March 2013

Dreaming and Surviving in Heterotopia: First-Generation Immigrant Girls' Pursuit of the American Dream in New York City

Kaoru Miyazawa

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/taboo>

Recommended Citation

Miyazawa, K. (2017). Dreaming and Surviving in Heterotopia: First-Generation Immigrant Girls' Pursuit of the American Dream in New York City. *Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education*, 13 (1). <https://doi.org/10.31390/taboo.13.1.06>

Dreaming and Surviving in Heterotopia: First-Generation Immigrant Girls' Pursuit of the American Dream in New York City

Kaoru Miyazawa

The construction of identities is spatial (Foucault & Rabinow, 1984, Harvey 1989; Rasmussen, 2004). The meaning of who we are is shaped by meanings of spaces that we occupy in our lives. As we enter and exit various spaces in our lives, we construct multiple senses of ourselves and negotiate the meanings of those selves. When it comes to new immigrants, we need to examine not only “real” physical spaces (e.g., host countries) and self, but also their imaginary space and self. This is because images of America and successful future-self they hold are central to immigrants’ experience in a new land (Ogbu, 1987); those images of America they hold have a great impact on the meanings they assign to their current-spaces and current-selves in the U.S. Such meanings further determine their present actions. In this article, I will examine what meanings first-generation immigrant girls assign to their current spaces and current-selves, and how they imagine their future spaces and future-selves. Additionally, I will look at how the dialogues between their current-self and future-self influence their actions at school. Based on the post-structuralist belief that power plays a significant role in construction of space and self (Ong et al, 1996), in my analysis, I will pay particular attention to how power operates in their dialogues.

Immigrants’ Hopes and Upward Mobility

Beliefs of meritocracy in America, which are juxtaposed with new immigrants’ perception of limited economic opportunities in their home countries (Alba & Nee, 2005; Gibson, 1987; Ogbu 1987), continue to attract immigrants from various parts of the world. Today immigrants come to the United States from multiple nations—resulting in a foreign-born population that makes up 12.5 percent of the total U.S population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2009). Immigrants’ firm beliefs in American meritocracy are also combined with their views of American education. Many im-

migrants believe in the good quality of American education and view education as a promising investment for their financial success (Ogbu, 1987). In fact opportunity to receive quality education is one of the major reasons why immigrants enter this country (Suárez–Orozco et al, 2008).

Such positive images of American society and American education are sustained among new immigrants even though their new lives in the U.S. are filled with challenges such as temporal economic and social downward mobility, linguistic cultural barriers, and racism (Alba & Nee, 2005; Gibson, 1988; Matute-Bianch, 1986; Waters, 1999). Today, the formation of these beliefs is not immune to the influence of neoliberalism, which is the dominant economic and political system in the US. (Harvey, 2005). Neoliberalism assumes that free market principles (i.e., individuals' free choice and attendant responsibility for their choices) promise a financial prosperity for individuals and society as a whole. To propagate this belief success stories of individuals, who are from humble beginnings and made their way up through their own effort, are circulated in the public discourse (Ong et al, 1996).

Among many celebratory representations of “successful” persons, stories of immigrant girls from working-class backgrounds are highlighted in the media (Harris, 2004). The representation of these girls overlaps with the common findings of recent immigrant assimilation studies: first-generation immigrant girls have higher educational and occupational aspirations and achieve higher academic goals than boys and subsequent generations of immigrants (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Qin, 2003; Zhou & Bankston, 2001). While boys tend to demonstrate oppositional behavioral patterns in reaction to racism and limited opportunities for upward mobility in the U.S. (Matute Bianch, 1986; Valenzuela, 1999; Waters, 1999), girls tend to remain hopeful about their future in the U.S. (Lopez, 2003). Their optimism further promotes them to develop positive relationship with their American peers and teachers and to engage in academic activities persistently (Lopez, 2003; Qin, 2003; Suarez-Orozco et al., 2008).

In other words, immigrant girls tend to focus on their future success and appropriate their current behaviors to become the ideal self in the future. This indicates that dialogue between future-self and current-self about the meaning of who they are and where they are is critical in understanding immigrant girls' success in school. Based on this belief, this study will explore answers to the following research questions: (a) What meanings do first-generation immigrant girls assign to current/future self and space? (b) How does the meaning of current/future self and space shape their current actions at school?

