

Where is “home?”

Interpreting Horn of Africa youth discourse and the politics of “displaced youth”

Aster Solomon Tecele

A dissertation

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the

Requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Washington

2012

Reading Committee:

Associate Professor Susan P. Kemp, Chair

Professor David G. Allen, member

Associate Professor Eugene Aisenberg, member

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

School of Social Work

University of Washington

**Abstract**

Where is “home?”  
Interpreting Horn of Africa youth discourse and the politics of “displaced youth”

Aster Solomon Tecele

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:  
Professor Susan Kemp  
School of Social Work

This dissertation is a discursive inquiry into the language Horn of Africa (HOA) youth use as they talk about their experiences. Study participants are 1.5 and second generation HOA youth, mainly from Eritrea, Ethiopia, and Somalia, living in the Pacific Northwest and actively participating in youth programs provided by three agencies serving HOA immigrant populations. Youth in the study participated in three focus groups. Employing postcolonial and poststructuralist frameworks, the study aims to reveal the function of language in *representing* HOA youth: it assumes language to be a “site of contestation” where youth position and reposition their claims as they characterize themselves and their experiences.

The study’s thematic findings highlight three aspects of HOA youth experience: their strategic use of the language of *difference*; the *hybridity* of their experiences and aesthetics; and their use of this *inbetweenness* as a space of possibility. The study captures the nuances of HOA youth discourse, moving beyond dichotomous frameworks to more fully acknowledge the complexities for immigrant youth of negotiating inbetween spaces. These complexities reveal that HOA youth can and do displace discourses that *represent* them. Revealing the complexities of HOA youth language also has the potential to dismantle underlying paradigms that take-for-granted the politics of “displaced youth.” The study potentially contributes to social work methodology, theory, and practice, and to youth programming.

The study findings challenge theoretical and conceptual frameworks that assume HOA youth have a stable, rational, and unified identity, and assume related ideas about empowerment and change, which can ultimately victimize youth for not fitting into expected norms. From the perspective of this study, liberation from dominant discourses does not require a stable identity; rather, identities are continuously and complexly produced in and through competing discourses. The research points to the need for youth programs to focus on exploring how cultures and languages represent youth, and their populations, while also questioning what it means to talk across borders, as the youth move beyond conventional discourses of multiculturalism. The study also has the potential to inform host society perceptions of HOA youth in particular and African immigrants in general.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION AND SIGNIFICANCE.....	1
1.1 Significance .....	5
1.2 Research Questions.....	10
1.3 Summary of Chapters .....	11
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW .....	14
2.1 General Immigrant Youth Studies .....	15
2.2 Region-Specific Literature Informs HOA Youth .....	21
2.3 HOA Youth Discourses: A Turn towards a Discursive Framework .....	25
2.4 Conclusion: Moving Forward.....	30
CHAPTER 3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS.....	34
3.1 The Postcolonial Framework .....	35
3.2 The Poststructuralist Framework .....	37
CHAPTER 4. METHODOLOGY AND METHOD .....	50
4.1 Discourse as Power.....	50
4.2 Deconstructive Reading.....	52
4.3 Method: As a Research Process. The Context, Participants, and Process .....	53
4.4 The Narrative .....	67
CHAPTER 5. ANALYSIS: DISCURSIVE READING.....	69
5.1 What's in Origin?.....	70
5.2 Inbetweenness and Ambivalence.....	80

5.3 The Right Path .....	89
CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS AS POSSIBILITIES .....	96
6.1 The Language of Difference as Relational .....	96
6.2 Hybridization in and through the Language of Difference.....	98
6.3 <i>Inbetweenness</i> as a Space of Possibilities.....	100
6.4 Research Constraints.....	102
6.5 Implications: As Possibilities.....	103
6.6 Concluding Thoughts.....	109
REFERENCES .....	113
APPENDICES .....	134
A. Recruitment Flyer .....	135
B. Letter of Cooperation from Agencies .....	136
C. Letter to Parents .....	137
D. Parent Consent Forms .....	139
E. Consent Form (Age 18).....	148
F. Assent Form (Age 15-17).....	151

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my committee – Professors Susan Kemp, Eugene Aisenberg and David Allen – without whose support and guidance this project would have been impossible.

I wish to thank my family for their support and encouragement. A heartfelt appreciation to my husband and our sons for pushing me to go back to school, and their love and inspiration, which sustained me throughout this program. A warm appreciation to my beloved mother and sisters for taking care of my family while I was away from home. My beloved sister Hanna, who dedicated her life for justice, a martyr; and my brother, Petros Solomon Tecele, for sarcastically pushing me to continue with my studies, and his commitment for liberty before his political incomunicado status since 08 September, 2001. My friends in Asmara, Amaresh Zerai in particular, for her support in taking care of my family, and all my friends in the U.S. and abroad for keeping me alive throughout the process.

I am indebted to all Horn of Africa immigrant agencies and communities in the Pacific Northwest for allowing me to work with them. Lastly, I recognize the power and motivation of the youth whose experience and inquisitiveness inspired this project.

**DEDICATION**

To my husband, Ayneaalem Marcos Seghid,

and

my sons, Fidel and Falna A. Marcos

for their inspiration

## CHAPTER 1.

### INTRODUCTION AND SIGNIFICANCE

This dissertation is a discursive inquiry into Horn of Africa (HOA) youth language use as they talk about their experience in Washington State. In particular it aims to understand the ways in which HOA youth characterize their experiences and the political significance of their language. In this research, youth language or discourse is assumed as a “site of contestation” and negotiation (Bhabha, 1994). By engaging in a political critique of HOA youths’ language, this study seeks to move beyond conventional representations of these youth as “dislocated” (Kelly, 2002). Understanding the political nature of language enables recognition of how particular discourses about immigrant youth are centered while others are denied.

Study participants are HOA youth who are active in youth programs provided by agencies serving the HOA population in the Pacific Northwest. The research sample includes both young people who came to the U.S. at an early age (1.5 generation immigrants) and those who were born and raised in the U.S. (2<sup>nd</sup> generation).

Very little research has been undertaken on the experiences of HOA immigrant youth, and even fewer studies have taken an interpretive approach with the potential to reveal discursive *representations* (Wetherell, 2004; Wetherell et al., 2004). Nor has research in this area been conducted by social welfare and social work researchers. Yet, HOA immigrant youth experiences in the U.S. are of considerable relevance to understanding the implications of constructing discourses about, of, and for immigrants; youth development frameworks; and immigrant youth programs and services. The aim is to show possibilities of multiple interpretations of experience and to expose theoretical limits of certain types of research. In this study, I aim to capture the nuances of HOA youth discourse moving beyond dichotomous

frameworks to better understand the complexities for immigrant youth of culturally being at “home“ yet not rooted in one space, being culturally both here in the U.S. and there in Africa. This research thus has the potential to better understand HOA youth by showing how youth talk about their own experiences, which will contribute to the knowledge base in social work research, theory, and practice.

Methodologically, the study takes an interpretive approach, aiming to make visible how youth came to talk about their experiences in certain ways and not others, and how discursive *representations* shape the ways in which HOA youth understand and talk about their experiences. The object of the research is thus *representation*, or discourse, not the African youth *per se*. To frame the analysis, I draw from Said’s theory of discursive *representation* (1978, 1979, 1983), Foucault’s notion of *power/knowledge* (1966, 1980, 1994, 2007), Bhabha’s *inbetweenness and hybridity* (1994), and Derrida’s methodological strategies of *deconstruction and reading* (2005). My aim is to expose how discourse controls and disciplines (Foucault, 1980), as well as the ways in which HOA immigrant youth negotiate and interrogate these discourses.

Hence, the focus is not on youths’ programmatic experiences; instead, immigrant-based HOA youth programs are taken as spaces and places to talk, seek, and think about the condition of HOA immigrant youth and to reread the ideologies underlying what youth have to say (Barthes, cited in Sandoval, 2000). By theorizing the ways in which HOA youth characterize their experiences in such spaces, and beyond, my aim in this study is to *deconstruct* the ways in which immigrant youth are *codified in discursive representations* (Said, 1978, 1979; Foucault, 1980; Minh-ha, 1989, 1990, 2011; hooks, 1992; Gilroy, 1993; Irvin et al., 1999; Butler, 2001). I also aim to reread implicit understandings of youth language as direct and free choices, rather

than constructed, inherited preunderstandings, which are therefore less freely chosen (Allen, et al., 2001, 2005; Derrida, 2005).

In this research I focus on discourse as the topic produced and sustained through youth talks because discursive analysis reveals *representation*. Moreover, studies of immigrant youth mainly focus on identity framed as a stable, unified entity, and fixed within cultural boundaries, rather than identity as shifting, a process of constructing *hybrid* identities within cultural multiplicities, and identity as an effect of power and knowledge (Foucault, 1980; Bhabha, 1994; Hall, 1996; Mbembe, 2001; Alitolppa-Niitamo, 2002; Ibrahim, 2004; Arthur, 2008). By assuming that youth have a stable identity, spaces such as HOA youth programs more often than not act as producers of youth agency. A common assumption is that youth agency requires a stable and unified identity. However, such a framework essentializes “youth” as a predetermined entity. Such agentic spaces are also taken as necessary for “purely liberating” youth rather than as contingent, partial, and complex cultural spaces (Barthes, cited in Sandoval, 2000).

Moving beyond “identity” politics, in this dissertation research I attempt to understand the ideological implications or significance of language in youth discourse. Using participants’ (HOA youth) language/discourse to unravel the function of language in *representing* HOA youth, I ask the following: What ideologies are performed through youth language? When is such a language produced? What (un)intentionally sustains, or not, those knowledges? And what is going on as the youth interrogate, negotiate, or recycle what seem to be permanent knowledges?

This research thus aims *at* youth talk as a discursive practice through which knowledges are produced and sustained. Focusing on youth talk is a way of understanding and making visible inbuilt assumptions and knowledges produced for, by, and about HOA youth; how those knowledges come to be naturalized, or not; and how HOA youth negotiate boundaries. Hence,

the research is neither about the construction of immigrant youth identity nor how HOA youth make sense of their experience. My interest in HOA youth experience has to do, rather, with what the youth say about their everyday worlds and what discursive moves they make as they discursively *re-present* their experience.

As noted above, this approach reflects my interest in interpretive inquiries and my investment in contributing towards research methodologies concerning HOA youth, in particular, and African immigrant youth in general. Beyond this, however, as both an outsider and insider to the youth and the Pacific Northwest, I also felt the new in me, in HOA youth, and in African immigrants at large, because HOA immigrants have selectively embraced and rejected so much of their culture and the host society's in the last four decades of migration and (re)settlement in the Pacific Northwest. Given the cultural and historical contingencies and complexities of my experiences, I emphasize discursive approach as a framework that blurs binary divides, and as a key to better understanding and exposing what gives the impression that some discourses are more fixedly centered than others, and what we know as already predetermined.

The question of "where is home?" and the reality of being physically and culturally displaced have also been issues that led me to think beyond boundaries (categorical, territorial, and spatial). The flow of immigrants from the HOA to the West has been increasing since the 1990s. The last two decades of migration, in particular, have been marked by forced migration of Africans due to local and globalized political, economic, and military forces. The processes as well as the routes of migration HOA immigrants experience differ based on numerous reactions to and host societies' acceptance and/or rejection of claims for refuge. Likewise, the process of being categorized as a "refugee" (as an "alien"), striving for acceptability in refugee camps (designated as temporary spaces), and gaining access for visas to cross the Atlantic are long and

harsh experiences migrants from the HOA have to deal with. Resettlement programs in turn are another hurdle refugees must go through in the resettlement process (Moussa, 1993; Griffiths, 1997). Categorized as immigrants with a constructed “alien” identity, new experiences and *representations* are encountered. African immigrants in general, and HOA (im)migrant youth in particular, are always engaged in processes of negotiating the new. Migration, including immigrant negotiation, is thus about becoming (Bhabha, 1994).

The youth from the HOA who participated in this research have directly or indirectly been through such complex experiences. The indirect experience, including for those youth who were born and raised in the U.S., is based on the narrations of migration they grow up listening to from their parents’ accounts—narrations that directly and/or indirectly (overheard) inform the youth and become personal as they live in and through such accounts of exclusion and intimidation. Moreover, the historically malicious *representation* (Said, 1978, 1979) of continental Africa and Africans by western imaginations, which more often than not are taken-for-granted, also shape how HOA youth are talked about, and talk about themselves, and characterize their experiences in the host society as they socialize in school, neighborhood, church, youth programs, and with families and peers (*ibid*). Interpreting what youth say and what makes them talk in a certain way and not another is imperative to understanding and exposing the assumptions underlying HOA youth talk and the biases or preunderstandings that control what can be said or not, and how HOA youth negotiate these boundaries.

### **1.1 Significance**

The increasing number of immigrant students in the United States makes the need for more knowledge of the specificities of HOA youth experience pressing since these youth shape and are shaped by the diverse cultural flows they encounter. As demographic and educational figures

indicate (Edmonston & Passel, 1992; Hansen & Banchu, 1994; U.S. Census Bureau, 2006), in this decade 1 in 5 students in U.S. schools will be a foreign-born Black<sup>1</sup> (1.5 generation immigrant).

In addition, the role of discourse in the construction of immigrant youth is an area that has been rarely studied, even though such studies have the potential to illuminate the role of discourse in shaping how host societies perceive immigrant youth in the U.S. (Bigelow, 2011) as well as youths' own discursive constructions. Very little is also known about HOA immigrants in the U.S.; studies of HOA youth in particular are rare in the social sciences and humanities (Rong et al., 2008; Hassan, 2008). In studies of black students, HOA youth are typically *totalized* within a black category, or Caribbean studies dominate the scholarship (Waters, 1994, 1999, 2000; Touzard, 2008). Moreover, I argue that the focus on "identity" in immigrant youth studies has not been an effective analytical tool because of the multiplicities and intricacies involved in immigrant identity formations (Anthias, 2002) and because few of the studies have used discursive frameworks. Hence, the need for discursive and HOA-youth-specific studies to better understand and theorize their experiences beyond identity politics.

Furthermore, what makes this research significant is that literature about HOA youth, and African immigrant youth in general, is rare in social work and the social sciences. As detailed in Chapter 2, existing research largely relies on psychological conceptualizations of youth and the impacts of (im)migration on behavior. Psychologically informed studies tend to homogenize youth experiences and assume youth as autonomous individuals, stable, and rationale (for example, Erikson, 1994; Mead, cited in Chadee, 2011); consequently researchers tend to behaviorally define immigrant youth as "deviant" and "unfit" (Cohen, 1955), while recent

---

<sup>1</sup> The word "Black" is used here (instead of African) due to the periods of time and diversities of areas from which peoples of African origin migrated to the U.S., which includes the Caribbean Islands, West Indies, and Latin America.

psychological studies frame them as “global teens” (Nsamenang, 2002). Recent psychological and cultural adaptation research (Berry et al., 2011), however, tends to identify four patterns through which immigrant youth culturally and psychologically adapt in societies: namely, integration, ethnic, and national patterns, and a diffuse pattern in which the youth are confused, feeling like they are in-between cultures. According to developmental social theory, youth in general are more often than not *represented* as transitioning from childhood to adulthood, a period when adults enforce conformity to social expectations (Giroux, 2000). From this perspective, youth are the effects of adults’ discourse and its embedded power that force them to adapt (see Chapter 3 for details of power/knowledge). Moreover, I argue that a transitioning period also gives a sense of flow and therefore *fluidity*, which makes it even harder to stabilize and frame youth into one *homogenous* and fixed category unless for controlling purposes.

Immigrant youth are also framed using two common models: a deficit model, which is a fault-oriented behavioral model, and a strength-based model, which identifies positive aspects and seeks to build upon them. One of the major concerns about the deficit model is that more often than not it tends to focus on failures because of an underlying aim to identify the “perfect and the objective nature” of youth, the ideal, thereby ignoring strengths of youth that don’t fit into the ideal. Developmental discourses and representations that stem from deficit models of normative epistemologies blame the victim, as if youth failure stems from individual behavior alone, and/or pathologize cultural backgrounds depicted as backward and static. On the other hand, the strengths-based model assumes youth as energetic, responsible, and vibrant agents of change. For instance, HOA youth-serving agencies focus on instilling “local<sup>2</sup>” traditions, languages, arts, and history, as well as survival strategies in the host society that includes communication skills, bridging gaps across ethnic groups, and other activities related to

---

<sup>2</sup> “Local” refers to the immigrants’ ethnic and/or national traditions, language, art and history.

environmental justice issues. However, the programs might also be (un)intentionally repeating the same discourses they aim to address in the first place by focusing on risk-based assumptions and emphasizing traditionality

The production of knowledges for and about youth based on the two models is also constructed within an oppositional binary. This situates both models in a hierarchical relationship, each trying to center its discourse and in search of an “objective truth” about youth. Each discourse competes in the construction and production of models and ideal youth images thus ignoring the overlap and complex interlink of individual and contextual contributors that shape youth preunderstandings and their performances. The approaches also ignore the sociohistorical and cultural continuities and discontinuities of youth experience, which vary within specific cultural groups and across cultural groups, in ways that makes sense to each one of the youth or immigrants. Such simplistic understandings of immigrant youth also mask “the power and perception of the host society upon immigrant youth and their opportunities” (Bigelow, 2011). What needs to be interrogated, and the focus of this research, is how such discourses or knowledges are sustained and how they facilitate and/or hinder youth performance.

Recent studies of immigrant youth have extended the understanding of youth identities as fluid and unstable, and take into consideration particularities of youth as social actors (Ibrahim, 1999; Ong, 1999; Gianpapa, 2001; Maira, 2002; Shenk, 2007; Mendoza-Denton, 2008). Likewise, inquiries on the ways in which HOA youth talk about their experiences can provide more insights into the ways in which broader categorizations such as ethnicity, nationality, race, class, and gender, etc. become fluid and porous in an era of technologies of virtual mobility (Castells, 2000), the *travelling* of theory and culture (Said, 1983; Clifford, 1994), *new ethnicities* (Hall, 1988), *hybrid* and *hyphenated identities* (Bhabha, 1994), and *mestizo* (Anzaldua, 1987)

who act in and through borderlines. As youth move in and through local (ethnic) and western (U.S.) experiences, within flowing cultures, they mesh and recycle what is taken-for-granted and seemingly natural, such as traditional values and beliefs that characterize members. Immigrant youth, as well as those born in the U.S. from immigrant parents, also flow within cultural divides in western societies, such as racial ideologies constructed to keep immigrant discourses on the margin. As for the ethnocentric and national discourses that influence HOA youth by informing them about their ethnic, religious, and national enclaves and belonging, the distant belongings are imagined (Anderson, 1981) as homogeneous entities of origin. Youth discursive interpretations within, and without, these set-ups in turn stretches the boundaries beyond ethnicity, religious, and national homogeneity, as well as beyond discourses of “aliens, foreigners, and strangers.”

In line with identifying immigrant youth as the “alien,” and the stranger-danger *representation* of immigrants, for example, *The Seattle Times* published two articles in February 2006 about East African “gangs” when groups of HOA youth were arrested on University Way NE, close to the University of Washington, Seattle, campus (Kim, 2006). This incident triggered my decision to focus my dissertation research on East African youth. The local media focused on HOA immigrants and gang-related news, and gossip/street talk overwhelmed African immigrants. The production of such a discourse is part of the mediatized operation of characterizing African youth, as outsiders, black, unfit, and dangerous, thereby applying and imposing the “problematic” label upon the youth (Windle, 2008). However, no one had detailed information about whether the youth were involved in gang activities or not. I am not saying that HOA youth cannot get involved in gang activities. Rather, even if they did, the questions asked should have

been: what were the circumstances and experiences that led them to get involved in such activities? And what happened to the youth since their arrest in 2006?

The “HOA gangs” became media headlines and rumors spread out about differences and unity of youth from the HOA—Eritrea, Ethiopia (Amhara, Oromo and Tigrigna groups) and Somalia. The rumors became tools depicting destructive images of HOA immigrants in general, and youth in particular, because the media had already overwhelmed the public with news of “pirates” in the seas of the HOA. The label, “pirates,” referring to young Somalis in the HOA, amplifies existing images and portrayal of Moslems as dangerous “terrorists.” In consequence, Somali youth (and adults) have become victims of physical and racial profiling as potential dangers to the U.S. (Bigelow, 2008). Despite the lack of HOA youth positive images in the public sphere, the following questions arise: In what ways were the media reports constructed around these group of youth? Why the focus at this moment in time? What were the implications of those portrayals (of HOA youth) at that specific moment and context? No one knows unless one talks to the youth themselves. This research was instigated by that moment. I knew I wanted to understand the condition that created such dismaying situation, and to more closely explore what has been constructed as natural or innate of African youth just because they are assumed as “outsiders, blacks, immigrants and therefore problem groups.”

## **1.2 Research Questions**

Inquiries are needed to follow up on such actions and images, not only to interrogate dominant assumptions about HOA youth, but also to illuminate the power that underlies these assumptions, and the significance of media and public discourses that *represent* HOA youth, even in a city that has a progressive image. Again, the point is not simply to challenge negative images of HOA youth; rather, it is to better understand what functions such discourses or images

serve. My interest is in how existing discourses that seem to predetermine HOA youth as “the problem group” are produced and sustained—such as a comment referring to the HOA youth incident I overheard in the street, “what do you expect of them black kids?”—and in how such discourses facilitate and/or hinder youths’ perspectives and performances as they negotiate and interrogate such discourses.

The specific questions this research aims to address are:

1. What language/s do HOA youth use when they talk about their experience in youth programs? When do they use those language/s?
2. How did they come about to use those language/s and not others?
3. What is the political significance of those languages?

### **1.3 Summary of Chapters**

To summarize, youth *representations*, which portray positive and/or limiting images with embedded connotations, seem fixedly contradictory, assume the youth stage of life as an incomplete, risky period, and portray youth as moving towards something that would make them (or might make them) more worthy (in society’s terms), meaningful, and whole as adults. The assumption of “becoming meaningful and whole” through a risky transitional process, the contradictory and binary assumptions and depictions of youth as either positive or negative is what this dissertation aims to problematize in order to understand the complexities involved in HOA youths’ experiences. Youth experience is more complex than what deficit and strength-based models predict and construct discourses about youth behavior. A discursive approach reveals *representation* and facilitates understanding how youth come about to repeat (or not) such binary discourses. Hence, the need to focus on discursive practices that construct and deconstruct youth in order to move beyond the normative, in understanding the fluidity and

complexity of discourse, based on what they say about their experiences in youth programs and on how the understanding of experience sustains, or not, limiting discourses is critical for social work methodology, theory-practice and youth programs.

In terms of organization, the chapters are a process of (re) and (co)construction of knowledges of HOA youth. Accordingly, in Chapter 2, I discuss how youth are (re)constructed by focusing on disciplines in which immigrant youth studies are relatively numerous. This chapter also explores the literature that includes the construction of HOA immigrant youth and how youth construct and perceive their place as spaces of support and comfort.

Chapter 3 describes the theoretical frameworks that inform the dissertation. I use Said's theory of *representation*, Foucault's power/knowledge, and Bhabha's *inbetweenness* and *hybridity* to expose and rupture ideologies underlying youth language, frame youth experience as "discursive play of language" already constructed and the youth as bearers of discourse, and better understand how youth *hybridize inbetween* multiple discursive cultures.

In Chapter 4 I discuss the study methodology, which draws on deconstructive and interpretive reading as a methodology and analytic method. The methods section includes the research design: identification of HOA immigrant-run agencies that have youth programs; outreach and participant recruitment; University of Washington Internal Review Board (IRB) requirements and parents' consent; participants' characteristics, the transcription process, and ethical considerations.

Chapter 5 provides an analysis of three themes: *what's in origin, inbetweenness and the right path*. Chapter 6 discusses conclusions and implications of the research for methodologies, theory, and social work practice. My hope is that it will be used as a starting point to reread

existing discourses, boundaries, and traps in framing and working with HOA youth, and immigrants from Africa in general. I leave the text open for readers to reinterpret and deconstruct.

## CHAPTER 2.

### LITERATURE REVIEW

The role of discourse in the construction of immigrant youth is an area that has been rarely studied, even though such studies have the potential to illuminate the role of discourse in shaping how host societies perceive immigrant youth in the U.S. (Bigelow, 2011) as well as youths' own discursive constructions. Very little is also known about Horn of Africa (HOA) immigrants in the U.S.; studies of HOA youth in particular are rare in the social sciences and humanities (Rong et al., 2008; Hassan, 2008). In studies of black students, HOA youth are typically *totalized* within a black category, or Caribbean studies dominate the scholarship (Waters, 1994, 1999, 2000; Touzard, 2008). Moreover, I argue that the focus on “identity” in immigrant youth studies has not been an effective analytical tool because of the multiplicities and intricacies involved in immigrant identity formations (Anthias, 2002) and because few of the studies have used discursive frameworks. Hence, the need for discursive and HOA-youth specific studies to better understand and theorize their experiences beyond identity politics.

In this chapter, I begin by reviewing immigrant youth studies more generally to lay out the status of scholarship in this field. Most of these studies are educational, sociological, and psychological. This will be followed by a description of the few HOA-youth-specific studies. Even though it is hard to delineate borders between the frameworks used in the identified HOA-youth-specific studies, I try to distinguish between discursive frameworks (Bigelow, 2008, 2011; Ibrahim, 1999, 2000b), an amalgam of essentialist-constructionist framework (Kumsa, 2004, 2006), and structuralist frameworks (Foucault, 1980). Through a broad review of these frameworks, in terms of how they may inform this research, I build upon them and engage in

identifying ways in which this research can contribute to constructing theoretical frameworks that would have the potential to better understand HOA youth and to critique conventional discourses about, for, and of HOA youth in the U.S.

## 2.1 General Immigrant Youth Studies

The most common studies about immigrant youth in the social sciences include educational (Vorih et al., 1978; Ogbu, 1987; Wong Fillmore, 1991; Giroux, 2000; Schmid, 2001; McLaren, 2001, 2010; Zhou, 2003; Kubota et al., 2006; Bigelow, 2008; Touzard, 2010), sociological (Jenkins, 1992; Portes et al., 1993, 2001, 2003; Waters, 1994, 1999, 2000; Maira, 2004; Massey, 2005) and psychological studies (Suarez-O’Rozco, 2000; Nsamenang, 2002). Educational studies dominate what we know about black<sup>3</sup> immigrant youth, in general, maybe because schools are the spaces where the youth “socialize their identities and possibly envision their existence” (Ibrahim, 2004). The educational studies focus on 2<sup>nd</sup> generation immigrants and Africa-born students’ educational challenges and achievements (Oghbu, 1987; Portes et al., 1993, 2001, 2003; Kubota et al., 2006). According to these studies, the longer African students have been in the U.S., the lower the level of their educational achievement,<sup>4</sup> which results into labeling students as “at risk and delinquent.” Such labels in turn call for more “Alternative Programs” in education, which in turn underscore discourses of delinquency (Touzard, 2008).

In addressing immigrant black students’ educational lags in the U.S., Waters (2000) in her book, *Black Identities*, argues that class and ethnic cohesion matter in immigrant students’ educational progress. In addition to their socioeconomic background, Ibrahim (2000a)

---

<sup>3</sup> “Black” is used here not as a conventional racial category, but to differentiate immigrant students from African American and other non-black students because it is commonly used in educational studies of immigrants of African descent.

<sup>4</sup> Which, according to health related studies, is also true of immigrants’ health.

emphasizes the importance of understanding students' cultural background and their shifting identities—between ethnic and African American identities, which play a significant role not only in school but also in students' daily lives. Moreover, in his article, “hey, ain't I black too?” (1999, 2000b), Ibrahim asserts that African<sup>5</sup> immigrant youth “become black” in the U.S. but that their understanding and experience of the racial divide differ from the ways in which West Indian and African Americans experience racism because of their diverse sociohistorical and cultural conditions. HOA youth, for instance, claim to be Africans or members of their respective ethnic group to differentiate themselves from stereotyped black students, a finding that Bryce-Laporte (1972) affirms in his study with blacks from Latin America and the Caribbean. At the same time, the youth associate themselves with stereotyped black youth as they come to appreciate hip-hop and rap music and dressing styles (Ibrahim, 2001, 2003a).

Inclusion of students' language and cultural practices is the focus of other educationalists. Focusing on immigrant students' educational achievement (Ogbu, 1987; McLaren, 2001, 2010; Kubota, 2006) and language acquisition, previous studies have called for the potential of native (meaning local or ethnic) cultures and knowledges to improve immigrant students' educational success in schools (Vorih et al., 1978; Fillmore, 1991). These studies employ critical lenses that examine the role of structural factors, such as the education system, and call for the recognition and inclusion of native knowledges, which youth bring into their school. Yet, the meaning of inclusion itself can be critically questioned if it means recognition, because it will be followed by Fraser's (1996, 2003) question, “by whom?” Recognition by the very system that is exclusionary? Or is it to replace one side of the binary by another, which then makes the desire for centrality and possession of power faulty? Both Vorih and Fillmore (p. 342) argue how the assimilative force of centering English language results into native (or students' first language)

---

<sup>5</sup> By “African” youth I mean youth whose parents immigrated to the U.S. since the 1970s.

language erosion and loss affects parent-child communication as well as internal and external pressures of “assimilative force” that pushes children to conclude that the only way to be and communicate or be accepted in the outside world, or even in their own homes, is to speak English, thereby losing their own. The effects, according to the authors, are cognitive, emotional, social and educational development of the children. Lack of “talking” to children in a language parents feel confident breaks the link between parents and children resulting into alienation of children from parents. Both have implications on how HOA youth value their parents’ cultures without isolating themselves from the larger society, yet difference is welcomed. Most of the HOA agencies in the Northwest focus on creating possibilities for their children to learn their languages and cultures so that the parents won’t lament for “lost children.” Children’s use and mastery of English, as a language, also has the potential to reverse power relations between parents and children, such as when children become interpreters for parents when they engage with public institutions.

Some sociological studies focus on 2<sup>nd</sup> generation immigrants, structural categorizations, and the ways in which youth negotiate in and through assimilation (Jenkins, 1992; Portes, 2001; Maira, 2004). Three major frameworks dominate sociological studies of immigrant youth: (1) Assimilation discourse, which assumes the on-going adaptation of immigrant youth to the host society as they stay longer in the U.S., thus “shading off” their ethnic cultures; (2) Acculturation discourse, which recognizes the complexity of adjusting to a new culture, and capacity of immigrant youth to blend in spaces of “coevalness” (Massey, 2005); and (3) Segmented Assimilationist discourse, which frames youth as selectively embracing and rejecting multiple local and global cultures (Portes et al., 1993). Such unidirectional adaptation processes subjugate immigrants to apparently dichotomous structures, assume a culture clash between host and

traditional cultures, and have been challenged by studies involving young Somalis' interpretations of "plurilocal homes" (McMichael, 2005) and the (re)construction of identities as immigrant youth negotiate environments that identify them as fixed, aliens, and foreign (Ibrahim et al., 1999, 2004; Anthias, 2002; Kumsa, 2006).

Some psychological studies have also moved from conventional individual-based cognitive development approaches towards understanding the individual in context and the ways in which social contexts shape students' understanding of their world, which in turn influence immigrant youths' educational performance (Suarez-O'Rozco, 2000; Nsamenang, 2002). As already stated, two models are common in the production of knowledges about youth: the deficit and strength models. The deficit model is a fault-oriented behavioral model and the strengths-based model identifies positive aspects and builds on them within specific contexts and values. One of the major concerns about the deficit model is that more often than not it tends to focus on failures because of an underlying aim to identify the "perfect and the objective nature" of youth to be claimed as the Truth, the ideal; therefore it ignores strengths of youth that don't fit the ideal. Developmental discourses and representations that stem from deficit models of normative epistemologies blame the victim, as if youth failure stems from individual behavior alone, and/or pathologize cultural backgrounds depicted as backward and static instead of situating social issues in context (Ngo, 2008). For instance, youth from single-parent or immigrant families are automatically labeled as problematic and at risk, thus maintaining exclusionary practices and reproducing stigma of being a single-parent child and/or an immigrant. On the other hand, the strengths-based model assumes that there are "obedient, nice, conforming, and responsible" youth who play key leadership roles. The model depicts youth as energetic, responsible, and vibrant agents of change. For instance, the three agencies participating in this research designed

youth programs based on this model. Their mission statements contain the following points: to inspire and promote hope, future, and confidence in and from youth who are believed to be agents of change. The programs focus on instilling “local<sup>6</sup>” traditions, language, art, and historicities, as well as survival strategies in the host society through communication skills, bridging gaps across ethnic groups, and other outdoor activities related to environmental issues. However, the programs might also be (un)intentionally repeating the same risk-based assumptions they aim to address in the first place. For instance, the focus of the youth programs is to protect the youth from “risk” behaviors and slipping into the dangers of risk discourses that regulate behaviors in the process of “making up ideal types of persons” (Wenden, 2005).

