatives</strong></td>
<td>María’s Conference with Ms Barrett T: I gave her this program because I think you can=handle it, the Contemporary classics. It’s usually for the best=students in reading.</td>
<td>V: Y me dio ese programa porque=porque=yo soy más o menos=que puedo leer bien (And she gave me that program because= because=I am more or less=I can read well)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recasting Moral and Social Identities in Children’s Translations

Children’s management of criticism reveals perhaps more clearly their stances toward their paradoxical positions than does their handling of praise. The ethical dilemma that they faced is evidenced at the discourse level by the large number of false starts, hesitations, self-repairs, cut-offs, and embarrassed giggles that accompanied children’s translations of central problematic events as compared to when they translated other parts of the teachers’ narratives:

**Hesitations, False Starts, Self-Repairs**

**Nova’s Conference with Mr. Nolan**

*T*: So: when he gets his (0.6) English skills (.)

Uhm to be more proficient

he should be get-getting A’s and B’s in science

So he’s- you~know he’s meeting standards obviously

because I am not gonna (.) downgrade him on standards

uhm based upon his (.) English proficiency?

uhm so he will do better on the test as his English

improves=

**Miguel’s Conference with Ms Harrison**

*T*: the area of social studies you got a C

and I think that mainly that is based on test scores

from the social studies tests,

that you need to read through the chapter every night,

because some of the material you’ll just remember it-

will just- uh, you’ll just remember it because you’ve

read it so much.
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(she says that- this way- like- in social studies she gave me that grade that- because- this- the tests and that- that- this- I have to read the chapter two or three times)

Embarrassed Giggles

María’s Conference with Ms Barrett

T: She pays attention most of the time in class ((Smiling at María))

→ V: ((giggles))

→ T: Be honest

V: Pongo atención a veces en la clases
(I pay attention in class sometimes)

If in the teachers’ narratives we saw a tendency to portray children in a positive light, mitigate their agency, and avoid direct assignation of blame and responsibility, what is most striking about the way in which children recast problematic events or actions is how they presented themselves as agentive actors, amplifying their moral responsibility for their poor performance, lack of effort, or bad behavior in the classroom. Again the children drew on linguistic resources to do so; for example, they recast the teachers’ passive voice (used to avoid assignation of blame) in active voice, and used the personal possessive pronoun (“mis” or “my”) to denote ownership where the teacher had used the generic (“the”). In one conference with Ms Salinger, Maria consistently recast her teacher’s language (in which the teacher used the linguistic resources described above to avoid assigning moral responsibility to María) into a language of personal responsibility, saying:

“Tengo que mirarlos” (“I have to look at them”), “Tengo que componerlos” (“I have to fix them”), Tengo que buscarlas” (“I have to look for them”), “Tengo que leerla” (“I have to read it”), “Tengo que aprender” (“I have to learn”), “Tengo que proofread” (“I have to proofread”), Tengo que aprender más” (“I have to learn more”), and “Tengo que correctar (sic)” (“I have to correct them.”)