Spaces in Immigrant Girls' Lives

Utopia, Heterotopia, and In-Between Space (Mirror)

The exploration of dialogues between self in the present space and self in the future space requires conceptual frameworks that encompass both real and imagined

spaces. Thus, Foucault's notion of utopia, heterotopia, and space in-between (i.e., mirror) are appropriate frameworks for this study. Utopia, according to Foucault (1986), is a site with no real place (p. 24). Utopia does not have physical existence in our society. It is, however, connected to the real world (space) indirectly so that we can physically see spaces that are comparable to utopia or spaces that are opposite of utopia in our real world (i.e., heterotopia). America, in the minds of those who desire to immigrate there, is viewed as a land of opportunity. The successful future lives in America they develop prior to immigration is an imaginary spatial representation (utopia). In reality, this utopic image of America contradicts with the current American society characterized by expanding economic inequity and decreasing job security (Weis & Dimitriadis, 2008). However, new immigrants continue to view America as their utopia after immigration and dream of getting there through rigorous assimilation (Ogbu, 1987).

Heterotopias, in contrast to utopias, are real spaces that have actual physical manifestation (Foucault, 1986). There are different types of heterotopia, but all heterotopias satisfy at least one of the six principles.¹ Foucault (1986) states that various heterotopias are simultaneously represented and contested with each other in our lives. America is a type of heterotopia as it embraces a multitude of heterotopic sites which satisfy one of the six principles of heterotopia such as hospitals (i.e., space for crisis, *principle one*), corrective institutions (i.e., space of deviance *principle two*), and museums (i.e., space of multiple temporalities, *principle four*).

In addition to utopia and heterotopia, there is a space in-between these two spaces, which Foucault (1986) called a mirror. A mirror is a utopia and heterotopia at the same time as it is located in the real space (heterotopia) but it shows images of a future-self and a future-space (utopia). This in-between space plays a significant role in promoting individuals' internal dialogues between self in heterotopia (real space one is in now) and utopia (imagined future space). Especially, the gaze from the future-self in the mirror that is cast on the current-self in the heterotopia is important as the gaze changes one's view of current-self and space (Foucault, 1986).

In examining the dialogue between future-self in the mirror and current-self that is looking at the mirror, it is crucial to be aware that images seen are not always a perfect reflection of real objects or persons. As the imperfect surface of a mirror provides disguised images of what it reflects, the type of mirror we use molds what we see on the mirror. Therefore, we need to acknowledge the nature of the mirror that we are using to see ourselves clearly. In this article, I view neoliberalism as a mirror, a type of in-between space that is located in between utopia (imagined perfect America) and heterotopia (real American society immigrants live in). Furthermore, I assume this neoliberal mirror reflects an image of self that is shaped by neoliberal principles so that the images of future-self that immigrant girls see on the mirror embody neoliberal traits.

Neoliberalism: A Mirror in Immigrant Girls' Lives

Neoliberalism is an economic and political system that is based on market principles (Davies & Bansel, 2007; Harvey, 2005). Thus, neoliberal States function as free markets under the authorization of State government (Giroux, 2008; Apple, 2004). In the U.S., starting from the Reagan administration in the 1980s, the government has implemented various interventions in the effort to sustain a "free market" such as tax cuts among the wealthy population, deconstruction of trade unions, cuts in welfare programs and government investment in public sectors (e.g., education, criminal justice, and medicine), and privatization of those sectors (Apple, 2004; Davies et al., 2007; Grossberg, 2005; Harris, 2004; Hursh, 2005).

Under this condition where government has less responsibility over its citizens, individuals are expected to make free choices and be responsible for those choices (Harris, 2004; Hursh, 2005; Petersson, Olsson, & Popkewitz, 2007). And this expectation applies to all citizens including women. Thus, images of ideal female citizens seen on the neoliberal mirror are different from traditional images of women in patriarchal society. Neoliberal women are independent and actively participate in the labor market, traditionally been dominated by men, and earn competitive wages, equally with their male counterparts (Harris, 2004; McRobbie, 2007). The ideal neoliberal women are also financially wealthy individuals who exercise their consumption power; the model of successful women today are millionaires, who lead luxurious lives filled with commodities (Davies et al., 2007; McRobbie, 2007).

