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ABSTRACT

This discourse-oriented ethnographic case study, using constant comparison, critical discourse analysis (CDA) and cultural-historical-activity theory (CHAT) within a Foucauldian framework, investigates how the pedagogical practices of 2 teachers of English learners were (trans)formed over the course of 1½ academic years, and how their (trans)formation created spaces for culturally relevant pedagogy, and how those spaces promoted the literacy development of English learners.

This study showed that one White female teacher with a strong passion for English learners and with the discursive subject position as an immigrant in society, when she was afforded the opportunity to connect her pedagogical practices with the wider community practices, (trans)formed her pedagogical practices and moved from a hybrid/borderland pedagogy into culturally relevant pedagogy, allowing her English learners to participate in shared production of knowledge in Third Space. However, another White female teacher, who never experienced a lower discursive subject position in society, and who did not have opportunities for self-disrupting meaning-making processes concerning how to educate English learners, embodied and enunciated the teacher-scripted individual/technical discourses and practices circulating in teacher education, professional development, school and curriculum.

This study illuminates how teachers can become transformative intellectuals who empower English learners by creating expansive collective activity learning cycles that
include members of the whole community, connecting in-school literacy with out-of-school literacies. Implications are that (a) the enactment of culturally relevant pedagogy is not the inevitable result of an individual teacher’s desire or passion for the education of ELLs, but it is, rather, associated with the situation of teachers within networks of power relations and sociocultural discursive contexts that promote culturally relevant pedagogy; (b) teachers and teacher educators need to be educated about the inevitable impact of sociocultural context on the education of ELLs and about the importance of ideological and political clarity; and (c) funding is urgently needed for educating teachers of English learners about the *funds of knowledge* approach to education and for the recruitment of teachers from linguistically, culturally, economically marginalized groups, along with funding for English learner students’ resources and materials.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Classrooms around the globe are becoming more and more culturally and linguistically complex, as documented by the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2005). American public schools are no exception; they have experienced a dramatic increase in the number of linguistically and culturally diverse students since the beginning of the 20th century. Currently, 40% of the students in US schools are students of color, and it is expected that more than 70% of the US public school population will be students of color by 2026 (García, 2001). Minority enrollment in US elementary and secondary schools rose from 24% in 1976 to 40% in 2000, and the number of language minority students in US K-12 schools has exceeded 14 million (August & Shanahan, 2006). Over the past decade, secondary students who speak languages other than English have been the fastest growing subgroup of students in US schools (McCardle, Mele-McCarthy, Cutting, Leos, & D’Emilo, 2005) and are expected to make up one of every four students by 2025 (Ed. Gov, 2006).

Students from homes where English is not the primary language, i.e., English language learners (ELLs) make up a significant and increasing part of the student population. However, the academic achievement gap continues to widen between ELLs
and native English-speaking students. Kindler (2002) found that only 18.7% of ELLs met state norms for Reading in English, and that most failed to meet state standards for general education. English learner students are 300% more likely to drop out of high school (National Center for Education Statistics, 2004) and are more frequently placed in low achievement level groups than are students from English-speaking families (Ruiz-de-Velasco & Fix, 2000). The poor academic outcomes of these students have been attributed to multiple factors in the teaching and learning environment, such as curriculum and overall school environment (Linholm, 1987), assessment tools used, lack of support systems in schools and school districts, attitudes of school staff members, quality of teacher training, and low expectations toward ELLs (Ortiz, 2001). Many research studies have identified the power of the teacher as the single most important determinant of students’ learning (Au, 1991; Darling-Hammond, 2010; Delpit, 1995; Gay, 2000; Zeichner, 2003). In particular, many teacher education research studies have established the correlations between teacher beliefs and instructional practices, and between teacher beliefs and student achievement (Rios, 1996; Rist, 1971; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968).

In research conducted at the primary and secondary levels, teacher beliefs have been defined as “the highly personal ways in which a teacher understands classrooms, students, the nature of learning, the teacher’s role in the classroom, and the goals of education” (Kagan, 1990, p. 423) and “psychologically held understandings, premises, or propositions about the world that are felt to be true” (Richardson, 1996, p. 103). Teachers’ beliefs about students’ potentiality, i.e., expectations, and the communication of those expectations, are termed by Robert Merton (1948) as ‘self-fulfilling prophecy’, indicating
that students achieve to the degree that the teacher expects. The classic study by Rist (1971) showed that differential attitudes and treatment resulting from teachers’ beliefs about their students, in this case their perceptions of deficit in inner-city African American students of low socioeconomic status, were delivered covertly and overtly to those students, and led to their low academic achievement (Rist, 1971), affirming the role of schooling in the reproduction of social disparities.

Strong positive correlations between teacher expectations and student achievement were also reported by Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968), Rist (1971) and Rios (1996). A program evaluation project by Steele (1992) found that the academic performance of African American students improved just by projecting high expectations to those students, despite their poor socioeconomic status and insufficient learning environment. Research has found that the extent to which teachers change or resist change depends on the strength and degree of their beliefs about learners and learning, about teaching, subject matter, learning to teach, and about themselves and the teaching role (Block & Hazelip, 1995; Calderhead, 1996). Additionally, research focused on categorizing teacher knowledge: content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, craft knowledge, and (personal) practical knowledge (Calderhead, 1996) has concluded that personal practical knowledge (PPK) is in essence a teacher’s knowledge in practice (Connelly & Clandinin, 2001). A cognition study using the retrospective think-aloud protocol method (Calderhead, 1996; Clark & Peterson, 1986) also found that the thought processes and extemporaneous decision making of primary and secondary school teachers are critically important during instruction, and are influenced by personal experiences.
In addition to positive beliefs about students’ potentiality, teachers need practical instructional skills in order to achieve the successful actualization of those beliefs. A study by Valdés (1998) found that the social, psychological, cultural, linguistic distances between the school life and home life of two middle-school immigrant girls contributed tremendously toward their school failure. In Valdés’s study, neither ESL teachers nor regular content teachers were sufficiently prepared to teach immigrant students with diverse needs and English proficiency levels in the classroom, so they spent most of their time communicating trivial instructions in English and “focused almost exclusively around copying vocabulary lists and copying sentences” (Valdés, 1998, p. 7). In contrast to Valdés’s study, Sheets (1995), a teacher of at-risk Spanish speaking students, demonstrated the power of changing beliefs and instructional practices: when she placed students in the advanced class, they performed at an honors student level. Ballenger (1999), a teacher of Haitian-American students, saw an elevation of her students’ performance after she shifted her beliefs and practices to build on their cultural and familial strengths.

Despite the critical importance of teacher beliefs and instructional practices for the achievement of linguistically and culturally diverse students, existing research has predominantly looked at the personal practical knowledge (PPK) and practices of teachers, with the assumption that education takes place within a neutral institutional system (Apple, 1995). Little research has been directed toward inservice teachers of ELLs (Lucas & Grinberg, 2008; Zeichner, 2005) and, particularly, toward the ways in which the embedded, implicit language ideologies and epistemologies of ELL teachers are constructed, and toward the ways in which the societal and institutional language
ideological discourses form and transform the pedagogical beliefs and practices of ELL teachers (Razfar, 2003) from a Foucauldian genealogical poststructural perspective. In other words, little research has been conducted to investigate how the power-related, institutionally imposed, language ideological discourses traversed in the histories of the individual teacher’s personal and institutional spaces affect the teaching practices and the transformation of the pedagogical practice of ELL teachers.

The concept of power in this dissertation research is not the Marxian concept of power, that is something possessed by particular persons, but power as defined from a Foucauldian perspective: the governing systems of belief, thought and practice that exist everywhere in society, which control the discourses and discursive formations (DFs) of society, and which are produced and consumed, distributed and practiced in the daily realities within classrooms, schools and society, and work to produce a certain type of person with certain types of embodied practices, identities and subjectivities (Foucault, 1980, 1990; Luke, 1995). The reasoning systems underlying the pedagogical beliefs and practices of ELL teachers are not just neutral and benign individual ways of thinking, but are constructed, over time, in and through the participation histories of those ELL teachers within interconnected multilayered social spaces. Thus, this study explores the interrelated and intertwined issues of historically, socially, culturally, and politically constructed ideological language belief systems which guide teachers’ views about ELLs and about how they should teach language and literacy to ELLs, and analyzes the formation and transformation of the pedagogical practices that 2 secondary school ESL teachers bring to the educating of their English language learners, and how those pedagogical practices promote the creation of spaces for culturally relevant pedagogy.
Purpose of the Study

This study is grounded in a postmodern and poststructuralist framework, an archaeological and genealogical approach to discourse in action/practice framework (Foucault, 1980) in which it is understood that “everything in the classroom, from how we teach, what we teach, how we respond to students, to the materials we use, and the way we assess the students, needs to be seen as social and cultural practices that have broader implications than just pieces of classroom interactions” (Pennycook, 2001, p. 139). Escaping the positivistic causal relational paradigm, this study de-centers the subjects and considers ELL teachers as socio-cultural-historical beings and products of discourse and power relations (Foucault, 1972, 1980, 1990). In this way, teachers’ subjectivities and language ideologies in practice are seen to be (re)constructed through the coarticulation of the circulated societal and institutional epistemologies/power relations/discourses within their schools and curriculum, among people in the community and in society (Buendía, 2000; Buendía, Gitlin, & Doumbia, 2003).

This study seeks to elucidate the institutionally imposed language ideological discursive formations demonstrated in the belief systems and pedagogical practices employed by ELL teachers in an urban ESL classroom context, and to (re)conceptualize culturally relevant pedagogy by revealing the possibilities for, and hindrance to, the literacy development of ELLs through an examination of the spaces in which culturally relevant pedagogy takes place. The spaces of two secondary ESL classrooms were characterized and compared with each other by applying the following research questions.
1. What are the language ideologies circulating and practiced in society, in public school classrooms, curriculum and professional development, and in the pedagogy of two ESL classrooms in particular?

2. How and to what extent do the language ideologies circulating and practiced in educational contexts, as demonstrated in the professional development, curriculum and pedagogy employed in two ESL classrooms, support and influence the creation of a culturally relevant pedagogy?

3. How and to what extent do ELL teachers negotiate/contest/reify these language ideologies in their beliefs and pedagogical practices, particularly in the area of language and literacy instruction, and how and to what extent do those beliefs and practices facilitate/inhibit the creation of a culturally relevant pedagogy in the classroom?

4. How and to what extent do ELLs participate in the pedagogical space of knowledge production in the classroom?

**Significance of the Study**

Despite the dramatic increase in the number of English language learners (ELLs) in US public school contexts, US public school teachers continue to be increasingly, predominantly White and middle class (Ed. Gov. 2006). Studies of White inservice and preservice teachers have found that most have had few intercultural experiences and many hold deficiency perspectives toward minority students (Sleeter, 1991). Research results have also revealed that the socio-cultural and linguistic differences between ELLs and their teachers are huge (Trent & Artiles, 2007), and that many teachers are
unprepared to educate ELLs or interact with parents of ELLs (Duhan & Manson, 2000; Hollins & Torres-Guzman, 2005). In light of the inability of many schools to provide a quality education for students from racially, culturally, and linguistically diverse backgrounds, who are from mostly poor families (Nieto, 2004), the significance of this study is as follows:

First, it is essential to investigate and (re)conceptualize the conditions and constructions of pedagogical practices and culturally relevant pedagogy of ELL teachers, and to relate them to their socially and institutionally prevailing language ideologies. Teachers construct their belief systems about a particular language and about language learners from their own experiences and from the dominant D/discourses and I/ideologies about educating ELLs. These teacher beliefs and knowledge about subject matter, teaching, and learning are expressed implicitly and explicitly in their instruction concomitantly with their beliefs about learners and about themselves as teachers as they apply their teacher knowledge about subject matter dynamically and fluidly in accordance with diverse classroom situational contexts. The complex and multilayered internal networks of meaning and systems of teachers’ language ideologies are actualized in conjunction with their knowledge about content and pedagogy (Zeichner, 2003) in their instructional practices, and ultimately influence students’ performance in school.

Second, it is necessary to understand how the language ideologies in classroom practices of ELL teachers (re)construct and are (re)constructed by the discourses in and around disciplinary knowledge, school, curriculum, and society within which they are embedded in the US, because the dominant discourses about ELLs, second language and literacy education are the products of implicit and explicit power relations, discourses
and practices (Foucault, 1980, 1990) and “in any discourse, knowledge, social relations and social identities are simultaneously being constituted or reconstituted” (Fairclough, 1992, p. 8).

Third, it is crucial to explore the spaces of the culturally relevant pedagogy in urban ELL contexts because human learning and development processes are profoundly and inextricably rooted in culture (Hollins, 1996; Nieto, 1992; Rogoff, 2003; Vygotsky, 1986). Without connecting and actualizing ELLs’ linguistic and cultural funds of knowledge into the classroom instructions, it is impossible to succeed in the education of racially, culturally, and linguistically diverse students, mostly from poor families (Au, 2009; Au & Kawakami, 1985, 1991; Banks 2006; Delpit, 1995; Valdés, 1998). Culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995), culturally responsive pedagogy (Gay, 1975, 2000), and multicultural education (Banks, 2000; Nieto, 2001) have a 50-year track record, and have demonstrated their ability to enable academic achievement of culturally, linguistically diverse students.

Fourth, ESL classrooms in the US urban public schools are linguistically and culturally diverse and complex, reflecting the current multilingual and multicultural world (Ball, 2009). These classroom contexts encompass the complicated inter/intralinguistic, inter/intraethnic, inter/intraracial, and inter/intracultural relational contexts of people with diverse D/discourses, i.e., different ways of being, talking, learning, valuing, thinking, seeing, and representing the world. Thus, it is essential to construct hybrid Third Space in the classroom where the dominant discourses and nondominant discourses converge, i.e., the catalyst and empowering space for change emerge, in order to allow ELLs to develop academic abilities and construct positive
identities. This study provides a framework for a social organization that promotes learning both within and outside of the ESL classroom context.

Fifth, beyond the dialectic relationship of macro and micro concept, this discourse-oriented critical ethnographic inquiry-based study illuminates to what degree teachers of ELLs reify and negotiate the structural issues of curriculum, competing discourses about second language learning and literacy education, and the prevailing English-only ideologies in school, community, and the society in their pedagogical practices. The multiple analytic methods of constant comparison (Straus, 1967), cultural-historical- activity theory (CHAT, hereafter, Engeström, 1999, 2001) and critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1992, 2003; Huckin, 1995, 2002, 2010), lead to the uncovering of tacit complexities and tensions related to literacy events, activities, actions, material use, and utterances between teacher and students, and among students in ESL classrooms.

**Overview of the Study**

This dissertation explores the spaces of culturally relevant pedagogy and identifies the different discourses, activity systems, and contexts found in the classroom which promote or hinder culturally relevant pedagogy. The (trans)formations of ELL teachers’ pedagogical practices are also described and analyzed from a perspective of Foucauldian poststructuralism. Unlike modernism, which sees a duality between persons and society, and conceptualizes persons as having freedom and decontextualized, transcendent human reason, postmodernism and poststructuralism (Derrida, Foucault, Kristeva) question and reexamine human epistemologies and practices by acknowledging
limits to human reason, and implicate the deployment of power and discourse in the construction of reasoning processes. As stated by Benhabib (1995), “Many postmodern writers do not just say that there is no such thing as truth or knowledge, they also argue that what has masqueraded as truth is largely an exercise of power. Foucault, for example, was not interested in examining which truth claims were false (as typifies modernist projects) but in understanding why and how certain beliefs get to be considered truth” (p. 26). Human epistemologies and practices are not constructed individually, but are constructed by/in/thorough/within discourses. Put another way, according to Foucault (1977, 1980, 1990), our systems of knowledge and practices are constructed within/in/through discursive formations (DFs) and these DFs are always linked with the webs of the circulating power and vice versa.

Instead of blaming English language learners (ELLs) and teachers of ELLs for the failure of US public schools to meet the academic needs of ELLs, this study focuses on the discourses relating to language ideologies, particularly views about ELLs, second language, and the literacy education of ELLs, that circulate in the classroom, in university preservice teacher education programs, in professional development courses, in schools, in communities and society in general, and analyzes the impact that those discursive formations have on the (trans)formation of pedagogical practices, particularly those practices used for teaching ELLs that contribute to the creation of spaces of culturally relevant pedagogy. Based on a framework that takes a Foucauldian “archaeological” and “genealogical” approach to discourses in action/practice, this study analyzes the construction of language ideologies in practice among ELL language teachers by connecting the dots, as it were; by tracing the weaving threads and nodes of the
discourses presented in the trajectories of the lived experiences, epistemologies, views about ELLs, and knowledge formation about second language and literacy education demonstrated by ELL teachers, in order to uncover the reasons for their situated classroom practices.

Following this introduction are seven more chapters. Chapter II, the literature review section, examines existing research in order to identify the gaps in the literature about second language teacher education and to document the development of the theoretical concepts and constructs used in this dissertation: (1) research on second language teacher education, (2) research on the construction of pedagogical discourses and practices, (3) language ideology, and (4) competing discourses about second language and literacy education.

First, I present an overview of research related to second language teacher education and identify the gaps in the existing research about the pedagogical practices of ESL teachers.

Second, I discuss the existing research relevant to the influence of societal and institutional discourses on the construction of culturally relevant pedagogy in Third Space. In light of the dramatic increase in the number of ELLs in US schools, and the concomitant linguistic and cultural differences between ELLs and their teachers, culturally relevant pedagogy in Third Space, where the linguistic, cultural and social capital of ELLs are legitimated and prioritized, is needed in order to allow ELLs to succeed academically in the US. As seen from a poststructural perspective, ELL teachers do not exist only within their own classrooms and schools, isolated from the outside world, but they are situated within the multiple discourses and discourse
structures in their schools, state and society. Thus, the influences of discourses and discourse structures on the construction of culturally relevant pedagogical practices need to be examined.