Overall, immigrant youth are represented in and through such binary discourses: the deficit and strength-based models (Saleebey, 2009). There is an assumed perfection in the future of youth, that is, youth as independent agents making discursive choices freely. However, “choice” is not really free when conventional discourses control what youth think, act, talk about, and experience. Likewise, assigning a fixed label/s to youth who are already marked as “in transition” is problematic because the period assumes transitioning that allows multiple trajectories in the process.

Other youth-centered scholars, such as the geographers Windle (2008), Katz (2005), Dwyer (1998), and Skeleton et al. (1998), also provide rich information on how globalizing processes as contexts impact immigrant youth in schools, neighborhoods, and education; and the ways in which the youth produce counter discourses. Skeleton and her colleagues’ work challenges the fixedness of youth and elucidates how even as category “youth” is constructed through exclusion; the ambiguity of the term allows youth to create sub-cultures. Dwyer (1998) focuses on Black Caribbean and African Muslim youth *representations* in the U.K. based on

---

<sup>6</sup> “Local” refers to the immigrants’ ethnic and/or national traditions, language, art and history.

religion, race, and styles of dressing including the scarf, on one hand, and the ways in which youth create a cultural space where they interrogate social expectations, and racializing and stereotyping discourses about Muslim females, on the other.

Likewise, Windle's study (2008) focuses on media *representation* of Somali youth in Melbourne, Australia. In this study, the author illuminates how African immigrants are portrayed as "perpetrators and problem group," thereby contributing to racializing discourses that according to police reports essentialize the youth as "innately problematic." The findings are similar to February 2006 police reports of HOA youth in the Seattle Area (see Chapter 1). These studies are critical for understanding the current political atmosphere of the HOA region and how the media constructs negative images of HOA immigrants. Yet, centering tradition as a counter discourse could trap the youth into discourses of tradition as if it is the natural state, and to be taken-for-granted.

Alternatively, Katz (2005) compares Sudanese youths' life experiences with those of New York's youth residing in disadvantaged neighborhoods. Katz describes how poverty, social categorization, and globalization intersect, and adversely impact these youths' experiences. That is, on one hand, poor investments in youth employment, and gender, class and ethnicity biases impact the youth. But on the other hand, while globalization and technological innovations expand transnational consumption, global and local socioeconomic and political forces are also pushing both groups (Sudanese and New York's youth) out of their homes into migration and the streets of New York. Katz's work explicates the adverse impacts of globalization as well as cross-border cultural implications. However, the focus on social categories to understand the youth reflects a search for a whole, stable essence and identity politics in conditions where multiplicities and complexities of identity formations make it problematic to employ categorical

analysis. Likewise, the political upheavals in the HOA, mainly in southern and western Sudan, Ethiopia, Eritrea, and Somalia, and the resultant forced migration, impact HOA youth uniquely, and tackling their concerns requires considering their accomplishments as well as failures in changing their condition.

However, underlying the focus on social categories to understand the youth is, and reproduces, the search for a whole and stable essence in conditions where cultural multiplicities and complexities of identity formations make it problematic to employ categorical analysis. In addition, discursive biases and representations of the Other that still serve to reimagine HOA youth immigrants already predominate discourses about, of and for HOA youth, and Africans. Moreover, critiquing such categorizations in the search of youths' tradition in turn might trap studies on HOA youth into traditionalism, as if "pure." As illustrated below, in section 2.3, the above cited frameworks have also been challenged by studies involving young Somalis' interpretations of "plurilocal homes" (McMichael, 2005) and the (re)construction of identities as immigrant youth negotiate discourses that identify them as fixed, alien, and foreign (Ibrahim et al., 1999, 2004, 2007; Anthias, 2002; Kumsa, 2006).

## **2.2 Region-Specific Literature Informs HOA Youth**

Political and cultural discourses about the HOA, since 9/11 in particular, have exacerbated cross-border migration and simultaneously the production of more literature about (im)migrants' experiences in the process of migration and in the host societies. Current images about the region play a great role in terms of how host societies perceive HOA immigrants (Bigelow, 2011). Local conflicts can only arise if they are based on resource allocation and power imbalances; and global interventions in the region have aggravated the geopolitical problems in the region resulting in massive migration.

Studies and novels of HOA exiles relate to accounts of religious violence upon Moslems, including how Moslems negotiate isolation, intimidation, and exclusion based on religious identity and Islam, and terrorism and counter discourses (Zine, 2000, 2001, 2006, 2007; Gow, 2002; Vayas, 2004; Nilan & Feixa, 2006; Kusow, 2006; Fangen, 2006). HOA immigrants negotiate and interrogate such a condition. Pam Nilan and Carles Feixa's (2006) work on global youth focuses on hybrid identities in "plural worlds" and reveal how Muslims interact with and against odd encounters that discredit their Muslim practices. Basford (2010) and Zine (2007), on the other hand, give attention to how East African Muslim students find themselves in conflict with the western status quo. Comparing the students' educational experiences in mainstream high schools with the experiences students had in a culturally appropriate East African charter high school, Basford concludes that Muslim students are discriminated against and/or misunderstood by teachers and students due to prejudiced discourses, and that schools that accommodate their culture create a comfortable space for the students, allowing them to embrace who they are as immigrants, Muslims, and Americans. Zine's work focuses on how Muslim students raised in and through Muslim cultural values find themselves isolated and discriminated against in Canadian schools based on their Muslim practices. Kusow (2006) and Fangen (2006) focus on Muslim Somali students' experiences of racial discrimination.

Most of these narrative studies were produced since the 2001 U.S. military attacks in Somalia, and the September 2001 attack in New York. Moreover, the two small nations in the HOA, Eritrea and Somalia, and the region overall, have historically been destabilized due to the presence of U.S. army in Ethiopia (Kagnew Station, U.S. base in Asmara, Eritrea) and ex-Soviet Union in Somalia during the Cold War (Wrong, 2005). This was followed by U. S. military and political interventions in the HOA since the end of the Cold War in 1989. Labels categorizing the

two nations in particular as “failed and weak states” (Rabasa, 2009), “terrorists” and “rogue states” since the 1990s have done more deteriorating rather than remedying for the image and stability of the Horn (Tisdall, 2007). HOA youth are absorbed in and grow up listening to discourses of forced migration, conflict, and war.

Local narratives and literature about the geopolitical interests of the U.S. and military interventions in the Horn and its effects, such as in Somalia’s internal conflicts and with Ethiopia, in South and Western Sudan, and the war between Eritrea and Ethiopia are also emerging. The resultant exodus of people from the Horn, regional and international migratory experiences, refugee camps, and the (missed) roles of UN bodies have become part of contemporary scholarship and HOA literary work (Asghedom, 2001, 2002, 2010; Farah et al., 2010). Even though the studies are dominated by Somalis experiences, images of HOA youth are (re)constructed with every literary and academic work.

HOA youth, 1.5 and 2<sup>nd</sup> generation, repeat these discourses, or not, as they retell their experiences. They grow up with and listen to such accounts by parents, families, and other immigrants from the region, as well as HOA politicians; both those who support the governments in the HOA and opposition groups in the U.S. recount their stories. Stories of forced migration due to local and cross-border wars, aerial bombardments, and stories of living in caves as survival strategies, detention of fellow citizens with no charges in Eritrea (Ephrem & Kesete, 2004), and experiences of drought and famine inform the youth about the past they claim as their origin. Moreover, experiences beyond national borders such as refugee camps in the Sudan, Ethiopia, and Kenya, where the parents spent lengthy periods of time in transition, never settled, shape how HOA youth imagine their background as those stories are repeatedly told to

them. The ways in which the youth think, talk, and act cannot be free from such family and nomadic narrations, as well as media and academic discourses.

Overall, even though structuralist paradigms recognize the subjugating effect of structures based on race, class, gender, ethnicity, and religion of immigrant youth, the hierarchical exclusion/inclusion paradigm these studies typically use maintains and sustains dualisms that in the first place are constructed to exclude. The ways in which exclusionary structures sustain dualism in hierarchical relations of a binary construct is when each one of the pair in a binary is treated as autonomous or a separate entity on its own, thus avoiding the understanding of one in relation to its pair. In other words, evading relationality assumes the inevitability of consequences—that frees structures from being questioned, or makes them seem apolitical—and blames victims of ideologies/structures.

In addition, although the above-mentioned studies (Skeleton, 1998; Nsamenang, 2002; Kumsa, 2004, 2006; Katz, 2005; Waters, 2004; Windle, 2008) acknowledge the roles youth can play inbetween institutions that make decisions on their lives, the ways in which youth are framed in the studies subjugates them to structures and systems that the studies aim to address in the first place. While these studies provide rich information, more often than not they speak to and within “isms” or ideologies that influence them and/or construct how we know what we know. Hence, efforts to identify interventions, such an ideological/structural approach, including critical approaches, delve into the struggle of rearranging and reforming structures, yet function within the same structural frameworks that ultimately sustain the same old dichotomous discourses. Such dichotomous frameworks, taken-for-granted, limit our understanding of immigrant youth as either/or, the status quo or ethnic culture, obscuring the overlap of the mainstream and ethnic cultures (Kumsa, 2006) that this research aims to uncover. There is a

need for social work, and social science, researchers to step ahead to construct multiple interpretations where immigrants mesh knowledges in spaces of multiplicities (Mbembe, 2001), where identities can be conceptualized as constructed through and in discursive *representations*, and as in process (Hall, 1996).

### **2.3 HOA Youth Discourses: A Turn towards a Discursive Framework**

The studies described below focus on HOA youth-specific discourses. Bigelow (2011) and Ibrahim (1999, 2000b, 2004) use discursive frameworks to explicate the role of discourse in shaping and being shaped by HOA youth. McMichael (2005) focuses on positionalities and fluidity of experience, the making of cultures in the process of displacement and resettlement where the sense of “home” becomes mobile, and how religion becomes a safe space of negotiation for HOA young and adult refugee women who speak from varied locations. Such frameworks move the analysis of HOA youth experience beyond the politics of identity and structural subjugation, towards frameworks that expand the analysis and our understanding of HOA youth discourse.

A discursive approach to understanding how youth come to repeat, or not, existing discourses reveals *representation* that needs to be understood and exposed, which is why this literature review builds upon existing scholarship and intends to come up with unconventional frameworks. As already stated, this literature review specifically focuses on recent studies that frame youth talk as (1) shaped by structural power dynamics, as in the educational and sociological studies; (2) essentialist and constructionist assumed as “mutually constituting” (Kumsa, 2004, 2006); and (3) discursive construction (Ibrahim, 2004; McMichael, 2005; Bigelow, 2011). The following section focuses on the second and third frameworks. At the end of the chapter, I critique the first two frameworks by acknowledging that immigrant youth’s

discursive constitution is relational thus unlimiting youth performance. Moving beyond cultural *representations* that limit boundaries into either/or, opens up for infinite interpretations.

Next, I will discuss HOA-youth-specific studies (and one Cypriot youth study that I found useful for my research). As already stated, the roles of discourse in the construction of HOA youth and of cultural fluidity are areas rarely explored. In an ethnographic study that explored displacement, resettlement, and well-being among Somali young and adult women in Melbourne, Australia, McMichael (2005) reflected on the role of religion in the construction of women's sense of "home" in forced migration and how they create a space in ways that make sense to them in processes of displacement and resettlement. As the women practice and live in Islam, the faith becomes a "home" and a space where they perform, think, and culturally identify themselves, as well as a space of relief and support. Unlike Western prejudiced notions and *representation* of Islamic faith and culture as anti-Western, dogmatic, and the Islamic Other (Said, 1978), the faith becomes a space where Somali women reinterpret their environments in host societies. The author also recognizes the notion of mobile "home" for immigrants as a home that translates its meaning in the process of migration and resettlement.

According to McMichael, the "home" becomes a "plurilocal home" that accommodates varied engagements of the women, both positive and negative experiences, in the process of displacement and resettlement. Unlike what is at stake in anthropological studies that assume culture (in this case Moslem culture) as stuck, fixed in the cultural practices that characterized them for centuries (Geertz, 1973), and *totalizing* all Moslems into one social category, McMichael asserts that Somali women's characterization of their cultural practices changes in the process of migration and resettlement, as does what they say about themselves and their environment. Such a framework marks the sense of displacement as being neither foundationally

uprooted nor fully in exile because interpretations of everyday encounters force immigrants to live in the present.

In line with McMichael's sense of fluidity, Martha Kumsa's research (2006) with Oromo young women, whose parents came from Ethiopia to Canada as refugees, aims to frame their experience through essentialist-constructionist ways of being and acting as concurrent and "mutually constitutive." Kumsa's Oromo refugees are in search of an inner "self" as well as an identity, which is how she uses the essentialist-constructivist framework. The young women question discourses of refugee, the construction of being and acting a "refugee" as they struggle to describe what it means to be a refugee while at the same time reflecting upon the honor and pride of being an Oromo. In addition, the role of the nation-state and nationalism, and the search for a nation that acknowledges the Oromo as an equally legitimate ethnic group, adding another layer to and contributing towards the youth identity formations is also central in her work in spite of her transnational constructionist approach in a globalized world. In other words, the search for an identity through national identity, while situating the search in a globalized setting, seems to carry multiple trajectories.

The importance of collective identity for immigrant youth is likewise evident in Anthias' (2002) exploration of the relationships between identity construction and experiences of exclusion amongst Greek Cypriots and Asian youth in the U.K. Contrary to Anthias' assumption that exclusion and isolation play key roles in how youth identify with their parents' ethnicity, her data analysis indicated that youths' identification with parents' ethnicities cannot be captured through the notion of identity. Instead Anthias argues that using identity as an analytical tool is limiting because in so doing communal identity is tapped as resource of identity formation.

Communal identity-based analysis reintroduces essentialism instead of framing identity as contingent and in process.

In other words, while youth's sense of belonging could be significant, it should not determine who they are or where they belong to because in the search for identity, there is an assumption of an already existing traditional homogenous group. Instead, according to Anthias (2002), analyzing identity as "relational, situational, and locational," and therefore always in process, problematizes the notion of identity as static and the property of a certain ethnic group to be talked about. Anthias even questions the notion of multilayered identity, arguing that embedded at the core of the endeavor is the search for a single identifier that intersects with other identities within social interactions.

Anthias' (2002) argument is that youth discourses are narrations of location and positionality, or "translocational positionality," emanating from stories (re)told within families, migrant groups, host societies, and normative discourses. The narration is a way of youth interpreting their social location in the order of things, yet not fully determined within such discourses. Hence, the narration is relational as well as a refusal of some characteristics, whereas positionality is a space at the intersection of structure (social position) and agency (practice). Instead of multilayered identifications, Anthias proposes a *translocational positionality* that is unstable. However, at the end of her arguments she also calls for inclusion of gender and class in particular to address narrations of collective identity and belonging, thus slipping back into the trap of identity analysis based on categorized social structures.

Beyond McMichael's and Kumsa's identity-national-global constructs, Ibrahim (2003, 2004) expounds the notion of being constructed in migration and immigration (as refugees) in his work with students from the HOA living in Canada. According to Ibrahim, students from the

HOA “become black in the U.S.” meaning the youth may have not heard their parents being categorized as blacks in their home country. On the other hand, Ibrahim (2001) illustrates how the youth yearn to become even the stereotyped blacks when it comes to hip hop and rap music in particular. The preference to align, or not, themselves with stereotyped blacks is either a way of voicing resistance and/or is related to “global youth aesthetics” (Hull et al., 2009). As the youth join the black group, they start mixing local and western languages, which the author calls “Black English as a Second Language,” or change their dressing styles to look like West Indians in Canada. They start to strategically fluctuate between “being made black in the U.S.” and bringing in certain aspects of/from their ethnic enclaves, depending on what made sense to them in specific moments and contexts.

In addition to Ibrahim’s notion of strategic black language use as performativity, Bigelow’s (2011) most recent study of language and (con)text illustrates the complexity of cultures through Somali students’ mixing of local languages with English—*translanguaging* or *codeswitching*—as a way of producing counter discourses and/or conforming to the normative. In response to a famous Somali author about his dissatisfaction with female students’ wearing *hijab* (veil or scarfs), Bigelow analyzes how one of her students uses technology, online chats, to talk back to the author in a poetic and hybridized language style, which shows the fluidity of language. The student uses language as a way of highlighting Islamic culture and how it shapes his everyday life. Bigelow’s study shows the function of language as students from HOA hybridize and integrate their language in the classroom, which informs their perspectives and through which educators can understand their students. Understanding complexities in and through language moves the dialogue, and analysis, beyond individual and collective identity.

## 2.4 Conclusion: Moving Forward

Overall, identity has been central to the majority of HOA youth studies illustrated in this literature review. Whether the analysis is around a multilayered identity or a simplistic one, identity continues to be the *focus* of the analyses. In the case of McMichael, while her contribution to the literature on the fluidity of HOA immigrants' culture is considerable, there is an underlying search for an *essence*, which the author seeks to explore through the women's religious practices and sense of support. While the framework ruptures cultural boundaries and rightly states that the aim of the research was "not to produce the *truth*" (p. 176) of young women's experience, it also tends to reach for the core or *essence* of those women using qualitative explorations of experience, as if what they say is a direct depiction of what is in their minds.

As for the case of immigrant language or discourse, religious beliefs and practices, I argue they are also cultural products that were already there for them to repeat, yet may alter with every repetition. The discourses that get repeated are products of institutions such as immigration, non-governmental organizations, and academia in the field of immigrants and refugees, and contribute to the construction of how immigrants, refugees, women, youth, Muslims and Islam are conceptualized. Likewise, what the women say as they characterize themselves, as well as their displacement and resettlement experiences, is a repetition of those discourses that overtime seem natural.

Moreover, the qualitative exploration of Somali women's identity through focus-group discussions is presented as if something new emerged—something that would open up a whole picture or essence of the unknown Somali Woman Moslem Other that needs to be explored in order to be understood. While the contributions from these studies are substantial, such an approach is typical of the pitfalls identified in Said's work of the Orient, the Oriental and

Orientalism (1978, 1979). The drawback lies in the continuous search for an *essential* traditional and pure origin that underlies the western construct of the Orient, the Other, that needs to be reinterpreted rather than rupturing the *representations*.

In contrast to McMichael's sense of "home" as fluid, the search for refugee youth "belonging" in Kumsa's research uses two trajectories, essentialist-constructivist frameworks, and aims to link them to discourses of nation and nationalism while critiquing the nation state. Such a dualistic approach also traps the youth in discourses of "be-longing for" a patriotic and ethnic discourse as a collective identity. To avoid this, in the current study I draw from Bhabha's (1994) notion of immigrants' experience that dismantles the idea of "longing" and "be-longing" as neither *nostalgic* of origin nor an act of going back to the past, but instead as a *hybridized* experience that cannot be the same as the past, present, and the future.

The use of language in Ibrahim's studies (1999, 2000, 2004) as well as in Bigelow's (2008, 2011) also illustrates how immigrant and refugee youth from the HOA mix and construct English language with Arabic and Swahili in their everyday conversations as a sign of identification and resistance, as well as of finding niches in odd environments. Ibrahim (2004b) refers to their acts as learning "under erasure," that is, youth continuously reinterpreting what they learn in school in ways that make sense to them. While the contributions from both authors are very useful, ranked in terms of discursively dismantling the *representation* of HOA youth, Ibrahim's notion of *mixing* cultures, illustrated in his article by how two circles construct a third one, tends to portray a simple mix in terms of what made sense to a particular student. However, I would argue that there is no truth here, just two different arguments and perspectives. What makes sense to HOA youth is "not liberated enough" (Barthes, cited in Sandoval, 2000) from

conventional discourses that construct them in order for them to make sense in a certain way and not another.

In general, while Kumsa (2006), McMichael (2005), and Ibrahim (2000a) focus on shifting identity formations and seem to rupture the fixedness of identities into binary structures, in the process of bridging two different paradigms Kumsa, for instance, (un)intentionally repeats the very foundational issue she aims to address in the first place—objectivity—while Ibrahim tends to simplify the notion of *hybridization*.

This literature review process leaves space for more political engagement in understanding HOA youth language by moving away from structuralist frameworks that subjugate immigrant youth to structures that force them to conform to an amalgam of essentialist-constructionist paradigms that foundationally differ yet may contribute to cultural critique of being neither. Additionally, the fluidity of language engaged in by youth illustrates identity as unstable, a process, and therefore complex. Hence, I draw on Bhabha's notion of *hybridity* (1994) that complicates the fluidity and mixing of cultures in ways that cannot be traced back, yet partially form the basis of their experience; and that cannot be understood or captured through conventional binary structures. Bhabha's notion of *hybridity* is *catachrestic* (Spivak, cited in Bhabha, 1994), a state whereby the students' cultural knowledges are required yet must be problematized. In other words, understanding HOA youths' discourse of experience in youth programs requires complex frameworks that have the potential to reread what immigrants say about their experience beyond either/or and essentialist-constructionist structures. Such taken-for-granted dichotomous frameworks limit our understanding of immigrant youth to either/or, thus obscuring the overlap of mainstream and ethnic cultures or knowledges.

There is a need to move the analysis of HOA youth language towards frameworks that leave HOA youth discourses open, unlimited, just because discourse constitutes and constructs them in the exercise of power (Chapter 3 describes this theory in detail). These are discourses or knowledges through which HOA youth reread and retell their experience, and social science researchers analyze their texts. The use of complex frameworks that leave discourses open allows the youth to (re)interrogate their condition and researchers to (re)question their work. No one thinks, talks, and acts outside of existing discourses about, of, and for the HOA youth because “*representation* has not withered away” (Spivak, 2006), and so the youth will keep on repeating, while recycling.

Based on this perspective, youth discourse is a medium of *representation* on which other discourses are projected (Opie, 2000) rather than language/discourse as a transparent tool of communication between subject and object. In other words, my research interest herein lies in understanding ontological and epistemological underpinnings in the language youth use and “how they mean” because language “articulates them” (Barthes, cited in Sandoval, 2000; Allen, 2005; Gadamer, cited in Risser, 2008). As the following chapter on theoretical framework will illustrate, for this dissertation research, my aim was to capture the nuances of such discourses or language/s and to ask what ideological work language is doing as youth talk about their experience? What does *representational* discourse appear to mean? What remains hidden and implied?

### CHAPTER 3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

*“The place to speak from was  
through those incommensurable contradictions  
within which people survive,  
are politically active, and change.”*  
Bhabha (1989: 67)

This chapter focuses on the overarching theories that frame the study’s analysis of Horn of Africa (HOA) youth language from postcolonial and poststructuralist frameworks. Postcolonial theory’s cultural critique facilitates the effort to gain an in-depth understanding of the positive and negative effects of HOA youth *mixing choices of cultures* (Appiah, 2006). Said’s (1978, 1979) theory of *representation* is used to understand what discursive *representations* do and how they are manifested in the construction of the Other. Foucault’s notion of power/knowledge (Foucault, 1980) is employed to read the constitution of knowledge or discourse as power of control. These cultural critiques dismantle notions of purity, authenticity, and forms of *essentialism* when HOA youth think and talk about their ethnic group. The notions of borderlands (Anzaldúa, 1987) and *hybridity* as spaces of tension, *interstitial spaces* of displacement and deterritorialization that shape the identity of the *hybridized* subject (Bhabha, 1994) disrupt the assumed homogeneity of nation and ethnic cultures. These theories elucidate the discursive construction of dominant ideologies and the ways in which such discourses are more often than not taken-for-granted. Unequal power relations are framed as relative, rather than absolute. The theories are also analytical tools applicable to interpreting local and global ideologies/discourses underlying, and influencing, individual understandings. These theories

frame sites of unequal power relations, assumed sites of *subjugation*, as sites of power as well as sites of counter-discourse.

I also draw from poststructuralist deconstructive readings to fill in the missing links of these frameworks in analyzing HOA youth talk, which is reading from within discourses' tensions; reading that individuals' discourse as power is not random, but rather strategic moves in the exercise of power as the youth "read under erasure" (Spivak, cited in Bhabha, 1994; Ibrahim, 2004). The poststructuralist is, therefore, "reading under erasure" in the margins, those considered unimportant to the understanding of texts or discourses. The implicit texts of an argument that are undermined, and that seem obvious selections in what HOA youth choose to say and what they do not or marginalize. Poststructuralist reading thus unsettles and exposes contradictions within texts or discourses that hold two opposing meanings, through Derrida's concept of "*differ* and *defer* or *undecidability*," to challenge the binary logic. As will be clear in the analytical chapter, the notion of *undecidability* reads the explicit arguments of a text while simultaneously destabilizing the foundational binary assumptions through their contradictoriness, which makes the text or discourse *undecidable*. Each of these concepts is discussed in detail below.

### 3.1 The Postcolonial Framework

The postcolonial is a condition of an *ambiguous* relationship to one's culture while being rejected by the center, yet still acting in and through both cultures (Memmi, 1965), which implies being neither *and* both. The condition rightly applies to the migrant and displaced who must act *inbetween* multiple symbolic worlds. The concept and condition of postcoloniality moves beyond integration, the claimed U.S. melting pot, and multiculturalism, by addressing the plurality of peoples, voices, histories, and experiences from other parts of the world (Chambers, 1996) that

disrupt the centering of the west. Overall, as already stated, drawing from postcolonial theories and their cultural critiques enables gaining an in-depth understanding of the positive and negative effects of HOA youth *mixing choices of cultures* (Appiah, 2006).

In line with postcolonial cultural critiques, Albert Memmi (1965) reverses dichotomous theories by claiming an “already contaminated” relationship in the colonialist and colonized condition. The assumed “purity” of the colonizer is “already impure, polluted and adulterated” because the colonizer can only be understood through difference, what the colonizer is not, the “other” that is also a part. In his work, *The Pillar of Salt*, Memmi (1965) asks:

Exactly who is he, colonizer or colonized? ... neither, because he belongs to one of those native but non-Moslem groups that are more or less privileged in comparison with the colonized masses, but...rejected...by the colonizing group, which however, does not completely discourage their efforts to integrate themselves into European society. (p. xxi)

Memmi dismantles purity and boundaries by questioning where the subject belongs—French or Moslem, local or foreign. The answer for him is being many, not fitting within any of them completely. Such *inbetweenness*, and *a state of uneasiness*, informs the impurity of the colonizer as well as the colonized, and the discourses about the relationship between the assumed dominant and inferior cultures. Accepting and recognizing such discursive nuances, and discomforts, of the symbolic or discursive world of migrants is the postcolonial lens. Postcolonial theory thus captures the symbolic tensions and nuances of constructed discourses of the producer and the produced. Unlike conventional discourses that aim to distort history and carry out “cultural estrangement” (Fanon, 1963), dominant discourses have been constructed in such a way that they could only be centered and ascertained in relation to what other societies and cultures are not. Hence the assumption is a natural superior western culture and an inferior

African culture. Such assumptions persist regardless of whether there is a physical presence of Europe (and the U.S.) or not because the assumptions and knowledges produced to support such assumptions are ingrained in western ontological and epistemological thinking (Foucault, 1980).

Gilroy's (2005) analysis describes the cultural tensions of the postcolonial condition as internal and external contradictions, such as the hostility directed at "immigrants, aliens and blacks" on one hand, and the value of a multicultural society, on the other. That is, contradictory discourses are sustained through claims of a multicultural society that assumes an inclusive image, yet exclusionary remarks on immigrants persist. Such a condition is, according to Gilroy, "*the impossible* to evade yet might terminate fear of difference."

Postcolonial theory questions western ways of knowing as *the* only way of knowing. Exposing the contradictions and tensions already within western ways of knowing has the potential to reveal discursive *representations* of the "other" and how we came to know the "Other" the way we do. By questioning ways of knowing, the theory also deconstructs *representations* in the continuum production of discourses and counter discourses.

### **3.2 The Poststructuralist Framework**

#### **3.2.1 Discourse and/as power**

In relation to discourses in power/knowledge, understanding the concepts of power—the technologies of power, starting from its lower-level mechanisms (Foucault, 1980)—and examining how power has been and continues to be practiced to displace local knowledges and to produce, disseminate, and/or impose western dominated and/or originated knowledges to the detriment, or not, of indigenous African peoples and individual youth are critical to understanding the political significance of what HOA youth say about their experience in youth programs. My focus on discourse and/in power is on how dominant discourses shape youth

perceptions and practices, and how such discourses can be deconstructed, thereby exposing limits and allowing relational possibilities.

A Foucaultian perspective about the conventional evolution of youth behavior, treatment, and outcome research illustrates how discursive *representation* or language constructs its “subjected subjects” (Foucault, 1980). In other words, discourse characterizes identities and actions. The argument is that HOA youth “gangs behavior,” for instance, is a response to discourses produced about youth in relation to gangs. The discourses characterize “gangsters,” and the ways in which some youth act as “gangsters” is based on what they hear, see, feel, read, and know about acting gangster. Such discourses also create fields of study that construct and sustain the discipline, while controlling youth perception and disciplining (Foucault, 1966, 1980) youth to their gang prevention discourses. The point is not that youth do not misbehave; rather the ways in which the youth come to act in a certain way is an effect of discourse. Foucault talks about power/knowledge as interrelated, and that one is embedded in the other. As already stated, the power of knowledge/discourse in relation to HOA youth is its ability to make believable and apparently natural a certain picture, or “Truth,” discursively produced about and for HOA youth. The focus of this present dissertation research is on understanding the function of discourse in shaping how HOA youth characterize themselves and their world in a certain way and not another.

Power is more often than not understood to be possessed by one group or the dominant social group (Pease, 2002). However, as Foucault (1980) remarked, power is an exercise, never *static*, and not a commodity or wealth. Power is dispersed. Power circulates, and “is exercised through a net-like organization where individuals not only circulate but also exercise this power” (*ibid*). Thus, as Foucault argues, the individual is not only its *effect* but also its *articulation*. This

means that individuals, at any hierarchical level, exercise power to voice their own perspectives, to reject or embrace varied cultures, and to act in certain ways, (etc.), but in a web of unequal power relations. Power is thus relational, discursively mediated, and hierarchical (*ibid*).

Power is also textual and is mediated through *performativity* or discourse (Foucault, 1980). There is nothing outside text (Derrida, 1994) because text constructs meanings that are constantly deployed and disrupted in the process (Kress, 2004). In this case, text means the centralized discourse that gives meaning—through regulated production, dissemination, and consumption—to social reality and social interaction (Hardy & Phillips, 2002). In other words, our experience is written for us by multi-conflicting discourses of which we are also a part because we use language, which is a form of *social action*; that is, we act and interact because language produces *social actors* (Wetherell et al., 2004).

However, our ability to act is also limited by contradictory discourses because each individual constructs and exchanges his/her own meaning. The contradictoriness of discourses destabilizes centered discourses and this could be exemplified by discourses about African youth that *represent* them as inferior, backward, and savage Africans. These discourses are dominant, yet, while the youth will be influenced by such discourses, it doesn't also mean that the youth totally buy into them—thus destabilizing centered discourses. Derrida notes that texts flow but without *authenticity*; and the ways in which HOA youth interpret such discourses is free but not free because of their preunderstandings learnt from their parents, families, school, and peers.

### *3.2.1.1 Youth program as em-power-ment practice: a critique*

The aim of critiquing “empowerment practice” is to understand underlying assumptions of empowerment so as to analyze how political empowerment plays out in cultural struggles, such as youth programs. Empowerment is a critical intervention in Social Work practice “to challenge

and combat injustice and oppression” (Ward & Mullender, 1991). The principle of critical empowerment practice is to create awareness of systemic and structural subjugation, thereby arming the oppressed to realize their potential and take control of their lives (Wise, 1995). Such a conceptualization of empowerment indicates a distribution of power (Pease, 2002). It suggests that power is a commodity or property that has to be transferred from experts who possess certain knowledge about empowerment. The experts become the centers who define and develop “technologies of empowerment” (Anderson, 1996). Hence, technologies of empowerment become tools that have to be devised by experts or professionals thus legitimizing their roles in the production of knowledge. Youth programs become the sites of experimenting with such technologies, for example, HOA youth who participate in bridging gaps across youth cultural groups and the discussions and reflections conducted with several youth groups that does empower them to voice their concerns, yet may not be liberating the meaning (Barthes, cited in Sandoval 2000) when produced in terms of a dichotomous divide of unequal power relations.

In the empowerment process there are (un)equal power relations. There is “constant tension between compliance and resistance” (Cruikshank, 1994). As Foucault (1984) remarks, there is no guarantee that a particular form of discourse or form of knowledge will lead to emancipatory practices. Hence, the way power is conceptualized influences how strategies for social change are designed and developed.