Dialogue with Ideal Neoliberal Self-Reflected on the Mirror

Individuals' responsibility and effort are crucial for financial success in neoliberal society (Ong et al., 1996). Ideal women in neoliberal society are the ones who continue to recreate themselves in order to survive in the uncertain society that operates on market principles (Petersson et al., 2007). The emphasis on being "responsible" is especially strong among minority young women from working-class neighborhoods today. Reflecting historically persistent stereotypes against working-class colored women as welfare dependents (Luker, 1997; Pillow, 2004), they are targeted as an "at risk" population. This population within the neoliberal regime is expected to transform themselves into independent and responsible women (Fine & McClelland, 2006; Harris, 2004). For example, teenage pregnancy prevention programs, such as AOUM (Abstinence Only Until Marriage) has been promoted together with the cuts in welfare. The program attempts to teach working-class minority young women the value of becoming financially responsible and productive individuals through self-regulations and careful life planning (Kantor & Bacon, 2002).

The creation of self-regulated individuals, who willingly conform to the interests of the neoliberal State, is indispensable for the expansion of neoliberalism (Foucault, 2003; Davies & Bansel, 2007). Furthermore, I argue that the dialogue between future-self reflected on the neoliberal mirror and current-self in the real world is the key for active and continuous self-regulation. When the ideal self in

utopia—a neoliberal woman who is professional, competitive, and financially independent, leading a luxurious life style—gazes back at the self in the heterotopia, the current-self thinks that she is not good enough (Davies & Bansel, 2007). Furthermore, it creates a desire within individual women to transform themselves into the ideal women that they see on the neoliberal mirror. This desire to be in utopia and to be the ideal self leads one to modify her current behavior actively within heterotopic space even though doing so does not directly benefit her in the present. Ironically, this self-driven transformation, which is promoted by the neoliberal State, is even experienced as an exercise of freedom to choose by individuals (Davies & Bansel, 2007).

Study of First Generation Immigrant Girls in a Newcomer School in New York City

In order to explore (a) how first-generation immigrant girls construct the meanings of heterotopia and utopia as well as meanings of current and future self through internal dialogues, and (b) how the meanings they construct shape their current actions, I interviewed three first-generation immigrant girls, who attended a newcomer school located in a working-class community within one of the New York City boroughs. New York City has been an initial entry point and home for new immigrants from all around the world (Kasintz, Mollenkopf, & Waters, 2006). The newcomer school attracted students from immigrant communities that were located within the borough. The school had a population of approximately 320 students ranging from 9th to 12th grade. The national origins of these students were various but the majority of students were Latino/as and West Africans. The data collection took place between 2005 and 2008. At the initial stage of the study, I observed my participants at their school and spent time talking to them in the cafeteria and library. The data for this article are drawn from a total of 12 focus group interviews and 15 individual interviews. The interviews were conducted in the library at their school during the lunchtime or in the library of my university on the weekend. In nine of these interviews, a photo-elicitation method was used. In six of those photo-elicitation interviews, I asked the participants to bring their favorite magazines and music videos; we then discussed images of women in those texts. In three other interviews, I asked participants to bring the pictures they took on the theme of “this is my life now and in the future” and we discuss their future aspirations referring to their photos (Pink, 2001). While these interviews, which involved photographs, focused on the topic of their future aspirations, other interviews focused on their current lives at home and at school, particularly their relationship with their teachers, parents, and peers.

Participants: Zero, Shy'm, and Bianca

The participants of this study were three first-generation immigrant girls: Zero, a Tibetan; Shy'm, a Guinean; and Bianca, a Jamaican.² They were all in 9th grade when they agreed to participate in this study. I first met Zero in the hallway after school. Through Zero, I met Shy'm and Bianca. The girls equally believed in the

quality of American education and meritocratic nature of American society. Based on this belief, the girls aspired to go to college and become professional women in the future. In addition, they were determined to achieve their goals through their own effort as their families lacked financial capacity or cultural capital to support their education.