Third, an investigation into the creation of spaces of culturally relevant pedagogy in Third Space by ELL teachers requires, as seen from a poststructural perspective, an understanding of the language ideologies circulating in the field of language and literacy pedagogy, and the impact of those language ideologies on language and literacy education, and on disciplinary knowledge formation. Thus, I discuss the predominant language ideologies, and the impact of English-only and standard language ideologies on second language and literacy education in secondary ESL classroom settings in the US.

Fourth, in order to trace the archaeology and genealogy of the disciplinary knowledge formations and practices of ELL teachers related to second language and literacy education, the following competing discourses about second language and literacy education are examined: (1) the behavioral approach, (2) the cognitive approach, (3) the sociocultural and dialogic approach, (4) the critical approach, and (5) the culturally relevant pedagogy approach.

Both product-based behavioral approaches and mental-process-oriented cognitive approaches are limited in terms of their ability to explain the critical interrelationships between the polycontextualized contexts with complex and complicated processes involved in second language and literacy development, or to explain the concomitant identity constructions of ELLs that take place within their immediate sociocultural context. Therefore, I take the culturally relevant pedagogy
approach, because it is based on context-oriented ecological perspective: sociocultural, dialogic, and critical approaches. According to sociocultural and dialogic approach, concepts and cognitions related to learning, development, knowledge, identities, and subjectivities are all intertwined and interconnected in the process of second language learning and literacy development, that is, the external is internalized and the internal is externalized in the situated diverse context. These circulating discourses construct the ways in which ELLs learn and activate their ways of learning and being within their sociocultural contexts. From the critical approach, the taken-for-granted assumptions about knowledge, society, and about certain populations represented in language-in-use, i.e., in everyday conversations, in texts, and in media, and particularly in those that relate to the educating of ELLs in the classroom, are debunked and (re)examined.

In Chapter III, the methodology section, I examine the Foucauldian archaeological and genealogical approach to discourse as applied within an action/practice framework, which is the theoretical framework of this dissertation. The following aspects of Foucauldian thought are discussed: (1) genesis of poststructuralist critical linguistics, (2) Foucault and discourse, (3) Foucault and power/knowledge, (4) Foucault and subject, and (5) application of Foucault's work to the pedagogical practices of ELL teachers. In this section, the formation of linguistic discourses are examined by tracing the historical formations of the relationship between language and meanings, and the effects of discourse and power on society, beginning from the modernistic view of language that separates mind from body, via Saussure’s structural linguistics that attempts to fathom meanings in the linguistic systems, and on to the postmodern and poststructural Foucauldian discursive formations (DFs).
After that, I describe the qualitative case study design, settings and participants, data sources, categories of analysis, and analytic tools that were used in this study. Three analytical tools were employed: constant comparison from grounded theory, CHAT (Cultural Historical Activity Theory) and CDA (Critical Discourse Analysis) methods. Level one analysis was performed using a combination of critical ethnographic interpretive descriptions and constant comparison method to examine the patterns of interactions, activities, and discourses. Level two analysis was conducted in order to examine discourses, events, and activities in/across the ESL classrooms using CHAT methods. From level one and two analysis, the selected relevant and significant discourses and interactions, particularly those suitable for contextualized interpretations were analyzed using CDA.

Chapter IV is an analysis of the language ideological discourses circulating in the US curriculum, and in ELL teacher professional development. First, the historical English-only discourses circulating in the nation are examined through a literature review. Then the discourses circulating in the Secondary Language Arts Core Curriculum text and the discourses circulating in a professional development course which Ms. Clark (pseudonym) attended for 1 year and Ms. Lewis (pseudonym) attended for 3 years were examined using constant comparison methods and CDA. The predominant discourses circulating in the professional development course were found to be: (1) Behavioral/Technical Discourses: “Just memorize this formula and you will be OK” and (2) Individual/Psychological Discourse: “What’s in your head?”

Chapter V describes, interprets and analyzes how Ms. Lewis, a White female teacher in her early 30s who had a strong passion for ELLs and ELL education, who
participated in five different professional development courses, performed community
service and visited her students at home, and engaged in continuous conversations with
her ELLs, transformed her pedagogy from hybrid-borderland pedagogy (Buendía, 2003),
i.e., a mixture of elements of culturally relevant pedagogy with elements of efficiency-
oriented assimilative pedagogy, and moved into culturally relevant pedagogy, once she
was situated in a context where she could connect her classroom practice with the wider
community practice. Ms. Lewis’s belief systems did not change, but her pedagogical
practices were transformed during the study period. This demonstrates that an
individual teacher’s desires and passion for ELLs and social justice are not enough for
the enactment of culturally relevant pedagogy, but the teacher's passion for teaching
needs to connect with the discourses and social relations of the community beyond the
classroom door in order to create the spaces in which culturally relevant pedagogy can
take place. This chapter also analyzes how English learners were empowered in the
collective shared knowledge production spaces in/across Ms. Lewis’s ESL classroom,
playing changing roles in dynamically moving activity systems through their dialogue
with preservice university and graduate students, parents, and other teachers in the
school. This chapter is comprised of the following subsections: (1) Overview; (2)
Discourses Circulating in the Community and School; (3) Belief Systems about ELL
Pedagogy; (4) Into the English as a Second Language Classroom; (5) Changing Roles
in/across Contexts: ELLs as Learners, Teachers, Researchers, and Social Activists; and
(6) Expansive Learning Cycles in the Community of Learners from a CHAT
Perspective; and (7) Epilogue.
Chapter VI describes, interprets, and analyzes the ways in which Ms. Clark, a White female ELL teacher in her late 20s, enacted reductive, subtractive pedagogical processes and practices in her ESL classroom. I examined the discursive formation of Ms. Clark’s pedagogical practices by connecting the discourses surrounding the subject positions through which she traversed in her personal and institutional histories, the discourses circulating in her community, school, and in a professional development course that she attended. Chapter VI includes the following subsections: (1) Overview; (2) Discourses Circulating in the Community and School; (3) Belief Systems about ELL Pedagogy; (4) Into the English as a Second Language Classroom; (5) Assimilative Pedagogy: Analysis from a CHAT Perspective; and (6) Epilogue.

Chapter VII is an analysis of the effects of power on the intertextual and interdiscursive processes of the (trans)formations of pedagogical practices. Critical discourse analysis (CDA), i.e., an examination of the dialectic relationship between discursive contexts and orders of discourse (style, genre, discourse) was applied to the following constructs: (1) Assimilative Pedagogy: The Intersection of the Discourse of “Being an English Language Teacher” with Individual/Technical Discourses and Deficit Discourses; (2) Culturally Relevant Pedagogy: The Intersection of the Discourse of “Being an Humanizing Educator” with “Community of Learners” Discourses and “Resource” Discourses; and (3) Culturally Relevant Pedagogy Versus Assimilative Pedagogy.

Chapter VIII presents the conclusions of this research, and includes the following subsections: (1) Discussion, (2) Implications, (3) Limitations, and (4) Future Research.
The conclusion of this research study is that, despite the hegemonic English only and individual/technical/cognitive discourses that dominate the teacher education landscape, teachers can become “transformative intellectuals” when they are situated in the discursive networks of social context that enable their motivations and passions for ELLs and ELL education to be actualized. Only then can they enter into the recursive processes of enacting, debunking and reconstructing deep seated belief systems about ELLs and ELL pedagogy through reflection in/on action.

It may seem remarkable that 2 teachers from the same city, who were so similar in so many ways, could be so different in terms of their pedagogical practices, but this just serves to spotlight the critical importance of discursive social relations and contexts for the formation and transformation of pedagogical practices. The teacher who had little interaction with people from diverse backgrounds, and who had few opportunities to be exposed to the concepts of critical pedagogy and culturally relevant pedagogical practices, always enacted assimilative pedagogy in the classroom every day. On the other hand, the teacher who was an immigrant, and had experienced linguistic discrimination at a young age, enacted culturally relevant pedagogy every day, after she was situated within the multiple social contexts that enabled her to move beyond her previous borderland pedagogy. Despite their outward similarities, the 2 teachers followed in this study came from quite opposite discursive social contexts, and only this can explain their opposite pedagogical beliefs and practices.

Implications of this study are that: (1) Individual teacher’s desires or passions for ELL education are not enough for the enactment of culturally relevant pedagogy, but the teachers' desires can be achieved within interconnected discursive contexts that enable
them to enact culturally relevant pedagogical practices; (2) Teacher and teacher educators need to be educated about the intertwined and inevitable issues of power structures and social contexts, and the importance of ideological clarity for the education of ELLs; and (3) An ESL certificate or endorsement does not necessarily guarantee that a teacher is equipped or prepared to be an excellent teacher for ELLs. It is important that all teachers serving ELLs receive ongoing professional development courses and one-on-one classroom mentoring based on a model of the authentic discourse-oriented and meaning-making ethnographic community of teachers.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This literature review begins by chronicling the progress of second language (L2, hereafter) teacher education research and proposing the statement of problem. Next is an examination of existing empirical research addressing the societal and local discourses and the institutional structures that promote or inhibit the construction of culturally relevant pedagogy and the implementation of culturally relevant pedagogical practices within and outside the classroom. After that, the concept of language ideology and the intertwined relationship between language ideologies and second language and literacy education are discussed. Finally, in order to explain the discursive formations that either foster or limit the creation of spaces of culturally relevant pedagogy in the classroom, a historical examination of the formation of knowledge about how to teach second language and literacy is presented in chronological order.

This chapter is composed of the following sections: (1) research on L2 teacher education, (2) research on the construction of pedagogical discourses and practices; (3) language ideology: (a) theorizing language ideology and (b) language ideology in second language and literacy education, and (4) competing discourses about second language and literacy education: (a) the behavioral approach, (b) the cognitive approach, (c) the
Research on Second Language Teacher Education

Second language (L2, hereafter) teaching and teacher education has been developed based upon a knowledge base drawn from linguistics, language learning theory, and language teaching methodology (Richards, 1987). In the mid-1970s, research on L2 teacher education focused on the relationship between teacher’s behaviors and students’ outcomes (Dunkin & Biddle, 1974) and was designed based on a positivistic process-product paradigm, measuring results in terms of the scores that students received on tests given to them before and after teacher training (Johnson, 2006). Freeman (1989) disagreed with this knowledge-transmission model of language teacher education, which assumes that knowledge about language and content will naturally be applied in practice, stating, “Both misconceptions stem from overattention to the ancillary areas supporting language teacher education, at the expense of a clear focus on language teaching itself and the person who is learning to teach” (Freeman, p. 30). In the 1980s, research on L2 teacher education adopted a cognitive-information processing approach, focusing on the examination of what and how teachers know, and what factors impacts the (meta)cognitive decision making processes that form their classroom practices.

The process-product design does not take into consideration the prior experiences, beliefs, and attitudes interrelated with the present performances of teachers, or the everyday D/discourses within the specific socio-cultural context. In this regard, Tedick and Walker (1994) pointed out five fundamental and interrelated problems in L2 sociocultural and dialogic approach, (d) the critical approach, and (e) the culturally relevant pedagogy approach.
education and research as follows: first, a failure to consider the interdependence between first and second languages and cultures; second, the fragmentation and isolation of language arts field themselves; third, the pervasive view of language as “object;” fourth, a paralyzing focus on methodology, and fifth, a continued failure to reflect in practice the connection between language and culture. Holliday (1994) also claimed that teaching theories and practices need to be developed based on an examination of individual, social, and cultural contexts in which language teaching and learning occur.

In the 1990s, the concept of language teacher cognition was posited by Freeman (1996) and was extended by Borg (2008). Teacher cognition refers to “the unobservable cognitive dimension of teaching – what teachers know, believe, and think” (Borg, 2008, p. 190). Based on the grounded analysis of the mainstream teacher research and language teacher research, Borg (2003) identified these components of teacher cognition: beliefs, theories, attitudes, metaphors, conceptions, perspectives, and knowledge, particularly about teaching, teachers, learning, students, subject matter, curriculum, materials, instructional activities, and self (Borg, 2008). He found teacher cognition to be quite variable and dynamic, influenced by multiple factors, such as the extent of former schooling experiences, professional coursework taken, the teacher’s classroom practices and experiences, and contextual factors caused by a mismatch between cognition and practice that affect classroom practices. Most research on teacher cognition, however, is still centered on teacher’s individual cognition, and does not specifically examine the historical, socio-cultural, economical, global, local, and institutional forces around language that affect language and language learners.
Thus, Allwright (2003) proposed three constructs of *Exploratory Practice* (EP), i.e., a form of practitioner research in language teaching: *quality of life* in the language classroom, *understandings* of the quality of language classroom life, and conceptualizing understanding as a fundamental *social* matter, not an *asocial* one. He envisioned “EP itself, as a continuously cyclical process of global and local thought and action” (p. 114) with “two processes, one as *taking action for understanding* and the other as *working with emerging understanding*” (p. 123). EP refers to the developmental processes through which language teachers’ practices develop by being engaged in the cyclic reflective processes and practices. Through complex situational understandings, reflections, explorations for the awareness of teachers’ own beliefs and behaviors collectively with coworkers and individually, the integration of their understandings into the classroom practices is accomplished within the mutual collegial academic community situations. EP is still in the process of development (Allwright, 2003), because the focus is still on the language teacher, instead of multiple other factors surrounding the teaching context and the language learners.

Kumaravadivelu (2001) suggests conceptualizing a L2 learning/teaching and L2 teacher education pedagogy drawn from three concepts: *particularity, practicality*, and *possibility*. *Particularity* emphasizes the uniqueness of each context and location, and asserts that a different pedagogy is needed for each combination of teachers, learners, goals, institutional context and sociocultural surroundings. *Practicality* demands teacher-generated theories of practice based on what works best in each particular situation, and *possibility* advocates harnessing the political tendencies of the oppressed to promote the establishment of equal power relationships inside and outside the educational system.
Johnson (2006) also argued for a departure from the dominant positivistic forms of conducting research on L2 teacher education and proposed, “an interpretive or situated paradigm, largely drawn from ethnographic research in sociology and anthropology, came to be seen as better suited to explaining the complexities of teachers’ mental lives and the various dimensions of teachers’ professional worlds” (p. 236).

A search of the literature related to L2 teacher research revealed a paucity of discourse-oriented ethnographic research analyzing the trajectories of L2 teachers’ beliefs and practices from the poststructrual perspective, which is based on a conceptual framework of power/discourses/knowledge (Foucault, 1980; McDermott, 1996; Popkewitz, 1998). This research will help fill the gap between research and practice, both by theorizing the formation and transformation of culturally relevant pedagogical practices and by practicalizing theories about L2 teacher education.

**Research on the Construction of Pedagogical Discourses and Practices**

...codes underpinned by local knowledge, or what we will frame as discourse, that index racial and classed meanings of people as well as construct places within institutional and city spaces... City educators are also involved in the production and maintenance of these codes and knowledge about city space and group identity. (Buendía & Ares, 2006, p. 1)

This section reviews the existing research related to the construction of pedagogical discourses and practices, particularly, research undertaken from a poststructural perspective that examines the formation of those pedagogical discourses and practices that promote or inhibit the creation of culturally relevant pedagogy in third space. The above quote is drawn from a study by Buendía and Ares
addressing the spatial aspects of the production of educational knowledge and practice. Buendía and Ares (2006) examined the pedagogical discourses about race and class that were associated with different localities within one metropolitan city using data drawn from interviews with teachers, principals, and residents, and from observations of the neighborhoods, schools, and classrooms. They found that encoded discourses about race and class were aligned with particular geographic locations. For example, students of color living in the low-income working class West Side were labeled “deficient” and “at risk,” while White students in the high-income East Side were considered “intellectually-able,” and students in Central City, in the space between East Side and West Side, were viewed as both “not West Side” and “not East Side.” Those codes produced and sustained the durability of local patterns of educational knowledge, institutional technologies, and pedagogical practices (Buendía, Ares, Juarez, & Peercy, 2004; Buendía & Ares, 2006). The historically constructed categories of local discourses represented in the language used by residents, portrayed in the public media, and followed by educators functioned as the “organizing logic” for pedagogical discourses and practices that treated students differently based on their location. Schooling technologies also aligned with the pattern of local knowledge and discourses; federal and state funding went to literacy education programs framed in phonics-based remedial literacy instruction in West Side, to balanced literacy programs in East Side, and to mixed model literacy programs in Central City.
Similarly, Popkewitz (1998) investigated “how the discursive practices produce *urbanness/ruralness* of child” (p. 3) and how those categories assign specific meanings to “the qualities of the child” through an analysis of a training program called Teach for America, which provided training to 500 youths, “grown up with privilege,” who aspired to be teachers, and who committed to spending “two years working with people who were often denied any privilege” (p. 9). Based on a conceptual framework that emphasized relations of Foucauldian biopower, knowledge, and socially categorized discourses, Popkewitz applied constant comparative methods and critical discourse analysis to ethnographic data he collected at the Teach for America program, including observations, interviews, and surveys, and found that discourses of schooling that were scaffolded by social and political rationality constructed “doublets, or double relationships, in which the child’s ‘negative’ or ‘pathological’ traits are recast in ‘positive terms’ that guide, rationalize, and racialize how the teacher constructs teaching intending to make the child become ‘successful’ and disciplined” (p. 56). He concluded that the interconnected networks of power, local knowledge and discourses were manifested “in what teachers ‘see’, think, feel, and talk about regarding children and school subjects” (p. 5), that is, the reasoning systems of schooling underpinning embodied pedagogical practices are constructed by discursive practices of differentiation, categorization, and statements/silences about particular forms of knowledge, and are inscribed by power
structures, so we need to consider “issues of schooling as social and political enterprise” (p. 2).