Table 6 shows the different linguistic resources that children utilized to portray themselves as responsible moral actors.
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Table 6: Assumption of Moral Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic Resources</th>
<th>Teachers’ Narratives</th>
<th>Children’s Translations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portraying oneself</strong></td>
<td><strong>Maria’s Conference with Ms Salinger</strong>&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><strong>M: Dice que cuando tomo las-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the semantic role</td>
<td>T: the only thi-reason</td>
<td><strong>M: Dice que cuando tomo las-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of agent&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>that I put an inconsistent,</td>
<td><strong>las tests, no hago bien</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is sometimes María’s math</td>
<td>(She says that when I take**-I have an “I”)?**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tests aren’t- they don’t show</td>
<td><strong>because when I take the-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>me as much as what I know</td>
<td><strong>the tests I don’t do well)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that she knows.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portraying oneself</strong></td>
<td><strong>Miguel’s Conference with Ms Harrison</strong></td>
<td><strong>N: reportes de libro que-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the semantic role</td>
<td>T: and in reading it’s the um,</td>
<td><strong>uhm, en unas partes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of agent + use of</td>
<td>the need to elaborate</td>
<td><strong>las hago bien</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morally-evaluative</td>
<td>and the completing of your=</td>
<td>y en otras partes no**-**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjectives [“malas”]</td>
<td>=reports.</td>
<td><strong>porque en unas-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the need to give as much</td>
<td><strong>en las malas este uhm uhm</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information as possible.</td>
<td><strong>doy uhm nomás una</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I find that that</td>
<td><strong>palabra o uhm una</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>when I read your reports,</td>
<td><strong>oración en vez de un</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>especially some of the book=</td>
<td><strong>párrafo.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>=reports,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>some sections you’re doing=</td>
<td>(book reports that-uhm,<strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>=very well</td>
<td>in some parts I do them well**-**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>but other areas you’ll just</td>
<td>and in other parts I don’t**-**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>answer one sent- one word</td>
<td>because in some-<strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or one sentence answer where</td>
<td>in the bad ones this uhm uhm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I’ve asked you for a paragraph</td>
<td>I give uhm only a word or uhm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substitution of</strong></td>
<td><strong>María’s Conference with Ms Barrett</strong></td>
<td><strong>M: Pongo atención a veces</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverbs of</td>
<td>T: She pays attention most of</td>
<td><strong>en la clases</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>the time in class</td>
<td>(I pay attention in class**-**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[“a veces”]</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>sometimes)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of possessive</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nova’s Conference with Ms Johnson</strong></td>
<td><strong>N: Dice que- que- en mis- mis-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal adjectives</td>
<td>T: uhm so he will do better</td>
<td><strong>este- tests que voy asi</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>3</sup> Although the pronoun “yo” (“I”) does not appear explicitly in the children’s translation, it must be pointed out that Spanish is a pro-drop language and that the semantic role of agent is morphologically encoded in the first person singular verbal suffix “-o,” i.e. Tomo = I take.
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Taken together, the discursive and grammatical features of the translations show how these children recast the moral and social identities that teachers constructed for them in a much more negative light; children gave discursive prominence to the central problematic events, magnifying their own moral responsibility, while simultaneously downplaying their good behavior and academic strengths. This recasting is particularly significant because the children’s translations and the identities that are instantiated therein are the versions that their parents ultimately get to hear.
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It must be noted that on a few occasions, the children also displayed their resourcefulness at using their position as translators to resist teachers’ and parents’ characterizations of their behaviors or to present themselves in a particular light. In the following segment, Ms Salinger portrayed María as being sometimes inattentive and talkative in class (“she has to talk a little bit’”). When María’s mother paraphrased the teacher’s description as (“habla mucho” –she talks a lot-), María, in a defensive move against her mother’s take-up of the teacher’s comment, corrected her mother’s translation replacing the adverb “mucho” (-a lot-) by the deintensifier adverb “poco” with the positive-affect diminutive suffix “-ito” attached to the deintensifier (“poquito”):

**Use of Deintensifier + Positive-Affect Diminutive Suffix (“-ito”) “Poquito”**

**María’s Conference with Ms Barrett**

**Teacher:** She pays attention **most** of the time in class ((Smiling at María))

**Maria:** ((giggles))

**Teacher:** Be honest

**Maria:** Pongo atención a veces en la clases  
(I pay attention in class sometimes)

→ **Teacher:** she has to talk a little bit’

**María:** ((giggles))

→ **Mother:** habla mucho  
(She talks a lot)

→ **Teacher:** yes

→ **María:** Poquito no mucho  
(A little bit not a lot)

As another example, Miguel distanced himself from Ms Harrison’s report on his grade of a “C” in Social Studies by adopting a negative and distanced stance toward the grade:
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Use of the Demonstrative Adjective “Ese”

Miguel’s Conference with Ms Harrison

T: the area of social studies you got a C
   and I think that mainly that is based on test scores
   from the social studies tests,

M: dice que- así- como- en social studies
   → me dio ese grado que- porque- este- las tests
   
   (she says that- this way- like- in social studies
    she gave me that grade that- because- this- the tests)

Miguel translates his teacher’s characterization of the central problematic event
“you got a C” as “me dio ese grado” (she gave me that grade-). The use
of the demonstrative adjective “ese” –that- indexes the child’s negative stance toward the
grade. This negative stance is further accentuated by the translation of “you got” as “me
dio” (she gave me-), which highlights the teacher’s role and responsibility in the
assignment of the grade. Such examples of resistance also suggest these children’s
understandings of how narrative practices in the context of parent-teacher conferences
expose them as objects of adults’ evaluation (Ochs and Taylor, 1992).