Shy'm, a Fulani Muslim girl from Guinea, came to the U.S. during the political turmoil in her country. She was hoping to return to Guinea in the future when the war ends. She was one of the high achieving students in the newcomer school. With her strong commitment to proceed to college and become a doctor in the future, Shy'm mastered the English language in a short period of time and passed all the New York State Regents exams by the end of 11th grade. She was determined to have a profession that gave her financial independence thereby freeing her from the patriarchal family structure in the Fulani community.

Zero, a Tibetan Buddhist girl who grew up in a refugee community in India, was in the average academic track. Zero and her mother were first hesitant about immigrating to the U.S. where Zero's father had lived for eight years. However, Zero changed her mind as people kept telling her, "in America you could get really good education." Zero told her mother one day, "I want to educate myself so that I could become a really important person". Shortly after this, the family immigrated to the U.S. Zero aspired to go to college and become a computer engineer to build a large house for her parents in the future.

Bianca, from Jamaica, strongly believed in American education. She expressed her positive view of American education by saying "Here, I am getting a good education that I didn't get in Jamaica." Bianca admitted that she struggled in most of her classes as she lacked basic academic skills. Her academic problem was due to her truancy in Jamaica. Bianca's mother sent Bianca to New York to live with her biological father, who she had never met. Her mother's hope was to put Bianca on the right path by removing her away from her friends who had negative influence on her. Her mother's plan worked: Bianca started to attend school regularly after she moved to the U.S. She even attended a college preparation program on weekends with her determination to get college education and to build homes for her mother and relatives in Florida and Jamaica.

A Newcomer School: A Heterotopia, a Space of Deviance

The newcomer school my participants attended was a type of heterotopia, a space of deviance, and a space where those who are viewed as "abnormal" are put into for the purpose of rehabilitation. What we need to be clear about in understanding a space of deviance is that people in this type of space are not essentially deviant. It is the action of "putting them into this space" that makes them become deviant. In other words, deviant subjectivities are constructed through the spatial practice. For example, the newcomer school's entry requirement, having to score at 20-percentile rank or below in the New York State's English language proficiency

tests (School website, 2008), was the first step for the students' to become deviant subjects. This requirement indicated that students were abnormal compared to the norm (i.e. native speakers of English) (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1983). Placing these deviant bodies (non-English speaking bodies) within this space away from normal bodies (English speaking bodies) created their deviant subjectivities. Students themselves further reinforced such subjectivities as they were in constant conflict with American students. American students, who attended small schools located on the upper floors of the same building, often reminded the newcomer school students of their deviant status. American students would shout at the newcomer school students "immigrants" from the stairs during the break. This triggered male students at the newcomer school to go up to the upper floors to fight back with the American students. These daily struggles accelerated the tension and boundaries between American students and immigrant students and reinforced immigrant students' non-American identity.

In addition to the territorial conflict among students, characteristics of the school's curriculum implied that the school was a deviant space. The purpose of the newcomer school was to correct these students' minds and bodies through education, to transform them into "worthwhile" citizens who fit in the economic and political system of the State (Forman, 2005). In that sense, the function of this deviant space overlapped with the function of modern disciplinary space that produces active docile bodies—bodies that actively conform to the authority (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1983). Teachers in the newcomer school had a high expectation for their students to conform to them. For example, school had a wide variety of regulations ranging from what students could wear and what they could bring to school to how they should speak to their teachers in class. To ensure students' obedience of the rules, teachers and security officers rigorously censored the students' attire and properties everyday at the entrance of the school building, in classrooms, cafeterias, and in hallways.

Among the many regulations, the regulation of time was the major concern for the teachers. It appeared that adults were obsessed with placing students' bodies in a particular space at a particular time to have them engage in assigned activities; an equivalent of the micro "penalty of time," a common practice in modern disciplinary space (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1983). A few minutes between classes in which students had to move from one classroom to another were the most chaotic moment in the entire school day. The vice-principal and principal would stand at the center of the hallway as soon as students were released from the class. They would yell at the students, who were busy chatting with their peers in the hallway and chased students out from the library and bathrooms.

Students were trained to be in a designated space at the designated time to actively engage in assigned activities in order to be considered a "good" student. The repetitive participation in these practices made them become dependent subjects. However, neither teachers nor students seemed to have realized the crafted nature of the students' dependence. Even though my participants complained that

teachers' control was "annoying" and made them feel somewhat depressed, the girls voluntarily came to school and engaged in daily rituals of the school actively.