Buendía (2000) also examined the ways in which relational and contextual pedagogical discourses among/around cooperating teachers and preservice teachers within school structures functioned in pedagogical practices from a poststructuralist, connectionist perspective. Buendía’s (2000) conceptual framework was one of Foucauldian relational power networks producing overall discourses in action/practices “from the interconnection and spatial and temporal positioning of multiple relations” (p. 148) and social theories of practice (Bakhtin 1986; Bourdieu, 1984). His data were collected during 7 months of daily classroom observations and weekly planning sessions, formal evaluation meetings, course syllabi, other artifacts, in addition to formal and informal interviews with a 23-year-old, single, White, middle-class female preservice teacher. Analysis of the data using the constant comparative method (Strauss, 1987) demonstrated that teacher’s pedagogical practices reflected the dominant pedagogical discourse, a psychological/individual discourse that functions as symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1984), or legitimate value, within all the interrelated discourses in society, and supports the concept of socially constructed pedagogical practices in the relations of power.

Another study by Buendía, Gitlin, and Doumbia (2003) explored the efforts of one Senegalese American middle class ESL teacher to implement culturally relevant pedagogy for his marginalized immigrant students. That study focused on investigating the ways that teacher’s personal desires provide learning opportunities
for his students interacted with school structures, systems, curriculum, curriculum materials, and discourses. Over an 8-month period, data were collected through classroom observations of the participant teacher, observation of his peer teachers, faculty meetings, parent-faculty meetings, and through in-depth formal and ongoing informal interviews, which were analyzed in order to identify the multiple layers of D/discourses and institutional structures. Comparative analysis of the data showed that “contextual structures and local discourses mediate the attempts by a critically minded African teacher to challenge the focus on language acquisition, assimilation, and an efficiency orientation that buries the values hidden in particular educational approaches” (p. 309), and revealed a kind of borderland pedagogy, i.e., a combination of culturally relevant pedagogy along with the pervasive assimilationist pedagogy.

Several studies explored the possibilities of the creation of third space in and out of classroom settings, and found that creating third space is possible when the teacher can escape from her authoritative status and enter into the worlds of her students (Gutiérrez, Rymes, & Larson, 1995; Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez & Tejeda, 1999); when traditional notions of school literacy are debunked (Sheehy, 2009), instruction that employs students’ multiple funds of knowledge is implemented (Gutiérrez, 2008; Moje et al., 2004)

Gutiérrez et al. (1995) explored the possibilities of constructing third space, and sought culturally relevant pedagogical relational context in a ninth-grade immigrant classroom setting from poststructuralist perspective, employing sociocultural notions of power and subject production, social heteroglossia and internal dialogic meaning (Bakhtin, 1984) and Goffman’s (1961) underlife as
theoretical constructs. Gutiérrez et al. (1995) examined power relations in the patterns of participation structures in the social space of the classroom, using data including video-tapes, field notes, and ongoing conversations with teachers, students, parents, administrators, and other school personnel across multiple contexts over the course of school year. Discourse analysis of classroom activities and utterances revealed that the teacher maintained power through monologism, stifling dialogue and interaction and propagated the dominant cultural values and inscribed knowledge of the teacher. Meanwhile, students’ counter-script emerged and submerged in a “contained form of underlife” (Goffman, 1961), i.e., “participants’ attempted to fit into existing institutional structures without introducing pressure for radical change” (Goffman, 1961, p. 199). The potential for third space exists when the teacher and students depart from their rigidly scripted and exclusive social spaces and when all students’ discourses, identities, roles, and epistemologies are valued.

Gutiérrez (2008) formed the theoretical construct for a collective third space from a sociocritical perspective of literacy, based on the study of one 16-year-old immigrant girl. The processes that Ave used to produce her autobiography revealed tools for “developing new beginnings in highly personal and idiosyncratic ways toward transformative ends, individually, and collectively, and educationally, and socio-politically” (Gutiérrez, 2008, p. 149). In the hybrid third space constituted of multiple synchronic and diachronic activity systems, immigrant ELLs were engaged in meaningful literacy and grammatical development through various semiotic meditational means, drawn from their own cross-contextual sociohistorical lived experiences.
In the same vein, Moje et al. (2004) performed a study, based on critical discourse and critical social theory and employing constant comparative analysis from grounded theory (Strauss, 1987; Strauss & Corbin, 1990), in order to explore the possibilities of translating students’ out-of-school funds of knowledge and Discourses into content area literacy, and utilizing those literacies in the school science curriculum. Moje et al. assessed the multiple everyday funds of knowledge held by 30 seventh- and eighth-grade Latino(a) students from “low income, or working class families” (p. 47) in urban Detroit, Michigan. Over a 5-year period, they collected participant observations, interviews, photographs, and artifacts and texts produced by students in order to identify and characterize the Discourses circulating among those students and in the community.

Moje et al. (2009) found that students “had to be invited to talk about” themselves because “students in this study generally did not volunteer their knowledges drawn from home and family experiences” (p. 64). They found that the students in their study generally considered the multiple funds of knowledge constructed through their social and cultural practices “as distinct from the reading, writing, and learning” (p. 59) they needed to do in school, so that they did not draw on their various funds of knowledge and Discourse in classroom learning contexts. For example, when a teacher said in science class that smoke was always White, a girl named Tana disagreed with the teacher’s statement, based on her experiences gained while frying tortillas at home. She did not express her opinion in class, but, later, while being interviewed, she explained how she knew that smoke was not always white. When they were interviewed, three Hispanic students connected their family lives in the US and in Mexico with the teacher’s classroom lessons about the importance of environmental issues such as water and air
quality. When asked about what could happen if a factory was closed because of “air-quality violations,” several students recognized how such issues could affect their fathers, who were farmers, dry cleaners, and landscapers, mentioning that such an action could cause their fathers to lose their jobs. Also, these bilingual Hispanic students spent a great deal of time “messing around” with their peers, bike riding, sharing music, surfing the Internet, and “listening to, reading about, and writing about music and television programs” (p. 58). Moje et al. proposed that through those interactional processes, students learn skills related to making “claims and providing warrant for choices or music, media, and clothing” and “how to make signs and written symbols that will be read in particular ways by other youths” (p. 58), which can be connected with school literacy practices. When they sought written material that could be used to connect community funds of knowledge with the science curriculum and enable science class to connect with social issues in the real world, Moje et al. found published letters written by community activists protesting against the construction of elementary school near a toxic waste site, and “a written survey on the quality of air as information gathering for a lawsuit against an industry that operates in the neighborhood surrounding the school” (p. 56). Moje et al. concluded that “inquiring about real-world questions should be supported, deepened, expanded, and even challenged by linking the community’s funds of knowledge about how to engage in social actions” (p. 56) through “a change in policies and perspectives that shape classroom practices.” (p. 68), and that connecting community funds of knowledge with the science curriculum in school is possible if teachers and curriculum developers work toward the active construction of third space by seeking out “deep understandings of the particular funds of knowledge and Discourse that their students
have available outside of school” (p. 65). Based on their findings, Moje et al. found third space to be: (a) a scaffolding space that enables students to connect their everyday knowledge with formal scientific knowledge, (b) a navigational space that allows student to explore and cross the boundaries of home and school discourse communities, and (c) a space that makes it possible for students to construct new and critical understandings and academic literacy by allowing them to reshape and challenge the conventional literacies.

Sheehy (2009) examined “whether non-school literacies can be used to teach school content” (p. 141) in the middle school science classroom, approaching the issue of literacy pedagogy using a conceptual framework based on the New London Group’s *new literacies*, Moll’s *funds of knowledge*, and Lefebvre’s spatial theory. Sheehy conceptualized spatial theory as follows: (a) Social life is produced and reproduced in the dialectic processes of the three spatial interactions: the perceived Firstspace social practices, the conceived Secondspace (i.e., representations of space), and the lived space (i.e., representational space) and (b) Power existing in the conceived Secondspace underpins school and classroom practices through ordering logic and “is produced in the full triad of perceived-conceived-lived space” (Sheehy, 2009, p. 146).

In order to explore the possibilities of enacting out-of-school literacy practices in a science class located in a low-income area of Upstate New York, Sheehy compared and contrasted the organizing patterns and logics of LINC (Literacy in Collaboration), an after-school literacy tutoring program designed and operated by Sheehy, with those of a conventional seventh-grade science class taught by a teacher named Sabrina. In the design of LINC, which targeted students from a low-income family background, Sheehy approached learning from a sociocultural perspective, utilizing, particularly, Rogoff’s
guided participation. LINC tutoring sessions and classroom observational field notes were characterized according to Jacklin’s (2004) typology of classroom pedagogy, that is, “discursive-led, repetition-led, convention-led, and no instruction” (p. 148).

Sheehy found that in the conventional school science class, “conventions of the workbook, test preparation worksheets, and lab worksheets organized all curriculum genres” (p. 150). Of the 30 lessons observed during the study, 3 were classroom labs and 3 were park labs. In classroom lab, students were kept busy completing worksheets and reciting the correct answers in response to the teacher’s questions. For park lab, students were told to find “samples of living things in and around the pond ecosystem in the park” (p. 150). But there were only two pairs of waders, so only two students could use them; the others just roamed around the pond. Classroom lessons were not connected with lab lessons, and the learned contents were not utilized in other curriculum genres. The interactions between teacher and students were mostly composed of the typical banal patterns of IRE (Initiation-Response-Evaluation) and repetition. Additionally, the focal student, Guyanese American Mannie, was not usually able to complete worksheets in class because “he periodically put his head on his arm and rested” (p. 152).

In contrast, Mannie, a LINC student, enjoyed writing an article about a rap video review with his tutor, Rob, a university student from one of Sheehy’s classes, who was also a professional rapper. During tutoring sessions, IRE patterns were used as a tool for collaborating with Mannie about how to write an article for a magazine. Lessons were connected with instructions, contents, and students’ tastes and “there was no re-inscription of LINC with practices” (p. 155). Mannie chose what he would like to write about, rap, and could follow whatever topics or tastes he liked while participating in
learning activities. Thus, Mannie’s perceived Firstspace of social practice was able to merge with LINC’s Secondspace vision of literacy in collaboration, and a lived Thirdspace was created, completely unlike the conventional science classroom, where a pattern of worksheet completion, IRE, round-robin reading, and repetition was the rule (Sheehy, 2009).

Sheehy concluded that students in the conventional science classroom were unengaged because of “Sabrina’s means of rearticulating the Secondspace vision of science operating in her school district at a given period of time in the school’s literacy history.” A Secondspace conceived with a vision of student engagement enabled LINC to be “organized around learning,” while the conventional science program was “organized around content distribution” (p. 156). The social networks outside of the classroom imposed a particular conception of science literacy through requirements of the New York State Education Department and through US federal requirements such as the NCLB (No Child Left Behind) law, which focus on school accountability based on individual student’s achievement scores and AYP (Annual Yearly Progress). Those social systems forced the school district and the middle school to concentrate on increasing students’ scores through test-preparation worksheets, because Tipton Middle School, where this research was conducted, “was identified as a school not making Annual Yearly Progress” (p. 149). Sabrina was a member of a district-wide science curriculum committee, and was involved in professional development that insured that the science curriculum and instruction were aligned with the state’s eighth-grade standardised testing. The dominance of those social structures meant that “ecology literacy involved literacy genres but it also involved relations to university personnel, state education personnel, a
curriculum committee, and science teachers across the district” (p. 157). Sheehy concluded that nonschool literacies can be practiced “when the vision for these practices becomes part of the social relations of the Secondspace relations that play in the ordering of Firstspace” (p. 157).

All these empirical research studies have investigated effects of power relations and language ideological discourses upon the formation of pedagogical practices. The pedagogical practices and subjectivities of teachers are constructed through the interaction of multiple social contexts networks of power-related discursive practices (Buendía, 2000, 2003; Buendía et al., 2004; Buendía & Ares, 2006; Popkewitz, 1998). Teachers’ desires are mediated by institutional structures and discourses (Buendía et al., 2003). The utilization of nonschool literacies in school settings is possible only when those conceptions of literacies are integrated into the Secondspace of social relations (Sheehy, 2009). Differences between a teacher’s meaning systems and those of students can hinder or prevent the enactment of culturally relevant pedagogy in classroom settings (Gutiérrez et al., 1995). These researchers all urge the pursuit of Thirddspace through sociocritical literacy (Gutiérrez, 2008) and the integration of students’ multiple *funds of knowledge* into academic literacy (Gutiérrez et al., 1999; Moje et al., 2004) by creating connections between teachers and students and between students using shared signs, texts, and dialogues.

However, little research has been conducted connecting power relations and language ideological discourses with the formation of ESL pedagogy and with the pedagogical practices that ESL teachers employ in the education of English learner students in ESL classrooms. Thus, this dissertation research examines the ways in which
networks of societal discourses and institutional technologies direct the formation and transformation of the pedagogical practices of teachers of secondary English learner students through the discourses that circulate in the nation, communities, professional development programs, schools, and classrooms: dominating discourses of English-only language ideology and competing psychological and technical discourses about how to teach English and English learner students. Thus, the following sections will deal with the existing research theorizing language ideology, the relationship between language/literacy education and English-only language ideological discourses, and the multiple historically-rooted competing discourses about how to teach English and ELLs.

**Language Ideology**

Theorizing Language Ideology

*A definition of language is always, implicitly or explicitly, a definition of human beings in the world.* (Williams, 1977, p. 21)

Linguistic ideologies may be sought in the narratives that explain linguistic structures in terms of social processes; Silverstein (1979), taking this approach, examined the relationship between metapragmatics and language-in-use from a linguistic anthropological perspective, and defined linguistic ideologies to be “sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use” (p. 193). On the other hand, when the social aspects of language varieties and communication processes are emphasized, language ideologies have been seen to be “the cultural systems of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests” (Irvine 1989, p. 255).
Furthermore, the moral and political contextualization of language ideology may be conceptualized at a variety of different levels.

First, when ideology has been conceptualized in terms of the ideas and beliefs that people possess, as it would be found in cultural conceptual schemata, language ideology has been defined to be those cultural belief systems, schemata, and ideational concepts about language shared by members of a group that support their own interests. This nonevaluative view of language ideology is typified in Mannheim’s (1936) “total conception of ideology,” and in Geertz’s (1973) claim that language ideologies mediate meanings for social purposes. Theories such as ethnography of speaking, language socialization (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984), folk theory, genre theory, and speech act theory (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969) align with this neutral concept of language ideology. However, Thompson (1990) criticized neutral views of language ideology because they do not address the interactivity between language and power.

Second, when ideology is sought within language-in-interaction processes, language ideologies speak to the explicit and implicit constructs that govern face-to-face communication situations, and map macrosocial processes with microlinguistic interactions. In this case, language ideology connects language-in-use with macrosocial status through processes of signifying practices and language iconization (Gal & Irvine, 2000), which position the subject in relation to the listener in terms of their particular languages, and the languages spoken within their situated sociocultural contexts. Categorizations, in terms of “Standard Speech” versus “Nonstandard Dialect” and “Good” versus “Bad” language speakers, channel the processes of signification, embodiment and imagination (Gal & Irvine, 2000).
Third, if ideology is identified in terms of power relations, language ideologies tie the identities of people to perceptions about their language, including “not only linguistic form and use but also the very notion of the person and the social group, as well as such fundamental social institutions as religious ritual, child socialization, gender relations, the nation-state, schooling, and law” (Woolard, 1998, p. 3). Modernistic linguistic theories (Locke) offer a nationalist form of ideology that incorporates the concept of one language/one nation, which may have consequences such as the domination of English in former British colonies where languages other than English are commonly spoken, as in the US, Zambia, Indonesia, and Hong Kong.

Fourth, if ideology is used to rationalize, distort, and produce illusion in order to maintain the interests of the dominant group, language ideologies function as cognitive manipulative tools, which are termed language ideological distortion by Kroskrity (2000). Just as Marxian false consciousness and Foucault’s power/ knowledge are examples of power exercised in consensual forms rather than in coercive forms, nationalist, hegemonic, standard-language agenda may be imposed in the name of communicative efficiency and national unity.

In conclusion, language ideologies exist in multiple forms: in our hidden mental schemata, belief systems, assumptions, folk theories, prejudices, attitudes, expectations, reasoning processes, and philosophical positions. These multiple forms of possessed language ideologies are interconnected with politics and identity, and concomitantly are enacted explicitly and implicitly in the our daily communicative contexts within the particular spatial-temporal moment as well as discourses intended to
achieve or maintain the interests of specific social and cultural groups, whether taught in school curricula or imparted through other power structures.

Language Ideology in Second Language and Literacy Education

...there is no equality of treatment merely by providing students with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers, and curriculum; for students who do not understand English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education. Basic English skills are at the very core of what these public schools teach. Imposition of a requirement that, before a child can effectively participate in the educational program, he must already have acquired those basic skills is to make a mockery of public education. We know that those who do not understand English are certain to find their classroom experiences wholly incomprehensible and in no way meaningful. (Douglas, 1974, as cited in Crawford, 1992, p. 253)

...students’ identities are affirmed and academic achievement promoted when teachers express respect for the language and cultural knowledge students bring to the classroom, and when the instruction is focused on helping students generate new knowledge, create literate and art, and act on social realities that affect their lives. (Cummins, 2000, p. 34)

The beliefs about language, language learners, and language and literacy education which shape the instructional patterns of the US language classroom, regarding what to teach and how to teach, are predominantly informed by standard language ideology, as evidenced by the obsessive error correction that is typical of language teachers (Tollfeson, 1999). Standard language ideology is characterized by “a bias toward an abstract, idealized homogeneous language, which is imposed and maintained by dominant institutions and which has as its model the written language, but which is drawn primarily from the spoken language of the upper middle class” (Lippi-Green, 1997, p. 64). The argument for the value of preserving linguistic homogeneity serves as justification for linguistic discrimination (Lippi-Green, 1997). Kroskrity (2000) also elucidated “the dual role of standard languages as embodiments of both national identity and state-endorsed
social inequality” (p. 28). According to Tollefeson (1999), standard language ideology connects language learning with accuracy of performance, such that if language learners cannot get their forms to fit the standard form, it is presumed to be because of the “users' carelessness, idleness or incompetence” (Cameron, 1995, p. 39). On the other hand, if we view language learning as a social phenomenon, we see language learning as being related to the learner's ability to engage with others in order to communicate and position their identities. Tollefeson (1999) further argues that the concepts of error correction, native speaker, and standard norm need to be reexamined because “heterogeneity is an integral part of the linguistic economy of the community, necessary to satisfy the linguistic demands of everyday life” (Labov, 1982, p. 17). However, standard English ideologies about English literacy have become entrenched through the construction of standard assessments (Apple, 1995) that legitimize hegemonic symbolic domination and, ultimately, contribute to the reproduction of social inequality (Bourdieu, 1991).