Children’s Organization of Their Experiences in Translation

Finally, two features of the teachers’ narratives that were maintained faithfully in
the children’s translations are the cause-effect relationships as expressed in the teachers’
narrative logics and the optimistic futures that teachers often projected for the children.
Examples of these are presented in Tables 7 and 8.
### Table 7: Cause and Effect Relationships in Teachers’ Narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers’ Narrative Logic</th>
<th>Children’s Translations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maria’s Conference with Ms Salinger</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| T: Um, this- this “I” inconsistent means that sometimes on your math tests, you get- you do all your homework and you- and you participate in class, and you do everything you’re supposed to do, but when it comes to taking the test, you don’t- you don’t- get as good of a grade on your test as you do in the classroom. | V: Dice que cuando tomo las-tengo una “I”? porque cuando tomo las-las tests, no hago bien como le hago en-cuando tengo- cuando tengo tests-como cuando hago en Social Studies? Le hago más bien que en el test.  
(She says that when I take the- I have an “I”? because when I take the tests, I don’t do well like I do it in- when I have- when I have tests-like when I do in Social Studies? I do it better than on the test). |
| **Nova’s Conference with Ms Johnson**  |
| T: Uhm so he will do better on the test as his English improves= | N: Dice que- que en mi-mis- este- tests que voy así como- estoy bajo porque en mi lenguaje de- porque- porque no tengo la- el- el nivel del-del lenguaje  
(He says that- that in my- my- this tests that I am doing like this- I am low because in my language of because- because I don’t have the- the- the level of- of the language) |
| **Miguel’s Conference with Ms Harrison**  |
| T: the area of social studies you got a C and I think that mainly that is based on test scores from the social studies tests, | M: este dice que así como en social studies me dio ese grado que- porque- este- las tests  
(this- she says that this way like in social studies she gave me that grade that- because of- the test) |
As can be seen in these examples, the children’s translations took up the causal relationships and theories of events put forward in the teachers’ narratives. In reproducing the teachers’ narrative logics in their translations (i.e. having limited English proficiency as the cause for performing poorly on tests and getting bad grades as the consequence of low test performance), the children appropriated institutional theories of learning and performance as frameworks for interpreting and organizing their own academic experiences. These examples speak to how children are apprenticed into institutional systems of beliefs and how they may learn about institutions’ expectations (Miller et al., Sánchez and Orellana—Construction of Moral and Social Identity—36
The versions of events and the cause-effect relationships established in the teachers’ narratives that were maintained in the children’s translations provide institutional cultural schemata through which children structure their experiences. The significance of these interactions for how children learn to interpret their own lives in a culturally-inscribed narrative format is also underscored by how children took up the imagined futures their teachers project for them.

When these projected optimistic futures were present in the teachers’ narratives, they were almost always taken up by the children in their translations. Unlike praise, these optimistic projections for the future were never downgraded or left untranslated. (See examples in Table 9.) Although children construct their present identities in terms of their deficiencies and problematic behaviors, they embraced teachers’ orientations to more favorable futures and, thus, formulated future identities for themselves as successful students who were capable of performing better on tests, of getting As, or making the honor roll. Thus, the narratives served as vehicles for children to construct their moral and social identities of students not only in the present but also in the future. It is in the children’s uptake of these imagined futures that we can see most clearly how caregivers’ narratives about children simultaneously shape and constrain children’s organization of their own experiences along a temporal line of development (Cole, 2002; Ochs & Capps, 1995, 2001).
Table 9: Parents Responses to Teacher Narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology of Responses</th>
<th>Data Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1) Mother receives the information followed by a topic shift | (a) 02 Nova’s Conference  
→ N: me llevo bien con los estudiantes=  
= y ellos se llevan bien conmigo  
(I get along with the students and they get along with me)  
→ M: uhm huh  
Mother receives the information  
T: do you have any questions  
N: ¿tienes preguntas?  
(Do you have any questions?)  
T: any comments?  
→ M: uhm pues este- que le preguntare?  
Topic shift  
Uhm huh o que no he- podemos venir a sus reuniones-  
a sus juntas porque este-  
porque no hablamos inglés  
por eso a veces no- no hemos podido venir  
pero que nos interesa mucho estar aquí  
(Uhm well this- what would I ask her?  
Uhm huh that we ha- can’t come to your meetings-  
to your conferences because this-  
we don’t speak English  
that’s why sometimes we haven’t- we haven’t been able=  
=to come  
but we are very interested in being here) |
| 2) Mother provides a coda, summarizing the import of the teacher’s narrative | (a) 04 Miguel’s Conference  
M: ser más aplicado  
pos si- si pones más atención  
vas a ser mejor, vas a ser mejor  
(to be more dedicated  
cuz if- if you pay more attention  
you’re going to be better, you are going to be better) |
Parents’ Responses