College: A Utopia, a Space of Independence

At a glance it does not make sense that the girls agreed to conform to the orders that made them feel unpleasant. However, examination of their interaction between their future-self and their current-self provides a reasonable account for their conformity. The girls' active conformity was based on their belief that conformity would eventually take them to college, which they viewed as a utopia, a place where they could eventually gain freedom and independence (McRobbie, 2007). In developing such an image of future-self, which was molded by neoliberal values, the role the newcomer school played was significant. The school administrators and teachers presented college as the utopia. The school actively encouraged its students to proceed to college and become professionals (School Website, 2008). Teachers also facilitated students' college going by having them attend weekend college preparation programs in a university and taking students to college fairs. Exposure to the college environment expanded students' desire to attend college further. For example, after coming back from a college fair one day, Zero excitedly shared her experience:

Wednesday, we went to learn about different colleges. It was so much fun. We got to know about colleges instead of just reading about it. I found out about five colleges I want to go. I was happy. Some of them are in Canada. Some of them are really far away.

Direct contact with the admission staffs from various colleges made college real and increased Zero's desire to attend college. In addition to these special events, teachers at the newcomer school also repetitively talked about importance of college during classes. The following comment shows that Bianca interpreted that college was the first step to her successful and independent life:

Teachers always say college will make you successful. Once you go to college you get what you want. You don't have to wait for nobody. It is like taking in charge of your own life. You don't have to wait for your teachers telling you what to do. College is a great way to stand on your own and become a person you want to be in the future. I am going to go to college because I don't want to depend on someone for anything: I want to depend on myself.

College, a utopia in Bianca's imagination, contained all the characteristics that were opposite of the newcomer school (heterotopia). College, in her mind, was a place where students didn't have to wait for anybody and had to be told what to do. Bianca's teachers' presentation of college as a symbol of success and association of college with independence also attracted Bianca. This association of college with independence reflects a neoliberal value. In a neoliberal society in which State is withdrawing itself from the provision of social services and welfare, individuals are

expected to be self-sustainable and responsible for their own financial, social, and emotional wellbeing (Duggan, 2003, Davies & Bansel, 2007). College education, due to our world's shift to knowledge-based economy, has become an essential factor for gaining financial independence today (Duncan, 2011). Well-paid positions require highly technical knowledge and skills, which one can gain through college and/or post-graduate education. Thus, obtaining college degree has become a new obligation for competent citizens. Bianca's teacher led Bianca to imagine the utopia (college) and future-self in the utopia by guiding Bianca to look at herself through the mirror of neoliberalism. Bianca's comment about college and her determination not to depend on someone but to depend on herself shows that her teacher was successful in enticing Bianca with the neoliberal image of future-self (i.e., independent woman) and instilling within her a desire to transform herself to become an independent woman (Harris, 2004).

This desire for self-transformation paralleled with Bianca's acceptance of her current-self as a dependent subject, someone who lacked ability, and thus needed to be placed under the control of authority. In the next section, I will explain further how the girls came to accept such a negative meaning of current-self by focusing on the dialogue between their current-self and future-self.

Dialogue Between Self in Heterotopia and Utopia

Even though obedience served to suppress one's basic needs, the girls' belief that obedience was a necessary condition to escape from the current-space (the newcomer school) and get to utopia (college) drove them to actively conform to the orders of school. The following example of Shy'm shows that how she chose to suppress her needs and reappropriated her behavior to conform to the micromanagement of time and space in the newcomer school. The example shows that the dialogue between future-self and current-self was the key for reappropriation:

Shy'm: Last Wednesday, I had a headache, a big headache. My head was hurting and I felt dizzy, but they [teachers] didn't let me go.

Author: Why they didn't let you go?

Shy'm: They didn't think that I was going to go home. I don't know. I was like "this is so unfair." I went back to Capoeira (an elective course which she didn't choose) and the teacher was like "You have to do Capoeira." I was like "No, I am sick." He started say something. I said "Oh my god." He said he would only give F or A + to the entire class. I was like I have to get something [other than F]. If I go home, then I am going to fail. So, I stayed.