Regarding the long-term, persistent underachievement of language minority students, that is, English language learners (ELLs), Cummins (2000) argued that the theories that dominate education and second language acquisition (SLA) highlight barriers to literacy achievement of ELLs, such as cultural/linguistic mismatch between home and school and lack of target language exposure, but cannot adequately explain the failure of US public schools to meet the educational needs of ELLs. In order to deal with these issues, researchers, policy makers, and teachers need to focus on the sociocultural contextual issues relevant to language learning and teaching, such as the devaluation of identities, educational tracking systems, patterns of discrimination, assessment methods, curriculum, and the language of instruction used for teaching ELLs. Cummins (1986)
related a powerful example illustrating how English as a Second Language (ESL) programs fail ELL students: A Mexican immigrant student who arrived in the US at age 10 had greater academic success than a US born Chicano, due to the better L1 literacy ability of the former, and the sense of devaluation of his culture and language felt by the latter. Likewise, many research studies that have examined the relationship between social context and the quality of language and literacy education provided for ESL students have found problems, both at the structural institutional level, such lack of support for ELL literacy from states and schools, and in the microinstructional processes, such as skill-drill based instruction (Gebhard, 2004, 2005; McKay & Wong, 1996; Valdés, 1998; Wong-Fillmore, 2000).

Educational systems employing separated specialized instructions in English can also disallow the success of minority language students by positioning them as interpellated subjects, thus giving them a socially internalized self image dominated by their incompetence to use English, as revealed by Toohey’s (1998) longitudinal ethnographic study of six ELL children in Canadian ESL classrooms. According to Gebhard (2004), the harm caused by second language acquisition (SLA) instruction is an institutional phenomenon because “the discourses of school reform in the United States visibly and invisibly placed second language learners in new highly vulnerable positions” and ultimately, “classroom literacy practices inadvertently constrained the efforts of second language learners to acquire academic literacies” (p. 243). Fillmore’s article about “Loss of Family Languages” (2000) illustrates how the American way of imposing
the exclusive use of English in school settings led an immigrant Chinese boy to experience identity confusion and, ultimately, family disconnection.

Pennycook (1994) states, “English is one of the most powerful means of inclusion into or exclusion from further education, employment, or social position” (p. 14). Studies by Olsen (1997) showed that the label “Limited English Proficiency” applied to recently immigrated ELL students in California high schools limited the social and academic opportunities available to those students by segregating them from native speaking peers, and that the *subtractive bilingualism* promoted in those schools led to linguistic and cultural loss. “Schools are not neutral sites; they are impacted by larger semiotic and discursive practices that can produce, reproduce, or interrogate language practices” (Zentella, 1997, p. 240). The deep-seated perceptions and conceptions of the public are manifested in societal ideologies, and are mirrored in the classroom, leading English as second language classrooms to become *battlegrounds in culture wars* (Shor, 1986).

Unequal respect shown in schools and in society for the symbolic capital of people from minority languages and cultures leads to a significant correlation between low English language proficiency and academic underachievement among language minority students with low SES in the US. In this regard, Cummins (2000) argued for a transformative pedagogy characterized by three factors: *critical literacy, critical language awareness, and acting on social realities*, as applied by transformative educators. “Transformatiye educators acknowledge that educational structures are rooted in a sociopolitical context that traditionally has disempowered subordinated group students and they orchestrate interactions with their students that challenge these forms of disempowerment. In short, their conception of what education is all about and why
they are in the classroom is fundamentally different than that of most policy-makers who see education primarily in terms of the efficient delivery of a service” (Cummins, 2000, p. 281).

Competing Discourses About Second Language and Literacy Education

The two approaches to the education of ELLs which are currently most prevalent, the behavioral approach and the cognitive approach, are based on individual /psychological discourses (Buendía, 2000; Buendía et al., 2003). In contrast, culturally relevant pedagogy is rooted in sociocultural theory and takes a social-critical approach to education. Sociocultural thought sees learning to occur through social interactions within societal contexts; people learn language and develop literacy abilities in/through dialogic social interactions by appropriating psychological tools, i.e., language, reading, and writing, in the process of internalizing and externalizing the second language and literacies within the diverse activity systems in which they are situated (Engeström, 1985, Lantolf, 2004, 2008; Rogoff, 2003; Vygotsky, 1978). The social contexts and discourses in which ELLs are embedded, which play such a crucial role in their language learning and literacy development, are formed and maintained through the operation of power relations in society. Therefore, sociocultural theory has been supplemented by social critical analysis in order to address the ways in which human learning and development are influenced by power relations, which are the
focal point of critical approaches to language and literacy development. The
relationships and interactions between power, discourses, ideologies, social
identities, subjectivities, production of knowledge, and the agency of ELLs, which
all play important roles in the process of learning a second language and literacy,
are discussed in the critical approach section.

Behavioral Approach

Behaviorists think of learning as a process of habit formation by means of
input composed of stimuli and feedback, and responses to those inputs. Speakers
provide stimuli for language learners by modeling specific forms and patterns for
language learners to acquire through imitations. Then the speakers reinforce and
correct language learners’ forms and patterns through feedback. Input is considered
to be an external tool used to supply the appropriate manipulated stimuli and
adequate feedback in order to prompt those sets of imitative behaviors and habit
formations necessary for SLA. Behaviorists view language learning as a routine
and regular accumulation of habits, so that they cannot explain the acquisition of
complex grammatical features and creative word formation processes.

Behaviorists (Skinner) saw learning as a process of habit formations, a process in
which internal cognitive mechanisms are formed through repeated patterns of stimuli and
responses. The speakers provide stimuli for the language learners, modeling forms and
patterns, which language learners learn through imitation and repetition. Then, the
speakers reinforce and correct the language learners’ forms and patterns through feedback.
Input is considered to be an external tool, a way to supply the appropriate, controlled stimuli that will assist the learner to form the patterns of imitative behavior and habits that evidence SLA.

In the 1950s, the audiolingual method (ALM) was formed under the influence of Skinner’s behaviorist theory of learning and structural linguistics. ALM proposed that language is acquired as a type of habit, formed through a process of practice and reinforcement. ALM focused on frequent error corrections and accuracy over fluency. In ALM based class, the teacher is the center of learning, and directs students’ verbal and nonverbal behaviors. The benefit of ALM based instruction is language learners’ metalinguistic awareness and accuracy, but the disadvantage is that learners may not communicate effectively in real contexts. Additionally, behaviorists view language learning as the routine and regular formation of habits, so they cannot explain the acquisition of complex grammatical features and creative word formation processes.

Cognitive Approaches

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

In the early 1980s, communicative language teaching (CLT) was developed as an effort to improve learner’s communicative abilities. The basic tenet of CLT was that learners acquire language through communication with others in a variety of the triangular form-meaning-use contexts. CLT is based on psycholinguistics, largely influenced by Krashen’s (1981) comprehensible input hypothesis and Swain’s (1985) output hypothesis. In a CLT-based class, learners are provided with ample opportunities
to negotiate meanings and forms, and to tackle activities and tasks in a group. A teacher in a CLT classroom is like the conductor of an orchestra, initiating and facilitating all the structured input and output activities.

However, Donato criticized conventional psycholinguistics, saying that “underlying the construct of L2 input and output in modified interaction (which is said to foster negotiation leading to reorganization of a learner’s interlangauge) is the code model of communication, which presupposes that the goal of communicative language use is the successful sending and receiving of linguistic tokens” (1994, p. 34). Lakoff (1987) disagreed with the conduit-metaphor theory of communication, arguing that true communication happens only when speaker and hearer use the same language in a shared conceptual system. The individual code based phonology, morphosyntax, and referential syntactical aspects of modernist SLA theory cannot explain the delicate, complicated, and intertwined connections and relationships among specific events, D/discourses, and human agency that occur implicitly and explicitly in/through/within verbal and nonverbal dialectic, dialogical interactions among people and semiotic entities in their environment. Currently developed SLA theories, such as Larson-Freeman’s chaos/complexity theory, Lemke’s dynamic systems theory, Scollon’s concept of *langue, idiolect, and speech community*, and van Lier’s ecological and semiotic view of SLA, are all based on a postmodernist view of SLA.

In postmodernist social constructivist thought, context is the essential key to understanding language learning and literacy development. Context is defined in multiple ways: the environment of an organism from ecological approach to language learning (van Lier, 2004); the text – intertext relationships (Witte, 1992) from the constructivist
view of semiotics; a frame surrounding the event being examined and resources for its appropriate interpretation (Goffman, 1974) from linguistic anthropology; the threads, strands, and fibers of history (Roth & Lee, 2007) from cultural-historical activity theory (Cole, 2000; Leonti’ev, 1981). From poststructuralist view, second language and literacy development are interdisciplinary and multimodal and polydimensional nature of ecologically oriented activity based action (Kramsch, 2004) through language and literacy in use. Language is understood as the contextualized connections of cognition, culture, history, agency, and identity through processes in/through discursive practices within speech communities. Language is practiced and practicalized in multiple discourses representing different speech communities of practices.

The poststructuralist and postmodernist view of language learning show how language learners’ and teachers’ attitudes, motives, goals, and behaviors are dialectically related to material conditions, which in turn determine roles and identities of learners and teachers in and through discourses (Lantolf, 2004) in the related situational contextual discourse communities. The mechanistic dichotomy – input/output, implicit/explicit, learning/acquisition, subject/object, internal factors/external factors, subject/environment – do not exist separately, but exist in the specific situated diverse contextualized contexts constituted by spatial-temporal constraints from postmodernist thought.

Behaviorism based audio-lingual methods (ALM) are built on the tenet that language is acquired through habit formation. Cognitive psycholinguistics based communicative language teaching (CLT) emphasizes listening and speaking in real settings for the improvement of communicative competence. Neither ALM nor CLT prioritize literacy instruction, i.e., reading, writing, concept formation and
(meta)cognitive structuring through language, or the interrelated relationship between language, culture, cognition, and context, but ELLs in secondary public school settings need academic literacy, i.e., “Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency” in order to succeed in academia. In the consideration of the academic needs of ELLs across subject area, English language and literacy at the discourse level in multiple contexts must be emphasized in order to spur the development of multiple complex interrelated concepts and academic content (August & Hakuta, 1997; Chamot & O’Malley, 1994; Garcia, 1993; NCES, 1999), symbolic competence (Kramsch, 2006), and transcultural/translingual competence (Byrne) needed for the current 21st-century multilingual and multicultural society.

**Reading Comprehension**

CLT (Communicative Language Teaching) began to predominate in the early 1980s. Before that, reading comprehension research was based predominantly on a simplistic view of reading that saw reading comprehension to depend only on a combination of decoding ability and language comprehension (Gough & Tummer 1986). However, that simplistic view of reading was challenged by a more complex view of reading (Deacon & Kirby, 2004; Joshi & Aaron, 2000; Nagy, Berniger, Abbott, Vaughan & Vermeulen, 2006) that posited that readers use multiple variables, such as conceptual relationships, prior knowledge, interpolation, extrapolation, monitoring, and metacognitive functions in the process of reading. Research studies in which students demonstrated strong decoding and language skills, yet were unable to comprehend what
they read (Decon & Kirby, 2004; Joshi & Aaron, 2000; Nagy et al. 2006; Proctor, August, Carlo & Snow, 2006), also indicated that a more complex view of reading was needed.

Nevertheless, the dominant practices in L2 reading education continue to be the same skill/strategy training and postreading questioning from the simplistic view of L2 reading (Bamford & Day, 1998) that was borrowed from L1 reading research (Koda, 2005). According to Koda (2005), “Unlike beginning L1 readers, for example, L2 readers have more diversity in learning objectives, are metacognitively more sophisticated, and differ widely in prior literacy experiences. Because of these circumstances, their unfamiliarity with some strategies and different processing behaviors cannot be interpreted simply as knowledge or skill deficiencies” (p. 270). L2 reading involves more complex and multilayered constructs than does L1 reading. L2 reading occurs in the interaction of linguistic knowledge, L1 literacy, cognitive maturity and conceptual sophistication, and L2 reading research is sensitive to contextual variation, such as when, where, how, why and with whom L2 literacy research is conducted (Koda, 2005).

At the same time, the definition of literacy has changed so that it has come to include multiple literacies, encompassing a variety of social practices in contexts: emergent literacy, personal literacy, functional literacy, cultural literacy, transactional literacy, academic literacy, critical literacy, new literacy, and multiple literacies (Kasper, 1997). Academic literacy, i.e., schooled and schooling literacies, focuses on abilities and attitudes needed for school success, which is socially distributed. Personal literacy involves engagement in reading and writing for pleasure, communicating with friends, doing things for the individuals’ purposes. Functional literacy establishes some minimum level of knowledge and skills considered necessary in order for an individual to be
considered a contributing member of society. Critical literacy connects words with the
world in order to bring about social change using dialogue and praxis (Freire, 1970).
Because of the simplistic view of literacy prevalent in academia and society, educators
often do not recognize the different kinds of literacy that people engage in. The narrow,
simplistic definition of literacy has sanctioned minority students who might not be
familiar with academic literacy practices owing to the discontinuity of D/discourses
between home and school. A global definition of literacy is needed that rightly portrays
the language and literacy development of ELLs, and recognizes that “to be fully literate
is to have the disposition to engage appropriately with texts of different types in order to
empower action, feelings, and thinking in the context of purposeful social activity”

Sociocultural and Dialogic Approaches

Over a few decades or so, there have emerged criticisms of the traditional view of
literacy, which is based on decontextualized skills and inner mental processes (Cazden,
1994; Gee, 1992; Heath, 1983; Street, 1984). Literacy has historically been considered
from a computational view of the mind, as an individual mental skill involving the ability
to read and write. However, sociocultural approaches to language learning and literacy
development question these assumptions inherited from cognitive psychology,
emphasizing, instead, content and context tied with the nature of literacy. Gee said,
“Literacy practices are almost always fully integrated with, interwoven into, constituted
part of, the very texture of wider practices that involve talk, interaction, values, and
beliefs” (Gee, 1992, p. 40).
From the sociocultural perspective, second language and literacy development are seen to occur simultaneously as learners are engaged in literacy activities, i.e., listening, speaking, reading, and writing within/across these four language skill areas, as argued by Swain (2002). Both second language learning and literacy development are seen to occur in changing roles within shifting participation structures of activity systems within and across social-historical-material and discursive contexts through multiple forms of semiotic mediations, the most important sociocognitive psychological tool, i.e., language on the basis of Vygotsky’s three tenets: social interaction, semiotic mediation, and genetic analysis (Wertsch, 1990).

**Social Interaction**

Sociocultural approaches to learning and development were first systematized and applied by Vygotsky in the 1920s. Vygotsky argued for a social source of the mind, negating the Cartesian dichotomy between the internal and the external. The old paradigm about learning, which is based on theories such as cognitive psychology and information processing models, considers inner mental processes (Bruner, 1978). In this old model, cognition plays the most important role, as a black box that connects inner processes with the outside. Sociocultural theory, on the other hand, suggests that during meaningful learning, the internal knowledge is externalized into social contexts and that the external knowledge is internalized through social activities. History and the outer context shape the human mind; in order to understand learning, it is crucial to understand this interdependence between internal processes and external processes. According to Vygotsky, “Every function in the child’s cultural development appear twice, first between
people (inter-psychological) and then inside the child (intra-psychological)” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 57). From a sociocultural perspective, social interaction is a central component in literacy development. Literacy learning is not an individual activity; it is inherently social. Viewing L2 literacy learning and development through the lens of sociocultural theory, we see that L2 literacy teaching does not just involve teaching strategies, grammars, and words in decontextualized settings.

Humans achieve their greatest potential while engaged in joint activities with the support of those more capable others in their zone of proximal development (ZPD). Non-knowers become independent learners while taking on the responsibility for their own learning from those more experienced others in a gradual scaffolding process. According to Wells (1990), learning takes place within a community of collaborative inquiry. This is the process by which individuals transform their understanding of, and responsibility for activities through their own transforming participations (Rogoff, 1990). Diaz (1992) also extended Vygotsky’s theory by conceptualizing the movement towards internalization as a change from self-control to self-regulation. A child’s behavior is self-controlled when he or she carries out an action, but is self-regulated when he or she can guide, plan, monitor, and evaluate his or her own behaviors. Human consciousness is more than just awareness, and it includes self-regulatory mechanisms that humans use in solving problems. Vygotsky sought an explanation for self-regulated consciousness in the interactions between humans and with other artifacts.
**Semiotic Mediation**

The concept of semiotic mediation is central to Vygotsky’s theories of second language and literacy learning and development (Engeström & Leont’ev, 1985). The higher order mental processes are developed through mediating psychological tools or signs. According to Vygotsky (1978), humans use tools to interact with their external environment. Knowledge is not internalized directly, but through the use of psychological tools, such as language, pictures, gestures, and mnemonics. Of these tools, the most important cognitive device is language (Cole, 1995; Vygotsky, 1978). Vygotsky maintains that linguistic signs play the essential role of mediating social activity and cognitive functioning between individuals: they connect the social with the individual, and the dialogic dimension with the monologic dimension. These psychological tools are directed internally and are appropriated during activity (Wertsch, 1991).

Cole (1996) discusses three kinds of mediating artifacts: primary, secondary, and tertiary. Primary artifacts are physical things such as material objects, words, and the like. Secondary artifacts are representations of primary artifacts, portrayed by norms, perspectives, and institutions, which play the central role of transferring and preserving modes of action and beliefs. Tertiary artifacts belong to an invisible, imaginative, “autonomous” world in which people can perceive, change, and paint ways of seeing the “actual” world.