For the most part, parents did not participate vocally in these conferences. Teachers designed their narratives with the mothers as primary ratified recipients and spoke about the child in the third person (though they sometimes moved between the first and the third person). But the mothers generally did not respond directly to the narratives nor did they attempt to engage in conversation with the teachers. They rarely interrupted the teachers’ narratives and seldom challenged the teachers’ accounts of events. Miguel’s mother did direct a series of questions to Miguel in the course of his translations, and she prompted him to tell the teachers about things that the teachers might not know (e.g. that Miguel was Sánchez and Orellana—Construction of Moral and Social Identity—39
having problems with his locker partner, that he had begun attending an after-school homework assistance program, and that he would be getting more exercises in the summer. She also questioned Miguel about the problems his teacher named, but she did not direct her questions to the teacher. Miguel translated some but not all of this information back to his teachers; on one occasion he clarified to the teacher that his mother’s comment was “just for him.” And Estela’s mother engaged in a long exchange with Mr. Vick once space was opened for her to raise questions at the end of the conference, but this took place after the teacher had delivered his narrative. But with these exceptions the most common response by parents to teachers’ narratives was the passive receipt of information followed a topic shift, as illustrated in Table 11.

Sometimes, however, mothers offer a coda to the children’s translation of the teachers’ narrative in which they brought together the central problematic event and ways in which the child could improve in the future. (This is also illustrated in Table 11.) With these codas, mothers aligned themselves with the institutional narrative logics and moral universe portrayed in the teachers’ narratives. Alignment between caregivers in adults’ narratives in which the child is cast as protagonist has previously been documented as characteristic of family narrative practices in U.S. middle-class households and analyzed as crucial to the process by which children are educated and socialized into adult worldviews (Ochs and Taylor, 1992).

This complicity between teachers and parents was also evident in the third type of parental response. In addition to these codas, mothers often responded to the children’s translations of the narratives by problematizing the child’s behavior upon which the narrative was centered. This problematization took the shape of questions that were aimed at determining why the child was having the specific problem and establishing the degree of moral responsibility of the child. For example, Miguel’s mother asked him why he hasn’t completed his homework (the central problematic event named by his teacher:
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“Pero no le entiendes en realidad o no la haces?” (But you don’t really understand, or you don’t do it?). In terms of moral responsibility, not completing school assignments is different if the child does not understand what is required than if the child is simply not doing the work; if s/he doesn’t understand the teacher may be the morally responsible party, but if s/he simply is not completing the work, the child is morally responsible by failing to fulfill his responsibilities as a student. This scrutinizing practice resembles the ways in which teachers engage children in questioning in their narratives when trying to figure out why a specific academic problem has developed, as in the following example from Maria’s conference with Ms Salinger:

T: when you study: um, for your tests, is it that you sometimes forget what- what you’ve studied? um, on your math test? or is it more, that, um, when you’re taking the test, you don’t— (1.5) you go kind of quickly:?

However, an important difference between the ways in which teachers and mothers engaged children in questioning is that the mothers adopted a more explicitly critical/evaluative stance and cast children more overtly as responsible moral agents. In this sense, some of the mothers took up a strong narrative role of problematizers (Ochs and Taylor, 1992; Ochs and Capps, 2001) in parent-teacher conferences narrative practices.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

In this article, we have examined the discursive structuring of teachers’ narratives about youth told in the context of parent-teacher conferences, and immigrant children’s participation in and translation of these narratives. We have seen how the children were socialized through these narratives into institutional expectations and worldviews, and how they constructed their own social and moral identities in and through this talk. Their
parents were socialized as well, with children playing an active role in that socialization process, as mediators of the messages and the worldviews that they contain.

In their narratives, the teachers in this study most commonly centered on problems, actions, or behaviors that they viewed as creating disequilibrium in the children’s appropriate academic and social development. They attempted to persuade parents and children to see these problems in a particular ways (ways that usually exculpated teachers of moral responsibility) and to determine the students’ responsibility for the problems. Thus, the narratives functioned as both persuasive and sense-making tools (Mattingly, 1998). Because they regularly dealt with particular sets of students’ academic experiences that are explained in terms of institutional narrative logics, the narratives served as important vehicles for the socialization of immigrant children and their parents into institutional expectations, discourses, and moral orders. In addition, the teachers’ institutional narratives had a proleptic quality (Cole, 2002) in that they not only commented on students’ experiences and/or behaviors, but also created experience and provided an immediate context and continuity for development by bringing to bear children’s pasts and presents on their possible futures, according to institutional developmental expectations. The narratives, then, provided important cultural frameworks for children to organize their own academic experiences in terms of institutional worldviews.