Furthermore, as already indicated, power is not a thing that is possessed by one group and not the other (Foucault, 1984). Power is an exercise that circulates in a complex web wherein the poor and the rich exercise their powers. Individuals’ inner powers and their capacities for resistance mean that they are not completely powerless; they can exercise power. However, the binary construct that assumes the oppressed as powerless could dissuade them from exercising

their power (Healy, 1999). Thus, power is relational rather than a binary construct of the powerful and the powerless. Such a web model acknowledges the power of those with less power to resist and interrogate. Hence, the need to redefine power and empowerment as emancipatory strategies to develop alternative knowledges that *estrangle* centered discourses.

However, the danger of localism also has its ramifications, and there is a need to inquire further how the mission of youth programs are framed and what the mission implies in practice because, as already stated, romanticization of localism or traditionality itself is a form of power for subordination, exclusion, and displacement (Said, 1978). Thus, as the limits in exercising their culture become the spaces for alternative discourses, so will the ideals of traditionality produce counter narratives replacing other counter narratives. Such a framework of the cultural tensions HOA youth are facing destabilizes the notion of traditionality as essence or roots, and creates a space for a new transnational culture—a space where HOA youth negotiate the global-local encounter rather than becoming subsumed within a dominant monoculture that dooms them to cultural extinction.

### *3.2.2 Discursive representation: Edward Said*

I draw from Said's notion of discursive *representation* to frame what HOA youth say about themselves, their culture, and their place of origin, Africa, and to capture what discursive *representation* does to contain and control individual discourse, but without centering the orthodox notion of culture. Realizing gaps and critiques of this theory will hopefully move us forward to destabilize discourses produced for and about Africa/ns in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Said (1978, 1979) uses the symbolic aspect of postcolonial discourse in his work of the Orient. According to Said, discursive *representation* is the construction of the "Other" through institutionalized discourses that produce knowledges for and about the Orient, in this case

Africans or HOA youth in particular. Said's analysis of the perspective of "Orientalism" as the "symbolic-political construction" of an object called the "Orient" presents an argument on how assumptions and interpretations and attitudes can result into the imaginary creation of a "fictitious reality."

Said's discourse of "Orientalism," and its practices, describes the continuity of the *imagined* reality. Orientalism shows how symbolic constructions of the "other" camouflage the underlying political power and practices. As a discursive turn, Orientalism symbolically transforms the power into Truth about the "Other," thus legitimizing its practices while simultaneously providing further knowledge through research institutions. This supports the Foucauldian project that explains epistemological perspectives as "the symbolically mediated effect of historical constellations of power." Orientalism is therefore reconstructed as a "discursive myth" (Barthes, cited in Sandoval, 2000), a cultural projection constructing its "object" according to "a set of conceptions" or images that create a certain reality in a language/discourse that the Orientalist can understand (Said, 1979, 1978).

Discourses of modernity and globalization construct and reconstruct varied images that *represent* African indigenous peoples. Such *representations* can be traced back to European colonial encounters with the rest of the world and make certain peoples vulnerable to dominant ideologies. The *representations* take the form of texts—oral, written, and images—produced by historians, scholars, missionaries, travelers, and adventurers. The texts rewrite indigenous history, traditional cultures, social roles, and meanings through a western lens (Said, 1978, 1979). In other words, indigenous people are already interpreted by such texts. Such power laden textual *representations* are designed to justify Western assumptions of, and privileges in, modernizing targeted groups, such as peoples in Africa, thereby upholding Western supremacy.

Institutionalization of such texts assumes legitimacy, which also *delegitimizes* the Other, thereby rendering the Other inferior. Boundaries are thus discursively constructed to differentiate the unknown Africa/ns from the West/erners.

The boundaries are also characterized through texts as *the imagined Other*, the *exotic* and *essentialist*, of indigenous peoples in such a way that the boundaries seem fixed. As already stated, the Other is imaged through textual constructions that assert boundaries between the West and the unknown. It is assumed that the Other cannot represent itself and therefore that it is the burden of the West to talk, write, name, tell, discover, study, imagine, etc. about the Other, thus producing and reproducing authoritative discourses or knowledges about the Other, yet from a strategic location. The authoritative image that differentiates the two is thus marked as fixed, in a hierarchical relationship, depicting the west as superior and the Other as inferior.

The unknown, the Other, is also represented as *exotic*, thus to be feared. Interpreted through a lens of the dominant group and from a strategic location with embedded meanings, this renders the Other, the African, as terrifying, exciting, something to be explored. The construction of fearful stories, images, naming, and reports about the Other is used to justify the need to control and tame (Said, 1978, 1979). For instance, western media reports of internal conflicts in Africa, and tribal wars, depicted as inhumane as if the incidents were a new category of event in the history of mankind, conceal existing global and local political realities that pitch certain human beings into desperate situations of life or death despite their natural wealth. Introducing Western cultural values as universal norms is often a means of disparaging indigenous attitudes and beliefs. Christianity is one of the tools used to tame indigenous groups and is typically followed by dissemination of Western education that has further *subjugating effects* on the cultures of the Other. For instance, the Italian (1889-1941) and British (1941-1951) colonial

powers objectified and Othered Eritrean peoples, while simultaneously Christianizing and providing indigenous peoples with minimum education to serve their public services. Those Christianized and educated were considered more progressive than other ethnic groups, and were groomed to rule and control as power was transferred to them in the construction of new nation-states after WWII.

*Essentialization* is another process that aims to discipline peoples from Africa. A colonial history of *essentializing* discourses creates the condition that *disimage* and undermine the indigenous. Essentialist assumptions image an underlying and unchanging essence of the indigenous that portrays them as savage and primitive (Said, 1978, 1979). Such core assumptions tend to legitimize dominant discourses by asserting that it is in the indigenous nature to be backward and savage and that change is difficult if not impossible.

The construction of such cultural identities is based on binary constructions of the one and the Other engaged in hierarchical relations amongst ethnic groups. Binary constructs create predispositions that render local peoples vulnerable to both internal and external dominant discourses (Said, 1978, 1979). Construction of such binary discourses also creates rationalizations for the need of experts to produce knowledges about the Other with good, or not, intentions to assist them. The institutionalization of knowledges in turn legitimizes the exercise of power through interventions in the name of transforming the “primitive.” Such interventions, emanating from a modernization paradigm, have been characterized as producing profit and increased power for local elites while indigenous cultures and knowledges are ignored and even destroyed (Jarosz, 1992). Such are the stories HOA youth in the U.S. grow up listening to, repeating, and acting upon.

Essentialist frameworks and underlying logics need to be interrogated, not to romanticize indigeneity but to move beyond the notion of fixed identities and expose the controlling effect of the western lens on and local discourses of peoples from Africa. The assumed fixed boundaries are arbitrary, and therefore can be destabilized because not all individuals agree to the normative claim of binaries as common sense (Said, 1978, 1979). The boundaries are also *fluid* because indigenous peoples are not passive recipients; rather they negotiate *essentializing discourses* and challenge the dynamic interaction between dominant and local discourses. This process, in which oppositional discourse or *subjectivity* is mediated, is specific to historical continuities and discontinuities, and contingent on cultural particularities.

### 3.2.2.1 Rereading Said's representation: a critique

Said's theory of *representation* is critiqued for silencing the Other as a passive recipient of dominant discourses (Spivak, 2001). In his work on Orientalism, he does not acknowledge the Other as oppositional, imagine the Other as gazing back (hooks, 1997) or producing its competing discourse to redress the *subjugating effect* of dominant discourses. Young (2002) on the other hand focuses on the Other's presence referring to experiences of liberation movements against European powers in search for alternatives to existing conditions. However, was there and is there any guarantee that the movements will be liberating (Barthes, 2000)? Derrida's notion of *deconstruction*, which is proposed in the methodological chapter unpacks embedded power relations that underlie discourse by dissecting normatively claimed binary oppositions and suggesting that alternatives constitute and are constituted by dominant texts.

Textual *representations* manipulate the ways in which we picture, understand, and treat local or African societies in our interactions and experiences. Discursive *representation* constructs hierarchical relations thus reproducing conditions of binary and oppositional

relationships (Derrida, 1986) that become naturalized in the everyday *language-in-use* (Foucault, 1980) not only in relation to the external world but also within their own societies and their own selves. Fanon (1963) describes the latter state as *internalized oppression*, a concept that is also critiqued because of its victimizing character. Spivak (2001) moves the argument further, informing us that discourse is *taken-for-granted* when repeated and that every discursive repetition is *iteration* because nothing is static. That is, there is a change in every cultural repetition. When HOA youth repeat old stories and cultural experiences, they are recycled based on how the youth understand and interpret what they learnt. Spivak's argument signifies the *multiplicity* of interpretations (Mbembe, 2001), thus diffusing the boundaries of binary constructs of one and the Other.

The Other or the indigenous African or the African youth, therefore, is never outside or beyond the binary construct, but “emerges by coercion, within cultural discourse” (Bhabha, 1994). Hence, in the case of HOA youth cultural practices in the U.S. and their parents' African tradition, where both are Otherized and encounter the global-local in contemporary globalization, their experiences could be read as cultural interactions that can contribute towards new *mixed cultures* (Appiah, 2006), rather than as causing an inevitable clash between HOA youth culture in the U.S. (assumed as modern culture), and their parents' African cultures (assumed as backward culture). In other words, both cultural practices cannot be taken as two distinct cultures; and in the case of a western culture infiltrating every corner of Africa, the global power cannot be perceived as that which dooms local cultures to extinction.

### 3.3 The place: as liminal hybridized con-text

#### 3.3.1 HOA Youth in the local-global: so where is “home?”

In the struggle for survival and for securing local knowledges as mass culture in contemporary globalization seems overwhelming, (im)migrants and displaced peoples (re)create cultures and places constructed in and through displacement and migration (Ong, 1991; Turton, 2005). In such a process of migration and becoming, (im)migrants perform beyond “a bounded culture” as they negotiate in new spaces from which new places are constructed. HOA youth of the 1.5 generation who migrated with their parents at an early age, for instance, have lived in refugee camps in Kenya and/or Sudan. They learned Swahili and Arabic languages and cultures in the camp schools and the society at large, while their parents struggle to sustain their languages and cultures in new and harsh environments of the refugee camps. Creating spaces of “traditional culture,” parents hope that the new place and space could assist in transferring the history and culture of their homeland to their children. However, in the making of place, the sites recreate their pasts in different ways, as “continually being renewed” (Bender, 1998). That is, as cultures are practiced in new spaces and places, (im)migrants embody new traits as survival strategies; they (un)intentionally *hybridize*. These spaces and places are the *in-between* spaces or the *third space* (Bhabha, 1994) where negotiation and interrogation emerge. Displacement allows, as Minh-ha (1989) argues, the invention of “resistant forms of subjectivity.” Place and culture, therefore, live in *hybridization* (Bhabha, 1994), neither nostalgic nor pure.

However, *hybridization* does not make (im)migrants and displaced peoples less local or more global. As producers of “a differently imagined culture” (Minh-ha, 2011) peoples go through “multiplicities” of cultural experiences (Mbembe, 2001) that cannot be captured within conventional frameworks of either/or. The point then is to find out how peoples, as Jonathan Friedman (1999) puts it, “practice the local in the global.” That is, understanding how peoples

construct place and culture as they participate in *translocal* spaces where local specificities as well as global constructions become equally central. In this diasporic *ambivalent* space and complexities of experiences lies the possibility of linking space, place, and cultural fluidities to locate the immigrant youth experience or “home.” The questions are these: How do multicultural contexts, on one hand, and (im)migrant displaced parents who struggle to install “traditional” cultures to their children, on the other, make sense to HOA immigrant youth who negotiate in the midst of multiplicities (Mbembe, 2001) in new spaces and places? What are youth strategies of participating in programs that aim to shape them in a certain way and not another? An examination of HOA immigrant youth discourse on how they imagine their realities should reveal the links between discourse and *representation*. Such an examination must include exploring varied images of the way immigrants interpret their condition and of how immigrant youth negotiate cultures that strive to confine them within *traditionality* and *locality*.

Immigrant youth live in a *nomadic* condition, *inbetween* multi-cultures, which forces them to interrogate and negotiate from an *ambivalent* condition, divided, uncertain. In the words of Stuart Hall:

You have to be familiar enough with it [*the center*] to know how to move in it. But you have to be sufficiently outside it so you can examine it and critically interrogate it. And it is this double move or, what I think one writer after another have called, the double consciousness of the exile, of the migrant, of the stranger who moves to another place, who has this double way of seeing it, from the inside and the outside. (1998, p. 363)

For these youth, “local” spaces strive to enforce norms and frame their belonging—such as the organization of Eritrean, Ethiopian, Sudanese, and Somalis’ cultural activities—and western cultures aim to forcibly engulf them—through media, internet, school—yet distance them; both

forces interacting create the condition whereby youth slip into *double reading* of their condition. They are neither here nor there. The *inbetweenness* cannot be read through a conventional binary framework. Framing youth (im)migrants' condition through such an unstable and nomadic lens creates the possibilities to understand and interpret the complexities of migration, displacement, and globalization through frameworks that allow multiple experiences and practices to emerge.

As will be elucidated in the following chapter, interpreting HOA youth language, therefore, requires analytical tools that allow reading language as discursive power, beyond dichotomies, relational, and not necessarily always subjugating.

## CHAPTER 4. METHODOLOGY AND METHOD

*“We are producers and effects of language.”*  
Foucault, 1980

This chapter includes key sub-headings that explicate the research’s methodology, design and analysis. I start with the Foucaultian sense of discourse followed by an explication of deconstructive reading. The methods sections describes the research design, including the research context; procedures for identifying and recruiting participants (with information about consent forms and confidentiality); and the processes of transcribing the data and rereading data texts until saturation.

### 4.1 Discourse as Power

Methodologically, the dissertation research employed knowledge co-construction in a research process through (de)constructive reading as a methodology and analytical method in the interest of unmasking how the use of language (as discourse) generates and maintains practices. I use discourse in the Foucaultian sense as language use with a set of rules and practices that regulate how we know what we know, and how we talk about knowledge (Foucault, 1980). As illustrated in the following subheadings, discourse analysis and deconstructive reading analyze the themes of this research by examining Horn of African (HOA) youth language, “not to identify the superior one but to expand relational resources and possibilities” (Witkin et al., 2007). From a discursive framework, discourse is not transparent, and analyzing the patterns of

language-in-use (what is said and what is silenced) uncovers masked ideologies, enabling exploration of limits and enhancing understanding.

Discourse is political, and the words HOA youth use as they share their experience in youth programs emerge from a political stance. The youth may or may not realize what they were doing with the words they used because some discourses come to be seen as common sense while others are not. However, what they say is ideologically informed and therefore politically positions them, which is why their talk or language becomes a topic for analysis. Problematizing discourse, or critiquing youth language in this case, is needed to explore the limits of discourse and to keep normatively accepted ideas from becoming rigid, as if natural. The talks in the focus groups' discussions could be (un)intentional choices. The choices of what they say and when are all political and inform the types of discourses influencing HOA youth about how to *represent* themselves, their parents, schools, youth programs, their relations, and the way they perceive their world. In other words, the discourses were already there for them to use or to repeat. Hence, semiotic interpretation of the political implications of the words uttered enables the revelation of discursive *representations*—ideas and beliefs the youth have been negotiating and interrogating—and underlying assumptions of those *representations* that shape what is legitimized to be said and what is not, the silenced, and tensions within.

Semiotic interpretation deconstructs, rereads, and disentangles multidimensional *representations*, while simultaneously acknowledging the researcher as participant in the co-construction and interpretation of youth (research participants') discourse (Mischler, 1991). For instance, the ways in which I was engaged with the agencies, the youth programs and the youth already informs my understanding, or not, about the youth and contributes to how I engage with

the participants in the focus groups' discussions. In other words, my role in the co-construction and teasing out the discourse data and the research process in the analytics shapes this document.

## 4.2 Deconstructive Reading

*“Deconstruction reads the outside,  
the margin which is already inside.”*  
Derrida, 1997

Deconstruction, rereading, and heuristic inquiry are neither methods used to reach the Truth, nor methods applied to something that is outside text, as discourse. “Deconstruction reads the outside, the margin which is already inside” (Derrida, 1997). Deconstructive reading identifies what is silenced, the discomfort, tensions, contradictions, and the heterogeneity within and between texts. Analyzing the tensions between what is said and what is not said reveals hierarchies that uphold the relative (temporary) authenticity of one in contrast to the dependent, secondary, illegitimate, and silenced position of the other. However, some attributes of the other, which are devalued, could also apply to the assumed authentic texts.

Deconstruction is, therefore, justice (Derrida, 1986). It is “a field of political struggle where negotiated readings of the margins take their social position into consideration” (*ibid*). Such readings lead to a new perspective that engages other readings as preferred ones; thus, acknowledging the *iterability* of discourse. According to Derrida, political commitment cannot depend on any guarantee involving prior knowledge; our responsibility, however, is to consistently *repoliticize*, *hyper-politicize*, to constantly criticize, to suspect given cultures and institutions through deconstruction (Popke, 2003) because they hide subjugation, repression, and domination (Spivak, 1996). The goal is not to destroy them or cancel them, but to be *just for*

*justice*, to revision the relation to the Other as justice, thus disseminating the moment of political decision across infinite contexts.

My intent in using deconstruction as methodology and method can be exemplified by the *ambivalences* in the processes of social transformation: the ways in which silencing and victimization of minority groups in the name of assimilation becomes a space of power and resistance. This new space is a political space, where the act for freedom becomes the condition of the possibility of political struggle (Derrida, 1999). Hence, deconstruction does not say there is no subject, no truth, and no history. Rather, it questions the privileging of authority by which someone is believed to have the truth. At the same time, it is not focused on the exposure of error but looks into how truths are produced. That is why deconstruction is “a persistent critique of *what one cannot not want* (Spivak, 1996) yet must criticize—a *catachrestic* space.”

Deconstruction of dominant ideologies is central to modernization, globalization, migration, and assimilation, on one hand; and to the liberation ideologies central to social movements and youth programs, on the other. It provides a key to understanding their exclusionary discourses and practices, how they appear to be justified and inevitable, and how those sites become sites of negotiation, because discoursing is practicing power.

### **4.3 Method: As a Research Process. The Context, Participants, and Process**

#### **4.3.1 The context**

The three youth programs I worked with in this research are conducted under the auspices of HOA agencies that serve East Africans in Washington State. The agencies are run by HOA immigrants. They are small with low budgets and few staff. Volunteers run most of the programs. Such small agencies have to compete with bigger not-for-profit agencies that have

longer histories of providing social services to immigrants for small grants from cities and private foundations. The staff acknowledge that their workload is beyond their capacity to manage and that they struggle to sustain programs targeted towards youth, and East African immigrants, because they find it hard to ignore immigrants' high demands and needs. Moreover, program staff contribute from their own pockets to sustain the youth-serving programs as well as other programs for immigrants from the HOA.

HOA youth programs are designed to respond to constructed and stereotypical discourses about immigrant youth. In response, the programs promote a certain image of an "ideal youth": one they believe is positive from the perspectives of both the larger host society and HOA ethnic groups. To achieve such an image, the programs aim to provide participating youth with skills that will assist them to survive the hurdles immigrants face and to become "productive" members of society, thus facilitating a different image of HOA youth as well as their integration into American society. Youth are involved in projects and activities to get informed and trained about their historicities, languages, cultures and arts as well as communication skills and ways in which they could integrate in the host society. The trainings are assumed to inculcate an ideal HOA immigrant youth image.

As I was trying to understand what that "ideal immigrant youth image" meant to the program staff and the youth, the questions I was struggling with throughout the research process were: Who are these youth? Are they the school dropouts and street kids that such programs usually aim to reach and serve? Are they repeating what they have been instructed? Are they telling me stories they think I expect to hear from them or not? How do they reconcile their understandings with what they were learning from the youth programs? Do I have to intervene when they get into hot discussions? Can I draw conclusions or leave the discussion open so that

they don't get influenced by my biases? If I do, would they take my ideas as the Truth, and would I want to accept that? I asked myself these questions repeatedly, even when I was transcribing the audio-taped focus group discussions because throughout the interactions, we were producing and constructing discourses that might or might not change our perceptions (the research participants, HOA youth immigrants, and me as a researcher). The account from this research is always at risk of being changed in the process of understanding—interpretation—in a circular interplay between tradition and the interpreters of that tradition (Gadamer, 2008).

#### **4.3.2 Design**

Focus groups with open-ended questions and participant observations were used as methods of collecting discourse data. From a discursive lens, the focus group discussions are framed as discourses the researcher and the participants co-construct (Mischler, 1991). I developed an interview guide and discussed with agency staff. The interview guide included open-ended and probing questions that invited participants to talk about their experiences in youth programs. The interview guide included a broad question such as: how did you come about to join the youth program? I conducted the focus-group discussions for an hour and half to two hours, audio-recorded and transcribed them.

The research also involved participant observation when the youth were engaged in activities and when staff were engaged with the youth. Fifty hours of participant observations with note-taking were taken. However, the notes will not be used in the analysis because of the potential that the events could be misinterpreted (Wood & Kroger, 2000). But the notes taken during participant observations helped me to understand the context under which youth discourses were produced since those discourses were not produced under a strict set of

questions from an interview guide (*ibid*). Furthermore, participant observation also assisted in identifying activities related to the research questions.

#### **4.3.3 Consent forms**

The University of Washington Institutional Review Board's consent forms detail the procedures and processes of the research (see Appendix D). Professional translators translated the form into two languages spoken by many parents in the recruitment area (Tigrigna and Amharic). In cases where the parents could not read, even with translated forms, youth program staff read the consent forms to parents and made sure that they understood the process before signing the form. The researcher is fluent in Tigrigna, Amharic, and English, which made it easier to communicate with the youth in any of those languages. The University of Washington Institutional Review Board approved the application for Human Subjects, and its modifications. Human Subjects approval assures confidentiality and safety of all research participants.

#### **4.3.4 Recruitment and participants' characteristics**

Three nonprofit agencies run by HOA immigrants were purposely identified because they have youth programs and because of the variety of youth who benefit from their services. HOA immigrants include refugees and immigrants whose parents are from Sudan, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Somalia, and Djibouti. Participants' country of origin and location of the identified agencies were coded for confidentiality purposes. The sample youth programs were also coded as Program A, B and C. I am well acquainted with the three agencies because I have volunteered with some of them for quite some time, which facilitated the agencies' roles in recruiting HOA youth and obtaining parents' consent. My role as a volunteer and a participant observer also contributed to knowing the youth in person and building relationships, which created a more

comfortable space for all us in engaging in discussions and dialogues. A letter of support from the agency was provided to participants' parents (see Appendix C). Hence it was a purposeful sampling that included a wide variety of program participants ranging in age, gender, ethnicity, language proficiency, and time resident in the U.S. Duration of stay assisted in capturing home and broader societal influences.

For recruitment purposes, flyers were distributed in the identified agencies and youth who volunteered to participate in the study contacted me through emails and phone. All the youth were fluent in English and some in African languages. Twenty-nine youth participated in 3 focus groups that on average lasted for 1.5 hours. Participants had been engaged in HOA immigrant-run youth programs for a minimum of 2.5 years. The focus groups were conducted in locations the youth felt were convenient. The parents' consent form together with support letters from the agencies were mailed to youth's parents. The University of Washington Internal Review Board requires parental consent for participants under 18 years old.

At the time of the research, youth participants' age range was 14 to 18 years. There were 11 females and 18 males; mostly high school and a few middle school students, except for one who was in college. Most of the participants (23) were born in the U.S.; 5 came from Africa at a younger age, and 1 was born in the United Arab Emirates and came to the U.S. when very young. For confidentiality purposes, each participant was assigned 2 alphabetical identifiers followed by a dot and the agency's code. For instance, a participant assigned AB as an identifier who participated in agency A's youth program would be coded as AB.A. There were no dropouts of those recruited.

#### **4.3.5 Focus groups**

The three focus groups were organized based on their affiliation with the three agencies. The groups' composition was mixed in terms of gender and age. The number of participants per group ranged from 7 to 12 (7 in group B, 9 in group A, and 13 in group C). The focus groups were conducted in areas that the youth felt were convenient in rooms within the agencies' compound at a time when neither youth nor staff were on work hours. Each focus group discussion was conducted for a minimum of 1.5 hours. The focus groups were conducted in the summer, over two months. I facilitated and audio-recorded the focus-group discussions with the youths' permission. The discussions were open, involving a lot of joking and laughing, which made them friendly and created a relaxed atmosphere.

Youth were asked to participate in focus groups, because this approach suited to facilitating open discussion of participants' worlds in relation to how they are oriented to the topics of discussion, even though the flow of group discussion remains flexible. The moderator is central in conducting focus groups and having an experienced moderator assists groups in staying focused to the issues on the table, while simultaneously allowing flexibility to stretch the discussion. As can happen in such groups, participants' discussions sometimes diverged from the research guide, but such diversions are okay as long as the discussions are in line with participants' interests or experiences. Since the questions in the guide were quite general, specific topics of interest to participants resulted in such diversions. Since focus groups are intended for exploring how opinions or attitudes are constructed, the diversion (from the main question/issue) and focus (towards the questions) allowed both flexibility and differential exchange of experiences and perspectives so as to understand how (the process and) participants came to talk that way.

Participants may or may not reach a consensus from a collective experience, such as a youth program. Some individuals might and did have unique experiences that led to disagreements with the majority, depending on their background, migration, and immigration experiences, in addition to parental and peer influences. The idea and advantage of focus groups is to create the possibilities that allow varied ideas to air, even allow participants to vent their frustrations, and assure them that all viewpoints are valid, as much as they can be valid as narratives (aka information).

Moreover, focus group is a process conducted in a specific context (Mischler, 2001) within which a group interaction is conducted and observed. There was an intergroup dynamic, an interaction of sharing ideas and experiences, agreements and disagreements, even hot debates, and body languages to be observed and engaged with. Even though there may be an assumption of homogeneity as an ideal composition of a focus group, individuals with shared experiences in a youth program can have unique experiences, challenges, and interpretations of their experiences. In a focus group process, some may refute while others may be influenced by one's point of view or the flow of the discussion; participants who disagree with the majority voice may be challenged. Such divergences in ideas and opinions or "dissent voices" (Kitzinger, 1995) do not jeopardize the flow of discussions; instead, participants who challenge normative talks or have different attitudes and opinions were (and/or should be) encouraged; that way the focus group process is enriched.

Power plays a big role in group discussions, and it would be naïve to assume that the emergence and flow of the talks within a youth group is "natural." Diversities in perspectives, background, experiences, cultures, and ideas that emerge in the process of the focus groups (which should be explored further) illustrate power dynamics and group dynamics that impact

the flow of discussions. The jokes, anecdotes, laughs, changes of mind, referring to what others have said, all indicate the nature of talks amongst participants. Such indications and language differences captured through observation and field notes provided a sense of the process. The aim of the focus group process was to highlight such individual acts/talks, attitudes, priorities, languages, and frameworks of understanding that otherwise would be silenced and/or remain inhibited (Wolfinger, 2002). What I realized during the research process was that in focus groups there are individual narratives, group narratives, and intergroup interaction narratives (Duggleby, 2005), all influencing each other.

Duggleby (2005) argues for a focus on intergroup interaction process as a way of capturing not only transcripts but also field notes including body languages. Intergroup process presents the flow of the discussion within a specific context and topic for discussion. However, individual information could also be captured depending on what each participant's idea or comment on the issue is/was. There will be influences from the intergroup interactions along the process that direct the discussion towards a certain direction, yet, individual information could be determined through "cross-code" (Kidd & Parshall, 2000), because unlike what Kerry and Smith (1994) argued, individual information cannot be isolated from the context. Individual information can also be analyzed based on field notes and individual responses.

Before starting focus group dialogues, participants had to reach a consensus to respect basic principles of conducting focus groups, which made it a learning and valuable process, and therefore ethical. Some of these principles were: All participants are equal, i.e., have equal say regardless of their differences; each participant must be given a chance to express his/her ideas, feelings, and perspectives; respect all group members regardless of their age, gender, race, ethnicity, religion, and background; everything said and discussed within the group is

confidential; and that all members have equal chance of participating in the discussion so that all voices are heard.

Adopting these basic principles created harmony within the groups that could generate a horizontal space in the process of exploring and exchanging perspectives, while simultaneously co-constructing a certain way of looking at how youth perceived their experiences, their world. The space was laden with power and power relations that could fluctuate the tone of the conversation, with transformations in process, without necessarily reaching a consensus. There were modifications, alterations, and resistance to some of the conversations, which showed that information is provisional and a site of contestation. Always in constant flow and open, yet the basic principles created the possibilities to (dis)allow engagement of variations equally and together. Such a lens framed the rationale of the study design.

#### **4.3.6 Transcription**

I started transcribing the audio-taped discussions after listening to each group's discussions twice to become immersed in the data. I was also able to identify unique responses and ideas that differed from the most common discussions that at times seemed provocative. I used *Atlas-ti* version 5 for data management purposes. The software allowed me to organize the data by areas of discussion, as well as to see the relations and overlaps of the discourses within and across groups, and sub-discourses within the already identified discourses.

The transcription process included epistemological and methodological underpinnings too because what I wrote, and chose or not, for interpretation depended on theoretical frameworks used in the research (Lapadat et al., 1999; Davidson, 2009). Looking into what was not said, what was metaphorically said, and how it was talked about was central in the deconstructive reading of the discussions too, which became an intervention rupturing embedded meanings and

how they came to mean. I did not label what I interpret as “emerging theme/s” because they are not something new and/or waiting for a researcher to be explored; rather “what emerges” is a rupturing way of reading. Thus, I do not list a series of sub-headings as themes; instead I identify prominent discourses and flows of discourses purposefully chosen for discursive deconstruction based on the methodological frameworks of this research.

In this research, listening, talking, and interacting with HOA youth was a process of rereading what they meant and how they meant it, and of connecting pieces together to see tensions within and ideological underpinnings. Parents’ stories are told, and how they are heard and repeated by the youth, is in terms of what they know about roles or characters in stories shared by their parents and/or the youths’ interpretations and repetition of those stories may involve shifts in power and/or identities the youth desire to claim. The ways in which the youth see themselves and interpret their world, from the perspective of who they take themselves to be, thus involves learning of existing categories that exclude and include others (ex. Male/female, modern/tradition) and participating in the discourses through which meanings are assigned to those categories. When the youth talked about themselves and their experiences, for instance, they were positioning themselves in terms of the categories as if they belong in one category and not the other, which ultimately leads to a commitment to category membership. These processes are related to the notion of understanding oneself as a “continuous and unitary experience.” As such, what are assumed as contradictory experiences or positions are considered problematic and therefore in need of remedy. Hence, the position the youth take on as they talk about their experience, when or which part of the talk, and how they are then positioned is critical in interpreting youth discursive practices.

#### **4.3.7 Ethical considerations**

The role of power and the power relations that influence the research design, process, and interpretation were central throughout the research. The power dynamics between me as the researcher and the participants, including topics discussion and the types of words used, was a critical aspect of the flow of the discussions. Maintaining transparency, recognizing the redistributing of power (acknowledging the interviewees actions or performances, and understanding the interview as discursive co-construction) and the ongoing negotiation (Mishler, 1991) was central to the process. The political *representation* of youth in the U.S was questioned throughout the research processes.

The focus group discussions and research process are assumed as a discourse co-constructed with the interviewees (Mischler, 1991) and will be politically validated by taking the interpretive analysis and reporting back to the participants and/or other individuals or scholars who work with immigrant youth. All of us, me as a researcher and them as researches (participants), were co-constructing (*ibid*): what we thought relates to what was said at that specific moment and to the context of the focus groups, yet is also based on our pre-understandings. Hence, I was asking critical questions throughout the research process: What were the youth who were working with me doing in the focus groups. What was language doing when they were interpreting what I said and them interacting within their group?

#### **4.3.8 The analytic process**

The main principle of data analysis was that analysis must always relate back to the research questions. Several steps of reading transcripts (Hole, 2007) were conducted as an interpretive process. The first reading was for content and to ensure that the transcript reflected what they youth said. The second reading identified youth focus or prominent discourses. The

third reading focused on the positioning of the speakers. For instance, did the youth present him/herself as naïve or questioning. The fourth reading uncovered discourses in the discussions and how they were at work, such as, how these discourses might shape and discipline the youth speaker. This step-by-step reading gave me an idea of each group's foci, direction of the discussions, and functions of the discourses.

As the following chapter on deconstructive reading and interpretation illustrates, interpreting the ideological underpinnings of youth talks required that I focus on the specific words each youth uttered in relation to the issues discussed. Specifically, I focused on words, phrases, and sentences constructed and negotiated in talking and responding to each other, and on putting them within a context in relation to the question asked and/or topic the youth were discussing (Wetherall et al., 2001).

In conventional understanding, the subject is an individual actor, autonomous, with reason, authentic, and with independent meaning. A constructionist perspective displaces the subject as the origin of knowledge. Hence, it is not the youth as subjects who are taking sides when they claim to belong to their ethnic group or to have a continental affiliation. That is, the youth may produce certain discourses or texts, however, the discourses are produced within the limits of existing "regimes of truth" of a specific culture and particular time. Discourses produce those knowledges for them because "discourse speaks us" (Hall, 2004; Allen, 2005). Thus there is no way that my research was in search of the real subject or HOA youth. What I was trying to do through this research was to better understand their discourse because discourse is the author of *representation*. That is why Foucault stated, "the subject is produced within discourse." Hence, the youth are the vehicles who carry knowledges or discourse produced.