Physical tools control the external environment, but linguistic signs mediate, control, and organize interpersonal and cognitive activity. These psychological tools are directed internally and are appropriated during activity. Object regulation precedes the
development of self-regulatory private speech, and gradually develops to the point of channeling behaviors toward specific goals by means of psychological tools or signs. According to Vygotsky (1978), language is the most important psychological tool for connecting the external world with internal contexts of humans, and is essential for language learning and literacy development. Knowledge must be externalized as well as internalized through semiotic tools in order for language learning and literacy development to occur because all learning is social in nature through mediation (Vygotsky, 1978).

According to Gee (2003), cognitive development stems from such factors as situated meaning, semiotic domains, active participation, and cultural models. Defining situated meanings Gee (2003) said, “The meaning of signs – words, actions, objects, artifacts, symbols, texts, etc, – situated in embodied experience. Meanings are not general or de-contextualized. Whatever generality meanings come to have is discovered bottom up via embodied experiences” (p. 209). He explained the term “semiotic” as:

A fancy way of saying we want to talk about all sorts of different things that can take on meaning, such as images, sounds, gestures, movements, graphs, diagrams, equations, objects, even people like babies, midwives, and mothers and not just words. All of these things are signs…that ‘stand for’ (take on) different meanings in different situations, contexts, practices, cultures, and historical periods. (pp. 17-18)

Gee (2003) defined cultural models as “images, storylines, principles or metaphors that capture what a particular group finds as ‘normal’ or ‘typical’ in regard to a given phenomenon” (p. 143). These factors operate simultaneously when a person actively participates in an event or situation, and create a person’s cognitive understanding of the world around him/her at a specific time. According to Gee (2003),
“meaning and knowledge are built up through various modalities language, images, texts, symbols, interactions, abstract design, and sound, etc."

Engeström and Leonti’ev (1985) proposed activity theory, maintaining that the relationship between human agents and objects of their environment is mediated by cultural means, tools, and signs, and illustrating that relationship with a set of interconnected triangles: subject, object, rules, community, and division of labor. Activity theory explains human behavior as object-oriented action, controlled by the conventions, customs, and community to which he or she belongs. The mutual transformation of internal activities and external activities is accomplished through tools, which are also created and transformed by activity itself. In those processes, tools influence the nature, not only of external behavior, but also the mental functioning of individuals. According to Vygotsky (1978), human capacity to use speech provides us with a powerful tool for learning through interactions. Learners experience cognitive conceptual development through the internalization of social speech into inner speech via the bridge of private speech.

Genetic Analysis

Genetic analysis theory asserts that it is possible to understand many aspects of mental language and literacy functioning only if one understands their origins and the transitions that they went through during their development. Unlike other species, the social relationships and behaviors of human beings are not limited to those furnished by their biological inheritance, but arise from their social and cultural inheritance. People are born into an environment shaped by the activities of previous generations. In this
environment, they are surrounded by artifacts that carry the past into the present (Cole, 1996); by mastering the use of these artifacts and the practices by which they are employed, they are able to “assimilate the experiences of humankind” (Leonti’ev, 1981, p. 55).

According to sociocultural theory, second language learning and literacy development take place in socially and culturally shaped contexts. People learn by taking part in the activities of the place they belong to at the moment (microgenesis), which will change over their life spans (ontogenesis), as their culture is transformed by each individual in contact with it (sociocultural history). Development is a process of changing participation in dynamic cultural communities (Rogoff, 2003). Because historical conditions are constantly changing, resulting in diverse contexts and varied opportunities for learning, no Piagetian universal stages of learning can adequately represent the dynamic relationship between external and internal aspects of L2 literacy learning and development (John-Steiner & Souberman, 1978). Learning does not follow a set pattern of development like biological growth does, but is impacted by social and cultural occurrences preceding development (Vygotsky, 1978).

**Sociocultural Approaches to Second Language and Literacy Development**

As seen from a sociocultural perspective, second language and literacy development occurs in/through social interactions of internalization and externalization within socio-cultural communities using language, the most important psychological tool (Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1991). Literacy learning and development are situated within the activities of the learner, and are the products of transformative participation and
practice in the community (Lantolf, 2000, 2008; Rogoff, 2003; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Wertsch, 1991). ELLs learn and socialize themselves into the target speech community by learning language, learning about language, and learning through (Halliday, 1980) in/through social interactions.

Through the semiotic mediations and dialogical utterances-in-situ, ELLs develop their higher order cognitive abilities in the classroom discourse. Literacy learning implies the participatory metaphor (Larsen-Freeman, 2007), reciprocal learning, and negotiations of meaning in the learner’s zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978), in the communicative classroom environment. Learning and cognition are distributed, contextualized, and situated during the learner's progression from “legitimate peripheral participation” to full participation in a community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). In sociocultural processes, ELLs develop their understandings of academic discourse community practices, and construct their roles, responsibilities, and social identities through a scaffolding processes. In such learning contexts, the gradual release of responsibility for learning take place from the more knowledgeable persons to less capable others (Bruner, 1975).

Marie Clay’s Reading Recovery (1985) applies the zone of proximal development concept to the teaching of reading comprehension, and illustrates transformative knowledge co-construction taking place within students’ ZPD. In the Reading Recovery (RR) program, a teacher focused on the building of individual scaffolding for a struggling child in shared activity, rather than teaching of letter-sound correspondence and sight vocabulary words. In the RR program, a teacher enables students to become independent learners, who know how to improve their own reading and writing skills, through the
scaffolding provided by joint reading and writing activities. The development of conscious mental processes is realized through shared activities; each child’s own writings, the teacher’s revision of them, and the child’s activities, such unscrambling puzzles, become the transformative tools for their internalization of writing ability. The effectiveness of instruction is subject to moment-to-moment dynamic assessment (Brown & Ferrara, 1985); the child’s intrapsychological functioning is constantly evidenced in their writing and speaking.

Reciprocal teaching (RT) is the process of internalizing cognitive activities via the transference from social speech to private speech, and ultimately through inner speech. Dialogues between the more experienced and the less experienced contribute to intellectual development (Bruner, 1990). The use of dialogues between students and teacher facilitates the engagement of students in self-regulatory activities while comprehending texts. One of the important features of Palincsar, Brown and Champone’s work (1993) is the portrayal of how “divergent classrooms can become learning communities, i.e., communities in which each participants make significant contributions to the emergent understandings of all members, despite having unequal knowledge concerning the topic under study” (p. 43). I suggest several ways in which a sociocultural approach can have an impact on pedagogical theory and practice in ways that can lead to second language learning and literacy development of ELLs in the classroom.

First, the traditional concept of literacy involves the ability to read and write texts at a certain grade or skill level (Smith & Wilhelm, 2002). This decontextualized autonomous model of literacy “disguises the cultural and ideological assumptions that underpin it so that it can then be presented as though they are neutral and universal and
that literacy as such will have these benign effects” (Street, 2003, p. 1). The familial, social, and cultural effects on literacy development are not considered; however, from a sociocultural perspective, reading and writing involve far more than simply decoding and encoding texts. Rather, language and literacy learning is a complex social practice developed through dialogical communicative practices and apprenticeship in/through/within the discourse communities between/among speaker and hearer or between/among author and reader. It involves skills of abstraction, reflection, analysis, interpretation, cross-cultural understanding, collaborative problem-solving, critical consciousness and critical thinking. The concept that reading/writing/literacy abilities are developed in the connected classroom discourses with three types of speech events, i.e., the social, private, and inner speech in the dialogic utterances introduce new forms of conceptual tools for language learning and literacy development to be developed by teachers of ELLs in the classroom setting.

Second, the cultural-historical activity theory (CHAT) (Cole, 1996) helps bring to light innovative activities that can be undertaken within and outside the classroom settings. Teachers can implement dynamic activity models by making adjustments to each element of the activity triangle: subject, object, mediating artifacts, norms, rules, community of learners and division of labor. The activity triangle reveals how learning is distributed and contextualized in goal-directed activities (Engeström, 1999) through self-regulation via other regulation mediated by the classroom discourse community. The interconnected elements of the activity triangle may be changed dynamically during activity implementation, depending on the emergent contextual requirements. Students can internalize and externalize the higher order thinking skills and strategies, and the
manipulation of conventional semiotic mediations through engagement a wide variety of activities in the classroom discourse community (Vygotsky, 1978). Learners internalize other sign systems, language and dialogicality (Bakhtin, 1981) through engagement in activities with their teacher and with their peers. Both internalization and externalization occur during the process of releasing the responsibility for problem solving from the expert to the novice working collaboratively with teacher and their peers. This scaffolded performance is a dialogically constituted inter-psychological mechanism that promotes the novice student’s internalization of knowledge co-constructed in shared activity systems (Wertsch, 1979).

Cole’s Fifth Dimension project (1996) is a good example of an application of Gee’s multimodal principles of language and literacy development. The project explores a new semiotic mediation connected to home, community, and school through a variety of specially created artifacts, such as computer games and educational activities based on Engerström’s activity triangle. The activity triangle and online discussions are used as tools for learners’ internalization of information and development of higher order of thinking. In a social situation with college students after school, high school ELLs generate questions and comment; language internalization occurs as responsibility for learning gradually passes from the expert to the novice through online discussions, emails, and chatting.

Fourth, the notion that language learning and literacy development are interconnected with language, cognition, culture, history, ideologies, identity, power and context provides a deeper understanding of the determinants of success and failure among students in schools, and especially among culturally and linguistically marginalized
students. This concept expands our perspectives so that “when language is systematically unavailable to some, it is important that we not limit our explanation to the traits of the persons involved; it is equally essential that we take into account the interactional circumstances that position the people in the world with a differential access to the common tongue” (McDermott, 1996, p. 283). According to Rogoff (2003), teachers need to know what is viewed as important in their students' culture before trying to teach them. Rogoff also recommended that teachers should use each student’s norms, values, and beliefs as a teaching guide, and scaffold learning experiences that build on each student’s understandings and strengths, in that “learning and thinking are always situated in a cultural setting and utilization of cultural resources” (Bruner 1990, p. 30). A student can be an active participant in the activities, with the teachers’ guided participation in the target speech community. The teacher needs to facilitate students’ learning by observing their needs, understanding the communication patterns and cultural norms embedded in their home/community cultures, and privileging them.

Fifth, Vygotsky’s concept of language use mediating human mental functioning was extended by Bakhtin (1981), who introduced new psychological tools useful for L2 literacy learning and development: three elements, i.e., voice, utterance, and dialogicality that interact during interpersonal conversation. Wertsch’s voice (1991) “is concerned with the broader issues of a speaking subject’s perspective, conceptual horizon, intention, and world view” (p. 51). “Voice” refers to what a speaker and writer brings to a conversation, and how that in turn shapes the nature of the conversation. Utterance does not reside in words; rather, utterance exists in the effect toward which words are used by individuals in
a particular context. “Dialogicality” occurs when a speaker’s concrete utterances come into contact with the utterances of others, and is the central concept that illuminates how understanding is created (Bakhtin, 1981). The dialogic formation of understanding has significant implications for literacy learning and development, especially for linguistically, culturally marginalized ELLs, who usually are not invited into the verbal interactions in the classroom due to deficit views toward them caused by their lack of L2 proficiency.

Finally, from socio-cultural thought, we see that language learning and literacy development occur through social interactions in sociocultural communities, and understand learning and development as processes of acquiring conscious self-regulatory systems by means of mastering and manipulating mediating artifacts. This understanding opens up possibilities for positive contributions toward the still unmet goal of improving educational systems by creating innovative, multimodal toolkits to create, implement, and evaluate those systems. The concepts of participation and community also require us to develop and connect the literacy studies curriculum with practice. Further development is needed to enrich social contexts, to facilitate peer learning, and to promote authentic tasks within social apprenticeships, within school settings in connection with the larger community settings.

Critical Approach

Critical Pedagogy

This section focuses on Freirean critical pedagogy, as it is detailed in the book titled *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970). Taking a Marxian enlightenment subject
perspective, Freire argues that the oppressed regain their humanity only through liberating themselves from the oppressor’s prescriptive images and guidelines that they have internalized, when they possess their own autonomy and responsibility, and recognize the oppressor’s manifestations of dehumanization. Their conscious perception and awareness of the reality existing in the constant dialectical relationships between the oppressors and the oppressed can lead the oppressed to acquire subjectivity. Without subjectivity, they cannot objectify their reality and transform it. How can the oppressed transform their immersed social structures? Freire argues for continuously repeated alternation between true, critical, liberating, reflective dialogue and action: reflection producing action, and reflections on action prompting further action. For human liberation, the oppressed should adopt their own ways of thinking and action without allowing any interruptions from the oppressors’ manipulations and false generosity. The oppressors’ method cannot transform society; only the methods and strategies of the powerless can change the existing social and power structures. Therefore, Freire suggests educational projects rather than the institutionalized systematic education imposed by power.

Freire’s education bases itself on departing from the dehumanizing “banking concept” of education, where knowledge is transmitted and stored in students’ minds. Students become thinkers to liberate themselves in the process of solving and manipulating complex problems and tasks. A teacher learns with and from students, instead of suggesting and imposing predetermined answers to the questions. Freire’s
paradigm helps students practice discursive literacy that offers them the ability to theorize as well as function in society. “Knowledge emerges only through invention and reinvention, through the restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry human beings pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other” (Freire 1970, p. 72). Authentic liberation can be realized through being ourselves inside society, not being for others. The more students store knowledge, the more adaptable they become to the society imposed by the powerful. Finally, they play a passive role in society without critical and reflective thinking.

However, problem-posing education unveils reality through dialogues. Humans are considered to be in the process of being completed through transformation and inquiry rather than a finished existence, just as the reality in the process of being made. The word has two dimensions: reflection and action, which are the two components of praxis. Only the true words naming the world can become praxis. Without dialogue, no education exists. “Authentic education is not carried on by ‘A’ for ‘B’ or by ‘A’ about ‘B’, but rather by ‘A’ with ‘B’, mediated by the world - a world which impresses and challenges both parties, giving rise to views or opinions about it” (Freire 1970, p. 93). Only the historical-social human being can transform the reality through praxis, which is the source of knowledge and creation.

The dialogue is based on “generative themes” which exist only in the encounter between men and reality. The generative themes take the concentric location in individual’s contextual reality, moving from the general to the particular. Humans can decode the coded existential situation through projecting their subjective position into an
object as a situation in which he finds himself, together with other subjects. In the decoding process, the decoders can externalize their thematics and “real consciousness” of the world, and then, gradually, potential consciousness supersedes real consciousness. In the *Culture Circle*, the procedures are as follows: (1) breakdown of thematics, (2) codifications of thematics, and (3) didactic materials (photographs, slides, film strips, posters, reading texts, and so forth) are prepared to propose some themes to outside specialists for recorded interviews. The taped interview is presented to the culture circle again. As an introductory statement, the speaker, the contents, and the speaker’s photographs are presented while the speaker’s photograph is projected on a screen. The participants hear and critique the thoughts of intellectuals; meanwhile, they analyze newspaper editorials with the same event to develop a sense of criticism. Their consciousness and actions change actively, rather than passively, seeking to be free.

Freire (1970) emphasizes the importance of communion and dialogue between the oppressed and the leaders as equally the Subjects of revolutionary action: “Denial of communion in the revolutionary process, avoidance of dialogue with the people under the pretext of organizing them, of strengthening revolutionary power, or of ensuring a united front, is really a fear of freedom” (p. 120). In case that the trust among people for liberation is formed, the revolution is carried out for the people. The true transformation of the world comes true through the solidarity of the oppressed and the leaders.

According to Freire, many people with the mechanistic view of reality cannot perceive that the situation conditions their consciousness and, in turn, this consciousness conditions their attitudes and their ways of dealing with reality. They should rid themselves of their false consciousness of reality and transform the world with their
praxis: theory and practice, that is to say, reflection and action. The various dimensions of the theory of antidialogical action are as follows: conquest, divide and rule, manipulation, and cultural invasion; conversely, the dialogical theory of action involves cultural revolutions, cooperation, organization, and cultural synthesis. Manipulation is the pact between the dominant and the dominated classes, increasing subjugation. Diverse tactics and manipulation serve the ends of the quest. Oppressive cultural action takes the position of focalized view of problems. However, the dimensions of totality are based on the dialogical theory considering the reality as being unveiled. The harmony of the oppressed can be possible only when they are engaged in the struggle for liberation. Cooperation as a dialogical action occurring among Subjects can be achieved through communication. The cultural actions developing from antidialogical and dialogical matrices are expanded, affirmed, and transformed through praxis of human beings: theory and action.

In conclusion, according to Freire, every society has its own hegemony influenced by multiple ideologies, systems, and social structures. The liberation of the oppressed does not guarantee all the people’s freedom and liberty. When the oppressed own the power, it is possible for them to become more oppressive as shown in Freire’s book titled *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Just as history sometimes repeats itself, so does the dialectic relationship between the oppressor and the oppressed. Hegemony is a moving equilibrium (Gramsci, 1992). Just changing structuring structures cannot supply all the people’s equity and equality.
However, Freire’s pedagogy sheds light on educational system and practice, especially for low achieving minority students. His dialogue-based, problem posing education connected with reality, and the formation of love, hope, and trust between teacher and students and among students in a classroom will empower students. Voicing resistance and negotiating with peers in discussions might allow students to be reflective and critical thinkers. In particular, Freire’s approach to emancipating and empowering minority students in US schools would be as follows: (1) Teachers commit themselves to oppressed students, (2) Curriculum should be based on the knowledge of the oppressed students, (3) Teacher and learning should occur via dialogues, (4) Students are encouraged to develop a critical consciousness, and (5) Students and teachers engage in praxis devoted to institutional change.