Although teachers centered their narratives on children’s academic problems and behaviors, they did not define children’s identities in terms of their academic deficiencies and problematic actions. Rather, through the discursive structuring of the narratives and deployment of certain linguistic resources, teachers avoided direct assignation of blame and mitigate children’s responsibility for the problems and violations that they identified. At the same time, they highlighted children’s positive attitudes as students and emphasized their present and future potential. This may function to protect the children’s self-esteem.
and create a template for children to construct positive future identities of themselves as students.

In their translations, however, children narrated themselves in a more negative light. Although they occasionally took advantage of their positions as para-phrasers to resist certain characterizations of them by adults, most often they organized their translations around the issues their teachers have named for redress. They amplified their moral responsibility for problematic actions by casting themselves in the role of agent even when their teachers did not. They took on much greater responsibility for the problems the teachers named than the teachers accorded to them. While embracing their teachers’ optimistic future projections, children often defined their present identities as students in terms of their deficiencies and poor performance.

Children’s peculiar positionalities in these encounters were especially evidenced by the seemingly paradoxical ways in which they handle teachers’ praise in their translations. Often they simply did not translate the positive commentaries their teachers made. When they did, they generally downgraded them and transformed specific praise to more generic or neutral terms.

A child’s move not to translate or to downgrade the teachers’ praise may seem surprising, and we would like to consider several possible interpretations of this pattern. Some researchers have argued that this kind of self-effacing behavior and denial of the individual corresponds with a collectivist cultural orientation, in contrast with one in which people seek and/or give credit to individuals (Trumball et al. 1998, 2001). Others have suggested that there are social class differences in the degree to which children claim or are given attention for their accomplishments, especially in their interactions with adults (LaReau, 1994). These kinds of social class and cultural norms may partly guide the youths’ behavior in the context of parent-teacher conferences. Observations of these same youth at home certainly revealed a strong orientation toward the collective good and a
general tendency both to share responsibilities and celebrate achievements with others (Orellana, 2001; Orellana et al 2003).

Yet although there may be cultural and social class group norms that show up in parent-teacher conferences – an interpretation that would require more research with participants from a wider range of cultural backgrounds – it is important to note that in many contexts, self-praise and displays of agreement with others’ praise in everyday conversation with non-intimates is a dispreferred practice (Pomerantz, 1978, 1984). Thus, whether they are modeling themselves on a local group norm or a more generalized one, the self-effacing behavior of the children in this study can be read as a display of their competence as social actors and language users.

The children’s behaviors can also be seen as an index of their social attunement to parents’ and teachers’ orientations in these interactions (see above, Pillet-Shore, 2001, 2003a), as well as of their own orientation to the reportable central events in the teachers’ narratives. That is, their translations corresponded with and reinforced the narrative structures that the teachers use, in that the teacher’s core message was one of identifying a problem and a solution to the problem. Praise for good behavior, while sincere, was used by teachers discursively in part to set up the problem and then to soften its final effect. This is underscored at the discourse structure level, since the positive assessments that children do not translate are often those that preceded the central problematic events in the teachers’ narratives; the central problematic events therefore became the first structural element in the children’s translations of the narratives.

Importantly, this attunement to the discourse process points away from interpretations that the youths’ missed translations were attributable to linguistic or cognitive deficits. Indeed, the children’s translations generally corresponded with the teachers’ messages at a deep level, even when details, such as specific praise, were omitted. Often, the youth summarized the teachers’ comments rather than offering line-by-line.
line translations, and the ability to summarize and extract main ideas requires a sophisticated level of linguistic skills. For example, Nova reduced his teacher’s praise to a neat summary: “Me llevo bien con mis compañeros y ellos se llevan bien conmigo.” (“I get along well with my classmates and they get along well with me.”) This translation leaves off the specific laudatory detail but captures the core meaning of the teacher’s words, in a way that deflects attention from Nova by sharing credit for good behavior with his classmates.