Hence, the words, phrases, and ideas chosen for analysis were based on the theories that frame my research and the research questions. The process was a back and forth movement to make sure that I was seeing in multiple ways: what they said, how I interpret what they said, and how they interpret what I said.

The discussions were to a certain extent culturally specific, making particular references to their country of origin, history, and culture, but were also present in a western world: participants often jokingly and metaphorically referred to stereotypical assumptions, labels, and challenges encountered at school, including how they negotiated cultural differences.

Throughout the research process, I was able to reconsider my preconceptions and expectations from the group discussions. For instance, I expected youth discussions on race and racism from a marginal positionality, so it surprised me to come across these youth who were talking beyond the limits of race, racism, identity, and ethnicity towards a more fluid understanding of who they are. This forced me to question the programs in terms of their content, and made it hard for me to spot the youth as conforming or resisting program expectations because of their strategic positioning and repositioning. I will refer to this in the implications chapter, in the hope that it will inform social welfare practice.

Cross consultation (verification in quantitative term) was done from the transcribed data across youth groups where there were similarities but also differences. The differences were some of the multiple dimensionalities through which the youth understand their experiences, and which rupture the universalization of expectations from youth. Another source that helped me with understanding and substantiating what participants were saying in the discussion groups—particularly discussions of cultural differences with their parents and the ways in which these fracture the dual walls to understand their parents as well as their multiple and complex

experience in-between—was the arrival of two young adults to the U.S. while I was in the process of transcribing and rereading the transcripts. The process of (re)knowing them, establishing a new life, engaging them in a different society, and the ways in which understanding each other after having been apart for a long time was materializing, started changing my pre-assumptions about youth, and contributed to how I was rereading the transcripts. I felt I had a discourse that would allow me to understand them easily after all they are Eritreans and young! But I also started realizing that the ways in which we talked to each other were different, our perspectives differed, due to the specific cultural environments that informed how we perceive our experiences. We were quite apart despite the familial attachments we preserved, yet close enough to understand each other. Soon, I realized that cultural differences between parents and children are wide open, not a cultural clash (Ngo, 2008), and should be embraced. This is common across various groups of refugees and immigrants, yet each one of us has his or her own ways of making it work by moving in and out, the here and there, performing in double spaces.

Moreover, asking African experts in the area—experts in the field of education, social work, refugee studies, and anthropology—as well as youth programs' staff and immigrant parents about their experiences with HOA youth also helped with my understanding what the research participants were saying, the sarcastic and metaphoric moves in particular.

I leave my interpretation with no conclusive political stance as to what was said about youth experience; rather I position youth talks as multiple, complex and in process. I leave the discussion open for readers to reinterpret.

#### 4.4 The Narrative

Information collection started with participant observations and writing notes at the three HOA sites during daily routines, workshops, and activities that involved youth and staff. Little notice has been given to the practice of writing field notes. However, writing field notes is an interesting area to study because the process brings forth critical questions that can be easily neglected (Sanjek, 1990b cited in Wolfinger, 2002). One of the taken-for-granted assumptions that need to be considered is that writing field notes is a straight forward observation and writing while in the field is part of doing research. Do researchers already know what they are going to write? Which incidents do they remember the most and reflect upon? Or even, when do they choose to write notes? The same questions came to mind in the process of reflecting and going back and forth between my field notes and focus group dialogues, trying to connect and/or examine divergent notes that needed to be evaluated. My questions were as follows: What part of the process being observed did I capture, and why? Which comments are more important than others? Where do I focus? What about the observed activities that I didn't write about or cannot remember? Even though I had decided not to include the field notes (taken before conducting focus groups) in the analysis, the interaction between the textual meaning of the notes and what unfolds in the writing process can never be free from my pre-understandings and assumptions.

There are debates in regard to focus group information and how the information should be analyzed and reported. As I have already indicated, the individual-group-interaction information is one of the debates in focus group studies, which was not part of my research concentration. However, my interview styles and the questions I asked do influence information collection. I had broad questions to encourage participation, and I purposely avoided specific aspects of youth experience. Participants were encouraged not to limit their discussion to the questions. After a brief introduction, I started with a common first question, "Can you tell us how you decided to

participate in the youth program?" I didn't give further guidance beyond the first question to let participants cover areas they want to talk about so as to promote the "fusion of horizons" (Geanellos, 1998). But I also had to make sure that there was full participation, and so I occasionally asked those who were silent, "Can you please share your ideas on..." Questions were also posed for the purpose of clarification.

I found it hard to ignore when participants raised a topic but then diverted the focus due to divergent reactions to what was said. Those were the moments when I would draw participants' discussion back into focus. Yet, the influences of my preconceptions, interests and areas I wanted discussed might have predominated in some cases, because the nature of open-ended questions allows coverage of different areas. For instance, when some youth were discussing culture and how youth perceive their relationship with their parents, I was tending to focus on whether they perceive it as a cultural clash. Perhaps I displayed a tendency to draw the discussion toward an either/or binary, that I wanted to hear about, even though talking about "culture clash" was not specifically part of the topic they were discussing.

## CHAPTER 5.

### ANALYSIS: DISCURSIVE READING

When interpreting youth as “the bearers of discourse,” three major themes emerged from the focus groups. The first theme, *what’s in origin?*, was one of the most prominent discourses in group discussions. The youth would assert where they came from (Africa) with pride, as if to say that there is no me without Africa, yet that continent was different from their parents’ and the historically constructed image of Africa. While stating their origins—country of origin and the continent—the youth simultaneously asserted that they are also from the U.S. The question is: how do HOA youth talk about the difference-tolerance dream or struggle (Touraine, 2000) in our 21<sup>st</sup> century world? Details on the theme may give some lights to the answer of this question.

The second theme, *Inbetweenness and ambivalence*, resurfaced over and over again in youth’s discussions, not as hyphenated cultural identities but as openness to possibilities of multidimensionality. This was evident from the ways in which the youth imagined who they are in a multicultural society that both draws them in and pushes them out. Uniqueness, taking your own way, was the forward-looking move they hinted at in terms of how the youth envisage future youth, which could be market-oriented yet could also be interpreted as difference with no boundaries but with tolerance and acceptance.

*The right path*, the third theme, portrayed counter discourses to western ideologies and cultures based on the Coptic Orthodox faith, which is considered an ancient culture in Eritrea and Ethiopia because it was introduced in the 4<sup>th</sup> century A.D. While the strict norms of the youth program administered by the church could be interpreted as “narrow, stressing on ethnic enclave,” they could also be read as a way of building confidence and respect of parents’ values,

and of contributing to their educational achievements and creating smooth communication spaces between youth and parents, and the immigrant groups in general (Viroh et al., 1978; Fillmore, 1991).

Some of these prominent discourses or themes have commonalities across the groups and individual talks, although there were differences too. The back-and-forth conversations were not only in support of and/or against what was said but also sometimes sarcastic. The metaphors used throughout the discussions indicated the diversities, complexities, and multi-dimensionalities of constructing discourses around the topics discussed, which makes the youth talks both illusive and elusive—hard to spot!

### **5.1 What's in Origin?**

Discourse around “origin” dominated most of the discussions. The youth stressed their origin as the foundation for who they are now, but noted that they are also open to change. Almost all the participants spoke proudly about their origin, referring to Africa and local cultures, even though most of the youth could hardly speak their local languages and have never been to Africa. For me, this raised the question, “what is in origin?” A typical saying amongst the youth in Group B, which was constantly raised by AD.B, was, “...at least we have somewhere to go to, unlike the African Americans.” Meaning, the youth may experience discriminatory discourses, the same as African Americans, yet “we” are strong enough to respond to exclusionary discourses because “we” have a solid ground to use as a spring board, or at least in principle, another country to return to. The youth drew strength from their background: histories shared by parents along with enforced duties and responsibilities at home that teach them cultural values. In the process of negotiating “origin,” to retain homeland bonds, they *hybridize* cultures as they

talk or perform. They *hybridize*, yet look for an anchor, a referent, which is Africa. As AD's excerpt indicates:

AD.A: If you know where you come from, you have more confidence because you know yourself. For people who don't know their background, like black Americans they don't know where they are from just Africans so it is a disadvantage for them because they can't go back and say this is my culture and language, don't have certain culture that they can represent/refer.

There are two aspects to the assertive language that AD performed. One is that knowing one's origin builds confidence. The other is that the assertion could be exclusionary—an in/exclusion dichotomy. But the young man is also reproducing social ontologies from normative discourses and *representations*. The sense of “we have a strong origin,” implies that “Others” could easily be victimized because of a lack of “origin” to depend on and from which to draw strength. The youth associate knowing one's origin with one's cultural identity and, furthermore, with a less stigmatized identity.

Yet, centering difference based on “origin,” as if natural, also (un)intentionally reflects the superiority of one over the “Other,” thus reiterating stereotypical *representations* of the youth, as the “Other,” in search of their roots. But do immigrant youth need a *root* to know who they are? Why the need to associate oneself with a root, constructed around a nation-state and/or an ethnic group? Is it in response to normative discourses about Diasporas? This is beyond the scope of this research. However, based on the previous argument of *hybridization*, the youth do not need to ground themselves in a fixed root to understand their present condition. Rather they seem to be able to understand the present as contingent upon the historicities they learn from the youth programs and parents, as well as the socio-cultural contexts in the U.S.

But what is in “origin?” Is there any origin, especially pure origin? And what is the political implication in the youths' understanding of the concept (origin) and its effects? Why

are they interested in being African, a place they have never been, alive with languages they cannot speak? Is this Kumsa's (2006) notion of "be-longing?" Can they just "be?" Even though it is hard to delineate a line between when they hybridize and when they anchor or refer to themselves through Africa, as the following themes will indicate, the youth centered their African or Habesha origin in response to exclusionary and stereotyping discourses encountered at school. As the youth were discussing how they came about to join the youth program, they were talking to each other jokingly, remembering the first time they met and how easy it was to connect because they "clicked to each other so quickly." Some were directly or indirectly talking in response to racial divides at school. Such as HS.A who said,

“... we are all from the same place, we have something in common unlike school, we are all Habesha!”

And LAH.A said,

“...it is good to be Habesha because we are proud of ourselves of being Habesha.”

But TG.A's was upfront,

“...everybody has something in common [*here in the program*] when you come here everybody is the same race, we are all the same. So it's easy to start a conversation.”

TLK.S “...here you feel you are welcomed [*compared to school*].”

All of them realize the commonalities that brought them together: same culture and language and belonging to the Habesha group. TLK.A compares the environment with school by stating that s/he feels welcomed at the program site. Shared languages and cultures created comfort and a feeling of “being at home.” The youth felt proud of their origin: Habesha, their sameness that drives them to come back to the program. However there is also a totalizing effect

in the ways they speak about being a member of Habesha, with commonalities despite differences within. Such differences are the embedded discourses, not spoken about because they have been taught to keep their group intact regardless of internal differences. Although within-group differences are glossed over in the youth's language, the comments, "here you feel you are welcomed," and "we have something in common unlike school," point to the differences youth feel in other contexts, particularly at school. When I probed them about what makes it easier in the program than at school, two of them said,

RN.A "...it's easy to make friends in school too but there [*at school*]...they fight, they do silly stuff,..."

TLK.A "...it's not hard to make friends. But here [*at the program site*] you feel you are welcomed; we are not social outcasts here. If you are over there [*meaning school*], no!"

The youth's sense of support and comfort is well illustrated when TLK said that unlike at school, he doesn't feel as an outcast in the program group. The divide between home/school environments leave HOA youth with a feeling of "outcasts," thus creating tensions between varied expectations that leave the youth undecided as to how they should perform, depending on the context: a sense of difference in the ways they are treated, that seemed irritating. I left the discussion at that because the issue of "unfit youth" relates to their school environment, which is not the focus of this research. I decided, however, to treat the pride they have in their "origin" as a theme to understand how it facilitates or hinders their understanding of experience.

In response to the question, "what's in origin?" I will elaborate two of the core perspectives of this dissertation: (1) Said's emphasis on the symbolic construction of the "other," both how such a discourse shapes the other's background, origin, and foundation, and Said's failure in falling into an *essentializing* trap by grounding the "other's" identity; and (2) what a

hermeneutic perspective enables in terms of how background assumptions shape preunderstandings without reducing speakers to some underlying essence.

Since for HOA youth, as a constructed “Other,” talk or an utterance is interrogation, negotiation, and experience, what are the underlying implications of referring to “origin” and using it to differentiate themselves from another constructed “Other?” What does it mean in the dialogue of and about the HOA “Other” and the American “Other?” I am using the youth talk as a hermeneutic move to show the underlying politics of what is said, in relation to the concept of Africa as their “origin,” in ways that, unlike Said’s project, avoids *essentializing* both the Oriental and the “Other.” In this case, what are these youth, (also a constructed “Other”) doing through discourse of “origin” as a way of differentiating themselves from African Americans, another constructed “Other”? How can we understand the interactions and performances between two constructed “Others?”

The sense of “origin” reflects on what constitutes self-identity. The discursive power of origin, and therefore tradition, stems from ontological essentialism that constructs the Other in terms of some natural, ahistorical reconstruction of discursive assumptions as a background. An Other institutionalized and sustained in the context of political practices (Foucault, 1980). An Other objectified through normative, or in Said’s term (1978, 1979) the Orientalist interpretation, thus creating a fictitious reality. As one of the youth said, “There is nothing that can explain Africa as Africa. Africa is Africa.” Africa may mean something particularly dear to the youth. Yet, it is also a continent invented and described for them through colonial history. According to Mbembe (2001), the name “Africa” itself is a European construct. However, reading Africa through the Orientalist interpretation doesn’t mean that there is not also another Africa underneath that needs to be explored. Nor also does it mean that everything was acted out or

upon in a vacuum. Rather than there is no pure Africanism. The symbolic constructions of Africa, as the Other, camouflage underlying political power, while the historical construction of a pure Africa *essentializes* the people of the continent.

This argument is in line with the Foucaultian (1980) project that explains epistemological perspectives as “the symbolically mediated effect of historical constellations of power.” Orientalism is therefore reconstructed as a “discursive myth” (Barthes, in Sandoval, 2000), “a cultural projection constructing its ‘object’ according to a set of conceptions” (Foucault, 1980), a myth that people such as HOA youth are led to believe about themselves and that they have internalized as providing a “true origin” beyond the stereotypically constructed images. Said assumes the interpretation of the “Other” as constructed, not true, and distorted. However his assumption also assumes an essential truth as if there is another truth of the “Other” that needs to be explored—a discourse beyond the orientalist symbolic construction that portrays the true image of the “Other.” This is what the youth in Group A and Group C were doing when they say we have another history, tradition, and culture that Black Americans lack.

In other words, the youth are assuming an *essentialist* and unitary notion of identity as the Other’s cultural identity, rather than identifying it as emergent and always in process (Hall, 1990; Anthias, 1992; Gilroy, 1993, 1997). This identity is assumed as the real identity beyond the Orientalist discourse, which they can use as a springboard to produce competing discourses, as if the Other’s origin could be traced back as pure, such as when AD.A asserted an origin in Africa and augmented this notion by saying,

“Africa is Africa. There is nothing that can explain Africa as Africa.”

RL.B from another group said,

“The youth, we want to be American [*using whites’ tone*] but also don’t want to forget African tradition.... We got too much pride [*in who we are*],” and

YB.C said, “We all originated from Africa and it’s nice and I like that.”

This tone was present in the three groups. The youth are referring to Africa as the origin of who they are. For AD.A no one can describe Africa’s reality. There is pride of belonging to Africa. But YB.C also acknowledges that all of them originated from Africa and that it is good to have a common origin within his group. He likes to be with youth who come from the same continent. While confirming one’s identification with Africa has positive implications in their everyday encounters, it could also be a counter discourse reaction to exclusionary discourses from the host society. When HOA youth present themselves as Africans, they are reconstructing discourses based on what they learned from youth programs, families, and their own interpretations. However, such discourses are not free from the constructing discourses that speak them. Just as the HOA youth are seeking to identify themselves by claiming their difference, in a study with Black immigrants from the Caribbean and Latin America, Bryce-Laporte (1972) describes how and when Black immigrants use their local languages in public spaces. Bryce-Laporte argues that the aim of shifting languages relative to context is differentiation. Immigrants’ use of local languages lets people in their vicinity know their difference from other stereotyped black Americans. There is a very subtle experience and play of language. What they are doing with language is embedded within longstanding ideologies of race, language, and binary ethnic categorizations (Lee, 1996; Skapoulli, 2010). The language is essentializing since it is used as a tool to *reiterate* the same old stereotypical *representation* of African Americans, while claiming their (Caribbean and Latin) difference. HOA youth were also acting similar to Black immigrants from the Caribbean when they use their Africanity, originality,

and traditionality to claim a centered foundation, while reproducing and changing as immigrants and Americans who live in constant (re)negotiation (Bhabha, 1994).

According to Hall (1990), identity is always in the process of construction, never fixed. He thus evades the dangers of, and the notion of, a black subject, purity, essentialism, and reductionism of Africa. Diasporas, according to Hall, "...are constantly (re)producing and transforming cultural identities." But the youth speak as if there is a *pre-understanding* of Africa that can be used as a point of reference, such as when AD.A insisted that being African is central to her existence in the U.S. How about the possibility of Africa as always in the making? HOA youth also come to value the people they meet in the program. The weekly activities and personal interactions developed into familial relationships, which in turn drive the youth to attend program activities regularly.

YB.C It inspires me to come here [*at program site*] because I am able to see all people from same community and stuff...that's the people. I like the people coming here. I like Saturdays.

Facilitator What is it about the people you like?

HS.A I come here Sundays and Saturdays. We are like a family here. We are now best friends; we go to movies, go hang out together something like that. It goes like a multicultural space since I came here. Most kids here are our age. I think it's easier for us to come here on Sunday mornings. We get here for church and we get together and have fun.

TG.A For me, just as he said it's my 2<sup>nd</sup> family outside my family. It's good to have Habesha friends.

The weekends are like a family day for HS.A because it is a day program participants hang out together. For TG.A, the connection that led to a familial relationship is the program under the umbrella of a church. As they were discussing how they enjoyed the programs, it became clear that the programs were also spaces of friendship, support, and comfort.

Despite their interest in “origin,” Group B youth did not start the discussion about the youth program by identifying themselves with Africa or Habesha as their origin or the need to preserve their cultural identification. Instead, they focused on similarities of their experience with African Americans, popular culture, and the rapper 2Pac in particular:

AB.B The youth, the program, videos and topics discussed: youth violence, hip hop, 2Pac because he has lots of similarities with youth [*experience*].

IN.B Lyrics?

RL.B Men! what he writes is true. It’s just something I listen to. The lyrics, he does open, and relate nowadays. His words, especially the way he grew up, relates to us in a lot of ways.

All Youth Ye!

IN.B What’s the message?

AR.B Everything he does affects me but in a positive way. He grew up without a dad and I grew up without a dad, but he made it and I’m going to make it.

RB.B Hip hop in general is bad for youth. Rappers, like 2Pac, they are much worse than rappers...but for me as an individual I don’t care because I’m...[*sarcastic, and all laugh*]

AR.B He was in gang violence, but that was the life in those days.

AR.B in particular related his experience with 2Pac’s in that he was also raised by a single mom. When RL.B says, “he does open, and relate nowadays,” he is referring to silenced discourses that were expressed through rap and that speak to their experience as youth and as black. AB.B acknowledges experiences of youth violence and that hip hop is associated with gangs, yet 2Pac’s lyrics talks to their life experiences. Group B was the only group that raised and discussed such an experience. The group members were the only ones who associated themselves with African Americans’ experiences and taking an oppositional stance to stereotypical constructions of African Americans. Their discussions implied ideological

discourses of racial biases, poverty, making ends meet with single moms, and low income housing because in his rap lyrics 2Pac raises and responds to these discourses. Ibrahim (2004) states, “popular culture is where people and youth in particular socialize their identities and thus envision the possibilities of their existence.” However, relating their experiences to an African American rapper’s does not mean that they were negating the notion of an African “origin.” Whether the sense of having a certain “root” is essentializing, or not, the youth also enjoy symbolic expressions and aesthetics of rap music, they even rap meshing their local languages with English. This is one way of expressing their presence in the U.S. as Americans—shared experiences with Blacks—but also as immigrants hybridizing rap music while simultaneously claiming difference through the language they use. The youth were engaged in a process of “black hybridization” whereby such an identification process that questions authority becomes a site of “becoming black” in the U.S. (Ibrahim, 1999, 2000a, 2000b). HOA rappers in the African American groups, such as Nipsey Hussle and K’Naan, as well as those who rap in their respective languages mixed with “black stylized English” are cases in point of becoming black.

Overall, there were similarities and differences in how HOA youth spoke about their “unstable home” in Africa and an African continent they claim as “origin.” Such as the saying, “Africa is Africa. There is nothing that can explain Africa...*but Africans [emphasis mine]*.” The “unstable home” that is deferred, always changing, and to which there is no return. The unstable “home” challenges the idea of an absolute and predetermined image of Africa and Africans when the youth bring in or add their versions of identifications that leaves and enriches them in ambiguity.

## 5.2 Inbetweenness and Ambivalence

As already indicated, inbetweenness is a performance that cannot be captured or understood through conventional binaries. In the case of HOA youth as immigrants, Africans and Americans, their lives are processes of interrogation and negotiation across conventional mainstream and traditional exclusive and inclusive discourses. In the negotiation process, the youth recreate meanings or discourses in ways that make sense to them in specific contexts. Yet, they speak from a pre-present-post-understanding of both the host society's and ethnic traditional discourses of culturally "fitting in." The youth also acknowledge cultural influences via media and marketing, but also stress historicities and experiences through their parents' accounts of locality and migration. When the youth moved *inbetween* (Bhabha, 1994) these multiple discourses (Mbembe, 2001), they were talking beyond discourses of originality, initial subjectivities, and boundaries as static markers. The excerpts below illustrate how they negotiate *inbetweenness*.

UNC.C I know I'm from X (country code) but you also have to know that you are in a different [context or world]. Things you have to be able to adapt to the circumstances here but still like remember where you came from.... You know you are from X? ...but you have to also try hard to know and adapt to the customs in America because that's where you are and be American but also remember where you come from.

YB.C Like either [is] ok. I shouldn't think I should be this or that, or American. You have your own concepts...but not keeping...you can't say I'm this or I'm that but you can be of both.

For UN.C, youth have to maintain both their affiliation with a country of origin and culturally adjust in the country they are living at the moment. In other words, the youth claim spaces both "here, at home," and "there, at home": an *ambivalent* engagement with a historical background, an imagined elsewhere in Africa as well as the present in the U.S. In the process,

they rework local discourses (the ethnic and American, eastern and western) that are differently taken up by and/or imposed upon them, and they redefine themselves as they negotiate and interrogate collectively assigned markers, representations, and expectations. For instance, when YB.C said that he shouldn't think of this or that, because "you can be both," he is claiming beyond marked boundaries, making it hard to call them "the lost kids" or the "unfit." Yes, they cannot fit both nor can they be described through both lenses, and embracing something from both is youth ambiguity.

In this case, YB.C does not read cultural engagement and difference as pre-given ethnic prescriptions inherited from his parents as the only way to be. His collective values are negotiated in the interstitial space of "displacement of difference and overlap" (Bhabha, 1994). The articulation of difference is thus a complex and ongoing negotiation seeking to *hybridize* as the youth transition *inbetween*. As they talk, the ideal "tradition" as "original" is *estranged* in the utterance, as they encounter difference, where contradictions and conflicts of difference create the possibilities for fluidity, back and forth movement.

Talking about the challenges of maintaining both the traditional and modern, and the condition that could also allow them to embrace both, the youth expanded the discussion from their parents' and American influence towards a condition whereby it is "easy to change," meaning when one wants to ignore parents' advice, all of which show the ambiguity they live in. From discussions of "easy to change" in a world informed by the media to asking questions such as, "what is in the change?" YB.C illustrated how they negotiate *inbetweenness*,

YB.C We know most kids who come here tend, or some, to forget their culture and more interested in how Americans do and what we do is outreach, tell them their history and [I] am proud of this.

BB.C Help them in what way?

FEM.C It is about culture, knowing where they came from.

SN.C How would it help them?

YB.C I think it helps the culture keep going than dying out.

The youth were focusing on how culture can be maintained. But what about individual actors?

UNC.C Individuals, you have to know your background. It's deep seriously. If you don't know who you are then?

BB.C I don't know, not much. It's [...] I feel culture is what keeps us all together. I don't know it's like one thing we have in common, that's us, it's our tradition [and it should be maintained]...nothing [there is nothing wrong with American culture] only that they [HOA youth] should be influenced by their [traditional]culture first.

YB.C I don't think it's hard [to change]. You watch TV or commercials, then you'll be influenced. But I think culture changes happen [based on what youth watch] what's on MTV.

It is “seriously deep” for UNC.C to know one’s culture because at the end of the day it is about identification. Culture is an amalgam of a society that should be sustained and maintained for BB.C, and knowing one’s culture helps sustain it for YB.C. The conversation also seemed hard for them to describe because of the complexities of culture. When HOA youth talked about their strength in tradition, they were not articulating in opposition to a western culture. As BB said, “there is nothing wrong with American culture.” Rather, they were engaged in complex dialogue performed in and through the language of culture that embraces while transforming. The depth and seriousness of cultural implications of losing the tradition for BB.C also implies the subtlety of cultural influences he believes has the potential to push the youth away, but not away, from their “origin.” They embrace a bit from all sources, while acknowledging difference. The hybrid is a complex mix beyond boundaries (Bhabha, 1994; Hall, 2001; Ibrahim, 2008).

Even though group C members in particular were concerned about the seriousness of their culture, they also realized the need to keep up with cultural changes. These are changes that in

turn drive them to change their perspectives. In other words, the youth see themselves as always on the move. As YB illustrated, “culture is changing every day and is changing people as it changes. As a youth it changes my perspectives.” It is not hard to change living in a world of mass media influences as YB.C asserts. Watching TV and commercials has a great impact on youth, who may yearn to become what they see on TV because they are made to believe that is the order of life. For UN.C, there is a traditional culture that represents them, yet he also stresses that youth should adapt to life in the U.S. Youth are molded by cultural institutions—such as education, media, medicine, and the church. They are made to consume and trans-form culture, as are their parents.

The role of such institutions in molding youth perceptions was clear from the discussions. It is about constructing marketized cultures that inform consumers’ ways of “fitting in.” UN.C believes that youth have to adapt to the American way of life, which is the marketized consumer culture, but also urges them to remember their background and where they came from. Seemingly, there is a search for a stronghold that would prevent them from slipping into marketized cultures. However, YB.C concluded the cultural influences and change discussions by saying that there is no fault in being this and that, because neither is positive nor negative, and both cultures could be embraced.

Some group B members had a different take on cultural change. They see two separate cultures: the parents’ and the youth’s. TI.B has this to say,

- TI.B     There are two cultures. My parents are East African and we are growing up in an American culture and most Africans are proud of being Africans and they don’t want to assimilate into the American culture.
- RL.B     The youth we want to be Americans but also don’t want to forget African tradition.

The youth in this group talked about the need for their parents to catch up and adapt. TI.B believes that parents are closed, blinded within their tradition, while youth are open to other cultures. RL adds to this by sarcastically saying that the youth are ready to change but not at the expense of their African culture. One youth said, "...when I talk about my culture I'm talking about myself, so it is important to know one's history and culture." Yet, this talk was in the spirit of revision and reconstruction of the tradition that was already disrupted and disrupting the idea of origin. For group C, it is hard to maintain one's culture in a multicultural society. But talking about one's culture also means talking about oneself and knowing oneself. Even group B members agree that maintenance of tradition is key, but believe that doesn't mean that they have to repeat their parents' experience. This implies that the youth are moving beyond the assumption of "difference as an imposed hierarchy" (Bhabha, 1994); knowing and practicing both cultures is okay for them. In doing so, they are disallowing the understanding or epistemology of themselves and their culture as prior to knowledges produced for them to consume as "original." The culture, the "home" thus becomes an ex-centric site of experience; not centered as the only way to be; rather as a site where something new starts, something that hybridizes both cultures. The sense of *Habesha* group as homogeneous, filled with pride, uniqueness, purity, and foundation of cultures is also redefined in their own unique ways.

The ideas of cultural "purity" and "origin" are also acting as "subject and object," insider and outsider in this condition, and while "locality" changes through youth experience (as a symbolic dimension), the youth also change when experiencing the new, a becoming within old-new and modern-local cultures. Talking in a *liminal* space, the binary logic of Africa and African *vis-à-vis* non-Africans is displaced. This is illustrated when Group B members said,

RB.B It [parents' cultural difference] is not positive or negative. It's something we have to overcome.

AB.B This days everybody has "a swag"...it is like cultural, it shows who I am [by] the way I dress. My swag is I'm African damn! That's my swag.

RB.B ...sometimes positive or negative. It means being unique, your own way.

For RB.B cultural difference need not be judged. For him, it is a matter of experiencing the difference as it is and moving on. However, overcoming difference for him is through an individualistic "swag" that as already stated is market oriented and gives a sense of indifference. The discussion, however, takes a different turn in Groups C and A: "Our parents live in tradition,"

YB.C ...kids in America want to be American, and parents want you to follow X's [*country code*] culture even though I'm American, and kids have hard time with that because they are not used to that.

BB.C My parents don't understand American culture. They are in their 50s!

*[All laugh]*

MS.A They always remind me that they came [*to the U.S.*] with their sticks (.) for us [*their children*],...

TG.A I like my mom having me on track [*following local culture*] but let them know what it is in America!

DGN.A My American life style is way different from *Habesha* life style. My American [*pause*] I'm not myself; when I'm [*act like Habesha*] I feel 100 percent, but when I'm American I'm just 70 percent [*slow and low voice*]. If you are hanging out with friends from school you wouldn't be acting like the way you do here [*in the church*].

TG.A I'd say you just can't stick to one culture.

YB.C acknowledges that as Americans, they find it hard to follow their parents to which BB.C adds that it is about a culture time-lag because parents think in terms of the 1950s. TG.A

respects her mother's concerns but also wants her mother to understand her American situation because she cannot restrict her acts to one cultural boundary. DGN.A shares how she feels complete when she thinks and acts as a member of her parents' *Habesha* group, unlike when acting American where she feels partial. MS.A is more concerned about how her parents' struggle to remind her that they do not want to "culturally lose them." The fear of losing the children to a foreign culture and the strength of maintaining the tradition were raised over and over. The youth understand the complexities involved in their parents' cultures but also that they do not fit into the American way. The youth respect the culture as a tradition, and they depend on it as a resource, yet also recycle it. The understanding of a "backward" culture is in relation to the youth's (in the U.S.) assuming their U.S. side as "modern," and the urge for parents to "catch up" and/or accept their kids' style, not only as if there is a smooth continuity and unidirectional progress for the youth but also appreciating their parents' care and shield simultaneously. There is a back and forth discursive movement as the youth talk about their parents' insistence of maintaining traditionality as "in the 1950s" and them as moving forward, but less freely from consumerist cultures. Participants' discussions illustrate this point.

At the end, RL.B and AB.B conclude the discussions by saying,

RL.B All we need is a human respect.

AB.B I don't care if I am green, yellow, or red; we are mixing.

AB.B is talking beyond color divide and acknowledging the mix of people and families beyond borders. RL.B has a broad embrace of humanity and human dignity. These points came up at the concluding sessions of group B focus group. The youth are nullifying "purity" once considered a pride, a spring board. The youth are not trying to recover a meaning of their culture, because to try to experience the culture as if it is original is a futile effort they already criticized,

and putting themselves in the past is denying the influence of the present and historical condition upon their understanding. Preconceptions and prejudgments of culture and language have already been instilled, such as why they interrogate being labeled as “blacks,” how they attribute a “backward” label to their local/parents’ culture as if “stuck,” and the demand for their parent to “catch up.”

The aim of deconstructive rereading in this research was to better understand which of their preunderstandings hinder and/or facilitate their (mis)interpretations; and as the concluding quotes illustrate, the back and forth movements facilitate both their understanding and misunderstanding of their condition.

Overall, HOA youth in this study are struggling to maintain their language and culture, which are dear to them, yet which they also considered as lagging behind. Even though they embrace the new cultures and languages that come their way, they are not “shading off” their parents’ culture either. However, the “locality” or tradition-based language that built confidence and strength and the *ambiguity* in the usability of local languages beyond their ethnic group because they are already delegitimized, although they are proud to have one, create the condition for double reading. Both performances, “locality” and *ambiguity*, existing simultaneously creates the condition for reading a sense of inferior-superior, insider-outsider in relation to other languages and cultures whereby intentionality is negotiated in the moment of repetition. A *catachrestic* moment in which the youth are claiming a space that they “cannot not want” to inhabit their parents’ tradition, yet must criticize (Spivak, cited in Bhabha, 1994).