**Critical Literacy**

*In a society tending toward homogeneity, it is easy to think of literacy simply in terms of specific skills and activities. Given broad cultural consensus on the definition of literacy, alternative constructions are either remote or invisible, and so literacy becomes a seemingly self-evident personal attribute that is either present or absent. In a culturally heterogeneous society, literacy ceases to be a characteristic inherent solely in the individual. It becomes an interactive process that is constantly redefined and renegotiated, as the individual transacts with the socioculturally fluid surroundings.* (Ferdman, 1990, p. 187)

Critical literacy connects words with the world: “Reading the word implies continually reading the world. … Reading always involves critical perception, interpretation, and rewriting of what is said” (Freire & Macedo, 1987, pp. 35-36). For Freire, literacy is a social act to transform the society and emancipate the oppressed from the unequal society through dialogue and praxis. Similarly, Street (1993) also recognizes literacy as “encapsulated within cultural wholes and within structures of power” (p. 9),
distinguishing between autonomous mode and ideological model of literacy. The autonomous model of literacy conceptualizes literacy “as independent of social context, an autonomous variable whose consequences for society and cognition can be derived from its intrinsic character” (Street, 1993, p. 5). The ideological model of literacy emphasizes “the ideological character of the processes of acquisition and of the meanings and uses of different literacies” (p. 7).

The purpose of critical literacy, i.e., the New Literacy Studies (The New London Group, 1996; Gee, 2000) is for social change, cultural diversity, economic equity, and political enfranchisement by reshaping “literacy education in the interests of marginalized groups of learners, who on the basis of gender, cultural and socioeconomic background have been excluded from access to the discourses and texts of dominant economies and cultures” (Luke, 1997, p. 143). Thus, critical literacy (Gee, 1996; Street, 1996, 2001) considers literacy as inherently multiple and ideological: “Literacies are social constructions forged in the process of humans pursuing values, goals, and interests, under conditions where some groups have greater access to structural power than others” (Lankshear & Lawler, 1987, p. 79). Literacy encompasses more than just academic skills, strategies, and knowledge; that is, what “being literate” means varies depending on the socially, culturally, and politically constructed social world. The learning of language and literacy depends “in large part on patterns of the distribution of power and knowledge in a society” (Luke & Freebody, 1997). Language and literacy practices are historically and contextually situated, and are informed by values, beliefs, and attitudes (Pennycook, 2001; Purcell-Gates, 2007; Street, 1984, 1999). In this regard, Street (1984) also uses the term “literacy practices” to show the connections between identities, relationships, and power
positions within social and cultural structures (Hull & Schultz, 2002). In a pluralistic society, there is also no neutral literacy (Ferdman, 1990; Rogers, 2002).

Culturally Relevant Pedagogy Approach

Numerous research studies (Au & Kawakami, 1985, 1991; Cazden, 1994; Gay, 2000; Heath, 1983; Philips, 1983; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988) have shown that US public schools fail to help linguistically and culturally diverse students attain academic success. Three theories have been proposed in order to explain the failure of US schools to serve minority students: cultural mismatch (Heath, 1983), minority assimilation and acculturation, and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1991). These theories all implicate a mismatch between the home and the classroom in terms of their discourse processes, such as social language, interaction patterns, and literacy beliefs.

This section is a presentation of the need for spaces of culturally relevant pedagogy and an endorsement of the ability of culturally relevant pedagogy to meet that need. First is an explanation, from a social linguistics perspective, of the process by which a mismatch between discourse contributes to the academic failure of language minority students. Next, the history of the development of deficit-based thought toward language minority students with low socioeconomic status is chronicled in order to elucidate the deficit perspective toward language minority students that persists within US educational systems. Finally, pedagogical approaches that are characterized by a resource perspective toward language minority students, such as funds of knowledge and culturally relevant pedagogy, are highlighted; the concepts of
funds of knowledge are theorized, and the features and options of culturally relevant pedagogy are reviewed.

Social Linguistics Perspective

Unless the boundaries between classrooms and communities can be broken, and the flow of cultural patterns between them encouraged, the schools will continue to legitimate and reproduce communities of townpeople who control and limit the potential progress of other communities and who themselves remain untouched by other values and ways of life. (Heath, 1983, p. 369)

Language, as seen from the social linguistics perspective, functions in multiple ways in home, in the school and in society: language for learning (Bakhtin, 1981; Burner 1990; Halliday, 1980; Heath, 1983; Vygotsky, 1978; Wells, 1990; Wertsch, 1990), language for communication (Hymes, 1974; Widdowson, 1978), language for social production/reproduction/change (Bernstein, 1996; Bourdieu, 1986, 1997; Pennycook, 1994, 1999), language for social transformation (Freire, 1970), and language for identity kits (Gee, 1996, 2008). In this dissertation, I primarily address language for learning and identity (trans)formations, and particularly, as it relates to language learning and literacy development of ELLs.

Social language exists in the connection of language with the context. For example, people have different dialects, styles, accents, intonations, registers, choice of words, and sentence structures that are associated with their race, culture, L1, ethnicity, SES, communities, which require a differentiated synchronic and diachronic code fitted for the given spatial and temporal conditions. The different styles or discourses embedded in social languages are important factors in the education of ELLs in US K-12 public
school settings, because students (sub)consciously come to school with differing levels of mother tongue, (meta)linguistic knowledge, registers, styles, interactional and communicative patterns, and cultural identity kit, and (sub)consciously learn social language from teachers (Gee, 1996; 2003).

Gee (1999, 2004, 2008) distinguished social languages from Discourses with a capital “D.” Discourses are “ways of being in the world; they are ‘forms of life’; they are socially situated identities” (Gee 2008, p. 3) with their own tacit theories and ideologies. In a complicated connection with Discourses, many social languages/literacies are used for different purposes and occasions. For Gee (2008), the home-based primary Discourse “gives us our initial and often enduring sense of self and sets the foundations of our culturally specific vernacular language and is the way that we use language, feel and think, act and interact, and so forth” (p. 156). The secondary Discourses are a more “public sphere” and are acquired within institutions. Gee (2008) also stated that the difference between the primary home-based Discourses and the secondary school-based Discourses caused African American children to lose their identities as they tried to adjust, or resisted in response to treatment as an “Others” in the classroom and school, and ultimately effected those students’ academic achievement.

The pioneering work concerning the contribution of the linguistic/cultural dissonance between home and school on language minority students’ school failure is Heath’s (1983) ethnographic research, which in the 1960s and 1970s, studied four communities, one White and one African American middle class community in Maintown, a White working class community in Roadvill, and an African American
working class in Trackton. Heath’s study leads us to consider the influence that children’s historically, culturally embedded primary discourses at home and community have upon their response to the secondary discourses in their school. Typically, members of middle-income, White communities use a functional language that emphasizes activities such as asking and answering displayed questions, remembering events, labeling procedures, what-explanations, meaning-negotiations in communications, and bedtime stories; on the other hand, the functional language of White working class communities focuses on what-explanations and labeling features without much meaning-making or analyzing processes involved in their communication. The functional language of African American working class communities was found to concentrate more on interactions, social relationships, and directives without bedtime stories. When these African American children were confronted with displayed questions in class, students struggled to answer those questions, which caused a conflict between teacher’s perspectives and students’ perspectives in the classroom.

Michaels (1981) concluded that the miscommunications between the first-grade students and the teacher during “sharing time” confirmed the difficulties of language minority students in socializing themselves into the dominant classroom discourses. African American students use “topic associating” narrative structures, whereas European American students use “topic-centered” narrative styles. From the teacher’s criteria about narrative structures, the “topic-associated” story telling style is not legitimated as a coherent and logical method of expression due to its lack of focus in the story. In addition, if the teacher is not familiar with the socio-cultural literacy practices of language minority
students, and does not know how to bridge the differences of home language/literacy practices with schooling language/literacy practices, these children may not have enough opportunities to learn grade-appropriate content and the dominant discourse patterns; thus, finally, their identities suffer and they may not succeed in school (Delpit 1995, 2002; hooks, 1994).

Ethnographic research on the difference between primary D/discourse at home and the secondary academic D/discourse in school and its impact on the academic failure of linguistic-cultural minority students (Erickson, 1987; Moll, 1990, 2005; Ogbu 1987, 1991) illuminates how students receive different preparation for school instruction from their different communities and ethnicities, explains how middle class students gain privilege through their language use at home, and explores the cultural mediation of psychological phenomena. Literacy articulation informed by social context suggests that literacy develops and spreads through a process of socialization, the means of which may include, but are not necessarily limited to formal instruction (Reder & Green, 1986).

Research about cultural variation and its interrelationship with language and interactional patterns can give us positive outlooks on minority students’ capabilities, and help us understand how schooled literacy constrains and distorts their learning.

**Deficit and Resource Perspectives**

...the leaders of culture from postindustrial societies typically maintain political order through a complex mix of popular (political) and professional (social science and public policymakers) opinion-makers. These opinion-makers use cultural institutions such as the media and schools to create powerful public discourses or discursive regimes that construct images of threatening, marginalized groups or cultural others. (Foley, 1997, p. 125)
Beginning around 1930, a cognitive deficit model that indicated genetic pathology to be the primary cause of poverty was very accepted within the educational community (Valencia, 1997). The popularity of this biological model was weakened in the 1940s and 1950s by the devastation of the middle class during the Great Depression, by Hitler’s racial purification program, by higher intelligence testing results of ethnic minority groups, and by the constructivist views of cognitive development championed by Piaget. In the 1960s, the deficit thinkers needed to direct their attention toward the cultural dimensions of poverty because the genetics-based deficit explanation implied racism. At this opportune time, anthropologist Oscar Lewis (1965) published research identifying 70 traits of impoverished lower-class people in urban areas, and proposed a “culture of poverty” theory, arguing that the poor have their own inferior cultural traits, such as their values, norms, linguistic, familial and social practices, that cause them to remain in poverty. Lewis’s deficit-oriented theory provoked a negative cultural image about the urban poor, and provided the interdisciplinary discourse that led to extensive research based upon this flawed theory, such as Bernstein’s (1975) linguistic deficit view, which contrasted lower class children’s ‘restricted code’ and middle class children’s “elaborated code,” and Hess and Shipman's (1965, 1967) research about the “retarded parenting styles” of poor, lower-class families.

However, the culture of poverty theory has come under criticism because of its exclusion of historical and socio-economical dimensions, and because of its biased analysis from a deficit perspective toward people in poverty. In contrast to such poverty/deficit thinking, anthropologists and sociolinguists since the 1970s have portrayed the positive community and family values and socio-cultural practices of low-
income minority communities through in-depth exploration of their cultural particularities and practices. Educational anthropologists have emphasized the essential impact that differences in linguistic and cultural interactional patterns have on the failure of schools toward minority children: African American literacy studies (Heath, 1983), American Indian children’s schooling processes (Erickson, 1987; Philips, 1983), indigenous Hawaiian (Au & Jordan, 1981), and school failure caused by mainstream speech styles and standardized lessons (Mehan, 1979).

Most recently, cultural anthropology has moved away from focusing on the causes of school failure (Ogbu 1991) toward focusing on the causes of school success among minority students. Foley (1990) showed how middle-class Mexican American adolescents achieved school success by negotiation of their image (Foley, 1990). Harklau (1994) portrayed the efforts and negotiations that Asian Americans made that allowed them to escape from low-track remedial language programs. Latino family studies directed the mainstream view regarding parenting styles and familial practices of ethnic minority families from the deficit perspective toward the positive valuable resource perspective (Delgado-Gaitan, 1990). This paradigm shift from the poverty/deficit view to the positive resource perspective about minority students has allowed researchers to build on the strengths of the community practices of ethnic minorities. “Funds of knowledge” (Moll, 1990), culturally relevant pedagogy, and multicultural education are those efforts arising from the resource perspective that seeks to empower minority students, their families, and their communities through theorized practices and practicalizing theories.
Funds of Knowledge

In contrast to the culture/deficit models of language education used for the schooling of minority students (Valdés, 1998), the basic tenet of funds of knowledge is that everyone is competent to learn (Moll, 2005) if provided the right context for learning. Based on socio-cultural-historical theorization of learning and development, humans are seen not just as empty vessels, but as sociocultural historical beings that have been constructed by, and are constructing and learning in and through their lived experiences and the present practices within their embedded sociocultural context (Vygotsky, 1978). Thus, minority students’ lived experiences are considered to be a key resourceful element for curriculum and pedagogy (Buck & Sylvester, 2005). In funds of knowledge, children’s learning follows community paths of socialization (Heath 1983). Funds of knowledge validates poor and minoritized families’ unaddressed implicit/explicit operational cultural systems and local histories, and uses them in classrooms to promote learning by linguistically and culturally minoritized students (Vélez-Ibáñez & Greenberg, 2005). In contrast, current educational curriculum and instructional practices are simplistically stereotyped and standardized drawings from the dominant mainstream cultures and knowledge (Amanti, 2005).

Funds of knowledge refer to “historically accumulated bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household functioning and well-being” (González et al., 1995, p. 4). Funds of Knowledge provides a toolbox of cultural artifacts for mediating teachers’ comprehension of their students’ lived experiences and ongoing everyday life experiences at home and in the communities, and debunks the deficit views toward the social, historical, political, and economic contexts of minority households. Funds of Knowledge
goes beyond description, even beyond amelioration of the microinteractional and 
processual cultural mismatches in the classroom that lead to minority students’ school 
failure (Foley, 1996; Jordan, 1995; McKay & Sau-Ling, 1998; Valdés, 1998); *funds of 
knowledge* draws on local knowledge in classroom teaching practices and curriculum by 
understanding and uncovering the macro power dynamic potential of the social, cultural, 
and linguistic practices hidden in the homes and communities of diverse students (Moll, 
2005).

Teachers in the *funds of knowledge* project are provided with “theoretical tools 
that can help them discover for themselves the *funds of knowledge* within their reach” 
(González, 2005, p. 28). Teachers explore the emergent intersections and hybridity of 
culture that have developed in students’ communities through home and community visits, 
and locate them at the center of “a set of inquires,” instead of receiving the uniform 
categorizations of a shared group culture (González, 2005). Using ethnographic inquiry 
tools, teachers collect local knowledge, formulate and transform it into pedagogical 
knowledge, and activate it in the classroom, actively engaging in the multiple roles: 
ethnographic researcher, curriculum developer, unit planner, creative thinker, etc. (Moll, 
Amanti, Neff, & González, 2005). This is in great contrast to the role given traditional 
teachers, who are constrained by the given curriculum, standardized tests, and scripted 
lesson plans. While seeking *funds of knowledge*, White upper or middle-class, preservice 
teachers with gendered, classed, and racialized experiences have evolved their thinking 
from “a deficit-oriented perspective to an asset-oriented one” through their ethnographic 
explorations of African American minority students’ households in poor urban areas, and
have seen students’ *funds of knowledge* captured in their ethnographic field notes and transformed into pedagogical resources (Buck & Sylvester, 2005).

Taking the *funds of knowledge* approach, teachers function as mediators between home and school, not just maintainers of school discipline. Beyond the walls of classrooms and schools, teachers create streams of empowering practice, building connections between home literacy and classroom literacy. Based on mutual trust, i.e., *confianza*, *funds of knowledge* empowers everyone, especially those living in linguistically, culturally, economically marginalized social spaces. Through *funds of knowledge*, parents of low SES students are engaged deeply in their children’s education, and are empowered through the presentation of their knowledge and abilities in the classroom (Hensley, 2005).

*Funds of knowledge* can “engender pivotal and transformative shifts in teacher attitudes and behaviors and in relations between households and schools and between parents and teachers” (González & Amanti, 1992; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & González, 1992, cited in González, Moll, & Amanti, 2005). Through systematic and intentional inquiry-based home visits (Lytle & Cochran-Smith, 1990), teachers can escape from the practices of a hierarchical educational system based on asymmetric power relations, and derived from ahistorical, atheoretical, and politically motivated research (Amanti, 2005).

Students are intrinsically motivated to learn and develop themselves in schooling contexts that connect with their own ways of being and build from their cultural identities. All students are empowered by the integration of marginalized students’ cultural practices into the curriculum, and through authoring themselves, rather than
being authored by a teacher entrenched in rote memorized instruction, as is often the case in traditional teacher-centered classrooms (Amanti, 2005; Moll & Greenberg, 1990; Moll & Díaz, 1987). Students can maintain pride in their themselves, their language, their families, and their communities as they construct sound identities as students, learners, and whole persons (Mercado, 2005).

**Culturally Relevant Pedagogy**

*Culturally relevant instruction* aims at school success for students of diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, acknowledging that a disproportionate number of these students typically experience failure in school. To close the achievement gap between students of diverse backgrounds and their mainstream peers, we use culturally responsive instruction – teaching that allows students to succeed academically by building on background knowledge and experiences gained in the home and community. (p. 179)

Gay (2000) also summarized the characteristics of culturally responsive teaching based on his review of programs that were successful in enabling marginalized minority students to accomplish academic, cultural, and personal competence as follows:

The praxis of culturally responsive pedagogy confirms the theory. When instructional processes are consistent with the cultural orientations, experiences, and learning styles of marginalized African, Latin, Native, and Asian American students. This success is most evident in learning "spaces" where culturally relevant content, teacher attitudes and expectations, and instructional actions converge. (p. 181)
Ladson-Billings (1995) attempted to articulate culturally relevant pedagogy through an examination of the pedagogical practices of eight exemplary teachers of African American students. From a context of Black feminist thought, Ladson-Billings defined three criteria for culturally relevant pedagogy: (1) an ability to develop students academically, (2) the willingness to nurture and support cultural competence, and (3) the development of a sociopolitical or critical consciousness. According to Ladson-Billings (1995), teachers who implemented culturally relevant pedagogy were teachers who believed that all students are capable of academic success, who made connections and practiced scaffolding with all their students in collaborative communities of learners, and who used multifaceted assessment that incorporated multiple forms. Ladson-Billings defined a culturally relevant pedagogy “as a pedagogy that empowers students intellectually, socially, emotionally, and politically by using cultural referents to impart knowledge, skills, and attitudes. These cultural referents are not merely vehicles for bridging or explaining the dominant culture; they are aspects of the curriculum in their own right” (pp. 17-18).