The teacher's attitude toward Shy'm shows that engagement in assigned activities during the assigned time in the assigned space is equated with a responsible action within the space of deviance. Additionally, only through the continuous demonstration of responsible actions can one successfully exit from this heterotopia and become an independent subject in the utopia.

Shy'm seems to have internalized this view of the authority. When Shy'm's future-self (i.e. an imaginary independent self in college) reflected on the neoliberal mirror gazed at Shy'm's current-self in the heterotopia (a newcomer school, a space of deviance) in the present, Shy'm knew that she had no choice but to stay in the Capoeira class if she was to escape from the heterotopia and get to the utopia (college). During the research, Shy'm consistently expressed her dream of going to college, becoming a doctor in Guinea, and living in a beautiful house in a city. She planed her life linearly to achieve these goals. Getting an A in that class to keep a high GPA to proceed to college was crucial for Shy'm to proceed the path of success she envisioned. Thus, regardless of the physical pain and her belief that the teacher's treatment was unfair, Shy'm "chose" to stay in class and performed a good dependent student.

As this example shows, in the space of deviance girls dreamed of being in the utopia (i.e., college) and actively engaged in transforming themselves. The irony was that regardless of teachers' talks on the importance for these students to be "independent," the actual transformation from dependent subjects to independent subjects never took place. In fact, as Shy'm's incident shows, participation in everyday practice of school for the sake of becoming independent women in the future, led them to become dependent subjects and accept their dependent status. In other words, Shy'm actively became docile subjects to become independent in the future. Such automatic and active reappropriation of one's behavior that is aligned with the interest of the authority shows that governmentality (Foucault, 2003) was operating in the newcomer school.

Discussion: Another In-Between Space to Get to Other Spaces

Zero, Shy'm, and Bianca placed importance in their future space and assigned negative meanings to their current space. They viewed their current space a constraining space from which they were destined to escape. When it came to current-self, they accepted deficit meanings (e.g., lacking competence and independence) assigned to them by the authority and invested in transforming themselves. Their focus on their future further diverted their attention from the present and hindered them from critically examining the nature of everyday rituals at the newcomer school, which placed them in unequal relationships with their teachers and even deprived them of rights to satisfy their basic needs.

Neither were girls aware of the chances of not reaching to the utopia (college) and becoming the ideal future-self (financially successful woman) through attainment of education and profession. Contrary to girls' beliefs, American society operating under neoliberal free-market principles presents fewer opportunities for individuals' financial success. Neoliberalism has expanded the economic inequity among the privileged and underprivileged with the level of inequality at its highest since the 1940s (Collins, Leonard, & Williams, 2008). The income gap is apparent in that

70% of the wealth in the U.S. is shared only by 10% of the population (Bulman, 2005). In addition, education no longer guarantees self-sustainability in American society. For example 10% of college graduates works at minimum wage and 70% of welfare recipients have a high school degree (Anyon & Green, 2007). In other words, the common immigrant utopic image of America, or the future space they hope to move toward, does not reflect the reality of America. Furthermore, the fact that the graduation rate of the newcomer school my participants attended was only 60% in the academic year of 2008 (School Website, 2008) indicates a limited chance for the girls to proceed to college. However, my participants continued to hold on to the classic American dream. They believed in their future success through investment in education. Their desire to become self-motivated active individuals, who reinvent themselves to achieve individualistic financial goals and be responsible for their own choices and actions, overlap with the expectations neoliberal America has over its citizens (Davis & Bansel, 2007; Harris, 2004; Petersson et al, 2007).

Governmentality, active self-regulation through the dialogue between current-self and future-self, was the key for the girls' conformity to neoliberal values. Thus, disruption of the neoliberal hegemony lies in changing the nature of dialogue between current-self and future-self. The dialogues girls had through the neoliberal mirror were monotonous; they led girls to get to one fixed ideal place, the "free" market and to be one fixed ideal subject—a financially sufficient independent self. The dialogue was also individualistic—it did not allow other individuals to be involved in the achievement of their educational and career goals. Each girl had their own vision of neoliberal future and they individually pursued those personal dreams.