Such is the deconstructive dilemma of the “posts” who negotiate and interrogate contingent boundaries of “(re)location and reinscription,” proud of their traditions and struggling to maintain them, yet also questioning. In such a way that the unsettling moment reminds them to

know, practice, and repeat the tradition, yet under “*erasure*” that in the final analysis “evades resemblance.” The *iterative* “unpicking and relinking” opens up as “a supplementary space of contingency” that avoids grounding and fixity, and permits cultural hybridity (Bhabha, 1994) and multiplicity (Hall, 1997; Mbembe, 2001). Moreover, as the following youth discussions indicate, the same confidence based on (African) locality is also used to show *difference*, not for static identities, rather for youth as social actors, *vis-à-vis* stigmatized *representations*.

Throughout the focus group processes, the youth transitioned from talking about their common culture as the “home” and origin, to understanding the American way of life, and finally to centering their uniqueness and their own ways of knowing. HOA youth cannot be understood as simply naïve in their understanding and experience of *estrangement* from the host society. In addition, concerning the various images that portray them as black Americans, some they can relate to and others they reject. Throughout the focus-group sessions in this research, Groups A and C youth did not present themselves as victims of stigmatized images and *representations*. So how are HOA youth reconciling with these images full of tensions in relation to being labeled as blacks? Are they opposing racial markers by siding with African Americans or acting within conventional discourses of Blackness, or both?

Close analysis of their language suggests that in fact they are actively rupturing the homogenization of “black/s” in the U.S. As one participant, AD.A, asserted, “I am not Black. I am African. I don’t want the school to categorize me as ‘black.’ In a school application, there was Caucasian, Black/African American, Native, and then all Asians had their countries listed. So I had to protest and talked to the principal. I told them I am not going to fill in this form unless they include ‘my country’ or ‘African’ in the list.”

This was one of the instances where AD.D, a 1.5-generation youth, uses African origin as a resource to spotlight the school's identification problems. AD.D was opposing the categorization of students based on skin color, but neither is the nation the best choice? An atemporal discourse that according to Bhabha (1994), "opens up a strategic narrative for the emergence of the minority, marginal, or Diasporic that incite us to think through—and beyond—theory" (p. 181).

### **5.3 The Right Path**

This theme relates to immigrant resistance to mainstream discourse using culturally protective measures. Religion is centered as a means of bringing back the assumed "lost kids." The particular sect here is the Orthodox Coptic, which dates back to the 4<sup>th</sup> century A. D. Eritreans and Ethiopians are the main followers of this religion. Taken as a way of life, the followers have a cultural faith. The youth talk about how being part of a faith-based youth group helps them to understand their surroundings. Furthermore, the ways in which they describe those friends who do not join them in the church group are related to western cultures, as outsiders but with negative connotations. In so doing, HOA youth are claiming ethnic practices as the way to be, while as already discussed, recycling parents' expectations.

Youth programs construct idealized youth images of and for the youth, and the youth describe how they reimagine and destabilize those images. As already stated (see p. 19), the mission statements of the programs include: to inspire and promote hope, future, and confidence in youth. According to the agencies mission, the youth are believed to be agents of change. Those youth who attain the idealized image by participating and acting in accordance to institutional expectations are assumed to be the "good youth." These youth are also considered to be on the "right path." In discussing expectations of them in the program, the youth referred to "the right path" but did not talk about it in detail. This seemed to be a preferred silence, not

spelled out at that moment until it was raised later on as they were discussing how they act (including how they communicate and what vocabularies they use) at the program site and outside. But this is what they shared when discussing expectations:

TG.A I compare my life to my friends who don't go to church; I feel like knowing the bible and having people here having friends every weekend, it's like being good; making sure you are in the right path; other than my friends who don't have God in life...But don't you feel that if your friends are offered drugs or something, you have a stronger conscience, whereas your friend doesn't have that background.

TLK.A ...because they don't want us to end up in the streets.

TG.A's expectations of the program illustrate her desire to be in "the right path" by comparing her life with her friends who don't go to church. For her, "the right path" is having God in her life, keeping away from drugs, and having a strong will to say no. For TLK.B the program staff (and parents') expectations and therefore the "right path" is not ending up in the streets. The youth talk about themselves by comparing their experience with their friends, in relation to what they are not, the ones who did not join the youth program.

This comparison was also raised when the group was discussing what it means to be "local," meaning *Habesha*, and "American." From the discussion that was going on between group members, it was clear that there are expectations in place, which they believed would make them look and act differently from their "Otherized" friends, be it at school or the program site. TLK.A, who goes to a nearly all-white school, commented how he feels isolated in his neighborhood and school and sarcastically told RN.A, "you felt in place," because RN who goes to a black-dominated school in the southern part of the city didn't have such an experience. "There are more programs for African Americans in the south," said LAH who lives in the northern part of the city, and s/he continued, "up north there is one program; and no one in my

school told me,...up north there aren't black people...I'm the only black people in my neighborhood," to which AD.A added, "the school doesn't tell you." So who need youth programs? Place mattered for the youth in terms of what to expect and the ways in which one is supposed to act

Group A also discussed stereotypes attributed to black students by the status quo as the "Other"—such as "loud, ghetto, nigger, not interested in school, and not smart." Direct quotes are included below to follow the discussions. The youth were also producing counter discourses in response to such stereotypes. Arguing against such representations STR said,

"They think we are ghetto. No, we are not ghetto. The hell!" and added,

"They think blacks are bad" to which AD.A responded,

"I'm not black. I'm African," asserting an origin as illustrated in the first theme.

Both are distancing and differentiating themselves from conventional categorizations of place and race. Yet, there were also some youth who think that some blacks buy into the ways they are stereotyped and that frustrates them. Such is the images and discourses that black youth repeat. Such discourses are the ones they are supposed to know and act. This is the legitimized discourse about and for black youth. Any other acts would be questioned. For instance, as already stated, when AD.A had a good grade in math, both her teacher and classmate were surprised. However, no one in the group raised issues of how the youth who buy into the stated stereotypical *representations* would have acted had they joined youth programs. Would they be labeled as acting "badly?" because those who buy into it were not called as the "bad youth." In other words, the opposite of being "good youth" was not discussed. They didn't discuss what the "bad" friends do or what drives the good ones to label them as such. Such discourses are the unsaid discourses. However, there were eye communications and nodding heads, smiles and

looking down, because they were referring to those friends who are not in the program; those who are labeled as “bad youth.” The space was full of complex contradictions—acceptance, uncertainty, and rejection. Then TG opened up the conversation by saying,

TG.A They [*the assumed bad youth*] don’t see and it’s harder for them to overcome temptations; for me if I have temptations in front of me I know I can get through them because I have faith and say this is not the right thing to do.

For TG.A, what she learns from the program, and at home, helps her surmount temptations. She feels she can evaluate what is right from wrong and distance herself from peer pressure. Through such learning, molding, and shaping processes of constructing “the good youth,” youth are made to think that they will be the pure, local, traditional, faithful Christians, and based on the mission statements (see p. 19), future leaders, and therefore superior to those youth who are not in the program. What remained unspoken about their friends, that is, what differentiates them from youth who do otherwise—such as going to parties, dressing in “bad” styles, and forgetting tradition—constructs an “Other,” an assumed opposite of “good youth.” Those who regularly attend the program, behave accordingly, attend weekly bible studies, and go to church on Sundays are assumed to be “good youth,” and those who do not are the “bad youth” or at least not-good.

TG.A illustrated the divide when she said, “But don’t you feel that if your friends are offered drugs or something, you have a stronger conscience, whereas your friend doesn’t have that background.” As already stated, what makes the “good” youth for TG.A are going to church, knowing the bible, and having God in one’s life. Accordingly, those who do not believe or do not go to church are considered easy prey and therefore the “bad” youth who, according to TLK.A, “can end up in the streets.” For some of Group A members, who were from a church group and

were disciplined to act in a certain way, acting otherwise would demonize them. It is sinful to act any other way. The creation of “fear of God” binds these youth to the group.

When DGN.A shared,

“...my friends tell me to go to places with them before I started to come here...ever since I started coming to church I stopped going out with her and they say, ‘you don’t have life. Why don’t you hang out with friends?’ and then I’m like ‘I want to be in a good environment.’ It’s bad influence, the biggest sinners.”

For LV.A, the youth will isolate her if she goes out to parties, so she prefers to stay in the program. In her words, “For me it’s like I don’t want to be out-casted [*if I go to*] in parties. But when I come here, I’m doing a good thing. I’ll have better chance than going with them....I’m not saying that I’m perfect but I’ll go to heaven than hell.”

Binary discourses trap or limit her thinking processes and therefore traps her into thinking in terms of either/or, thus distancing herself from her friends. Through this good/bad binary, the youth engaged in characterization and construction of what entails “good” versus “bad” youth learned from the church. Through such discursive *representations*, the “good” youth are (un)intentionally constructing an “Other, bad youth,” in a hierarchical relationship. Or they might also be responding to existing stereotypical *representations* of immigrant youth by reconstructing new images that aim to replace existing stereotypes. Either way, as the youth were repeating what they have learned from the programs, they were reproducing binaries within institutionalized discourses. Thus they are sustaining binary discourses—of this or that, of good/bad from within an assumed homogenous HOA youth group—that they aim to address in the first place. There is a sense of differentiating oneself from within familial relationships, developed when the youth met in the program, by constructing a certain way of acting, assumed virtuous, in opposition to those who do not go to church and do not conform to expectations. Central to this discourse is the way in which the youth are made to believe and perform as if they

are different from what they would have been had they not joined the group, the unspoken about “bad youth” who also are their friends.

The “bad” youth are not necessarily *only* the opposite of the expected “good” youth. Derrida talks about how concepts are constructed in relation to another concept, usually the opposites. However, none of them can exist or be understood independently, on its own, that is, as an absolute. When Derrida refers to the “Other,” constructed as the opposite of the “center,” as not absolute but relative to what it is not, he refers to the “Other” as *the* constituting part of presence-ing the assumed center, normal, original, and natural. From this perspective, the “good” youth cannot be understood without the “bad youth,” because both possess something in common. There is a common space, which is where the youth should have been molded. The good and bad youth are different but also deferred, temporary; hence their positions are unstable, which means either one of them could be good in some ways and not others, and vice versa. The “good” youth, on the right path, are therefore already contaminated in their everyday interactions with the “bad” youth and others, which is why they are still friends with the “bad” youth. The common space is the interstitial space where the youth mediate and accommodate varied cultural expectations. They are flexible, change their cultural identification and their language based on con-text. They create spaces of negotiation strategically identified, a borderland where knowledges and cultures mix, transform, and mark broader possibilities (Anzaldúa, 1987) such as respecting parents’ tradition as well as telling their parents to be present in America, “this is America.”

Overall, the youth talk, think, and act in the spaces of already constructed language for them to repeat. The question which this research aims to better understand is: Which of those discourses hinder and/or facilitate HOA youth performance? According to the themes, the youth

repeat as well as reject existing discourses. They repeat conventional discourses that seem natural while also eliminating some that seem to counter their values. As will be elaborated in the following chapter, rereading the dynamic processes involved in the discussions, the construction of subject positionings and a certain “reality” for the youth to act upon, allows readers to expose what seem to be naturally centered and counter discourses and how both influence each other through intertextuality.

## CHAPTER 6.

### CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS AS POSSIBILITIES

*“It was a while before we came to realize that  
our place was the very house of difference  
rather than the security of any one particular difference.”  
Audre Lorde*

The aim of this research was to understand the function of language in youth discourse: what claims are being produced; how does language function in those claims; what were the youth doing when they talked about their experience and how they see themselves; and what do the claims imply about the relationship between identity and politics? These are the questions I entertained as I was transcribing the audiotapes and (re)reading the focus group transcripts. The themes from this study will inform social work research, theory, and practice with HOA youth in ways that, to my knowledge, have rarely been addressed in previous endeavors.

In this chapter, I focus on the implications of three points that emerged as central themes across the three focus groups: (1) the language of difference, (2) *hybridizing*, in and through language of difference, and (3) *inbetweenness* as a space of possibility. These three themes suggest that HOA youth differentiate themselves from conventional discourses that speak of, for, and about them while also claiming their continental affiliation as Africans. In other words, these youth do not completely fit themselves into existing either/or discourses.

#### 6.1 The Language of Difference as Relational

If we read their discourse closely, HOA youth are both claiming a space as part of the host society, their specific ethnic group, and Africa, and are differentiating themselves, in that they do

not (forcibly) fit into any of these names and *representations* but rather embrace aspects of all. Claiming their difference, they construct a space for strategic negotiation so that the ways in which they perform, and/or through their “swag,” can be accommodated within the larger host society as well as in their home communities.

Swag, in urban slang, is a way of presenting oneself: a cultural or stylish flexibility whereby youth, as consumers, use marketized items creatively, as raw materials, while continuously reconstructing them to their individual ways of doing. Swag can be a style of dancing or dressing. The “swag” HOA youth were talking about is market-oriented, but also expresses individual creativity. It is thus neither free from marketized discourse nor fixed in that youth re-stylize market items. The youth thus reiterate market-oriented identity formations through their “swags, being unique, your own way.” They report this as if they are fleeing controlling discourses—both American and traditional-local. Yet they are reproducing consumerist and individualistic discourses in their own ways. Nonetheless, youths’ “swags” also become their spaces of contestation: spaces where they mesh cultures, question totalizing discourses such as “black” as a constructed social category, “Africa/n” as homogeneous and original, “youth” as always at risk and deviant, and “immigrant” as alien.

Such interpretations keep these youth always on the move, recreating and reshaping their “swags” depending on specific contexts and discursive encounters. When they say they can be “anything,” regardless of socially and culturally categorizing discourses, they leave the question of “who they are” open. This openness is the flexibility of performing through a continuous process of reinterpreting existing discourses that represent them. These flexible performances are ways of acknowledging, responding to, and challenging the power relations inherent in predetermined and constructed identifications. That said, it does not also mean that HOA youth

just flow or float in a vacuum. Their marketized and individualistic discursive performances also need to be critiqued.

## 6.2 Hybridization in and through the Language of Difference

Through my research, I aim to deconstruct languages that work to make what we know about HOA youth seem natural, as well as the ways in which the youth who participate in youth programs come to *reiterate* or *rearticulate*, or not, such languages. The youth in this study consistently talked about notions of cultural identification and specificities, constructing the notion of “youth” as always in process, hybridized, and therefore hard to categorize. In underscoring the importance of this theme, I am not rejecting the notion of identities as social actors. Rather I try to challenge Said’s (1978, 1979) search for the true Orient—in this case HOA youth. Such a notion implies that there is a true identity, one which is distorted by western discourse in the production of the unknown Other, but which nonetheless can be revealed, as if youths’ performances pre-exist the identity politics embedded in racial, educational, and behavioral discourses. Drawing from Foucault and Derrida, the *performative* subject and the *deferred* subject offer a way of opening up the debate about the politics of “displaced youth.” I argue that youth are the effects of power/discourse; not fixedly placed, but on the move with every discursive production. Throughout the research process, the youth were performing in two ways: they *hybridized*—sometimes stressing their heritage and roots in Africa, and at other times centering their Americanness, and African Americanness—strategically carrying the pride of their cultural historicities as they differentiated themselves from stigmatized discourses. These are ways of responding to (temporarily) centered discourses about “black African immigrant youth.”

The ways in which HOA youth (re)produced discourses can be seen throughout the research data, for instance when the youth agreed that the youth programs are spaces where they feel proud because they learn about their culture and tradition but in their own ways. The knowledge they gained from the programs gives them the confidence to talk about who they are when Americans ask them about their origin: “Where are you from? Are there giraffes in your backyard? Do people wear shoes?” In responding to such (un)knowingly asked questions, the youth learn to appreciate their culture, to persist, and to collaborate (Fine, 2007). In other words, identities are performed in counter discourse production.

Yet, these youth’s language also has the potential to reconstruct dividing boundaries within “minority” groups. This is demonstrated in cases such as the politics of race, which can be rearticulated as a dividing tool within a *totalized* black group when “black immigrants” use conventional exclusionary languages to differentiate themselves from “black natives” (African Americans, blacks from the Caribbean and Latin America) who have stigmatized and stereotypical *representations* attached to them based on skin color. For instance, what makes the youth from Group A feel more comfortable with *Habesha*, “like us,” than with other students and youth? Such a discourse could be an act of acknowledging difference, a call for recognition, and/or a way of dismantling the assumed homogeneity of black people, as well as exposing exclusionary practices. Their discourses are strategic moves *inbetween* discourses that exclude as well as include them.

However, the performative act goes beyond recognition and difference. As Nancy Fraser (1996) eloquently argues, recognition by the very structure targeted for scrutiny does not guarantee justice. The ability to think, act, and move beyond *totalizing* labels such as “black group,” or the cultural and racial divides used to identify “minority” ethnic groups, requires a

*third space* that cannot be understood using dichotomous discourses of us/them. Counter discourses thus have to be interrogated so that reiterations of subtle discourses around conventional “ethnic” and/or “minority” understandings can be challenged. Acknowledging the extent to which the groups are already meshed—that their everyday action, talks, and styles are all *mixed* in ways that make sense to each one of the members uniquely—creates spaces where justice is more possible. Tolerating individual uniqueness, accepting the porosity of our culture(s), and leaving the discourse open for other possibilities so that all feel welcomed anywhere and “at home” everywhere contributes to the ideals of justice as stated in social work’s mission statement (National Association of Social Work).

### **6.3 *Inbetweenness* as a Space of Possibilities**

The HOA young people in this study talked consistently about feeling welcomed and not social outcasts in the youth programs they were attending, unlike their experiences in school. Yet, in doing so the youth were responding to and reproducing conventional discourses. They claim a sense of security, belonging, and acceptance in their program sites *vis-a-vis* an alienating school environment, but do so by distancing themselves from stigmatizing discourses around black youth. In other words, HOA youth are already shaped in terms of how they act, think, and perceive their experience and their world, yet they also interrogate, they react. They were claiming difference by interrogating discourses produced for the Other, such as when they respond as Africans when it comes to resisting white students’ and teachers’ stereotypical *representations*. This reflects a discourse strategically *reiterated* for specific purposes. But the ways in which they respond to such discourses also seem to indicate that they recognize a non-translated “origin,” beyond stigmatized discourses. This is what Spivak (cited in Bhabha, 1994) calls *catachresis*, “a condition that one cannot not want” but has to criticize because the youth

need to be in school—an environment where they are already labeled as “blacks,” a category that is also associated with labels such as “immigrants, aliens, unfit,” and where their educational performances are already marked as “delinquent and failures” (Touzard, 2008).

The youth reinterrogate these namings (Ong, 1991) and labels. By also critiquing such labels, HOA youth are claiming and forming multifaceted identities—prize winners in some areas and failures in others—thus, in so doing contesting boundaries assumed natural. Hence the issue is not whether HOA youth misbehave or not, and/or whether they are low achievers in school or not, but rather how such discourses are produced, what their aims are, and how the youth come to repeat, or not, both discourses that are challenging, alienating, and exclusionary, and those that are inclusive.

Discursively *ambiguous, hybrid and performing inbetween, the multiplicities* (Mbembe, 2001) of these youth disallow efforts to fix their identity formation to one claim or one boundary. What they say about their experience is both *atemporal*, and *relational* to existing discourses. Youths’ discourses are *atemporal* in that they defer, and do not fix themselves to existing labeling discourses despite challenging experiences (such as students in school facing challenges from the system, teachers, and students). Rather, they interrogate and strategically negotiate. The discourses are also *relational* because as effects of power in a web of interconnections and cultural expectations (school, parents, families, peers, churches, and neighborhoods) they can only be understood by looking at both their differences from and relationships to existing discourses.

This inbetweenness reflects the complexities HOA youth are engaged in, a condition that leaves them flexible and open to varied possibilities. These youth are always in transit, traveling, always becoming with every encounter, in connection within, between, and through the

conventional American and traditional discourses they claim. By claiming their difference, HOA youth are also showing their unstableness and *inbetweenness*. They fluctuate and perform differently from and within their ethnic group, their claimed “origin,” and the host society, showing the multiple ways in which identification for them is performative.

#### **6.4 Research Constraints**

Overall, even though I the research produced useful knowledges, it does not also mean there were no constraints. These include the participants and sites or agencies, my role as a researcher, and the potential for the research to reiterate conventional discourses of “youth at risk.” The sample participants were from agencies that already identified the youth as “good youth” because they participate in youth programs. There was only one participant who had had experience with the juvenile justice system. An important question to keep in mind, therefore, is whether the focus of the discussions would have been different if the sites from which the sample was drawn were different (schools, for example), or the groups included youth with a more diverse range of experiences. Moreover, this was a small-scale qualitative study, and only a first step in a discursive study of HOA youth language.

Also to be kept in mind is that the agencies from which the participants were recruited were primarily service-oriented and less engaged in raising awareness and mobilizing youth around critical issues. Furthermore, my role as a researcher, my status as a HOA immigrant, and my previous experiences with the youth and the agencies as a participant observer and volunteer undoubtedly also impacted the research process in terms of what questions I asked, and my responses and interactions with the youth—all of which could impact the framing and analysis of the data. I have used the word “(un)intentional” throughout this document because of my awareness that both the participants and I may well have been reiterating the very normative

discourses we were trying to counter and/or respond to in ways that make sense to us, because those discourses constitute us in the first place. Finally, I have not named those youth discourses that were different from the most consistent discourses we produced as “deviant”; rather I engage those discourses as raw materials for my future research and employ them in ways that hopefully will expand the boundaries of youth discourses.

### **6.5 Implications: As Possibilities**

As the thematic analyses indicate, the youth participants in this research were preoccupied with cultural identification and difference. My focus, however, was not on identity *per se*, but rather the politics of identity: how certain claims become legitimized while others do not; and how claims from delegitimized positions (un)intentionally reproduce or *reify* certain discourses and *representations*. In this case, my interest was in how HOA youth come about to talk about their experience in certain ways and not others. Through deconstructive reading and discourse analysis, I attempted to tease out the layers of particular youth discourses, revealing the embedded *representations* within HOA youths’ discursive claims.

I take the implications of this research with young people from the HOA as one of the many possibilities in HOA youth performance. With every utterance, for or against expected norms, the youth (and I, as a researcher) were (re)positioning the center. Our discourses were constructing and deconstructing the center, thereby showing the complexity and relationality of discourse, as well as the atemporality and partiality of discourse. As such, this research has the potential to contribute to social work research, social working (Kumsa, 2004), and HOA youth programs. This research contributes to reframing methodologies and theoretical frameworks, with the goal of trying to better understand what discourses produce HOA youth, how the youth perform the way they do in any context, and how HOA youth sustain, or not, discourses that

already delegitimize them. Not to center one over the other, rather to critique what HOA youth refer as their “real” experience and unmask “reality” through discursive frameworks.

### 6.5.1 Methodologies

This study examined HOA youth language with the aim of understanding the role of language, or discourse, in the production of knowledges about HOA immigrants. Focusing on how and when youth participants came to make certain claims about their experiences, and not others, provides access to the ideologies embedded in youth language. The need for a discursive understanding of the ideologies underlying language emanates from the methodological assumption that ideologies shape how the youth come about to talk about their experiences and perspectives on the world in certain ways.

Exploring these subtle ideologies has the potential to inform research and theorizing on HOA youth and similar populations. Yet social work researchers rarely employ methodologies that frame participants’ language as part of broader discourses. Nor do they typically recognize participants’ experiences as already polluted by normative discourses of and for immigrants. The assumption underlying much youth research, for example, is that youth are autonomous individuals with reason and free choice, and therefore bear the consequences of their actions. Such a framework produces discourses that *represent* and blame the victim as the problem.

The assumption undergirding this research, in contrast, is that individuals or identities do not precede discourse; rather discourse, as power, produces social actors. As Pease (2002), Bigelow (2008), and Ibrahim (1999) assert, the case may be that it is institutionalized discourses, such as social work, that produce and inform certain ways of knowing HOA youth and immigrants in general. Hence, there is a need to tease out underlying paradigms that inform and drive how HOA youth came to stress their “origin, inbetweenness, swags, and the right path” and

to move beyond homogenizing discourses of “black, immigrant, alien, and youth” to inform social work methodologies and practice.

### **6.5.2 Theorizing**

The research’s discursive framework has the potential to inform social work theory-practice. In social work theorizing, a discursive approach *de-essentializes* clients, challenging the ways in which social workers aim to assist clients to fit into “ethnic enclaves” and conventional neoliberal norms, and promoting instead open discussions about the construction of identities and positive attitudes towards immigrants’ knowledges and ways of knowing. While engaging social work “clients” in their contextual “realities” may offer potential remedies in social working, such an engagement may also have repercussions in that it maintains us/them binaries.

The findings of the study also contribute to theoretical understandings of “youth” by illuminating the discourses that produce HOA youth, how they come to perform the way they do in a particular context and period of time. As such, the research pushes the boundaries of how youth are perceived—by scholars, program providers, and the general public—by pointing out the competing yet relational nature of discourses of the status quo and those of the youth. On one hand, conventional discourses about, for, and of HOA youth construct them, variously, as immigrants, Americans, youth, black, delinquents, African Americans, aliens, unfit, and at risk. On the other hand, HOA perceive themselves (and act) as the swaggers, Africans, rooted in ethnic history and culture, African Americans, and Americans. All these names and labels, both attributed to them and those they identify with, and/or reject, are “namings that control” (Minh-ha, 1990); competing discourses that sustain and shape how youth practice their world. Framing HOA youth language discursively thus has the potential to dismantle underlying paradigms that

inform the politics of “displaced youth,” which informs the continuous search for youth’s politico-cultural “home.”

### **6.5.3 Social working**

Addressing HOA youth issues beyond homogenizing discourses of “black,” “youth,” “immigrant,” and “alien” groups could also allow social working (Kumsa, 2004) to engage in more culturally specific interventions. The themes of this research imagine HOA youth, as social workers’ clients, in non-essentializing ways. Social working with HOA youth (un)intentionally starts with preconceived ideas and understandings of HOA youth, and immigrants, based on existing literature produced for and about immigrants (Pease, 2002). This includes totalizing immigrants and their experiences into existing classified categories (such as, our culture/their tradition; our scientific knowledge of health and mental health/their tradition of healers and understanding of medical treatment). The sociocultural and historical contingencies that represent them in terms of how we know them now are not usually taken into consideration in social working (ibid). Non-conforming youth are thus assumed “deviant and unfit.” However, as some HOA youth participants indicated, the youth respect but do not fully conform to the norms, such as their parents’ cultural expectations. Nevertheless, they do not see themselves as outcasts. Their valuing of their parents’ traditions confirms earlier research showing that parental and youth cultures in the U.S. are not in a “culture clash”; rather youth are meshing something from every encounter in ways that makes sense to them (Hall, 1991; Ibrahim, 1999; Ngo, 2008). However, it does not also mean that it is okay for HOA youth to flow towards all directions. Youth discourses also need to be critiqued as consumers who flow, talk, and practice within existing market-oriented discourses. The youth are not free from and indeed sustain conventional discourses as consumers through their “swags, having individual ways of doing, neither positive

nor negative cultural practices.” But, congruent to previous education studies with HOA youth (Anthias 2002; Ibrahim, 2003b; Bigelow, 2011) the research framework allows social working to approach HOA youth, and immigrants, from a broader, deeper, more open and critiquing approach than has been common, enabling social workers to understand the complexities of youth experience and design specific plans with, not for, their “clients.”

#### **6.5.4 HOA youth programs**

This research has the potential to inform HOA youth programs. In line with other youth program studies (Sutton et al., 2006; Nakkula et al., 2006; Delgado et al., 2008), this research has shown the important role of youth programs in building relationships, creating peer bonds, and providing opportunities for HOA to explore and reflect on who they are. However, based on my experiences with the three agencies, they are primarily service-oriented. HOA youth need these social services, but my research suggests that a critical view of how the staff and programs shape the youth they work with is also warranted. More often than not, the programs’ focus on assisting the youth to meet status quo expectations—particularly skills that would enhance their “social mobility”—to allow them to get good jobs and move up the ladder to reach the “American dream in the land of opportunity.” The question is: Is such “social mobility” an easy ride in a system that pushes immigrants to the margin and where programs typically lack critical perspectives on where the youth are positioned, and position themselves, in relation to the host society and/or other American youth? It does not mean that such programs could not help improve the youths’ future; rather what is (un)intentionally ignored is how the programs influence youth in terms of responding to culturally and politically challenging conditions at school, home, neighborhood, the church and other public services.

The programs' perfectionist attitude towards inculcating the youth with "nationalism and/or traditionalism," as a staff member of one agency indicated, while critical for their confidence may also result into drawing bolder boundaries around their ethnic groups. Such traditionalist learning processes could also stress identity formations around the nation and tradition that are already discursively constructed to control the youth within expected norms. My research shows that some of the youth think beyond their boundaries. This insight is central for program staff, and social workers, in developing and designing youth program strategies. What HOA youth need is also explorations of the outside world. There is a felt need to reframe agencies' and through them youth programs' learning processes towards exploring how varied cultures and languages—such as other African immigrants, African Americans, Natives, Latinas/os, Asians, Pacific Islanders—represent youth, and their populations, while also questioning what it means to talk across borders so that the youth move beyond conventional discourses of multiculturalism. In line with Bigelow's assertion (2011), such an approach could also inform host societies' perceptions of HOA youth in particular, and immigrants in general.

Overall, HOA Youth programs and their host agencies can benefit from this research in developing and designing programs focusing on language and in ways that inform youth to problematize and critique discourses that seem to be given—such as their tradition determining who they are; their swag as if their own identification even though it is creative; and the west as modern and Africa as representing tradition that people from outside the continent could hardly understand, in their words, "Africa is Africa." As Foucault indicated, to problematize is to engage in ethical dialogue. Problematization, therefore, is action that has the potential to equip the youth in ways that continuously question their practice, so that what is taken for granted gets destabilized.

The research findings have also forced me to question the programs in terms of their content, which made it hard for me to spot the youth as conforming to or resisting program expectations. Studies of youth programs and immigrant youth assume constructive spaces for the youth to “be”; however, based on this research I argue that HOA youths’ discourse was “doing” (Butler, 2001) and the sites were spaces of contestation. HOA youths’ discourse was illusive because of their strategic positionings and repositionings. Hence, there is a need to frame youth programs and interventions, as well as studies of HOA youth, in ways that capture the complexities of their hybridized performances so that their counter discourses become equally legitimate. This will be my future research endeavor in the hope that it will inform social work methodologies and theory-practice with HOA youth. My future research will also focus on HOA 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> generations’ youth-parent communications, with the aim of elucidating differences, or not, between the two generations’ discourses.

## 6.6 Concluding Thoughts

The primary finding from this study is that HOA youth cannot achieve a self-identity because *they are and they are not*; they became black in the U.S. and they are not black; they are Africans but they do not see themselves as fitting fully into the images of either their African parents or the larger society. Congruent with Fuligni and his colleagues’ (2005) findings on the importance on familial identification among Latino/a youth, and the urging of supporting families as contributing to their motivations around higher education and future aspirations, HOA youths’ affiliation with their parents’ traditions also increases their academic potential. However, unlike Fuligni’s assumption that Latina/o youths’ performance stems from responses to ethnic and immigrant discrimination, which underscores ethnic boundaries, HOA youth, while trying to fit in preexisting discourses (such as their parents’ traditional views, or larger

understanding of blacks in the U.S.), also dismantle discourses that *represent* them as purely African or as American blacks. They identify with “historically configured positions” within discourse (Mouffe, 1992a, p. 372), for example their stress on being “African in origin.” In the process of identifying themselves with certain discourses (ideology), they are trying to find an explanation of their position and situation (ibid). The attempt may seem “to involve closure” or a fixed position—in this case pure African origin, or Latin origin in the case of Fuligni’s youth. However, there is no single discourse that produces HOA youth, rather multiple discourses that overlap, contradict, and work in connection with each other.

The discursive (ideological) positionalities of these youth are thus *temporary*, in that ideology does not resolve their desire to be at “home.” The ways in which HOA youth identify themselves and their actions are therefore contingent: performed in a continuum, always in process, resisting the closure (fixity) that seems to be imposed through language. As the youth talked they were/are disrupting the symbolic (language) through a *catachrestic* state—the youth want to be part of their ethnic group, African, African American, and other hyphenated Americans, but they also criticize these identities. In order to identify themselves, HOA youth have to differentiate themselves from African Americans and their parents, but also claim them.