The success of culturally relevant pedagogy such as the Kamehameha Early Education Program (KEEP), the Multicultural Literacy Program (MLP), and the Webster Groves Writing Project (WGWP), in the education of minority students has been demonstrated by research. In 1972, KEEP began teaching underachievement Native Hawaiian children using styles better fitted with their collaborative and co-narrational cultural background. In KEEP classes, 50% of the class time was spent in interaction and active discussion for kindergartners, and up to 70% for the first graders, using E-T-R (experience-text-relationship). Native Hawaiian children in KEEP classes
met the 50th percentile on standardized tests of reading achievement, compared to 31.7% for students in no-KEEP classes (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988).

The Multicultural Literacy Program (MLP) utilized a variety of different genres of literature, with the goal to facilitate motivation among multiethnic students: Asian, Native, Latino, African, and Native Hawaiian Americans. Multiple forms of social organizations for learning are set up in order to inspire learning: learning centers, peer interactions, reality-based reading opportunities, community of learners, sustained silent reading (SSR), directed reading-listening-thinking activity (DRLTA), readers’ theater, choral reading and reading aloud, personal response to literature, and dramatic interpretation (Diamond & Moore, 1995, p. 35). Teachers in MLP played the roles of cultural organizer, cultural mediators, and orchestrations of social contexts for learning (Diamond & Moore, 1995, p. 35).

The Webster Groves Writing Project (WGWP) was also based on culturally relevant pedagogy; WGWP employed teaching strategies which included personalizing, individualizing, cooperative learning, building on student strengths and the connection of orality with literacy. A instructional style was sought that drew from African American cultural values, interaction patterns, and communication styles, such as rapping, performance, strong personal voice, using code-switching, affirming personal responses to reading, peer response, organization of study buddies, and creation of mutual trust and community of learners (Krater, Zeni & Carson, 1994). Teachers in WGWP acknowledged that teaching and learning occur within dynamic, fluid, dialectic, and informed processes, and took diverse roles and responsibilities in order to promote learning within the community of learners. Teachers in WGWP came to realize that the
use of any one specific teaching method did not improve student writing skills (Krater et al., 1994).
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Theoretical Framework

Introduction

This discourse-oriented critical ethnographic inquiry-based dissertation study approaches the learning of pedagogical practices by teachers from a poststructuralist perspective, which maintains (1) that humans do not exist separately from societal context, but are (re)positioned by/within/through/in interconnected, situated circulating power structures and discourses in diverse contexts, and (2) that the language ideologies and pedagogical practices of teachers dynamically, concomitantly, complexly, implicitly, and explicitly (re)shape each other by streams of discourses in action/practices through the interrelated and intertwined webs of microphysical power that exist in the specific contexts of school, community, university teacher education programs, professional development courses, and society, and finally, (3) that in order to understand the pedagogical practices of teachers in the classroom, these power structures must be investigated, rather than merely checking individual teacher’s pedagogical positions (Buendía, 2000; Buendía et al., 2003)

Thus, the theoretical framework of this study is constructed based on Foucault’s genealogical approach, tracing the nodes of discourses in actions and practices within the
intertwined webs of historically, socially, and culturally defined meaning and practice from a poststructuralist perspective with the following three theoretical constructs: Culturally Relevant Pedagogy in Thirdspace, Language Ideology, Competing Discourses about Second Language and Literacy Education. These three constructs were examined closely in the above Literature Review section.

Foucault's genealogical approach was used in order to examine how the circulating language ideologies surrounding nation/community/school/classroom influence the creation of the spaces of culturally relevant pedagogy in their classrooms, and the negotiation/reification/contestation that takes place among the competing discourses about second language learning and literacy education which would influence the structural issues of curriculum, assessment, and state requirements.

This section will discuss the theoretical framework of this study, which builds on Foucault’s work. The details of that framework are as follows: Genesis of Poststructuralist Critical Linguistics, Foucault and Discourse, Foucault and Power/Knowledge, Foucault and Subject, and Application of Foucault’s Work to Pedagogical Practices of ELL Teachers.

**Genesis of Poststructuralist Critical Linguistics**

Modernism can be traced back to the 17th-century rationalism of Descartes. In accordance with Descartes’ philosophical statement, "Cogito ergo sum" (I think, therefore, I am), modernism locates human mind/reason at the center, and maintains a Cartesian mind/body dualism. This modernist intellectual model of mind postulates that humans use an innate conceptual structure called the mind to produce intelligent actions through
reasoning processes. A person's will is actualized through the thinking process, resulting in various forms of voluntary, purposive, or intentional actions. Seen from this modernist perspective, language is defined as a universal and self-evident autonomous construct rather than as a social construct. This reason and science oriented approach to language, focused on autonomous choices and universals, led modernists to create the educational system still dominant in western countries, “deeming education to be requisite to gaining linguistic precision” (Bauman & Briggs, 2008, p. 7).

Structuralism, on the other hand, finds meaning in the social structures and sign systems found in human culture. Saussure, known as the father of modern structural linguistics, proposed that language is composed of socially produced arbitrary sign systems: “every means of expression used in society is based, in principle, on collective behavior or – what amounts to the same thing – on convention” (Saussure, 1960, p. 60). These linguistic signs are composed of two parts: signifier, i.e., form (the sound-image itself) and signified, i.e., the concepts that are carried by the signifier. Meaning, as seen by Saussure, exists in the relation between signifier and the signified, both of which are culturally defined linguistic codes (Culler 1976). For example, the meaning of the word “father” is understood from the concept of fatherhood, and in the difference between “father” and “mother,” “daughter” or “son.” Meanings are assigned to words based on their structural relationships, often expressed as binary oppositions: black/white, off-white/brilliant white, and night/day.

Saussure also recognized that langue, the underlying structure related to social life, differs from parole, the actual signifying utterances of individuals; language is a social phenomenon, whereas speech is an individual free act. According to Saussure,
interlocutors cannot communicate with each other without sharing a socially-coded common linguistic structure, i.e., langue. Saussure’s underlying structural approach to language is similar to Chomsky's natural mentalist approach to language in that Saussure's langue/parole and Chomsky's competence/performance both involve dualism. However, Saussure focused on language as a window on the world, while Chomsky focused on linguistic competence as a window on the mind. Saussure argues that humans are born into a language, while Chomsky maintains that humans are born with language. According to Saussure, language is a social construct within a language-meaning-society relational framework, whereas for Chomsky, language is an individual phenomenon that develops out of an innate human language acquisition device (LAD), which possesses an ability to create infinite sets of sentences.

Although Saussure, having made the distinction between the two aspects of sign (signifier/signified), focused exclusively on the synchronic structures of the linguistic code (langue) for the exploration of meaning, Saussure’s arguments had a far-reaching influence upon theories of representation and human culture, and ultimately on the fields of psychology, sociology, and anthropology. Many scholars, including Michel Foucault, Louis Althusser, Claude Lévi-Strauss, Julia Kristeva, and Jacques Derrida built upon the linguistic ideas of Saussure.

If the relationships between the signifier and the signified are defined by social convention and historical development, their meanings can never be fixed; “because it is arbitrary, the sign is totally subject to history and the combination at the particular moment of a given signifier and signified is a contingent result of the historical process” (Culler, 1976, p. 36). Just as culture and history change over time, signified meanings and
representations also change as interpretations are applied to them by participants during communication, in accordance with the evolving conventions, norms, values and ideologies prevalent at their particular locations and historical moments, and within their situated sociocultural contexts. One interpretation produces new meanings, and *chains of interpretations* do not lead to the absolute Truth.

The French critic Barthes (1967) expanded the dualistic concept of langue/parole by distinguishing between denotation and connotation. Denotation refers to those descriptive level meanings which most people would agree on, while connotation speaks to the varied interpretations that people maintain in association with their own particular values, historical schemata, cultural norms, and societal ideologies. Connotative meanings are important in Gee's *cultural models*; “the theories that form the basis of such choices and assumptions have a particular character. They involve (usually unconscious) assumptions about models of simplified worlds. Such models are sometimes called “cultural models, folk theories, scenes, schemas, or frames” (Gee, 1996, p. 78). These cultural meanings and practices were analyzed by the French anthropologist, Claude Lévi-Strauss, who studied the underlying codes and structures found in the folk tales, customs, rituals and myths of peoples of Amazonia. These studies by Barthes and Lévi-Strauss led to the formation of a semiotic approach toward the analysis of representation, meaning, and social practices. This semiotic approach also takes into consideration the ways humans communicate through the delivery of meaning by context-dependent representational systems other than language: “not only words and images but objects themselves can function as signifiers in the production of meaning. Clothes, for example, may have a simple physical function - to cover the body and protect it from the weather.
But clothes also double up as signs. They construct a meaning and carry a message. An evening dress may signify ‘elegance’; a bow tie and tails, ‘formality’; jeans and trainers, ‘casual dress’; a certain kind of sweater in the right setting. ‘a long, romantic, autumn walk in the wood’ (Barthes, 1967). These signs enable clothes to convey meaning and to function like a language - the language of fashion” (Hall, 1997, p. 37). Constructive semiotic analysis of both language-in-use and various other communicative representations reveals a conveyance of complex and multiple meanings at the local micro level, within a context of those broad macrolevel meanings associated with nationhood, culture, ethnicity, race, and cultural practices.

Historically, those forms of language and other communicative representations used by people in powerless positions have been disparaged or forbidden by people with power and in government institutions, while the language and visual representations of people with power have always been promoted; therefore, questions as to whose codes, knowledge, and practices should be represented remained unresolved. Thus, poststructuralism arose in the early 1960s in order to address the failure of structuralism to define human freedom in terms of political and economic oppression, and rejects the separation of langue from parole. Poststructuralism stems from Western European continental philosophy and encompasses a number of related fields, such as deconstructionism (Derrida, Kristeva), feminist poststructuralism (Spivak), postcolonialism (Bhabha, Said), psychoanalytic poststructuralism (Lacan), and queer theory (Butler).

This dissertation analyzed, using Foucault's archaeological and genealogical discourse in action and practice framework, D/discourses related to language ideology,
and particularly those D/discourses related to the views about ELLs, second language and the literacy education of ELLs that circulate in the classroom, in professional development programs, schools, communities, and in society in general, and analyze the impact that those D/discourses have on the construction of the pedagogical practices, particularly, the creation of Thirdspace of culturally relevant pedagogy that are used for teaching ELLs. Therefore, the next section will focus on a discussion of Foucault's work.

Foucault and Discourse

Reason-based modernism, Saussure’s structuralism, and Barthes’ semiotic approach to language have been discussed above. According to Hall (1997), there are three approaches to language: the reflective, intentional, and constructionist approach; the approach that will be taken depends on one’s conceptualization as to the location of meaning. The reflective approach to language tried to discover the meaning of language by understanding the existing world, things, ideas and events. The intentional approach to language sought meaning in the intentions of individual speakers and authors. However, those who take a constructionist approach to language maintain that “neither things in themselves nor the individual users of language can fix meaning in language,” but that it is constructed within “the symbolic practices and processes through which representation, meaning, and language operate” (Hall, 1997, p. 25). This semiotic constructivist approach to language was established by Saussure, who contributed to the 20th century’s linguistic turn away from the universal/rational/personal concept of language prevalent in the 16th and 17th centuries. However, Saussure’s structuralist linguistics and Barthes’ semiotic
approach to language were transformed by Foucault (1972) to apply at the critical discourse level.

The structural and semiotic linguistic approach taken by Saussure, Pierce and Barthes emphasized relations between representation and meaning without consideration of power and its inscription of subjectivities. According to Foucault (1980), semiotics does not account for linguistic conflict because “semiology is a way of avoiding its violent, bloody and lethal character by reducing it to the calm Platonic form of language and dialogue” (p. 115). As conceptualized by Foucault, language functions as the agent for the production and representation of knowledge as it foregrounds the linguistic realities emerging within historically grounded networks of power/knowledge and subject. According to Foucault (1972), representation and meaning, ultimately, contribute to the production of knowledge and subject only if they are relevant to the circulating powers, and only within the constraints of those power structures.

Foucauldian discourses are the metasystems of representation, metaconcepts, rules, and regulations that govern human meanings, actions, and bodily practices, the networks of representational systems and practices through which knowledge is produced at any particular historical place and moment. Things may exist, and people may have their own Saussurian parole (individual acts of free speech); however, the meanings of things and people within any specific setting can be fully understood only in context of existing discourses because “nothing has any meaning outside of discourse” (Foucault, 1972, p. 32). Discourse is not monolithic, but is complex, flexible, dynamic, strategic, and discursively formulated:
We must not imagine a world of discourse divided between accepted discourse and excluded discourse, or between the dominant discourse and the dominated one; but as a multiplicity of discursive elements that can come into play in various strategies. (Foucault, 1990, p. 100)

Discourse constructs and is constructed by meanings and social practices, and produces the currently prevailing systematic theories of knowledge, i.e., epistemic distinctions, certain forms of knowledge, practices, procedures, strategies, skills, concepts, and texts in the given spatial-temporal-historical-institutional context. For example, in two of his books, *Discipline and Punishmen* (1977) and Volume 1 of *The History of Sexuality* (1978), Foucault argued that *psychiatric discourses* such as ‘madness’, ‘punishment’, and ‘sexuality’ in the 19th century were defined by social discourses, and that each was “constituted by all that was said in all the statements that named it, divided it up, described it, explained it, traced its development, indicated its various correlations, judged it, and possibly gave it speech by articulating, in its name, discourses that were to be taken as its own” (Foucault, 1972, p. 32). The formation of those discourses were “made possible by a group of relations established between authorities of emergence, delimitation, and specification” (Foucault, 1972, p. 44) across a variety of contexts at that historical moment. But whose discourses, knowledge, and practices are represented, dispersed, enunciated, inscribed, decoded, encoded, and taught? Foucault (1980) does not deny the existence of scientific factual knowledge, but asserts that discourses are always linked with power/knowledge.

**Foucault and Power/Knowledge**

In material Marxism, power is defined in terms of a dualistic power/powerless concept; the means of material production are perceived to function as the basis for the
operation of society, and ideology is thought to support the superstructure of the societal system by generating a form of false consciousness through the dialectic relationships, thesis-antithesis-synthesis. Marxian theorists see society as being produced in the interplay between the interests of the economic classes through Hegelian ideological distortion. Dichotomous sovereign/subaltern power concept were reconsidered by Althusser (1970) and Michel Foucault (1980). Althusser identified two different forms of power: repressive state apparatus (RSA) and ideological state apparatus (ISA). The repressive state apparatus is exercised through coercion, such as by police and military, while the ideological state apparatus functions through the ideology taught in schools, churches, and mass media.

Foucault located power in the microprocesses-practices of discursive formations, where it displays considerably more complexity than the Marxian dialectic power concept. According to Foucault (1990), “Power is everywhere; not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere” and “one is always ‘inside’ power, there is no ‘escaping’ it” (Foucault, 1990, p. 101). This definition of power envisions multidirectional, multidimensional, flexible, dynamic, strategic, technical, conceptual, contingent circulating networks of power influencing the individual’s private and public daily lives, rather than power as a single individual possession or institution (Foucault, 1978) with a top-down structure: “Power is not an institution, and not a structure; neither is it a certain strength we are endowed with; it is the name that one attributes to a complex strategical situation in a given society” (p. 93). This power is always linked with forms of knowledge and practices of knowledge: “there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not
presuppose and constitute at the same time, power relations” (Foucault, 1977, p. 27).

Individuals may have their own knowledge and opinions, but their knowledge cannot have any effect as a truth, to control, regulate, and order discourses or the conduct of people, unless it possesses some discourse/power/knowledge linkage. No one absolute Truth is universally recognized in all societies; truth is constructed and constituted through discursive formation, and becomes a regime of truth:

…truth isn’t outside of power, or lacking in power…truth isn’t the reward of free spirits, the child of protracted solitude, nor the privilege of those who have succeeded in liberating themselves. Truth is a thing in the world: it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms constraint. And it induces regular effects of power. Each society has its own truth, its ‘general politics’ of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to teach is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true. (Foucault, 1980, p. 131)

Power circulates everywhere at every moment as a working mechanism that regulates practices, behaviors, attitudes, and epistemologies of people through an assortment of diverse heterogeneous apparatus (Foucault, 1980). Foucault distinguishes episteme from apparatus in that episteme refers to a specifically discursive apparatus. The term apparatus encompasses both discursive and nondiscursive forms, i.e., “elements which participate in a rationality” (p. 197), which are “discourses, institutions, architectural arrangements, regulations, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical, moral, and philanthropic propositions” (p. 194). This apparatus is always strategically aligned with power/knowledge:

The apparatus is thus always inscribed in a play of power, but it is also always linked to certain coordinates of knowledge which issue from it but, to an equal degree, condition it. This is what the apparatus consists in: strategies of relations of forces supporting and supported by, types of knowledge. (p. 196)
Foucault directed the concept of language away from the domain of modernistic reason and structural linguistic-based analysis and toward the discourse level; not discourse as patterns of linguistic forms associated with context, but discourse as a meta-regulative system that produces a certain type of knowledge, meaning, and practices through an amalgamation of discourse/power/knowledge in a discursive formation process. Foucault's work has influenced social science enormously by his linkage of micropower relations with knowledge formations and society. However, it cannot be said that there is no criticism of Foucault’s approach to discourse. Foucault has been criticized for placing too much emphasis on discourse, and not enough emphasis on the influence of economic, material, structural forces in his account of the construction of power/knowledge (Hall, 1997), and for not considering the importance of human agency, which can be seen in the contribution of human struggles and resistance in the discursive formational processes. Human subject or agency as articulated by Foucault differs from the creators of the individual free speech acts (paroles) that are central in Saussure’s perspective, and from Bourdieu’s (1998) neo-Marxian dialectic view of structure/agent. Foucault de-centers the individual in the discursive formations. A detailed explanation of subject, as articulated by Foucault, will be discussed in the next section.