The key for changing the nature of the dialogue lies in changing the in-between space that connects real space (heterotopia) and imagined space (utopia). Specifically, in changing the neoliberal hegemony, we need to replace this neoliberal mirror (a type of in-between space) with another in-between space so that we can change the nature of the dialogue from an individual one to a communal one. I imagine a boat, another space Foucault (1986) argued as important, can replace the neoliberal mirror.³ A boat is a sort of in-between space with its own physical entities and moves physically from one place to another constantly. It is also located in-between utopia (imagined space one tries to get to) and real space; it embraces utopias as places we have never been to and desire to get there. These imaginary spaces that members on the boat envision are important, as it is our desires to get those places that guide our journey on the boat. In order for a boat to determine its destinations, the members on the boat must have dialogues about multiple utopias and develop common views of utopias so that we can sail toward those destinations together.

We can imagine curriculum as boat, an in-between space, a space of possibility (Helfenbein, 2011) that recognizes multiple subjects and their imaginations. Unlike in the space of deviance where teachers provided students with one perfect image of the future, using the neoliberal mirror, the teachers' role on the boat will be to draw students' multiple imaginations about utopias, whether those images "present

[the current] society itself in a perfected form or else society turned upside down” (Foucault, 1986, p. 26). The dialogues on the boat would be fundamentally different from the ones the girls had in their lives. While students on the boat may continue to have internal dialogue between their current-self and future-self, other students and teachers on the same boat will also mediate their dialogues. Such dialogues on the boat (about utopias as imagined future spaces) have the possibility of taking us to multiple other spaces, outside of the space of deviance and beyond the “free” market.

Notes

¹ At the same time heterotopia embraces common characteristics, any one of the following six principles. Heterotopia (1) takes individuals who are at the time of crisis), (2) withholds deviant population in the society (e.g., prison), (3) embrace several sites that are incompatible with each other, (4) embrace different temporalities (library museum festival), (5) contain a system of opening and closing, and (6) serve as real spaces that are based on illusion (puritan society) or serve as illusory space that contain all the characteristics of real world (e.g., brothel) (Foucault, 1986).

² These are the pseudonyms that were chosen by the participants.

³ Although Foucault discussed boat as a type of heterotopia, I am using this metaphor as an example of in-between space in this article, as boat is a placeless place and it connects heterotopia and utopia (Foucault).

References

- Alba, R., & Nee, V. (2005). Rethinking assimilation theory for a new era of immigration. In M. Suarez-Orozco, C. Suarez-Orozco, & D. B. Qin (Eds.), *The new immigration: An interdisciplinary reader* (pp. 35-66). New York: Routledge.
- Anyon, J., & Greene, K. (2007). No Child Left Behind as an anti-poverty measure. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 34(2), 157-162.
- Apple, M. (2004). Creating difference: Neo-liberalism, Neo-conservatism and the politics of educational reform *Educational Policy*, 18(1), 12-44.
- Bulman, R. C. (2005). *Hollywood goes to high school: Cinema, schools, and American culture*. New York: Worth.
- Collins, J. L., Di Leonardo, M., & Williams, B. (2008). *New landscapes of inequality: Neo-liberalism and the erosion of democracy in America* (1st ed.). Santa Fe, NM: School for Advanced Research Press.
- Davies, B., & Bansel, P. (2007). Neoliberalism and education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 20(3), 247-259.
- Dreyfus, H. L., & Rabinow, P. (1983). *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Duggan, L. (2003). *The twilight of equality? Neoliberalism, cultural politics, and the attack on democracy* Boston: Beacon.
- Duncan, A. (2010, January 12). *Secretary Arne Duncan's remarks at OECD's release of the program for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2009 results*. Accessed from <http://www.ed.gov/news/speeches/secretary-arne-duncans-remarks-oecd-release-pro->