Hence, from a deconstructive perspective, identity is unbounded difference, not self-presence. As already stated, the HOA youth in this study decouple notions of black and African American from discourses of race and cultural racialization. Although they appreciate African American aesthetics and art, they recognize that appreciating hip hop is not about being African American and black. Thus claiming ideologies of racism as unnatural or/and any links between race and African American is dismantled. Revealing race as normative allows for subversion, while resisting racial discourses but within a binary discourse (re)frames cultural racial divides

as if these are innate. In other words, counter discourses cannot be fully liberating unless they are framed beyond binaries (Barthes, cited in Sandoval, 2000). Youth, therefore, are indeterminate; they are undecidable. In their words, “It [*culture*] can be anything, positive or negative,” “I have my way of doing;” and there is no truth in “youth” but *representations* that have the potential to be reinscribed indefinitely.

Indefinite reinscription, which allows infinite interpretations, does not also mean that the process is fully liberating. However, the notion of *deferred* subject positions or indefinite repositionings and interpretations might seem void of action, which is incompatible with the social work notion of “social transformation.” For instance, in social work practice both the social worker and groups or individuals work towards a plan that could lead to a social change, be it in a society, group, or individual. The notion of “change” was also one of the themes in HOA youth discussions, which is why I was interested in how they perceive this notion. Foucault argues that the subject that power has constructed is also its vehicle (1980, p. 98). In other words, the effect of power is also its articulation. In this sense, there is no pre-discursive subject that struggles for its liberation and change based on a social worker’s plan; rather, there is a process of discursive production, and counter discourse, produced in and through power to act or position oneself in a certain way. Thus, what may appear to be problematic HOA youth behavior, such as “gang involvement,” for instance, is the effect of discursive power constituting the subject—“youth gang.” In other words, HOA youth talk embraces existing discourses that produce and represent the youth, and the youth act according to and reject or act counter to the discourses. Thus, HOA youth are effects of discursive institutions and disciplines such as social welfare, immigration, schools, families, art, and media. When HOA immigrant groups got caught up in the media’s discourse of “East African Youth Gang Groups” in 2006, one way of responding to

such discourses was to question what led these youth to act this way in the first place: What is their background experience in the U.S.? And have their concerns been attended adequately?

However, the boundaries of the institutions that produce discourses about, of, and for HOA youth become porous as youth negotiate and interrogate the discourses that represent them. With every repetition, there is change. So when the youth act or talk about their parents' tradition, with respect while looking for change, it is already in a different format and tone. Hence, it is HOA youth counter discourses that become the raw materials for make social change. Discursive performativity or acting is becoming a change. Thus, as HOA youth have demonstrated throughout the research process, they do not need the concept of an *essential, stable and unified* identity in order for them to be understood and "liberated," rather processes of identity formations in and through discursive negotiation and interrogations that leaves them open for multiple possibilities.

## REFERENCES

- Allen, D. G. (1995). Hermeneutics: Philosophical traditions and nursing practice research. *Nursing Science Quarterly*, 8, 174-182.
- Allen, D. G. (1996). Knowledge, politics, culture, and gender: A discourse perspective. *Canadian Journal of Nursing Research*, 28(1), 95-102.
- Allen, D., & Cloyes K. (2005). The language of “experience” in nursing research. *Nursing Inquiry*, 12(2), 98-105.
- Allen, D., & Hardin, P. (2001). Discourse analysis and the epidemiology of meaning. *Nursing Philosophy*, 2, 163-176.
- Alitolppa-Niitamo, A. (2002). The generation in-between: Somali youth and schooling in metropolitan Helsinki. *Intercultural Education*, 13(3), 275-316.
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Ang, I. (2001). *On not speaking Chinese: Living between Asia and the West*. London: Routledge.
- Ang, I. (2003). Together-In-Difference: Beyond diaspora, into hybridity. *Asian Studies Review*, 27(2), 141-154.
- Anthias, F. (2002). Where do I belong?: Narrating identity and translocational positionality. *Ethnicities*, 2(4), 491-515.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands/La Frontera: The new Mestiza*. San Francisco, CA: Spinsters/Aunt Lute.
- Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. *Public Culture*, 2(2), 1-24. (Long version).
- Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 7, 295-310. (Short version).
- Appadurai, A. (2000). Grassroots globalization and the research imagination. *Public Culture*, 12(1), 1-19.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

- Arthur, J. (2008). The second generation immigrant youth: Multiple and shifting identities. In J. Arthur, (Ed.), *The African diaspora in the United States and Europe* (pp. 103-120). Surrey, UK: Ashgate Publishing.
- Asher, N. (2008). Listening to hyphenated Americans: Hybrid identities of youth from immigrant families. *Theory into Practice*, 47, 12-19.
- Barry, P. (1995). *Beginning theory: An introduction to literary and cultural theory*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
- Barthes, R. (1967). Death of the author. *Aspen*, 36(5/6).
- Barton, S. (2004). Narrative inquiry: Locating Aboriginal epistemology in a relational methodology. *Journal of Advanced Nursing Research*, 45(5), 519-526.
- Basch C. (1987). Focus group interview: An under-utilized research technique for improving theory and practice in health education. *Health Education Quarterly*, 14, 411-418.
- Basford, L. (2008). From mainstream to East African charter: East African Muslim students' experiences in U.S. schools. Dissertation. Retrieved May 2012 from [http://conservancy.umn.edu/bitstream/45637/1/Basford\\_Letitia%20July%202008.pdf](http://conservancy.umn.edu/bitstream/45637/1/Basford_Letitia%20July%202008.pdf)
- Basford, L. (2010). From mainstream to East African Charter: Cultural and religious experience of Somali youth in U.S. schools. *Journal of School Choice: Research, theory and reform*, 4(4), 485-509 .
- Beck, C. T. (1994). Reliability and validity issues in phenomenological research. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 16(4), 254-267.
- Bell, V. (1999). Performativity and belonging. *Theory and Culture*, 16, 1-10.
- Benhabib, S., Butler, J., Cornell, D., & Fraser, N. (1995). *Feminist contentions: A philosophical exchange*. London: Routledge.
- Berardi, F. (2004). What is the meaning of autonomy today? Subjectivation, social composition, refusal of work. Retrieved May 2008 from <http://multitudes.samizdat.net/What-is-the-Meaning-of-Autonomy>
- Bereketeab, R. (2004). Dynamics of National Service in Eritrea. *News from the Nordic Africa Institute*, 1, 9-11.
- Bernal. V. (2004). Eritrea goes global: Reflections on nationalism in a transnational era. *Cultural Anthropology*, 19, 3-25.
- Berry, J. W., Poortinga, Y. and Breugelmans, S. (2011). *Cross-cultural psychology: Research and applications*.

- Berry, J. W., Phinney, J.S., Sam, D. L. and Veder, P. (2006). Immigrant youth: Acculturation, identity and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 55(3), 303-332.
- Besteman, C. (1999). *Unraveling Somalia: Race, violence and the legacy of slavery*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1989). Location, intervention incommensurability: A conversation with Homi Bhabha. *Emergencies*, 1(1), 63-88.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1990). Introduction: Narrating the nation. In H. Bhabha (Ed.), *Nation and narration* (pp. 1-7). New York: Routledge.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bhatia, S., & Ram, A. (2004). Culture, hybridity and the dialogical self: Cases from the South-Asian diaspora. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 11, 225-241.
- Bigelow, M. (2008). Somali adolescents' negotiation of religious and racial bias in and out of school. *Theory into Practice*, 47, 27-34.
- Bigelow, M. (2010). *Mogadishu on the Mississippi: Language, racialized identity and education in a new land*. Blackwell's Publishing.
- Bigelow, M. (2011). (Con)Texts for linguistic and cultural hybridity among Somali Diasporic Youth. *The New Educator*, 7(1), 27-43.
- Bleicher, J. (1980). *Contemporary hermeneutics: Hermeneutics as a method, philosophy and critique*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Blommaert, J., & Bulcaen, C. (2000). Critical Discourse Analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 29, 447-466.
- Bloor, M. F., Frankland J., Thomas, M., & Robson, K. (2001). *Focus groups in social research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Bowie, A. (Ed.) (1998). *Schleiermacher: Hermeneutics and criticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boyne, R. (1988). Interview with Hans-George Gadamer. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 5(1), 25-34.
- Bratich, J.Z., Packer, J., & McCarthy, C. (2003). *Foucault, cultural studies, and governmentality*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Breitmayer, B. J., Ayres, L., & Knafl, K. (1993). Triangulation in qualitative research evaluation of completeness and confirmation purposes. *Journal of Nursing Research*, 25(3), 237-243.

- Bremer, K., Roberts, C., Vasseur, M., Somonot, M., & Broeder, P. (1996). *Achieving understanding: Discourse in intercultural encounters*. London and New York: Longman.
- Brink, P. (1987). On reliability and validity in qualitative research. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 2, 157-159.
- Brown, R. H. (1995). *Postmodern representations: Truth, power, and mimesis in the human sciences and public culture*. Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Bryce-Laporte, R. S. (1972). Black immigrants: The experience of invisibility and inequality. *Journal of Black Studies*, 3(1), 29-56.
- Butler, J. (1997). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Cadge, W., Jaworsky, B. N., Levitt, P., Hejtmanek, J., & Curran, S. (2008). The city as context: Spaces of reception in new immigrant destinations. American Sociological Association Annual Meeting.
- Chabal, P., & Dolaz, J. (2006). *Culture troubles: Politics and the interpretation of meaning*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Chait, S. M. (2011). *Seeking Selaam: Ethiopians, Eritreans, and Somalis in the Pacific Northwest*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press. Chambers, I.
- (1994). *Migrancy, culture, identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Chambers, I., & Curti, L. (1996). *The post-colonial question: Common skies divided horizons*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Chadee, D. (2011). *Theories in social psychology*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Clarke J.B. (1998). Hermeneutic analysis: a qualitative decision trail. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 36, 363–369.
- Clifford, J. (1994). Diasporas. *Cultural Anthropology*, 9(3), 302-38.
- Cohen, A. K. (1955). Delinquent boys: The culture of the gang. In Williams, F. P. & McShane, M. D. (1998), *Criminology theory: Selected classic readings. [133-147]*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing.
- Conrad, A. (2006). *A Culture of War and a Culture of Exile: Young Eritreans in Germany and their Relations to Eritrea*. Institute for Political Science, University of Hamburg. Retrieved from [http://www.eritrea-online.de/media/conrad\\_2006.pdf](http://www.eritrea-online.de/media/conrad_2006.pdf)
- Coombe, R., & Sroller, P. (1995). Beyond modernity's meanings: Engaging the postmodern in Cultural Anthropology. *Culture*, 1(1), 111-124.

- Cooper, C. (2002). *Understanding school exclusion: Challenging processes of docility*. Nottingham: Education Now, University of Hull.
- Crain, M. M. (1997). The remaking of an Andalusian pilgrimage tradition: Debates regarding visual representation and the meanings of "locality" in a global era. In A. Gupta & J. Ferguson (Eds.), *Culture, power, place: Explorations in critical Anthropology* (pp. 291-311). London: Duke University Press.
- Cresswell, J. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Crist, J., & Tanner, C. (2003). Interpretation/analysis methods in hermeneutic interpretative phenomenology. *Nursing Research*, 52, 202-205.
- Crotty, M. (2004). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Davidson, C. (2009). Transcription: Imperatives for qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 8(2), 35-52.
- Delgado, M. (2000). *New arenas for community social work Practice with urban youth: Use of the arts, humanities, and sports*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Delgado, M., & Zhou, H. (2008). *Youth-led health promotion in urban communities: A community capacity-enhancement perspective*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Derrida, J. (1974). *Of Grammatology*. Translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, 1997. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Deutscher, P. (2006). *How to read Derrida*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Diamond, J. (2004). *Guns, germs and steel: The fates of human society*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Diamond, J. (2005). *Collapse: How societies choose to fail or succeed*. New York: Penguin.
- Dorman, S. (2004). Past the Kalashnikov: Youth, Politics and the State in Eritrea. In J. Abbink & I. van Kessel, (Eds), *Vanguard or vandals? Youth, politics and conflict in Africa* (pp. 189-204). Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers.
- Downing, L. (2008). *The Cambridge introduction to Michel Foucault*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Dreyfus, H. L., & Rabinow, P. (1983). *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*. Second Edition, with an Afterword by and an Interview with Michel Foucault. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

- Dwyer, C. (1998). Contested identities: Challenging dominant representations of young British Muslim women. In T. Skeleton & G. Valentine. *COOL PLACES: Geographies of youth cultures* (pp. 50-65). New York: Routledge.
- Dwyer, C. (1999). Veiled meanings: Young British Muslim women and the negotiation of difference. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 6, 5-26.
- Edmonston, B., & Passel, J. S. (1992). *The Future Immigrant Population of the United States. Program for Research on Immigration Policy Discussion*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press.
- Epstein, J. (1998). *Youth culture: Identity in a postmodern world*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ephrem, M., & Kesete, S. (2004). *The Ruling*. Solna, Sweden :African Triangle.
- Erickson, E. (1994). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton.
- Fabian, J. (1983). Presence and representation: The Other and Anthropological writing. *Critical Inquiry*, 16(4), 1053-77.
- Fairclough, N. (1997). Technologization of discourse. In C. R. Caldas-Coulthard & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Texts and practices: Readings in critical discourse analysis* (pp. 71-83). London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.
- Fangen, K. (2006). Humiliation Experienced by Somali Refugees in Norway. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 19(1), 69–93.
- Fanon, F. (1968). *The wretched of the earth*. New York: Grove. Farah,
- N. (2011). *Crossbones*. New York: Riverhead Books, Penguin
- Fillmore, W. (1991). When learning a second language means losing the first. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 6, 323-346.
- Forman, M. (2002). Keeping it real? African youth identities and Hip Hop. *Critical Studies*, 19(1), 89-118.
- Foucault, M. (1972, 1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. C. Gordon (Ed.). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. London: Routledge.

- Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. A. Sheridan (Ed.). New York: Vintage.
- Foucault, M. (1981). The order of discourse. In R. Young (Ed.), *Untying the text: A poststructuralist reader* (pp. 48-77). London: Routledge & Keegan Paul.
- Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of the Self. In L. H. Martin; H. Gutman, & P. H. Hutton (Eds.), *Technologies of the self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault* (pp. 16-49). Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Foucault, M. (1994). *The order of things: An archeology of the human sciences*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (2008). *This is not a pipe. Ceci n'est pas une pipe*. Translated and edited by James Harkness. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Francis, B. (2000). Poststructuralism and nursing: uncomfortable bedfellows? *Nursing Inquiry*, 7, 20-28.
- Fraser, N. (1989). Foucault on modern power: Empirical insights and normative confusions. In N. Fraser (Ed.), *Unruly practices: Power, discourse, and gender in contemporary social theory* (pp.17-34). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fraser, N. (1996). *Social justice in the age of identity politics: Redistribution, recognition, and participation*. The Tanner Lectures on Human Values. Delivered at Stanford University April 30–May 2, 1996. Retrieved from <http://www.intelligenceispower.com/>
- Frazer, J., Darden, J., & Henry, N. (2009). *The African Diasporas in the United States and Canada at the dawn of the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. Binghamton, NY: Binghamton University, Global Academic Publishing.
- Frazer, N., Honneth, A., & Joel, G. (2003). *Redistribution or recognition: A political-philosophical exchange*. New York: Verso.
- Friese, H. (2002). *Identities: Time, difference and boundaries*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Frow, J., & Morris, M. (2000). Cultural Studies. In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 2nd edition (pp. 315-346). London: Sage.
- Friedman, J. (1990). Being in the world: Localization and globalization. In M. Featherstone (Ed.), *Global culture: Nationalism, globalization and modernity* (pp. 311-328). London: Sage.
- Friedman, J. (1992). The past in the future: History and the politics of identity. *American Anthropologist*. 94, 837-859.
- Friedman, T. (1999). *The lexis and the olive tree: Understanding globalization*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.

- Garcetti, E. (1999). Civic and ethnic allegiances: Competing visions of nationalist discourse in the Horn of Africa. Paper presented at the 40th Convention of the International Studies Association, Washington, DC, February 16-20, 1999.
- Geanellos, R. (1998). Hermeneutic philosophy. Part 1: Implications of its use as methodology in interpretative nursing research. *Nursing Inquiry*, 5(3), 154-163.
- Gee, P. (2006). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. New York: Routledge.
- Genz, N., & Kramer, S. (2006). *Globalization, cultural identities, and media representations*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Giampapa, Frances. (2001). Hyphenated identities: Italian-Canadian youth and the negotiation of ethnic identities in Toronto. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5, 279-311.
- Gil-Gomez, E. (2000). Rethinking identity construction: Placing the lesbian of color. In E. Gil-Gomez, *Performing La Mestiza: Textual representations of lesbians of color and the negotiation of identities* (pp. 3-36). New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Gilkes, P. (1991). Eritrea: historiography and mythology. *African Affairs*, 90(361), 623-628.
- Gilroy, P. (1990). Nationalism, history, and ethnic absolutism. *History Workshop Journal*, 30, 114-120.
- Gilroy, P. (1993). *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and double consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Giroux, H. A. (2000). *Stealing innocence: Youth, corporate power, and the politics of culture*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Goh, R. B. H., & Wong, S. (2004). *Asian diasporas: Cultures, identities, representations*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Goldblatt, H., & Rosenblum, S. (2007). Navigating among Worlds: The experience of Ethiopian adolescents in Israel. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 22(6), 585-611.
- Gow, G. (2002). *The Oromo in exile: From the Horn of Africa to the suburbs of Australia*. Melbourne, Australia: Melbourne University Press.
- Graham, J. (1991). Fordism/Post-Fordism, Marxism/Post-Marxism: The second cultural divide. *Rethinking Marxism*, 4(1), 39-58.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks* (Q. Hoare & G. N. Smith, Trans.). New York: International Publishers.
- Griffin, C. (1993). *Representations of youth: The study of youth and adolescence in Britain and America*. Cambridge, MA: Polity.

- Gruenewald, D. (2003). The best of both worlds: A critical pedagogy of place. *Educational Researcher*, 32(4), 3-12.
- Guba, E. (1990). The alternative paradigm dialog. In E. Guba (Ed.), *The paradigm dialog* (pp. 17-27). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In Denzin & Lincoln, (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Guha, R., & Spivak, G. (1988). *Selected subaltern studies*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gupta, A., & Ferguson, J. (1997a). Introduction. Culture, power, place: Ethnography at the end of an era. In A. Gupta & J. Ferguson (Eds.), *Culture, power, place: Explorations in critical anthropology* (pp. 1-29). London: Duke University Press.
- Gupta, A., & Ferguson, J. (1997b). Beyond "culture": Space, identity, and the politics of difference. *Cultural Anthropology*, 7(1), 6-23.
- Halion, K. (2001). Deconstruction and speech act theory: A defense of the distinction between normal and parasitic speech acts. Retrieved from: <http://www.e-anglais.com/thesis.html>
- Hall, S. (1980). Cultural Studies: Two paradigms. *Media, Culture, and Society*, 2, 57-72.
- Hall, S. (1986). On postmodernism and articulation. An interview with Stuart Hall. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 10(2), 45-60.
- Hall, S. (1989). New ethnicities. In D. Morley & K. H. Chen (Eds.), *Stuart Hall: Critical dialogues in cultural studies* (pp. 441-449). London: Routledge.
- Hall, S. (1994). Cultural Identity and Diaspora. In P. Williams & L. Chrisman (Eds.) *Colonial discourse and post-colonial theory: A reader* (pp. 392-403). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hall, S. (1996). Introduction: Who needs "identity"? In S. Hall & P. du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 1-17). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hall, S. (1997). *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Haw, K. (1998). *Educating Muslim girls*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Hannerz, U. (1987). The world in Creolisation. *Africa*, 57(4), 546-59.
- Hannerz, U. (1989). Notes on the Global Ecumene. *Public Culture*, 1(2), 66-75.
- Hardin, P. (2001). Theory and language: locating agency between free will and discursive marionettes. *Nursing Inquiry*, 8, 11-18.

- Hassan, F. (2008). Resilient teens: Social exclusion of parents and impact on the second generation Eritrean youth. *Theses and dissertations. Paper 95*. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.ryerson.ca/dissertations/95>
- Healy, K. (1999). Power and activist social work. In B. Pease and J. Fook (eds.), *Transforming social work practice: Postmodern critical perspectives*. St. Leonard's: Allen and Unwin.
- Hebdige, D. (1987). *Cut 'n' Mix: Culture, identity and Caribbean music*. London: Methuen.
- Hepner, T. R. (2003). Religion, nationalism and transnational civil society. *Identities: Global studies in Culture and Power, 10*, 269–293.
- Hill, M. (2004). Ways of seeing: using ethnography and Foucault's "toolkit" to view assessment practices differently. *Qualitative Research, 9*, 309-330.
- Hirsch, E. & O'Hanlon, M. (1995). Introduction. In E. Hirsch (Ed.). *The Anthropology of landscape: Perspectives on place and space*. [pp. 1-30]. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hole, R. (2007). Working between languages and cultures: Issues of representation, voice, and authority intensified. *Qualitative Inquiry, 13*, 696–710.
- hooks, b. (1992). The oppositional gaze. In b. hooks, *Black looks: Race and representation*, (pp. 115-131). Boston, MA: South End.
- Hull, G., Zacher, J., & Hibbert, L. (2009). Youth, risk, and equity in a global world. *Review of Research in Education, 33*, 117–159.
- Ibrahim, A. (1999). Becoming Black: Rap and hip-hop, race, gender, identity, and the politics of ESL learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(3), 349-369.
- Ibrahim, A. (2000a). Trans-framing identity: race, language, culture, and the politics of translation. *Trans/forms: Insurgent Voices in Education, 5*(2), 120-135.
- Ibrahim, A. (2000b). "Hey, ain't I Black too?" The politics of becoming Black. In R. Walcott (Ed.), *Rude: Contemporary Black Canadian cultural criticism* (pp. 109-136). Toronto, ON: Insomniac.
- Ibrahim, A. (2001). "Hey, Whadap Homeboy?" Identification, desire, and consumption: Hip-Hop, performativity, and the politics of becoming Black. *Taboo, 5*(2), 85-102.
- Ibrahim, A. (2003a). Marking the unmarked: Hip-Hop, the gaze and the African body in North America. *Critical Arts: A Journal for Cultural Studies, 2*(1), 15-24.
- Ibrahim, A. (2003b). "Whassup, homeboy?" Joining the African diaspora: Black English as a symbolic site of identification and language learning. In S. Makoni, G. Smitherman, A. F. Ball & A. K. Spears (Eds.), *Black linguistics: Language, society and politics in Africa and the Americas* (pp. 169-185). London, UK: Routledge.

- Ibrahim, A. (2004a). One is not born Black: becoming and the phenomenon(ology) of race. *Philosophical Studies in Education, 35*, 77-87.
- Ibrahim, A. (2004b). Operating under erasure: Hip-Hop and the pedagogy of affective. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 20*(1), 113-133.
- Ibrahim, A. (2005). There is no alibi for being (Black)? Race, dialogic space, and the politics of trialectic identity. In C. Teelucksingh (Ed.), *Claiming space: Racialization and spatiality in Canadian Cities* (pp. 20-32). Waterloo, ON: Waterloo University Press.
- Ibrahim, A. (2007). Linking Marxism, globalization, and citizenship education: Toward a comparative and critical pedagogy post 9/11. *Educational Theory, 57*(1), 89-103.
- Ibrahim, A. (2008). THE NEW *FLÂNEUR*: Subaltern cultural studies, African youth in Canada and the semiology of in-betweenness. *Cultural Studies, 22*(2), 234-253.
- Incirlioglu, E.O., & Tandogan, Z. G. (1999). Cultural diversity, public space, aesthetics and power. *European Journal of Intercultural Studies, 10*(1), 51-62.
- Irvin, A., Epstein, L., & Chambon, A. (1999). *Reading Foucault for social work*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Jackson, J. E. (1990). "Déjà Entendu"—the liminal qualities of anthropological fieldnotes. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 19*, 8-43.
- Jacquin-Berdal, D. (2002). *Nationalism and ethnicity in the Horn of Africa: A critique of the ethnic interpretation*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Jalata, A. (1993). *Oromia and Ethiopia*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Jaroz, L. (1992). Constructing the dark continent: Metaphor as geographic representation of Africa. *Geografiska Annaler, 74B*(2), 105-115.
- Jenkins, H. (1992). *Textual poachers: Television fans and participatory culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Jones, S. R., Torres, V., & Arminio, J. (2006). *Negotiating the complexities of qualitative research in higher education: Fundamental elements and issues*. New York: Routledge.
- Johnson, A. G. (2000). *Privilege, power and difference*. Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.
- Johnston-GoodStar, K., Trinidad, A. & Tecele, A. S. (2010). Critical pedagogy through the reinvention of place: Three cases of youth resistance. In B. Porfilio & P. Carr (Eds.), *Youth Culture, education and resistance: Subverting the commercial ordering of life* (pp. 197-216). Netherlands & Boston, MA: Sense Publishers.
- Kanu, Y. (2008). Educational needs and barriers for African refugee students in Manitoba. *Canadian Journal of Education, 31*(4), 915-940.

- Katz, C. (2005). Growing up global: Economic restructuring and children's everyday lives. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*. Retrieved from [www.upress.umn.edu/book-division/books/growing-up-global](http://www.upress.umn.edu/book-division/books/growing-up-global).
- Kao, G., & Tienda, M. (1995). Optimism and achievement: The educational performance of immigrant youth. *Social Science Quarterly*, 76, 1–19.
- Kaplan, C. (1987). Deterritorializations: The rewriting of home and exile in Western feminist discourse. *Cultural Critique*, 6, 187-198.
- Kauffman, L. S. (1995). Dangerous liaisons: The reproduction of women in Roland Barthes and Jacques Derrida. In R. H. Brown (Ed.), *Postmodern representations: Truth, power, and mimesis in the human sciences and public culture*. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Kibreab, G. (1987). *Refugees and development in Africa: The case of Eritrea*. Trenton, New Jersey: Red Sea Press.
- Kibreab, G. (1996). *People on the edge in the Horn: Displacement, land use and the environmental in the Gedaref Region, Sudan*. Oxford, UK: J. Currey Ltd.
- Kibreab, G. (2004). Pulling the wool over the eyes of the strangers: Refugee deceit and trickery in institutionalized settings. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 17(1), 1-25.
- Kim, A. (2006). Focusing on motivating teenagers in local East African communities. *The Seattle Times*, September 1, 2006.
- Kelly, P. (2002). The dangerousness of youth-at-risk: The possibilities of surveillance and intervention in uncertain times. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23(4), 463:476.
- Koch, T. (1996). Implementation of a hermeneutic inquiry in nursing: philosophy, rigor and representation. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 24, 174-184.
- Kubota, R., & Lin, A. (2006). Hard times: Arab TESOL students' experiences of racialization and othering in the United Kingdom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(3), 615-627.
- Kumsa, M. (2004). Sieves and reeds: Identity, cohesion, and be-longing in a glocalizing space. Young Oromos in Toronto. PhD Dissertation. University of Toronto.
- Kumsa, M. (2005a). Shifting spaces of justice and the poetics of be-longing. *New Scholarship in the Human Services*. 4(2), 1-16. Retrieved from: [http://www.ucalgary.ca/files/currents/v4n2\\_kumsa.pdf](http://www.ucalgary.ca/files/currents/v4n2_kumsa.pdf)
- Kumsa, M. (2005b). Between home and exile: The dynamics of negotiating be-longing among Oromos living in Toronto. In Tettey, W. J. & Puplampu, K. P. (2005), *The African Diaspora in Canada: Negotiating identity and belonging* (pp. 150-175). Calgary, Alberta, Canada: University of Calgary Press.

- Kumsa, M. (2006). 'No! I'm not a refugee!' The poetics of be-longing among young Oromos in Toronto. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 19(2), 230-255.
- Kusow, A. (2006). Migration and racial formations among Somali immigrants in North America. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 32(3), 533-551.
- Lam, W. S. (2004). Border discourses and identities in transnational youth Culture. In J. Mahiri (Ed.), *What they don't learn in school: Literacy in the lives of urban youth*. New York: Peter Lang Publishers.
- Lapadat, J. C. (2000). Problematizing transcription: Purpose, paradigm and quality. *Social Research Methodology*, 3(3), 203–219.
- Lapadat, J., & Lindsay, A. C. (1999). Transcription in research and practice: From standardization of technique to interpretive positionings. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 5(1), 64–86.
- Lee, J. A. B. (1994). *The empowerment approach to social work*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lee, S. J. (2001). More than “model minorities” or “delinquents”: A look at Hmong American high school students. *Harvard Education Quarterly*, 34(2), 158-181.
- Lei, J. (2003). (Un)necessary toughness?: Those “loud Black girls” and those “quiet Asian boys.” *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 34(2), 158-181.
- Leonard, K. (1985). Punjabi farmers and California's alien land law. *Agricultural History*, 59(40), 549-562.
- Leonard, K. (1993). Intermarriage and ethnicity: Punjabi Mexican Americans, Mexican Japanese, and Filipino Americans. *Explorations in Ethnic Studies*, 16(2), 147:63.
- Levitt, P., & De La Dehesa, R. (2003). Transnational migration and the redefinition of the state: Variations and explanations. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 26(4), 587–611.
- Levitt, P., & Waters, M. (2002). Introduction. In P. Levitt & M. Waters (Eds.), *The changing face of home: The transnational lives of the second generation* (pp. 1–30). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Lewis, C. (2006). “What's discourse got to do with it?” A meditation on Critical Discourse Analysis in literacy research. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 40(3), 373-379.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Denzin, N. K. (2003). *Turning points in qualitative research: Tying knots in a handkerchief*. Oxford: Altamira Press.
- Lionnett, F. (1995). Introduction, *Logiques métisses: Cultural appropriation and postcolonial representations*. In F. Lionnett (Ed.), *Postcolonial Representations: Women, literature, identity* (pp. 1-21). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

- Lloyd, M. (2005). *Beyond identity politics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lohrentz, K. P. (2004). *Peoples of the Horn in the New African diaspora: Eritrean, Ethiopian, Somali, and Sudanese Émigrés in the United States and Canada*. A Bibliographic Survey. Lawrence KS: Kansas African Studies Center.
- Lowe, L. (1996). *Immigrant acts: On Asian American cultural politics*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Lye, J. (2004). Some post-structuralist assumptions. Retrieved from <http://www.brocku.ca/english/courses/4F70/poststruct.html>
- McLaren, P. (1995). Critical pedagogy and predatory culture: Oppositional politics in a post modern era. New York: Routledge.
- McLaren, P., & Farahmandpur, R. (2001). Teaching against globalization and the new imperialism: toward a revolutionary pedagogy. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(2), 136-150.
- McMichael, C. (2005). Everywhere is Allah's place: Islam and the everyday life of Somali women in Melbourne, Australia. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 15(2), 171-188.
- Maki, K. (2008). Theory on the move: Ama Ata Aidoo's Anowa and the politics of displacement. In F. Toyin, A. Niyi, & A. Adérónké (Eds.), *Migrations and creative expressions in Africa and the African diaspora* (pp. 415-428). Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- Maira, S., & Soap, E. (2004). *Youthscapes: Popular cultures, national ideologies and global markets*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Matsuoka, A., & Sorenson, J. (2000). Eritrean women in Canada: Negotiating. *Canadian Woman Studies/Les Cahiers de la Femme*, 19(3), 104-109.
- Malkki, L. (1994). Citizens of humanity: Internationalism and imagined community of nations. *Diaspora*, 3(1), 41-68.
- Malkki, L. (1995). Refugees and exile: From "Refugee Studies" to the national order of things. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 24, 495-523.
- Massey, D. (1992). A place called home? *New Formations*, 17, 3-15.
- Massey, D. (1994). *Space, place and gender*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Massey, D., & Magaly Sánchez, M. (2010). *Brokered boundaries: Creating immigrant identity in anti-immigrant times*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Mbembe, A. (2001). *On the postcolony*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

- McLaren, P. (2006). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education* (5<sup>th</sup> Ed). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Memmi, A. (1965). *The pillar of salt*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Memmi, A. (1967). *The colonizer and the colonized*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Mendoza-Denton, N. (2008). *Homegirls: Language and cultural practice among Latina youth gangs*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Mhando, L. (2008). Conjuring boundaries: Theorizing migration stories of Sudanese women. In F. Toyin, A. Niyi, & A. Adérónké (Eds.), *Migrations and creative expressions in Africa and the African diaspora* (pp. 429-442). Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- Minh-ha, T. (1989). (Un)Naming Cultures, focusing on ethnography and the politics of representation. *Discourse*, 11(2), 5-18.
- Minh-ha, T. (1990). Woman, Native, Other. *Feminist Review*, 36, 65-75.
- Minh-ha, T. (2011). *Elsewhere, within here: immigration, refugees and the boundary event*. New York: Routledge.
- Mitchell, T. (1988). *Colonizing Egypt*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Mitchell, T. (1990). Everyday metaphors of power. *Theory and Society*, 19, 545-577
- Mishler, E. (1991). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nadji, A., Black, R., & Koser, K. (2001). Refugees and transnationalism: the experience of Bosnians and Eritreans in Europe. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 27(4), 615-634.
- Nadji, A., Black, R., & Koser, K. (2001). The limits to transnationalism: Bosnian and Eritrean refugees in Europe as emerging transnational communities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24(4), 578-600.
- Nakkula, M., & Toshalis, E. (2006). *Understanding youth: Adolescent development for educators*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Ngo, B. (2004). The complexities of difference: "Diversity," race and immigrant identity at an urban high school. PhD dissertation, The University of Wisconsin - Madison, United States. Retrieved ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (Publication No. AAT 3127961).
- Ngo, B. (2008). Beyond "culture clash" understandings of immigrant experiences. *Theory Into Practice*, 47(1), 4-11.
- Nilan, P., & Feixa, C. (2006). *Global youth: Hybrid identities, plural worlds*. New York: Routledge.