We recognize that it is possible that the children’s range of vocabulary in Spanish may have delimited their capacity to translate some of the nuanced meanings of teachers’ commentaries. For example, much of the specific praise words like “wonderful” were glossed by the youth as “voy bien” (“I’m doing well”), and it is at least possible that this is because the youth did not know the corresponding superlatives in Spanish. But this interpretation is challenged by the fact that the youth did seek and find close equivalents for other more neutral terms in these and in other translation contexts (Orellana et al 2003). Moreover, they readily and often admitted what they did not know, and/or asked for assistance. For example, Nova noted that he did not know how to say “cool” in Spanish, and María responded to Ms Salinger’s introduction to the conference by saying “I don’t know how to say all that!” When they understood a term in English but did not know its precise Spanish equivalent, the youth were generally very skilled at conveying the meaning by explaining the term in other ways. Certainly, too, they knew how to intensify words by adding “very” and “really,” and they did so in other contexts, but these intensifiers were typically left off in their translations of praise. Finally, much of the praise that went untranslated was linguistically very simple.

Parents’ responses to teachers’ narratives also bear consideration. First, the parents in this study mostly positioned themselves as the receivers of teachers’ assessments of their children. This accords with other research on Latino immigrant parents’ relationships.
with schools (Valdés, 2002; Reese & Gallimore, 2000). Similarly, LaReau’s work (1994) reminds us that relationships between teachers and parents are shaped by the two groups’ relative social class standing, and the distribution of talk in any social context is also reflective of power relations between speakers. We should note that although parents did not challenge the teachers’ assessments of their children, they were not passive participants in the exchanges. They actively monitored the information that their children translated as well as the teachers’ manner, tone, and paralinguistic cues (as well as the teachers’ language itself, and they asked clarifying questions of their children after the conferences ended as well as sometimes within them. A more extended analysis of immigrant parents’ relations with teachers and schools falls beyond the scope of this paper, but it is important to note that through participation in these conferences, not only immigrant children, but also immigrant parents are being socialized into host society institutional expectations, ideologies, and discourses (i.e. Quiroz et al., 1998, 1999; Trumbull et al., 1998, 2001; Tse, 1996b), as well as into the social relations within which those ideologies are inscribed. But like the youth, parents are active participants in their own socialization processes.

What is important to consider for our discussion, however, is the narrative role that parents took up when they did speak in these conferences. For the most part, they took up positions as problematizers of the children’s actions and behaviors (Ochs and Taylor, 1992), focusing on the problems that they teachers named, and casting the children as responsible moral agents. In doing this, they displayed a more explicitly critical/evaluative stance toward the children than did the teachers, and they generally did not attempt to offer alternative explications for the problems. This appears to contrast with the “dance” that Baker and Keough (1995) identified between middle class white parents and teachers, as each tried to place the blame for identified problems in the others’ camp (even as they avoided direct accusations).
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The parents in our study may have taken up this role as an extension of their generally deferent stance toward the teachers. In underscoring children’s moral responsibility, they aligned themselves with the teachers’ interpretations and mitigated against any possible suggestion that the teachers may be at fault for the children’s behavior. It is also possible, however, that parents’ focus on the negative is partly shaped by the fact that these more negative messages are precisely what their children conveyed through their translations, as they accentuated their own problems, accepted moral responsibility, and downplayed the praise that their teachers have bestowed upon them.

The fact that both children and parents in this study differentially focused on the problems named by teachers is useful for theorizing about issues of positionality, cultural contact, and intergenerational relations. Parent-teacher conferences offer a unique window into these issues, because the conferences are explicitly structured around evaluations of children, and these evaluations are shaped by beliefs about what children (of particular ages and genders) can and should do. In conferences that involve children as translators, children are enlisted in evaluating their own behavior, and in interpreting the values and norms that both parents and teachers bring to that evaluation. They are simultaneously positioned as translators, co-participants, and the objects of evaluation, as they mediate between people with different world views who speak from different social positions. We call for more research on conferences-in-translation involving participants from a wider range of cultural and social class contexts so that we can further unpack these complex social processes.

But regardless of the reasons for the behaviors we have described, the results of the analyses we have laid out here have very important implications for practice. They challenge the popular assumption that youth inflate their own school performance, and suggest instead that teachers should take particular effort to emphasize the positive in their
narrations. This can be done by conveying praise in multiple ways, through repetition, as well as through paralinguistic cues, which, parents told us, are indeed cues that they read. But most importantly, teachers’ praise should be clearly separated from their problem-focused narratives. Otherwise the narrative structure may serve to reinforce the problem-focus, and the praise may more easily run the risk of being lost in translation.
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