- gram-international-student-assessment-
- Fine, M., & McClelland, S. I. (2006). Sexuality education and desire: Still missing after all these years. *Harvard Educational Review*, 76(3), 297-338.
- Forman, M. (2005). Straight outta Mogadishu: Prescribed identities and performative practices among Somali Youth in North American high schools In S. M. E. Soep (Ed.), *Youthscapes: The popular, the national, the global* (pp. 3-22). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Foucault, M. (1986). Of other spaces. *Diacritics*, 16(1), 22-27.
- Foucault, M. (2003). Governmentality. In P. Rabinow & N. Rose (Eds.), *The essential Foucault: Selections from essential works of Foucault, 1954-1984* (pp. 229-245). New York: The New Press.
- Foucault, M., & Rabinow, P. (1984). *The Foucault reader* (1st ed.). New York: Pantheon.
- Gibson, M. (1987). The School performance of immigrant minorities: A comparative view. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 18(4), 262-275.
- Gibson, M. A. (1988). *Accommodation without assimilation: Sikh immigrants in an American high school* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press
- Giroux, H. (2008). *Against the terror of neoliberalism: Politics beyond the age of greed*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Grossberg, L. (2005). *Caught in the crossfire: Kids, politics, and America's future*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Harris, A. (2004). *Future girl: Young women in the twenty-first century*. New York: Routledge.
- Harvey, D. (1989). *The condition of postmodernity: An equity into the origins of cultural change*. Cambridge, UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Helfenbein, R. (2010). Thinking through scale: Critical Geography and curriculum spaces. In E. Malewski (Ed.), *Curriculum studies handbook: The next moment* (pp. 304-317). New York: Routledge.
- Hursh, D. (2005). Neo-liberalism, markets and accountability: Transforming education and undermining democracy in the United States and England. *Policy Futures in Education*, 3(1), 3-14.
- Kasintz, P., Mollenkopf, J., & Waters, M. (2006). *Becoming American/becoming New Yorkers: the second generation in a majority minority city*. Accessed from <http://www.migrationinformation.org/feature/display.cfm?id=440>
- Kantor, L. M., & Bacon, W. F. (2002). Abstinence-only programs implemented under welfare reform are incompatible with research on effective sexuality education. *Journal of the American Medical Women's Association*, 57, 38-40.
- Lopez, N. (2003). Hopeful girls, troubled boys: Race and gender disparity in urban education. In *Urban high schools: the reality of unequal schooling* (pp. 39-65). New York: Routledge.
- Luker, K. (1997). *Dubious conceptions: The politics of teenage pregnancy* (1st Harvard University Press paperback ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Matute-Bianchi, M. G. (1986). Ethnic identities and patterns of school success and failure among Mexican-descent and Japanese-American students in a California high school. *American Journal of Education* 95, 235-255.
- Ogbu, J. U. (1987). Variability in minority school performance: A problem in search of an explanation. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 18, 312-334.

- McRobbie, A. (2007). Top Girls? Young women and the post-feminist sexual contract. *Cultural Studies: Critical Methodologies*, 21(4-5), 718-737.
- Ong, A., Dominguez, V. R., Friedman, J., Glick Schiller, N., Stolcke, V., Wu, D. Y. H. (1996). Cultural citizenship as subject-making: Immigrants negotiate racial and cultural boundaries in the United States *Current Anthropology*, 37(5), 737-762.
- Petersson, K., Olsson, U., & Popkewitz, T. S. (2007). Nostalgia, the future, and the past as pedagogical technologies. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 28(1), 49-67.
- Pillow, W. S. (2004). *Unfit subjects: Educational policy and the teen mother*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Pink, S. (2001). *Doing visual ethnography: Images, media and representation in research*. London, UK: Sage.
- Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (2001). *Legacies: The story of the second generation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Qin, D. B. (2003). Gendered expectations and gendered experiences: Immigrant students' adaptation in schools. *New Direction for Youth Development*, 100, 91-109.
- Rasmussen, M. L. (2004). Safety and subversion: The production of sexualities and genders in school spaces. In M. L. Rasmussen, E. Rofes, & S. Talburt (Eds.), *Youth and sexualities: pleasure, subversion, and insubordination in and out of schools* (pp. 1313-1152). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Suárez-Orozco, C., Suárez-Orozco, M., & Todorova, I. (2008). *Learning a new land: Immigrant students in American society*.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2009). Accessed from <http://www.census.gov/>
- Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S.-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Weis, L., & Dimitriadis, G. (2008). Dueling banjos: Shifting economic and cultural contexts in the lives of youth. *Teachers College Record*, 110(10), 2290-2316.
- Zhou, M., & Bankston, C. L. (2001). Family pressure and the educational experience of the daughters of Vietnamese refugees. *International Migration Review*, 39(4), 133-151.

Kaoru Miyazawa is an assistant professor in the Education Department at Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. Her e-mail address is kmiyazawa@gettysburg.edu