- Nsamenang, B. (2002). Adolescence in Sub-Saharan Africa: An image constructed from Africa's triple inheritance. In B.B. Brown, R. Larson, & T. S. Saraswathi (Eds.), *The world's youth: adolescence in eight regions of the globe* (pp. 61-104). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Obeng, S. G. (2008). Language maintenance among Akan-Ghanian immigrants living in the United States. In F. Toyin, A. Niyi, & A. Adérónké (Eds.), *Migrations and creative expressions in Africa and the African diaspora* (pp. 179-218). Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- Ogbu, J. (1987). Variability in minority school performance: A problem in search of an explanation. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 18(4), 262-275.
- Ogbu, J. U. (2008). *Black American students in an affluent suburb: A study of academic disengagement*. Taylor & Francis e-library.
- Ofuho, C. H. (2000). Discourses on liberation and democracy—Eritrean self-views. *The Electronic Review of World Politics*, 1(1).
- Oksala, J. (2007). *How to read Foucault*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Ormiston G., & Schrifly A. (Eds.) (1990). *The hermeneutic tradition from Austin to Ricoeur*. Albany, NY: University of New York Press.
- Ong, A. (1999). *Flexible citizenship: The cultural logics of transnationality*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Papadopoulos, D. (2006). World 2. On the significance and impossibility of articulation. *Culture, Theory and Critique*, 47(2), 165-179.
- Papastergiadis, N. (2005). Hybridity and Ambivalence: Places and Flows in Contemporary Art and Culture. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 22, 39-64.
- Pease, B. (2002). Rethinking empowerment: A Postmodern reappraisal for emancipatory practice. *British Journal of Social Work*, 32, 135-147.
- Popke, E. J. (2003). Poststructuralist ethics: subjectivity, responsibility and the space of community. *Progress in Human Geography*, 27(3), 298-316.
- Portes, A., & Zhou, M. (1993). The new second generation: Segmented assimilation and its variants. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 530, 74-96.
- Portes, A. and Rumbaut, R.G. (2001): *Legacies. The story of the immigrant second generation*. Berkeley, University of California Press; New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Portes, A. & Haller, W., & Guarnizo, L. E. (2003). Assimilation and transnationalism: Determinants of transnational political action among contemporary migrants. *American Journal of Sociology*, 108(6), 1211-1248.

- Potts, D. (1995). Shall we go home? Increasing urban poverty in African cities and migration processes. *Geographical Journal*, 161(3), 245-264.
- Prakash, G. (1990). Subaltern Studies as Postcolonial criticism. *American Historical Review*, 99(5), 1475-1490.
- Rabasa, A. (2009). Radical Islam in East Africa. RAND publications. Retrieved from [http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND\\_MG782.pdf](http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG782.pdf)
- Riser, J. (2008). Hermeneutics and the voice of the other: Re-reading Gadamer's philosophy, "Truth and Method." Retrieved from <http://www.butler.brocku.ca/english/courses/4F70/ph.php>
- Robertson, M., & Rikkinen, H. (2000). Leisure, recreation and young people's every day knowing: A cross cultural perspective of private and public spaces. *Proceedings Commission on Geographical Education, IGU, Kyungui, 7-12*, 127-142.
- Rong, X., & Fitchett, P. (2008). Socialization and identity transformation of Black Immigrant youth in the United States. *Theory into Practice*, 47(1), 35-42.
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Said, E. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Said, E. (1983). *The word, the text, and the critic*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Saleebey, D. (2009). *The strengths perspective in social work practice*. 5<sup>th</sup>. Ed. New York: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
- Sandoval, C. (2000). *Methodology of the oppressed: Theory out of bounds*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Sarroub, L. (2002). In-betweenness: Religion and conflicting visions of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 37(2), 130-148.
- Schwandt, T. (1990). Paths to inquiry in the social disciplines: Scientific, constructivist, and critical theory methodologies. In E. Guba (Ed.). *The paradigm dialog* (pp. 258-276). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Sewpaul, V., & Holscher, D. (2004). *Social Work in times of neoliberalism: A postmodern discourse*. Pretoria, South Africa: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Sharma, S., & Sharma, A. (2003). White Paranoia: Orientalism in the Age of Empire, *Fashion Theory*, 7(3/4), 301-318.
- Shenk, P. S. (2007). "I'm a Mexican, remember?": Constructing ethnic identities via authenticating discourse. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11(2), 194-220.

- Silverman, E. D. (2001). *Interpreting Qualitative Information: Methods for Analyzing Talk, Text and Interaction*. London: Sage. *Qualitative Research* 2(1). Retrieved from <http://qrj.sagepub.com>
- Skeleton, T., & Valentine, G. (1998). Contested identities: Challenging dominant representations of young British Muslim women. In (Eds.) *Cool places: Geographies of youth cultures*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Slack, J. D. (1996). The theory and method of articulation in cultural studies. In D. Morley & K.-H. Chen (Eds.), *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies* (pp. 112-127). London: Rutledge.
- Smith, A. D. (1981). War and ethnicity: the role of warfare in the formation: self-images and cohesion of ethnic communities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 4(4), 375-397.
- Smith, M. K. (2001). Young people, informal education and association. Retrieved from <http://www.infed.org/youthwork/ypandassoc.htm>
- Society for International Development. (2002, Apr 3-6). International Workshop of the Society of International Development. Eugene, OR.
- Sorenson, J. (1990). Opposition, exile and identity: The Eritrean case. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 3(4), 298-319.
- Sorenson, J. (1992). Learning to be Oromo: Nationalist discourse in the diaspora. *Social Identities*. 2(3): 439-467.
- Sorenson, J., & Matsuoka, A. (2001). Phantom wars and cyberwars: Abyssinian fundamentalism and catastrophe in Eritrea. *Dialectical Anthropology*, 26, 37-63.
- Spivak, G. (1995). *The Spivak reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Spivak, G. C. (1999). *A critique of postcolonial reason: Toward a history of the vanishing present*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Spivak, G. C. (1985). Can the subaltern speak? *Wedge*, 7/8, 120-130.
- Stefanos, A. (2000). Eritrean women: defending national borders and challenging gender boundaries. *SAIS Review*, 20(2), 167-181.
- Stephenson, N., & Papadopoulos, D. (2006a). *Analyzing everyday experience: Social research and political change*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stephenson, N., & Papadopoulos, D. (2006b). Outside politics/continuous experience. *Ephemera: Theory & Politics in Organization*, 6(4), 433-453.

- Suarez-O'Rosco, C. (2000). Identities under siege: immigration stress and social mirroring among the children of immigrants. In A. Robben & M. Suarez-Orozco (Eds.), *Cultures under siege: Social violence and trauma*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Suarez-Orozco, C. (2004). Formulating identity in a globalized world. In M. M. Suarez-Orozco & D. B. Qin-Hillard (Eds.), *Globalization: Culture and education in the new millennium* (pp. 173-202). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Suarez-Orozco, C., & Suarez-Orozco, M. (2001). *Children of immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sutton, S. E., Kemp, S., Gutierrez, L., & Saegert, S. (2006). *Urban Youth Programs in America: A Study of Youth, Community, and Social Justice Conducted for The Ford Foundation*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington.
- Swadeber, B. B., & Lubeck, S. (1995). Children and families "at promise." Deconstructing the discourse of risk. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Tettey, W. J., & Puplampu, K. P. (2005). *The African Diaspora in Canada: Negotiating identity and belonging*. Calgary, AB: University of Calgary Press.
- Thurlow, C. (2009). Speaking of Difference: Language, Inequality and Interculturality. In R. Halualani & T. Nakayma (Eds). *Handbook of critical intercultural communication*. London: Blackwell.
- Tisdall, S. (2007). Eritrea: victim or the newest rogue state? *The Guardian, World Briefing*. Thursday September 20, 2007.
- Touraine, A. (2000). *Can we live together? Equality and difference* (D. Macey, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Touzard, R. (2010). A critical constructionist view of "at-risk" youth in alternative education. Ph.D. dissertation, Loma Linda University, United States -- California. Retrieved December 4, 2011, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text. (Publication No. AAT 3414035). <http://udini.proquest.com/view/a-critical-constructionist-view-of-goid:578530707/>
- Tronvoll, K. (2004). "National service" in Eritrea: A metaphor of oppression. Retrieved from: <http://www.awate.com>
- Tuan, Yi-Fu. (1980). Uprootedness and sense of place. *Landscape*, 25, 3-8.
- Turton, D. (2005). The meaning of place in a world of movement: Lessons from long-term field research in Southern Ethiopia. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 18(3), 258-280.
- The Urban Institute. (2012). Data from the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series datasets drawn from the 2005 - 2009 American Community Survey. Retrieved from The Urban Institute, <http://www.urban.org>

- Vattimo, G. (1997). *Beyond interpretation: The meaning of hermeneutics for philosophy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Vayas, S. (2004). We are NOT all terrorists!: Listening to the voices of Muslim high school students in the post September 11 era. *E-Journal of Teaching & Learning in Diverse Settings*, 1(2), 222-236. Retrieved from <http://subr.edu/coeducation/ejournal>
- Vidino, L., Pantucci, R. & Kohlmann, E. (2010). Bringing global jihad to the Horn of Africa: Al Shabaab, western fighters, and the sacralization of the Somali conflict. *African Security*, 3, 216-238.
- Vorih, L., & Rosier, P. (1978). Rock Point Community School: An example of a Navajo-English bilingual elementary school program. *Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages* 12(3). Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3586053>.
- Ward, D. & Mullender, A. (1991). Empowerment and oppression: An indissoluble pairing for contemporary social work. *Critical Social Policy: A Journal of Theory and Practice in Social Welfare*, 11(32), 21-30.
- Waters, M. (1994). Ethnic and racial identities of second-generation black immigrants in New York City. [Special issue.] *International Migration Review*, 28(4), 795-820.
- Waters, M. C. (1999). *Black identities: West Indian immigrant dreams and American realities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Watts, M., & Ebbutt, D. (1987). More than the sum of the parts: research methods in group interviewing. *British Educational Research Journal*, 3, 25-34.
- Wetherell, M. (2004). Themes in discourse research: The case of Diana. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse theory and practice: A reader* (pp. 14-28). London: Sage.
- Wetherell, M., & Taylor, S. (2001). *Discourse as information: A guide for analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Wetherell, M., Taylor, S., & Yates, S. (2004). *Discourse as theory and practice: a reader*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Whitehead, L. (2004). Enhancing the quality of hermeneutic research: decision trail. *Journal of Advanced Nursing Research*, 45(5), 512-518.
- Windle, J. (2004). Schooling, symbolism and social power: The hijab in republican France. *The Australasian Educational Researcher*, 31(1), 95-112.
- Windle, J. (2008). The racialization of African youth in Australia. *Social Identities: Journal for the Study of Race, Nation and Culture*, 14(5), 553-566.

- Wise, (1991). Violent women: Questions for feminist theory, practice and policy. *Critical Social Policy: A Journal of Theory and Practice in Social Welfare*, 21(1), 7-34.
- Witkin, S. L. (2011). Social construction and social work practice: Interpretations and innovations. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Witkin, S., & Saleebey, D. (2007). Social work dialogues: Transforming the canon in inquiry, practice, and education. Alexandria, VA: CSWE Press.
- Wofinger, N. (2002). On field note writing: Collection strategies and background expectancies. *Qualitative Research*, 2(1), 58-95.
- Wrong, M. (2005). *I didn't do it for you. How the world betrayed a small African nation*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Xie, P. F., & Ibrahim, A. (2007). Gazing the Hood: Hip-Hop as tourism attraction. Retrieved from <http://www.halifuosumare.com/publications.html>
- Young, I. M. (1990). The ideal community and the politics of difference. In L. J. Nicholson (Ed.), *Feminism/Postmodernism* (pp. 300-323). New York: Routledge.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (2006). Belonging and the politics of belonging. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 40, 196-212.
- Zhou, M. (1997). Segmented Assimilation: Issues, Controversies, and Recent Research on the New Second Generation. *International Migration Review* 31(4), 975-1008.
- Zhou, M., & Bankston, C. L. III. (2001). Family pressure and the educational experience of the daughters of Vietnamese refugees. *International Migration*, 39, 133-151.
- Zhou, M. (2003). Urban education: Challenges in educating culturally diverse children. *Teachers College Record*, 105, 208-225.
- Zine, J. (2000). Redefining resistance: Towards an Islamic subculture in schools. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 3, 293-316.
- Zine, J. (2001). Muslim youth in Canadian schools: Education and the politics of religious identity. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 32, 399-423.
- Zine, J. (2006). Unveiled sentiments: Gendered Islamophobia and experiences of veiling among Muslim girls in a Canadian Islamic school. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 39, 239-252.
- Zine, J. (2007). Safe havens or religious "ghettos"? Narratives of Islamic schooling in Canada. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 10, 71-92.
- Zwangobani, K. (2008). From diaspora to multicultural: In search of a youthful Pan-African identity. *The Australasian Review of African Studies*, 29(1 & 2), 51-65.

**APPENDICES**



## B. Letter of Cooperation from Agencies

To: HWD2.D Subjects Review Administrator

From: [REDACTED]

Date: February 1, 2011; zws Re: [REDACTED]

Letter of Cooperation To

Whom It May Concern:

I am writing with respect to the HWJ12.0 Subjects Application submitted by Aster S. Teele. Aster is the Principal Investigator for the, "Wherein lies youth 'home'? Interpreting Home of Africa youth discourse and the politics of displaced youth" study and is working in collaboration with [REDACTED]

Aster has the permission to conduct the above named study, using focus group and participant observations in collaboration with our agency, and assist her to recruit participants for her study from our youth program.

The researcher will do the following:

- Apply for and be in compliance with the University of Washington's HWTWI Subjects Committee
- Conduct the participant observations and focus group within the guidelines of expected [REDACTED] events and activities
- Provide supplies needed for the study
- Maintain emergency contact information for participants
- Coordinate the project

The agency will do the following:

- Provide fliers to recruit volunteers/youth participants
- Recruit youth program participants
- Provide contact information of participants' parents (if needed) to sign consent form
- Provide access to students for focus group
- Provide meeting space for the focus group
- Provide information of youth events and activities for participant observation
- Collaborate (if desired) with project clarifications about events and activities.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

### C. Letter to Parents

University of Washington  
 School of Social Work  
 410115th Ave. NE  
 Seattle, WA 98105

RECEIVED Human  
 Subjects Division

JAN 05 2010

**UW**

11 December, 2009

Re: A Research Study of Hom of Africa Youth in Youth Programs

Dear Mr/Ms. \_\_\_\_\_

I am a Ph.D. student in Social Welfare Program in the School of Social Work, University of Washington. I am conducting a research project with Hom of Africa agencies where your child participates in the agency's youth program. I am writing this letter to inform you about my research and to ask for permission to recruit your child to participate in the study.

My research study focuses on the experiences of Hom of Africa youth in youth programs. The study will inform youth program designers to improve their program and better serve Hom of Africa youth. It is also my expectation that the study will be used for further research on African immigrants, for which there is limited studies. I hope to begin my study starting from 15 January, 2010.

The study includes participant observations whereby I will observe the youth in their activities and events, and focus group discussions about youth experiences in youth programs. If you agree, your child will participate in a group of ten to fifteen youth to discuss how they feel about the program, what activities they are involved in and how they benefited from the youth program. A second focus group discussion will be held in 15 March, 2010, with the same group, to verify and allow participants to make sure that the research report represents the information shared in the focus group discussion.

Your child's participation in the study is voluntary and he or she may withdraw at any time without penalty. If I find that your child shares information that lets me know that he or she intends to harm himself or herself and others, I will take appropriate actions to inform the proper authorities. In addition, **if** your child becomes upset during the group discussion, I will refer your child to appropriate service-giving agencies in Seattle.

The name of your child will remain confidential and will not be identified. There will be no information attached to your child's identity. Codes will be assigned to his or her name and separating these codes from materials that have his or her name. The information your child shares in the group discussions will not be used for other purposes in the program, school or other institutions.

In case your child feels uncomfortable talking about his or her personal experiences in a group, you are assured that the information he or she shares will be kept confidential. The study will assign codes to the children's names and no names of participants will be on the study data or on any publications from the research.

Please feel free to ask questions through [redacted] youth program staff by calling: [redacted]. Your child could also contact me through email, [astert@uw.edu](mailto:astert@uw.edu). However, confidentiality of information sent by e-mail is not guaranteed.

Please sign and return the enclosed Consent Form to [redacted].  
Program if you like your child to be part of the study.

Thank you for considering this request.

**Sincere**

-  
Doctoral Candidate  
University of Washington, School of Social Work

## D. Parent Consent Forms

**APPROVED**

Feb 0" 2010

UW Human Subjects  
Review Committee

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON  
PARENT CONSENT FORM

Focus Group with Hom of Africa Youth

RECEIVED  
Human Subjects Division

JAN 05 2010

**UW**

Researcher:

**Aster Teclé, Ph. D. Candidate, School of Social Work.**

Contact:

Faculty Advisor:

Susan Kemp, Associate Professor, School of Social Work.

David Allen, Director, Women's Studies.

We are asking your child to be in a research study. The purpose of this consent form is to give you the information you will need to help you decide whether you accept your child to be in the study or not. Please read the form carefully. You may ask questions about the purpose of the research, what we would ask the child to do, the possible risks and benefits, his or her rights as a volunteer, and anything else about the research or this form that is not clear. When we have answered all your questions, you can decide if you want your child to be in the study or not. This process is called "informed consent." We will give you a copy of this form for your records.

### PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

**Youth** Program aims to create a safe space for African immigrant youth where they can talk about their social, cultural and political issues. The purpose of this study is to understand how Eritrean immigrant youth talk about their experiences in s youth program. The study seeks to understand how the way youth talk about themselves can be interpreted to understand how they represent themselves. The way youth talk about themselves influences their everyday interactions at home, the school and in the neighborhood. The findings of this study will assist the program staff to improve program designs for Hom of Africa youth, and immigrant youth in general. Research about Hom of Africa youth in the U.S. is limited and the researcher will use this information for further studies to provide more knowledge about Hom of Africa immigrants and youth.

### STUDY PROCEDURES

With your permission, the researcher will compile information about youth experiences at — and ask your child to participate in a focus group of 10 to 15 youth that will take 1:30 to 2:00 hours maximum. The focus group involves or conversation on topics related to youth reflections about their experiences in program, and efforts to address youth issues amongst Hom of African immigrant youth in the Seattle Area. A second focus group will be held in 15 March, 2010 with the same group to verify and allow participants to make sure that the research report represents the information shared in the focus group discussion.

In a focus group, all members should respect some basic principles, including:

- Focus group starts with the basic value that all participants are equal and have equal say in the conversation.

- Respect to all group members regardless of their age, race, ethnicity, religion, and background.
- Group members should keep everything that is said and discussed within the group confidential.
- Each member of the group respects the ideas or perspectives of a group member regardless of whether all members agree with what has been said or disagree.
- All members have equal chance of participating in the discussion so that all voices could be heard.

Participation is strictly voluntary and your child may withdraw at any time.

The discussions will be recorded (audio taped) and transcribed. The information will be stored at University of Washington in a password protected computer. The audio tapes (from focus groups) will be kept in a locked file. Only members of the researcher's dissertation committee may have access to the data.

Your child will be given an opportunity to discuss the report of the study. The recorded discussions will be transcribed and audiotapes will be destroyed by August 2010. The transcribed records will be analyzed and used for publications only by the researcher.

#### RISKS, STRESS, OR DISCOMFORT

There are some risks for participating in the study. Your child may feel uncomfortable talking about his or her personal experiences in a group. He or she may also worry that someone will find out what he or she said during the discussion. The study will guard confidentiality by assigning codes to the children's names and separating files and forms that have his or her name. Analysis will be done on files without the names of participants.

All information your child provides will be confidential with two exceptions. These exceptions are as follows:

- Harm to oneself, that is, if your child shares information that lets the researcher know he or she intends to harm him or herself.
- Harm to others, that is, if your child shares information that lets the researcher know he or she intends to harm others.

If the researcher finds that what your child share may meet these two exceptions, she will take appropriate actions to inform the proper authorities. In addition, if your child becomes upset during the group discussion, the researcher will refer your child to appropriate service giving agencies in Seattle.

The decision to take part in this study is entirely up to you and your child. You or your child may withdraw at any time. There will be no consequence if your child refuses to participate and his or her decision will be private and confidential. It will not affect your child's participation in the program that provides. None of the data collected will be linked to the child individually or as a student; and none of the information will be released to his or her school or other youth

**APPROVED**

July 1, 2010

programs and institutions. Furthermore, during the discussion, your child can skip any of the topics under discussion if he or she does not want to share his or her ideas.

#### BENEFITS OF THE STUDY

The study will inform \_\_\_\_\_ about Hom of Africa immigrant youth. Agencies involved in youth programs will also benefit from the study. As participants, the study will help the youth to share and analyze their experiences, and respond to the pressures youth and other immigrant youth encounter. Your child may not directly benefit from participation in this study.

#### OTHER INFORMATION

Your child may refuse to participate and he or she is free to withdraw from this study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which he or she is otherwise entitled.

Contact information is necessary in case of follow up interviews for clarification is required. All individual data will be coded by fictional names. The link between the fictional names and the contact information will be kept in a password protected computer to which only the researcher has access. The linking information will be destroyed in August 2010.

Government or university staff sometimes review studies such as this one to make sure they are being done safely and legally. If a review of this study takes place, your child's records may be examined. The reviewers will protect your child's privacy. The study records will not be used to put your child at legal risk of harm.

---

Printed name of study staff obtaining consent      Signature      Date

#### Parent's Statement

This study has been explained to me. I support my child volunteer to take part in this research. I have had a chance to ask questions. If I have questions later about the research, I can ask the researcher listed above. If I have questions about my child's rights as a research subject, I can call the Human Subjects Division at (206) 543-0098. I will receive a copy of this consent form.

Tigrigna version

APPROVED  
 FEB 05 2010  
 UW Human Subjects  
 Review Committee

የዩናይትድ ስቴትስ ዋሽንግተን  
 የወላጅ ፈቃድ ፎርም

RECEIVED  
 Human Subjects Division  
 FEB 01 2010

ትኩረት ያለው ቡድን ከመልታይ ሜዲያ ትሬንስፕሬንሽን ሪሶርስ ኢንስቲትዩት ጋር UW

ጥናት አድራጊው/ዋ አስቴር ተክሌ የፕሌን ጻፈ ብቁ ተማሪ በሶሻል ስራ ትምህርት/ቤት

የመገናኛ ቁጥር: [Redacted]

foi:ODJ|OtD-hfi:A h"?H · (u.r) h.9"T, I\{l\... TC',C,fiC f(li\VA ♡ ·-l-9"UC-l- l (L.)

J>..itMt1 h1·c, f\·f.l- "ll-l-


f9"lmt. PJ ለ P' ለ9"lY.clro- fl"l:., ;,rue:, 1-tttA ro-.ll ftLU f J>G:C9"  
 P'l M"l MA PJ M"?..ft.ro- 1"l:., ለt>fl't- f"7.J'fi1-APJ:.,1 M 'l'l. 'l/lfl- 1looflm:.,  
 1-t:f-l\ ro-u MhPJ G:Cao-1 OY.9"ll J'1110'u tt."l:n 9"1 1Y.9"lmt.J>:./4>ro-T  
 f"?.ft.ro-11'9"l 1--1:11 fl.lro/9" f{.}1001 J> 'S :. J'Y.t.lm-1!fro-1 oo-o:.,r tD/9"  
 fb\·1-1 1t:1-1' ለtW 1"l:., ro.er G:C9" "l11 J'l'o-t:.,1 ለtJ't-1: 1'J<t t'tlPJ ለmt.<t  
 t.l'11\~u 1'1:9'1-1 Oao-1- hoot\fl 0 '1 A"l:PJ O'J'l-l ro-fi'J' 1 111 rot.?" 1 1.111  
 f"?:.1.9'...1 Mt9" ለtDfl't .e':fill\~ u

የጥናቱ ዋና ዓላማ

[Redacted] ft>IJ).f:f Tt:" 9" :.h-l-1: 01'1'SH  
 በሚገኙት ወጣት h. fro-J")'l h....,u.r- O""UO't-t:7 011UI\l OTI\Tt't 1--'W-'f lit.  
 ro-,e,e:, 1.1'fC hoo lJ" ;t- 1\0Dfi:tnC ro-u fti.U 1"l:., 'P'l 11"1 01'1'S :. f"?.rf.-l-  
 tDIJ} h.C} ro-J'1 ለtV9" :fro- [Redacted]  
 ft>IJ).f:f Tt:"/ 9" 1J>:., 1Y."7.. 71 1oot.-l ro-u 1"lil f"?..mt.+ro- OJlJ-1: 1J!.:.,  
 h C1tD- fl\ ለ:fm- 1Y."7.. ?1 'l Otf.U9" h.?lJ"?.. }J>.:l- 'l:fro-1 1Y."7..t>hi\ 1\ODl. :.,  
 ro-u ft>IIJ'II fM.?1C u- ;t- Of<?>' OCL;t:fro-r 0-l?"UC-l CL;t:fro- 1.lto-9" Otf'l :fro-  
 f"?.:':f:ro-1 u-);:t- t<>/. Au fti.U 'J'l:., ro-m:., 1\UDA:rJ, lli-'tJ' -)-&."}?J (ICfl  
 h.)fl-tf:f.-) rofi}.Y:f Tt:"/ 9" (1·1· Tt:'? oo-1 1J>:., 009" :. "1Y. 'i.AT  
 0".9"m 1 1·} t>llJ·Y·f Oh-A "1J!.:., Tt:'? ao-1 "liff\l ""}Y..!l. &\9" t.l. ለu Oh<t tt  
 co-(11' MI!C1 ).fi: hfi: t't J'l\ro- 'J'l-l- 0"19" ro-(11 Mtfl' J'l:., 1'00 "7 9'1- t.U1  
 h.lG:C>t7ilMl\m 1"l:.,'1 ll\l!C1 ).fi: hfi: t) tD<>:., 1.1'fC J' C.?l\u

የጥናቱ መመሪያ

በራሱም ፈቃድነት ጥናት ተመራማሪው ወጣቶች [Redacted]  
 ያላቸውን ልምድ እንዲሁም ልጅዎን በሚመሰረተው ከ10 እስከ 15 በሚሆኑ ትኩረት  
 ባለው ቡድን ከ1:30 እስከ 2:00 ሰዓት ባለበለጠ እንዲሳተፉ ለማድረግ ነው። ይህ ትኩረት ያለው

0· ' } M  O·t·IIJ'  
 '1-:;f:"f "'f. II>.f.f."f. H}Jt'a"CT  
 "IIA'?'ii"-H- nM:bi! 1?7f"f ont]hl\ J'lldJo') TGT .ew.?'t-l\:: IJ""tHfT O-  
 fi"IC"f 15, 2010 CJ9" hliJ"" h'IOGUJo 0· ' } ;JC nontn f:l!G'a>- T 0-l-htrllfJ'i"IT  
 ll- '1- /lt11 h1J!"1,mh1V"IG;J'J' h1.tdG"i f.f.9"t-A::J

- t'IIU ·HI-GT J'lJaJo fi- ' } V-Λ-9" M"-l- onfIG;I<fl ftf'- ononbJ'P'r } "/hOC f. <;'Ctt:'f'l'  
 • .eu-"l-h-GT J'lJaJo II-11"1- ' }9" M"-l- on(IG;t-'e Otf't- 1-P,f" f M"-l-1 O""hOC  
 h1-t-**II** OujJo.f.f.-/- '1.1. .e'J't-l\::  
 • Λ'7111a>9" "' "'- hM -tr hP:-l-1 hrrer h11 C'I-l-r h/f. "'l:-l-1 honftfl\.-} - aJo"f."  
 J'h-llt- Λ"  
 • hJ"}P, }fO - 't- M"-l- 00 - 'l- tJJo/l'f f"Y. mGa>-1f"onlMJh-l- M-'l-9" trI  
 "" } - }- "YhOC on?- J'fl l\;JA::  
 • f'J'J'1a>9" 'J°6 h}Jlfl"7 lJilU 11"1-9" M"-l- OMI-A'IT t:J""f:ftJJo } fonflm-l-1  
 fonft1" h Λ M:ftJJo

f.U „lt-l-1.": On1L..4!"f1+ IIIΛtf'l'Λ 1' (J""?) tJJo'J' 1)1. on(l)JJJ-} f."f"l\ u a>-f...ei: (J 'J'6  
 on.f1f D'JittJ' ,... -f ..e<tonfrll\ u f"l, flnflnaJo " .lt.":C"l.O } O"l, fltn.C 0"1, <#>on'J' ;rflmc  
 „,m114> }ifC/H: '1'01'?,., } 0"1.?'f.+ II'J'1.i:C" f f.<tonfrll\ u hrw '2 11 f.,?TtJJo f fJ.  
 C.,j( 04-..el tJJo/l'J' f.<l>onfrll\ u f.U } ;f>( li.Y'l'f. f'?...fl\ -l- 1"1:l: } f"l,on&a>- 11"1,1: 111-  
 'ltJJo

Λ 1' nrw b?CT f, \_?TtJJo } 1"1-l- 1\JJo.e.e+ f"7;f>G11 h Λ ..ettG'l'/:s fltJJo.e.e-l-  
 f.,< >P,m- h1"ontt?O 0 "1 i:J: OMil+ 2010 f.?m"/:λ u ..eu on1111 "' .ē N-<J>onmaJo  
 h1"m'i"O-l- OM 0"1"5a>- ?1\111 111- 1\611" f.<l>CfJAn

**ቸግር፣ ሃሳብ ወይም አለመመቸት**

nrw 1"1-l- nontt., ?J "1"11" f?c" f fl.lfc ..e" f"l\ u Λ 1' nn- ., tJJo/l'f MM1- mf.r  
 M&l. ?- "f. nn-aJofl'f flon'i" C 1' "" .efl"lm- m..er "'f.fl"1-l- ..e" f"l\ a: M·m.e9" h!..  
 nrw m.e.e+ a>-ll'J' M:l'i" ?Gm- m.e9" ll/\-l'i"1G"fm- ..e;ND;f>11/\ nnt/\ 1\J'ft{(Jm- m..er  
 1\J'ttM+ f. f\Λ ..etri"/:λ u 1"1-f: ..eu1 ?-P, ..e "l, ll'J't-<E'i" "M: "7"7'5 (J'f' f1"flf ll9" 1V:Jt  
 flJD (lon(lm- "'-1 (J-f-ΛJf 4-..e:/\1 t.:CUD J'II4>9""1/:λ u '9"TI' f"l, flmm- 1JD'9" CJ.e'l+  
 fl"1t;l'k?J'f } flJD tt.em< >) 'lm-u

- v-Λ-9" hΛ 1' f+?Ta>- ".lt.":C"l.7il hJ-l-l- 'l'c" f O<f>C O<>dl'fC f"l,mO.f ..etf'l\::  
 MIW9" f"l,h.,.Λ-T f.tfi"Λ-a  
 • &ll } on?-P,-l-1 ..eu9" Λ 1' ".lt.":C01J.7i't-) 0"7IJ /λ 1"1-l- "1"5m- hl-t'JJo;f>  
 fl!G?If m.er &(). } 1lon?-P,-j- fl!G'1 m.eJ' } f}M/f "f  
 • lbfl""f } f"l,)P,I ..eur 1:/: ?J " .lt.":C"l.7i't-1 0""t"l!L\ 1"1-l- ""f"fm- h}.C.;JJo;f>  
 t'il!G1!f m..er f,fl""f } 1lon?-'-l- t"lM/f

f'f"t "1"5a>- MIW1 V-ΛT T?Cf- Λ 1' J"J.//Λ III' t)uo'IO-l-ff ?-"f. } 1"l,J'()LΛ?m-  
 flflIIIITJ } l""?tm.P -"1-?ll-:1r:: n.,.al. ""trΛ 1' nrw tJJo.e.e+ rh'>Y+ M- nttQ;)(f 1"1+  
 ""fm- 1\Y-l-l m-l'J' 1"7..11-/-"ll"-1. ,, ,l' ?fl + U1"1h- ml!, fl\ -l- YM· ""VA OVED

·Eb 0 i; z0t0

UW num.:>:,JOJacts  
 Review Committee



Amharic version

PPI, OVED

Oll  
= L e.  
"t:lj() 'T" (Focus Group) JD() t-fl +Ct >tU? 111'1'1ou') I'Y-l-

IP('t?.Y.1 iicc\':1:  
'If. tDAJt ID/JA t.CJD

fllihVEtJ  
Human Su>J>>PJJov0;JOn

FEB 01 1010  
uw

./tJDb-"Jt l-- MI-I;C - Vitit: 'Cll" f. J. •Mtf. t (t)J; f.-l-) flfl.A J,lf. (l'ij'A roch  
<ll. flAh.

ፋክልቲ

- (pr) h?DTs>thM-l- TC:LIIC: flh·A >tt: fl7iYA men  
J!Q >ttf): -':f.lhi'C1 (J).OD; } fl;t-Jt()

01- h-9" >tIJ 'If. ou') (l)"-}- ODT'lb-1: hl'li'tt: ',fa-f. >t/\t;n Jll"J t:f)ll m·JJA  
ID-JA:h-9" >tll'L ouT;t:M: MI' n-TID-,..., 1nm"luh-9" h. :: -on-oL-l-h-9"  
'f'fl') i>h-9" >t'{-fl-}9"u -flflJll /J"J t;f.'fl od1"1/Ji: hT·lt-ln ID-JA h-?D } :J'f.  
h111C h9"h),fa-f;t;to: h;JT?D 1fl1 A flh ;t;-}-) 1JA"l;t--l-)s >tll'II ODT;t;J'f:  
11 Af1:;/t- tl-l-/1'1,...U^9/IP ou(lA'), 1fl1) t]A1J·Mll'rl ouf\t;1Jt mf. "'1 rf.  
tD/JA n-l-m-1: -l-11 ^- h."fr:JDu m-JA 'h-9" >t-ttL ouT't;Jt hl'l,...tt: u^h-9" m.Y:J'-l-  
?D(t OD"7it;Ah-9" ti-TID-fl.,(Do) -l-ll fl. h.1J?Dii

ዕለም ናደዢ መጽናዕት

M"J ou.(!-} ou'} flY-l- -l-tJA  
'>tfi:t:J>ID-) ou') (l,r)-

7^ti-JID-11-PrY-l- h·f'ff.A· 111i f. fl;t- 19"tt:"lc h.u M"? t;f.'tL ODT'flJ-1; >t-t'r'l  
OD.(!-fl 111'1"4 ou') flY-l- •(tflJil -r-ounc:Mu ');t-J'. h9"111ll. ')JDC-Prh. :: MI  
(oB1\1J-t: od') flYT -{lf/lll .,odtiC>-9" htf/) -')hi\o1. >tltt;f>id-)'" M!.,;t-1-  
11·flJll -)fl(19" rll99" >t/ ->t } JDC-Prhm"lthf h.n Hflf>-9",ou'} (J'-}- >t-o n.-l-  
-l-9"UC·b 1tf') >t-o MO. ltfm.Y:JJD' 11199" ODIJA:t'!! Ch11 ro·'} hih-flC t'-f.:  
01·J/h.-l- tff.'ll ODT'vjJ:t 'ouJ!11-l- ou'} (l,r)- 11fh'}T'fr flt-iM. ;t--1- -l-fJA +ct  
>t tjJ> od 111'-9" }hOD-t'J'.if')s -fl·ltLif "'J }t).f"9" OD') (y)-}- 11 1\ odJllJ·  
19"9"J11t\') dlii"111 ll.f.u -fltf)-fl tll cf>ct >..ttlt; t;-(l >..outt, ll,...(ll; OD')h(l.f-l-  
Hll· ODT;t;t) 01-,ft.h.n )ll OD1'tfM: -f·t)J'.Ull -f·out-"Jt-l- "'1 H: t)fl'II  
UDT;t;")-f: 11Ch11.l,(o&.;J- -fltl)!J >tt:tjJ>m·f} (1.(11";1·)- of·mfl"fi. ODT'IIJ-l: 'y'fi-f·tJ.ፈ.  
n-l-T+oufl. h.f'::

አገባብ መጽናዕት

1Jii:Jl' fl.?:D: htf ·'DDt-OJtT -flfl)ll >t-fl (JD fl OD') (l.f-)-  
(1-I-;t-1· on} hflY-l· flfiPl?D -fODtiC;J-1· ·tltt.:J· h-l-hh·fl

ኢ.ዩ.ኤ. ውላድኩም ደማ

"11 10 hll11 15 111'1- UD} (l.f-)- 11 hn."t 7'f:fl } (1 -)-} t.{j|>} 111itv.} hll-f- h..f./fu tf. "11111 uo" Cj/J:t "G:tJfl "l<:-T" (Focus Group) f-0'//:\n "G = t'J Ili' uo t.ll flf-1- uo} (lf-)- '11'1/Jfl 111 (19" "C l'l-1;1\*...}: Cj'f.'ll "11 11Ch11 uo 11 uo} (lf-)- llflsP9" ..uon£!"} 1h•l- .f. tJ /:\ 111i -l- uot.'ll h.f.n tJ/\\"f- "G:tJfl "t<:T" "11 15 uo.70.-1-: 2010 "cp ITD' 11- .,"hn .ttl&.:;1'-l- 11/\h/J h9"1JofUD1J1 } 'J11•f•IJ•,f.fl. 1-)/f-)- 11(J)oh/\'} llf.tv-)1/\'} }9"1V6-f:} flD(l'fflD h11';J• 1'-f-11 111<: OD} (l.f-)-h 19"/tlt'Jfh.,fn

h11 "G:t)(l "l<:Tt" fl.floflD h11/\-l- h'fi•t<:SJ' 11"1(11.9" UO(V;1'O>-..f") OD-)-h-)- hfICD.:s }ft-f-9" U?!

- "G:lll " "T" h-tt-9" h11^\-l- 1 -'l-:11 U?Jl. h9"11'ft-t-1 1h•tt.fr ll'JiJl. uoM-l- h9"111199"} f-"9"}u
  - /J tJDa /J1,-l-a %f.U?i-l-} ;J• -tj 'ihl. 11f.;l'} 111ff? (l '}'fi..floV0 M^\-l- 9"1iilC::
  - IM• 'o}Jl OD l.li 1fNJCtlfl. 1 -)/J-)-} -lfl11-l-} 1'ft-ttt:t 9"fltn.t. 111<:;9
- tD CijJ 9"(1 IJ/\h •ll.frfll.)n
- h-1f- "11/\ t; 11tl. roh ,,,,11-l-1 c +1 -l-11 1G:1 llf.-1-/llf.- ?...:1 1111fl 1'1 -t/fl111C::
  - tJ.floV" "11^\,... Cj'f. 9"fl:Jotj: o'J/Jl. UD(1:A "fiSJ'V"u

"11'11 1-f-11 9"1'1;/tt: 11tmfl'}:1' M111i: tvo\ ll-?" "11 1ff•"111. h11h?Clt -l-1i /:\ h.f./!::

t n-l- -l- m ll'J 11-t "11 1:T flCC hi-1.1V} h"-11 h.f.n kf: 11f"hn -'10&.:/' "11 'Pitl"1-f} f).'oCt'l.t 11V"1ltn.6-1'19" (code f1) 11-t'P,t,(l flS""Tf.i'C h/J4>11 h.f.u t 111:T flCC 111-:ft." 111. "11 /)10>- (l:J' n6Cf11 h.f.u "11^\-l- t:f-1.; OD Cj/Jt fl"Y.t 'rt--))l(1?"/JSJ OD(1:A U/\S1'9"::

tvoil ll-9" -t: 111'11 OD1\;61:11:fc11 "11.1{11 hlt-l-M• uo(lf:\ MSJ'/Pu 1: 11-t<fc" )l-)-q;- 9"11 i'f{tl,t, "7 "11 "•?"11 2010 1J11 Ti> m.l{"" h9"111itD'} h'OC h,f.: -f: 11-t.f{tltt, "11.1{11 }l-)- J-l-} } 1hdt-f'9"} JP llfi'P ;J• 1'11D6-UfJT 'rt.h.fu

**ካደጋታት፣ ጭንቀት፣ ወይ ደግ ዘይምቕላን**

"11'11 OD1Cj'J:f: V"fl;Jo ,, ,...?;T;° dU/\\$1' f.li /:\ h.f.u tvo\ h-9" 11'1/Jfl tvo\;J>f! 1-uone;Jo1;t;J- "11 C, -1Jl.-l-l- M-l- h-l-ltdlf.11 uf-Y..fl.m U? llf.-l-lll <l'fl't n-l-ltdl1iro 1 Nf.li /:\ h.f.: 11'1/J11'f: 111•1t.ntn+ ?).l.f-l- IJA>-l- hf.(lro- -l-t.cu •... lim.'}" t; 1-ft t- t m.,l,flH. }?"dt\O>- "1111 uofCj'J-f: "1'1"/1- 1- tt1• t o()V"fltn.t. hfla<J-l- (codes fl.i;1) h-l-IJ,,,f.u 11'ft"flil'J.Y.9" 1111? ' (1• '7 1111'1: fl-H- liMP ••1•t./\f. n•f-'111 h,f.u :;0'}-t(j' Cj'f.'ll OD1Cj'J1; h'OC 1hflO " ? "fl"11H- Cj'f-'119" - t'l't 1-t Mn"-1 } h.. f.: t. PF 1-r)\l

ID"t h-9" 11Ufl •lftJt;J- h-ft ID'),fl't-t hU/\P' h.f.: ·Ou.etl h/\·t ft..f:t- h-I;J-t-: 1fl't-1 llfJš

- Hlfl11 9"1·P;: "?M· W·lt 'h-9" Hlft./1 t:t-/M · TīJl.,l,{l1) h?"llft•ft 'l;J- •t-oot'"tT hl·t P;>t >tfJkft.'f/t;J-:
- 11-JA,\T 9"1·P; : tlJft r W·t h-9" 'IAM· oul (l.f."f t:t-/tJ1 4-/f, l,fl11 h?"llft•'1 'l;- -t-oot.llfJtT hl·fP;>t >tfJLMrl't;J-::

(J)o h-9" fJ11'tn 11-t-m[-l] tJA-t- h-'l:'r t1:t-ll111c ;,;eu'l>1 h9"Hft- :J- -t-oot-'"Jt-r ?"fl . "f.tA'r• 1119"Ah.f9" M-PA11J1 lh:t-T"C 1·9"1: tJ:t-w(lh.J': 11-t-W'li.s>t1'l'1: "11. ll-' ID"t h-9" 9"(1 11if<fA: >t11 11Chll- "O>t1A.Ift•t- 111UO:t-l}ft."f h-l-w-hf!9" h.J':

>t1'l'1 OD lf(t 19"1'l'1ll' 'l:t-h-9"1 lf.e ID"t h-9"1 ID'fl). h.f.:s 'fl"fi-9" w;f; tltJ (J)o h-9" >t11 111i'l ll' >t1'l'tt OD lf/)1; fJ11 9"1'l;1-if: h1·4>C :t'fi ft· h.li-9":s 9"-kt- h-9" flilll.lf·r >t.enuAP'1 h.f.s 119"flm.c "" h-1'·11 h.f.u ID"t h-9" >0J't lf f. oo'} flJ'T 00 11 '))ll'jof't;: >t.&hill'1>11 h.f.u 111'l'1 -'10&;1- 9"(1 lf f. ID"t h-9" OP111(l >t.&t-t>t'flfC') h.f. 11111'1 OD IT• 0..T T9"UC-t: f/l 1-JA,\T :t-l'J't-t >t.erruc.?ih> h.f.u 11-t-rol'li.s ID"t h-9" h·t'tfft. llf.:t-!Hf. ft. >tc M;J-t- 9"1'l 11U/\m.: n:t-llfl"C' t'..fiA h.f./f::

11/\ ;1-T lff.'tt OD lf/11:

rt ou lfil1: >tll't-t- .fllA >t1A"ft-t- 11·Mil fJ11 <t'c'l. M':t:J' 111·M- on") flf-r ,n&;J- hl.'tlfl-ft h.f"9"u IJA,\t- 9"1'l fl 1·;J- ou'} (lf.; 11fC'·-l-l)ft-t- DtJ fJ111 OD lf/)1; hliM h\_f}u h9" offl1•t;t oom's .f9" OD'} flfTID'1 .l,fj'l'.f9" hllt;ft.") •t•ouh£!',9" ht,..f,ft")s h9"h'0>-1 fJ11 hi'JO.Mv 11fUD1(9" l-'r;J-T 1h9"A'lift.') hli ft-9" h.f.u O>-t h-9" fJ11rt ou1tff11; 11<fr;J- 111.1ifl '116-e/1'111'l'1 aolifl11 ffl1u

ተወሳኝ ሓበሬታ

ID"t h-9" 1hf.fl·f·1 h11 1/JI', ""ll. f)O(J'lf OD lf/)1; h:J'C ") 'Th.f.u fJ11 OD(lf. 1ft)Cl>t f/l 111i'l f.'IT uof il1: >tf.h..7J"J") h.f.s:

1'fi;J-;J-ft. OD11C'l.;J-t- 9"(1 ll ft. ouwh(t -'O&;J- h ·ft. h.f.: -l: t-U11P-' ID/AJ>!! -'llt.;J- c;e -'lf-l- >fll"J-l- Cf-t-PU(l 119"flm.t-'e l'19" (code t• •) h-t-1,11 ,,f.u >0J uo1 l't >tfll"l-l-1 tl.-:l-1 11UAO>- cn11 119"flm.t-<e l'19" >t11 11-t;/m tl?"Tf.-t-c -f;J·fl.lf. ;J- -t-out-'"JtT 'rt-f. 1ht-J<#>UDft. fJA hUA'P "-f.u It -ftO&;J- >t() -'9"l\ 2010 fJ11 'r<i>"L W h. hJ(J)o'} h.f.: t\PPF,()\1[

.1, .1,}, "111. lfJl, ou'}?fl-l.") f.),ifCl\1:1 (lt.,•t-)-.} 11tlfP, OUYVffJT ;J-' of),,,7tD·1 M"Jro·) >t1'l·O 1/- t-'tlf. 9"11ctr 19"C"1.7 19".79" fl1.e h.f'?"s c;ert ao r,'Q'f: 19".79" 9"1'111/1)f: '1/? W·ft h-9" OU11loJ hl.h .e'fiA f,'firo')s M'?" 19"19"1: "r) c;f. O>-lt h-9" ID'AJ>!! ·hOt.;J- h/1'1>119" (rof, 'y)1]A,\- hfij \- tJ,MIP) h,f"9"u 1: Cf;f, ao Cf(J·f: OU111(l 'l)ID·t h-9" hll 111i'l ,l;J'e flhlf;J-;1-T ro.e ,1, ,7 n/? hID' ¥1 h.f.:

## E. Consent Form (Age 18)

APPROVED

JAN 05 2010

UW Human Subjects Review Committee

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON  
CONSENT FORM

RECEIVED  
Human Subjects

JAN 05 2010

UW

Focus Groups with Horn of Africa Youth

Researcher: Aster Teele, Ph. D. Candidate, School of Social Work.

Contact: [REDACTED]

Faculty Advisors: Susan Kemp, Associate Professor, School of Social Work.  
David Allen, Director, Women's Studies.

We are asking you to be in a research study. The purpose of *this* consent form is to give you the information you will need to help you decide whether to be in the study or not. Please read the form carefully. You may ask questions about the purpose of the research, what we would ask you to do, the possible risks and benefits, your rights as a volunteer, and anything else about the research or this form that is not clear. When we have answered all your questions, you can decide if you want to be in the study or not. This process is called "informed consent." We will give you a copy of this form for your records.

### PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The youth program aims to create a safe space for Horn of Africa immigrant youth to talk about youth social, cultural and political issues. The purpose of this study is to examine how Horn of Africa youth talk about their experiences in the youth program. Research about Eritreans in the U.S. is limited and I will use *this* information for further studies to provide more knowledge about Eritrean youth, and immigrants in general, so that your demands and needs can be met.

### STUDY PROCEDURES

The researcher will compile information about youth experiences at [REDACTED] and ask you to participate in a focus group of 10 to 15 youth that will take two hours maximum. The discussion guide or questions include: How you joined the youth program and why? What activities are you involved in? How did you benefit from the program? The findings of *this* study will help youth program staff to improve the program.

The focus group involves a [REDACTED] topics related to your reflections about your experiences in [REDACTED] efforts to address youth issues amongst Horn of Africa immigrant youth in the Seattle Area.

In a focus group, all members should respect some basic principles, including:

- Focus group starts with the basic value that all participants are equal and have equal say in the conversation.

- Respect to :U group members reg:mUess of their age, race, eutmcity, rc:ligion, and background.
- Group members should keep everything that is said nnd discussed wium the group conf6denoal.
- Each member of the group respects the ldeas or per.;pecovcs of 2 group member regardless of whether 2ll members agree wth what has been s:ud or ctisagree.
- AU members have equal chance of participating in the chscussion so that all votces could be heard.

Pacocipaon is stricdy volunwy and you may wltthdnw at any ume.

lItc discussions will be recorded (audio rapcd) and transcnbed. The information will be stored at Umvcrsity of W: shington in a password protected computer. The audio rapcs (from focus groups) will be kept in a lcx.kcd file. Only members of Ute resC: Cchcr's ctissenaon corrunttee may have access to the daa.

You will be given an opportunity to discuss the report of the study with Ute focus group members and the researcher. Inc recorded discussions will be u:mscobcd and audiotapes will be destroyed by August 2010. The tnscribed records will be analyzed and used for pubhcauons only b) the rcscaicher.

#### RISKS, STRESS, OR DISCOMFORT

Titere ace some nskcs for participating in the srudy. You may feel uncomfon:1ble tallang : bout your person:) experiences m a group. You may also worry that someone will find out what you sald during the ctisacssion. The srudy will guard confidentiality by assigning codes to your n:tnes :nd separating files nod forms that have your name. Analysis will be done on files without the n:tnes of pacucipants.

AU mfonnarion you proVlde will be confidencual with two exceptions. \*lItcsc excepoons ace as follows:

- l-larm to oncsclf, that is, if you share information that lets the researcher know you mtend to harm yourself.
- Han:n to others, th:lt is, lf you share tofonnation that lets the researcher know you mtend to harm odters.

If the researcher finds that what you share may meet these two exceptions, she will take :lppropiare acoons to mfonn the proper audtoooocs. In adchoon, lf you become upset ducmg the group discusslon, the researcher will refer you to appropoate SCCVICc g vmg agencies m Seatde.

The decision to rake part in this srudy is entirely up to you. You may withdraw at any orne. lItcr will be no consequence if you refuse to paroctpatc and your dectcion will be kept priv:uc and confidenti:ll. It will not affect your parricipaon m the program dtat provides. None of me dam collected ,Vlll be linked to you mdividually or as a srudent; and none of the mfonnauon will be: released to your school or other youth programs and instirutions. Furthermore, durmg dte discusslon, you can skip any of the ropics under discussion if you do not want ro share your ldeas.

UW PFH ; VED



#### BENEFITS OF THE STUDY

The study will inform \_\_\_\_\_ staff about Ecitrean immigrant youth. Agencies involved in youth programs with immigrants will also benefit from the study. As participants, the study will help you share and analyze your experiences, and respond to the pressures you and other immigrant youth encounter. You may not directly benefit from participation in this study.

#### OTHER INFORMATION

You may refuse to participate and you are free to withdraw from this study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Contact information is necessary in case of follow up interviews for clarification are required. All individual data will be coded by fictional names. The link between the fictional names and the contact information will be kept in a password protected computer to which only the researcher has access. The linking information will be destroyed in August 2010.

Government or university staff sometimes review studies such as this one to make sure they are being done safely and legally. If a review of this study takes place, your records may be examined. The reviewers will protect your privacy. The study records will not be used to put you at legal risk.

**F. Assent Form (Age 15-17)**

APPROVED

JAN 05 2010

UW Human Subjects  
Review CommitteeUNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

ASSENT FORM (AGES 15-17)

RECEIVED Human  
Subjects Division

JAN 05 2010

UW

## STUDY OF YOUTH EXPERIENCES IN HORN OF AFRICA YOUTH PROGRAMS

Investigator: Aster Teele, Ph.D. Candidate. School of Social Work, University of Washington.

Contact: (206) 733-0588.

Faculty Advisor: Susan Kemp, Associate Professor. School of Social Work, University of Washington.

David Allen, Director. Women's Studies, University of Washington.

## Investigators' statement

## PURPOSE AND BENEFITS

There are few studies about Horn of Africa youth experiences in youth programs. This means that you may not like the types of youth programs you participate in, and/or they may not help improve your experiences. This study is about Horn of Africa youth who participate in youth programs in the Seattle Area. Discussions about your experiences may help to learn more about the lives of youth so that youth programers can design better programs for you.

## PROCEDURES

With your permission, you will be assigned in a group of 10 to 15 youth and I will ask you questions that can help us start the discussion. In research, this form of discussion is called focus group. We will talk about your experiences for 1:30 to 2:00 hours maximum. I will tape record and then write down the discussions. The analysis and report that I am going to write out of this discussion will be about how Horn of Africa youth talk about their experiences in youth programs. A second focus group will be held in 15 March 2010, with the same group, to verify and allow participants to make sure that the research report represents the information shared in the focus group discussion.

## RISKS, STRESS, AND DISCOMFORT

It is okay if you don't feel comfortable to share your experiences in a group. You can leave anytime if you don't want to share. You can also ask questions if you do not understand what is going on.

## OTHER INFORMATION

We won't tell anyone you took part in this study. Your name will not be in the report. You don't have to take part in this study if you don't want to. No one will be mad at you. We will give you a copy of this paper to keep.

## CURRICULUM VITAE

**Aster Solomon Teclé**  
**University of Washington, School of Social Work**  
**4101 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, Seattle, WA 98105-6299**  
**[E-mail: [astert@uw.edu](mailto:astert@uw.edu)]**

### EDUCATION

- 2012**            PhD, Social Welfare Program.  
 School of Social Work, University of Washington. Seattle, WA.
- 2008**            MSW, Community Practice Concentration.  
 School of Social Work, University of Washington. Seattle, WA.
- 2002**            MA Sustainable International Development.  
 Heller School for Social Policy and Management, Brandeis University.  
 Waltham, MA.

### GRADUATE CERTIFICATES

- 2012**            Global Health Certificate Program.  
 Department of Global Health. University of Washington. Seattle, WA.
- 1997**            Educational Planning and Management. International Institute for Educational  
 Planning and Management (IIEP). Paris, France.  
 Thesis: *Girls' Education: Dankalia Province Case Study*. IIEP/UNESCO  
 Working Document.

### INTERESTS

Youth and Immigrants/Refugees \* Dis/placement, Diasporas and environmental justice \*  
 Globalization, transnational (im)migration and Refugees \* Global/Transnational Social Work \*  
 Indigenous Knowledge and Research \* Politics of food, global food systems and food  
 (in)security \* HIV/AIDS in the Black communities \* Program Evaluation

## RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

### **2011 Research Associate. Center For AIDS Research (CFAR). Department of Global Health. University of Washington. Seattle, WA.**

CFAR's Concurrency Project: Conduct HIV/AIDS education and informational campaigns targeting foreign born Africans, and African Americans in the Seattle Area to assess awareness and knowledge of concurrency and HIV/AIDS; design preventions to address barriers to services; and disproportionate prevalence of HIV/AIDS amongst these groups; and produce publishable papers.

### **2010 Principal Investigator and Program Manager**

Designed and conducted qualitative process evaluation of Refugee School Impact Grant (RSIG) funded, Refugee-run Afterschool Programs working with School's Out Washington in Seattle, WA. Conducted focus groups with Bhutan/Nepalese, Burmese, Ukrainians and Somali parents and elders; and in-depth interviews with Refugee-run NGOs' Afterschool Programs and Seattle School District staff. The study explored challenges parents face, community initiatives to address those challenges, as well as the way forward while maintaining achievements for student success, and narrowing gaps amongst parent-teacher, school-parent, and teacher-student relationships.

### **2009 Social Work Research Practicum.**

Conducted Wilderness Inner-city Leadership Development (WILD) youth program qualitative evaluation with International District Housing Alliance (IDHA), Seattle, WA. Methods used include participant observations, focus groups and in-depth interviews with youth, parents and staff. Explored the youth-environment-elders communication through dialogues about environment-neighborhood and identification of commonalities.

### **2006 Social Welfare Research Practicum.**

Examined intersectionalities of teen moms' age, race and intergenerational risks with welfare support and return to school. Used secondary data from Young Women's Health Study, longitudinal study of the School of Social Work, University of Washington. Seattle, WA. Strong correlations amongst the variables indicated underlying attributes to how teen moms find it hard to go back to school.

### **2002 Principal Investigator.**

*Quality Evaluation of basic education: Promises and Challenges, Ghinda & Dbarwa Sub-regions. Eritrea.* University of Asmara funded. Lead investigator responsible for planning, design, and implementation of a study on 25 village schools with emphasis on factors that influence the quality of primary level education. Trained staff in survey administration; data collection and analysis; and developed tools, protocols and other instruments. Collected data and conducted analysis of large statistical datasets using ACCESS and SPSS statistical software packages. Supervised all aspects of the project that addressed factors related to the quality of primary education, including: provision of

resources; teacher management, pool of teachers and quality; disparities in equity and access; retention and students' flow rates across five years of basic education.

**1997 Senior Research Analyst and Project Coordinator.  
Ministry of Education (MOE). Asmara, Eritrea**

Designed a school mapping survey technique that would assist MOE to identify and prioritize areas that would meet basic educational needs of regional administrative bodies, parents and students. Working in a team environment with educational and economic experts, provided leadership and supervision to design an Educational Simulation Model, which projected 5 to 10 years of national students' flow rates, costs per pupil, and financial requirements for three levels of education, primary, junior and senior secondary schools.

**1996 Supervisor and Research Team Leader.  
Ministry of Education (MOE). Asmara, Eritrea**

Led a team of research assistants and conducted a qualitative research, using Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA), on girls' education in the most disadvantaged provinces in Eritrea. MOE and UNICEF funded project. Purpose of the research was to identify barriers for girls not attending school. Major responsibilities: designed study, trained staff in all aspects of research, including data collection, analysis and report writing. Supervised and directed all phases of the project. Major findings: as the title of the report indicates, *But can she eat papers?*, lack of food and other basic needs within households were the major causes that hinder girls from going to school.

**1995 Research Analyst.  
Ministry of Education (MOE). Asmara, Eritrea.**

Survey on, *Girls Repetition and Dropout from School*. Designed and conducted a study focusing on economic, social, cultural and traditional factors that force girls to drop out of school and/or repeat grades. MOE and UNESCO Funded. Designed project, data collection, tools and instruments, performed data analysis and wrote reports based on project findings.

## TEACHING EXPERIENCE

**2009 Teaching Associate. School of Social Work, University of Washington. Seattle, WA. Social Work in Action: Bridging the Gap from Science to Practice (SocWL 101)**

Shared responsibilities for creating, organizing, and for developing and grading weekly assignments and quizzes. Assist students in writing papers

**2008 Teaching Assistant. School of Social Work, University of Washington. Seattle, WA. Introduction to Social Welfare Research (SocWL 390)**

Full responsibility for facilitating discussions and giving lectures in lab sessions. Lab sizes: 20 - 25 students. Shared responsibility for creating, organizing and for developing and grading online quizzes and exercises. Assist students in online research, using databases, identifying and narrowing research questions, and writing papers.

**2007 Teaching Practicum. School of Social Work, University of Washington. Seattle, WA. MSW Macro Practice (SocWL 570).**

Shared responsibilities for developing syllabus, preparing reading materials, evaluating weekly sessions, grading student papers, and teaching sessions in evening MSW Macro Practice classes.

## PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

**2007 Social Work Practicum.** Catholic Archdiocese of Seattle. Refugee Resettlement Program.

Worked with refugees and immigrants as case manager, rights advocate, interpreter. Analyzed UNHCR and U.S. immigration policies, and Refugee Resettlement Programs.

**2007 Teaching seminars and workshops.** Graduate School. University of Washington, Seattle, WA.

Participated in Classroom Management; Student work grading and evaluation; and teaching seminars and workshops. Graduate School. University of Washington, Seattle, WA.

**2004-present Teaching and research seminars and workshops; conferences and lectures.** Graduate School. University of Washington, Seattle, WA.

Participated in Classroom Management; Student work grading and evaluation; and teaching seminars and workshops.

Attended education, migration and refugee/immigrant related conferences.

- 1995–2000** Participated in various seminars, workshops, on-the-job trainings, surveys and studies organized by NGOs, government institutions and international organizations as a team leader, presenter, participant, data collection and analyst, including:
- 2000** *Beijing + 5*. UN Decade of Women five years national plan of action. New York.
- 1995** *Foundation of African Women for Education (FAWE)*. Nairobi, Kenya.
- 1995** *Training of trainers on Research Methodology*. UNICEF & MOE. Asmara, Eritrea.

## **PUBLICATIONS and MANUSCRIPTS**

Michele P Andrasik, Caitlin Chapman, Rachel Clad, Kate Murray, Jennifer Foster, **Aster S. Teclé**, Ann Kurth, Martina Morris, Malcolm Parks. (In progress). *Developing Concurrency Messages for the Black Community*.

Teclé, A. S. (In progress). *Ambivalent Silences: Understanding African-Born Women's knowledge of HIV/AIDS and concurrency in the Seattle Area and King County of Washington State*.

Teclé, A. S. (In progress). *Youth programs for what? Rethinking immigrant youth programs and the politics of (in)visibility*.

Teclé, A. S. (In progress). *Identity fixation or a mix? Horn of Africa youth talk*.

Teclé, A. S. (In progress). *Beyond Food Security/Insecurity Dichotomy: (Re)Interpreting food and culture for justice*.

Teclé, A. S. (Forthcoming). *Where is home? Interpreting youth discourse and the politics of displaced youth*. In Amutabi, M., Aubrey, L. (Eds), *Contemporary African Diaspora and the African American Diasporas: An Anthology*. Book project.

Johnston-GoodStar, K., Trinidad, A. & **Teclé, A. S. (2010)**. *Critical pedagogy through the reinvention of place: Three cases of youth resistance*. In B. Porfilio & P. Carr (Eds.), *Youth Culture, education and resistance: Subverting the commercial ordering of life*. Netherlands & Boston, MA: Sense Publishers.

Teclé, Aster S. (1997). *Basic Education Quality Evaluation: Promises and Challenges, Ghinda & Dbarwa Sub-Regions. Eritrea*. International Institute of Educational Planning/UNESCO Working Document.

## PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS

**Teclé, A. S. (2011).** Where is “Home?” Interpreting Horn of Africa Youth Discourse of Belonging. Approved Poster to be presented at CSWE-APM, 2011. Atlanta, GA.

**Teclé, A. S. (2009).** *East African Immigrant Youth Voices in the Black Diaspora discourse: Framing visibility.* Presented in: Africa and the Black Diaspora Panel of the Association for African American Historical Research and Preservation Biennial Black History Conference. Seattle, WA.

**Teclé, A. S. (2008).** *Participatory Action Research (PAR): Methodology and intervention.* School of Social Work, University of Washington. Seattle, WA.

## GRANTS AND AWARDS

**2004 – 2006** Bank of America Endowed Minority Fellowships. University of Washington, Seattle. WA.

**2000 – 2002** Brandeis University. Waltham, MA.

**1996 – 1997** International Institute of Educational Planning. UNESCO. Paris, France.

## PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

**2010 - present** International Association of Schools of Social Work. Student member.

**2008 – present** National Association of Social Work (NASW). Member.

**2007 – present** Council of Social Work Education (CSWE). Member.

**1996 – 1997** TESFA. Co-Founder and Executive Board member.

## COMMUNITY SERVICES

**2011 – present** Horn of Africa Services. Afterschool Program Coordinator. Volunteer.

**2010** Neighborcare Health Clinic. Seattle, WA. Volunteer Social Worker.

**2009 – 2010** African American Reach and Teach Health Ministry (AARTH), Seattle, WA. Volunteer.

**2008 – 2010** Seattle African HIV/AIDS and Health Initiative (SAHI), Seattle and Puget Sound Area Chapter. Co- founder.

**1996 – 1997** TESFA. Co-founder and Executive Board member. Local NGO that provided innovative Early Childhood Education and learning materials for disadvantaged children in rural areas. Eritrea.

**1987 – 1992** National Association of Eritrean Women. Central Council member and project coordinator.