Foucault and Subject

According to the modernistic Cartesian perspective, humans can exist autonomously as self-sufficient individuals led by their own reason and free will, whose utterances and behaviors spring from their own mental processes, independently from society. This dichotomous view of mind/body, human/society, and person/environment
was rejected by the sociological theory formulated by Bourdieu (1997), who posited that practice is produced and reproduced dialectically in the relations between practice and *habitus* (dispositions) in the field, and poststructuralism (Foucault).

Foucault (1980) proposed “conditions of identity” – procedures, strategies, tactics, discourses – using the *microphysics* concept of power mechanism, which includes “the discipline of the body and the control of the population” (Foucault, 1980, p. 125). “Power had to be able to gain access to the bodies of individuals, to their acts, attitudes and modes of everyday behaviors” (p. 125). Foucault related in his book titled *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, how that in the 19th century, Western systems of punishment based on public punishment of the body were replaced by those based on the correction of the soul. Panopticism is a metaphoric concept inspired by the panopticon, an archetype of 19th-century prisons, in which prisoners could be observed from a central location by unseen guards. Panopticism describes how humans are managed, observed, monitored, and subjugated like prisoners while unaware of the discourses that control them. This illustrates how discourse produces subject, that is, humans are subjugated into certain positions by discourses that reflect the power/knowledge linkage. Humans can resist this discursive formational subjugation, but their struggles can be effective only within structures of power: “Where there is power, there is resistance, and yet, or rather consequently, this resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power. Should it be said that one is always ‘inside’ power, there is no ‘escaping’ it, there is no absolute outside where it is concerned” (Foucault, 1990, p. 94).

In other words, humans can have self-awareness and be conscious of their own identity, but their meanings and representations are not effective unless they are
expressed within discourse. For example, even though English language learners (ELLs) have strong feelings, reflexivity, and consciousness about their own culture and identity, they cannot be actualized unless societal discourses and discursive formations, i.e., the rules of the US educational systems, enable those cultures and identities to be expressed. This subjectification over subjectivity explains how biological attributes like race, ethnicity and gender, and habitus, i.e., dispositions that include linguistic and cultural competence, are socially and culturally constructed in discourse processes and in the interplay of social structures, such as the school curriculum offered by public schools, and ultimately, inscribe within ELLs a certain type of identity and cause them to suppress their own ways of being in the world.

**Application of Foucault’s Work to the Pedagogical Practices of ELL Teachers**

Foucault (1980) argued that the circulating discourses linked with power/knowledge produce the *regimes of truth* that prevail at any historical moment. Regimes of truth govern such areas as epistemology, object of knowledge, concepts, strategies, skills, techniques, practices and subject, all of which are greatly relevant to classroom learning. Thus, the creation of Spaces for culturally relevant pedagogy by ELL teachers should depend on the following factors:

1. Archaeology and genealogy of knowledge pertaining to the education of ELLs: the history of the discourses constituting disciplinary knowledge, particularly that knowledge concerning second language and literacy education that is situated in university teacher education programs, and professional development courses, curriculum,
school and classroom, leads to the construction of the pedagogical beliefs, content, knowledge, and practices of ELL teachers.

2. Discourses that regiment English-only ideologies: the views about minority language, second language and literacy education, and about ELLs that circulate in and around the classroom, school, community and society, and which are demonstrated both by statements/silences and practices/non-practices, lead to the enactment of national language policy and planning, the state curriculum, and policies at the local level.

3. Pedagogical practices: the practices of ELL teachers are informed, inscribed, encoded, decoded, subscribed and enforced by language ideologies and by the discourses articulated and scaffolded by the rules of knowledge, i.e., the archaeology and genealogy of knowledge about second language and literacy education. The consequences of those practices may then serve to support or refute the discourses that informed them.

4. Enunciative modalities that direct the curriculum, skills, strategies, techniques, procedures and rules that are used in the education of ELLs.

5. Representations: symbols, texts, signs, and images that are used in the education of ELLs.

6. Production of subjects and objects through the discourses manifested in actions and practices: the self perceptions of ELL teachers as to who they are, and how they should teach and should not teach, are constructed through discursive formations. Teachers of ELLs develop as they interpellate themselves into the subject position, and ELLs themselves may influence the discourse through their action/inaction from the subject position.
7. The possibilities of new epistemic positions and practices: Discourses linked with power/knowledge are always subject to continuities and discontinuities. Resistance or disrupting discourses open up possibilities for change in the nodes of discursive formations that exist at a particular historical moment. Despite the extant systems, structures and discourses built around scripted curriculum, standardized testing, cognitive psycholinguistic-based second language teaching, and English-only ideologies that are so characteristic of US schools, communities, and society, ELL teachers surely can be found who create Spaces for culturally relevant pedagogy, in light of the significant role that teachers have played in the creation of the existing discourses.

Case Studies

The issues surrounding the (trans)formations of teacher’s pedagogical practices related to his/her language and literacy education are dynamic and complex, and involve both explicit and implicit language ideologies and discourses related to ELLs and ELL pedagogy circulating the country, community, school and classroom. In order to theorize the (trans)formation of pedagogical practices in the webs of circulating complex and intertwined discourses and practices, I employed a case study method in combination of ethnographic data collection method (Spradley, 1980), constant comparison method from grounded theory (Glaser, 1998), and CDA (critical discourse analysis) from Foucault, Fairclough, and Huckin, which I refer to as a discourse-oriented critical ethnographic case study method.

Case study is different from ethnography in that the case study “offers a means of investigating complex social units consisting of multiple variables of potential
importance in understanding the phenomenon. ... It offers insights and illuminates meaning that help structure future research; hence, case study plays an important role in advancing a field’s knowledge base” (Merriam, 1998, p. 41). This study employed a case study design for three reasons: First, case study methodology is most appropriate when the research is answering “how” or “why” questions, when behavior cannot or does not need to be controlled, and when the question focuses on “contemporary events” (Yin, 2009, p. 8). Second, the study topic and situation best aligns with the definition of “interpretive case study” (Merriam, 1998, p. 40). Finally, case studies can have a variety of “intents” (Merriam, 1998, p. 40), and can contain “rich, thick description” (Geertz, 1973) that can be used to “illustrate, support, or challenge theoretical assumptions held prior to data gathering” (p. 38).

As Merriam (1998) states, “the more cases included in a study, and the greater the variation across the cases, the more compelling an interpretation is likely to be” (p. 40). In this regard, this research employed a double case study design in order to allow for comparison and contrast between the discursive (trans)formations of the knowledge systems and pedagogical practices of 2 ELL teachers in two different schools. The differences between school sites in terms of socioeconomic class offered a look into how 2 teachers of ELLs negotiatecontest/reify the language ideologies and competing discourses about second language and literacy education circulating in their schools, communities, and classrooms.

Over a period of 1½ academic years (Spring, 2008 - Spring, 2009), these two case studies explored and investigated the Spaces for culturally relevant pedagogy through an examination of the language ideologies circulating in the nation/community/ school and
embedded in the knowledge frameworks and pedagogical practices of 2 White, middle class, female English language education teachers of adolescent ELLs.

**Research Settings**

Salt Lake City

Salt Lake City (SLC) is the capital city of the state of Utah. Salt Lake City was founded by Brigham Young and his Mormon followers in 1847, and has become the mecca of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (LDS Church) since that time. Before 1950, the racial composition of SLC was 99% White (2010 U.S. Census Data). However, the racial composition of SLC has changed dramatically since then due to immigration of employment seekers and refugee populations. In Table 1, SLC has a population of 189,899 compared with the population of 2,814,347 in the state of Utah: 75% of the residents of SLC are White, the second largest populations are Hispanic or Latino origin 22%, the third Asian 4% and two or more races 4%, the fourth Black 3%, the fifth Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander 2%, and the sixth American Indian and Alaskan Native 1%. (U.S. Census 2010, Table 1). Currently less than 50% of the population in SLC are members of LDS Church, which is a low rate, compared with about 62% of Utah State’s population (Salt Lake Tribune, 7/24/2005).

Considering the educational attainment in terms of what kinds of language are spoken at home, the distinction between White and Spanish speakers is most conspicuous. In Table 2, 43% English speakers own bachelor’s degree or higher, but only 17% of Spanish speakers graduated from a university. Additionally, based on the 2006 American Community Survey about SLC in Table 2, 50% of Spanish speakers and 19% of speakers
Table 1: SLC Demographics, 2010 U.S. Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Salt Lake City</th>
<th>Utah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>189,899</td>
<td>2,814,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaskan Native</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino origin</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent under 18 years old</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of Asian, Pacific Island or other languages did not graduate from high school, whereas only 6% of English speakers and 4% of speakers of other Indo-European languages did not. But 80% of Spanish speakers, 77% of Asian and Pacific Island languages, and 89% of speakers of other languages were in the work force in 2006, compared with only 69% of English speakers. In other words, speakers of other languages in SLC are primarily working poor as opposed to welfare recipients.

In Table 3, the poverty rate among school aged children in SLC is conspicuously high among speakers of other languages compared with English speakers: 17% of English speaking children lived below the poverty level, in contrast to 45% of Spanish speaking, 38% speakers of Asian and Pacific Island languages, and 87% of speakers of other languages (2006 American Community Survey, SLC, Population 5 to 17 Years).
Table 2: Educational Attainment and Employment Status by Language Spoken at Home for the SLC Population 25 Years and Over

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language spoken at home</th>
<th>Speak only English</th>
<th>Speak Spanish</th>
<th>Speak other Indo-European languages</th>
<th>Speak Asian and Pacific Island languages</th>
<th>Speak other languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent in labor force</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Educational attainment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Speak only English</th>
<th>Speak Spanish</th>
<th>Speak other Indo-European languages</th>
<th>Speak Asian and Pacific Island languages</th>
<th>Speak other languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school graduate</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS grad. (includes equivalency)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college/associate's degree</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree or higher</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: 2006 American Community Survey)

In summary, almost half of school aged children from homes where languages other than English are spoken live below the poverty level in SLC. Half of Hispanic speaking adults did not graduate from high school, and only 32% of Hispanic adults attended college, compared with 94% of English speakers who own high school degrees and 76% of English speakers who had attended college. These data demonstrate that in SLC, there is a strong correlation between language, educational attainment, and poverty, resonating with Bourdieu’s concept of symbolic capital, that is, English being operated as a mechanism of power, resulting in social reproduction of educational and economic class.
Table 3: Poverty Status by Language Spoken at Home for the SLC Population 5 to 17 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language spoken at home</th>
<th>Speak only English</th>
<th>Speak Spanish</th>
<th>Speak other Indo-European languages</th>
<th>Speak Asian and Pacific Island languages</th>
<th>Speak other languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below poverty level</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: 2006 American Community Survey)

In accordance with this educational and poverty level divide between English speakers and speakers of other languages, SLC is divided into East Side and West Side, which are characterized by the languages, educational levels and income levels of their populations. These phenomena have already been observed and analyzed in Buendía’s book (2006) titled “Geographies of Difference: The Social Production of the East Side, West Side, and Central City School.” The East Side of SLC, where Birch Hill High School is located, is characterized by a White population with high incomes and high property values, whereas the West Side of the city, where Cedar Grove Middle School is located, has been known as a low income working-class neighborhood.

Birch Hill High School

The central settings for this study were two different public schools and their ESL classrooms. The first study site was a public high school named “Birch Hill High School” (pseudonym), located in a high-income neighborhood in the East Side of Salt Lake City.
Utah. The students of Birch Hill High School were ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth graders, numbering approximately 2,100 in total. As shown in Table 4, the race distribution among students during the time when this study was conducted (Spring 2008 - Spring 2009) is shown in Table 4: Approximately 48% were White, 5% African American, 35% Hispanic, 9% Asian, 3% American Indian, and 18 students were of unknown ethnicity.

There are four different models for accommodating ELLs in US classrooms: ESL (English as a Second Language) in which students spend most of the day in a regular class and spend some part of the day in ESL class with ESL teachers for language support, Early Exit where students attend class with other native-English speaking students and are provided some long-term language support, Late Exit where students are provided considerable primary language support while introducing reading in both languages, i.e., their native language and English, and Dual-Immersion where students are provided equal amounts of instruction in both students’ native language and English. Despite

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>Not Specified</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Free or Discounted Lunch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1011 (48.2%)</td>
<td>117 (5.6%)</td>
<td>704 (33.6%)</td>
<td>191 (9.1%)</td>
<td>55 (2.6%)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2,096</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>976 (48.2%)</td>
<td>98 (4.7%)</td>
<td>763 (36.5%)</td>
<td>183 (8.7%)</td>
<td>59 (2.8%)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2,092</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: National Center for Education Statistics, Dept. of Education)
research results that have proven Dual-Immersion to be the most effective model (García, 2009), ESL has been the most common model in the US.

ELLs in Birch Hill High School were taught using the typical ESL model; students spent part of their day learning English with an ESL teacher and spent the rest of the day in classes with native English speaking students. ELLs were multilingual and multicultural students from a variety of countries: China, Somalia, Sudan, Mongolia, Egypt, India, Puerto Rico, Mexico, Algeria, Morocco, Libya, Uganda, and Kenya, etc.; in all 38 languages were spoken by students in that school. ELLs were graded 1B, 2B, and 3B, corresponding with their English speaking proficiency. Ms. Lewis’s class consisted of students with an English level of 2B, and included students from ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grade.

These high school English learner students were bused to Birch Hill High School from the West Side of Salt Lake City. In 2001, the city changed its school district boundaries in order to make the racial and social profile of schools less homogeneous and to distribute some of the educational and financial resources from the wealthy East Side to the linguistically and culturally diverse West Side. In order to accomplish this, ELL students in West Side must spend 45 minutes going to school in the East Side and another 45 minutes coming back home, and students not being allowed to attend schools in their own community has been identified as problematic (Interview, 2009).

Cedar Grove Middle School

The second study site was “Cedar Grove Middle School” (pseudonym), a public middle school located in a low-income neighborhood in the West Side of Salt Lake City,
Utah. In Table 5, the students of Cedar Grove Middle School were sixth, seventh, and eighth graders numbering 900 in total. The ethnic background of the students: 
approximately 65% were Hispanic, 14% Asian, 12% White, 5.5% African American, 2.5% American Indian, and 2% were of unknown ethnicity; two-thirds of them were ELLs. Given that 80% of public school students in the state of Utah are White, we can see that the community in the neighborhood around Cedar Grove Middle School is racially, ethnically, linguistically, and culturally diverse.

The particular classroom in Cedar Grove Middle School in which this study took place was a normal ESL class for eighth grade ELLs who had lived in the US from 8 months up to 5 years. These students had a C level English proficiency, which means that their English proficiency fell within the second level of the four different English proficiency levels, i.e., D, C, B, and A found at Cedar Grove Middle School. The class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>Not Specified</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Free or Discounted Lunch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13.2%)</td>
<td>(6.4%)</td>
<td>(63%)</td>
<td>(14%)</td>
<td>(3.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11.1%)</td>
<td>(4.9%)</td>
<td>(67%)</td>
<td>(14.9%)</td>
<td>(2.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: National Center for Education Statistics, Dept. of Education)
was composed of 11 ELLs from Mexico and South America, 8 female and 3 male, 1 boy from Africa, and the ESL teacher, Ms. Clark.

Participants

The central participants were two ESL teachers, Ms. Lewis (pseudonym) and Ms. Clark (pseudonym). These two ESL teachers were chosen with a criterion-based purposeful sampling method due to the following similarities and differences. These several similarities and differences allowed the researcher to achieve “representativeness of typicality of the settings, individuals, or activities” and “illuminate the reasons for differences between settings or individuals” (Maxwell 2005, pp. 89-90).

Ms. Lewis and Ms. Clark were similar in many aspects: they both (1) represented the 85% of the public school teachers who are middle-class, White and female (Ed. Gov, 2006), (2) owned master’s degrees with ESL teaching credentials and fewer than 5 years of teaching experiences, and were approximately the same age: Ms. Lewis in her early 30s and Ms. Clark in her late 20s, (3) worked for the same school district in the western part of the USA, (4) were teaching language arts in addition to ESL classes in secondary schools at the time when data were collected, i.e., from the spring semester of 2008 through the spring semester of 2009, (5) were willing to participate in this discourse-oriented critical ethnographic research study, and (6) participated in the same professional development course.

There were four differences between these 2 participant teachers: (1) Ms. Lewis taught ESL classes in Birch Hill High School located in the high-income East Side area of Salt Lake City, but Ms. Clark taught ESL classes in Cedar Grove Middle School
located in the low-income West Side area of Salt Lake City, (2) Ms. Lewis taught tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grade high school students, whereas Ms. Clark taught sixth, seventh, and eighth grade middle school students, (3) despite the fact that they looked very similar in terms of their appearances, Ms. Lewis was from an immigrant family - her mother immigrated from Sweden when Ms. Lewis was 4 years old, but Ms. Clark and her parents were born in the US, and (4) Ms. Lewis was rated as a very good teacher by her professional development teachers, but Ms. Clark was not. In order to explore Thirdspace and culturally relevant pedagogy in/across ESL classrooms and the genealogical discursive (trans)formations of 2 ELL teachers’ pedagogical practices, these 2 teachers’ pedagogical practices and knowledge systems will be compared and contrasted with each other.

**Data Collection**

I employed an ethnographic approach for the overall design of the present study. In accordance with accepted ethnographic data collection methods (Spradley 1980), (1) I was always present in the research setting as a participant, as a semiparticipant observer, or a nonparticipant observer over a prolonged period of time, observing ESL teacher professional development for 2½ years and observing ESL classrooms for 1½ years, (2) I tried to figure out and interpret the meanings of the words and practices of participant teachers from the perspective of the research participant, i.e., the emic perspective rather than my own etic perspective, (3) when I did my fieldwork, I jotted down my own feelings about the interactions, utterances, phenomena and events and, to place them in context, I recorded a detailed thick description of the setting, and (4) I adapted taxonomic
data analysis methods (Spradley, 1980). As the data became saturated enough to construct the abstract theoretical metaconcepts, I focused on the discourses, interactions, processes, changes, activities, and events with respect to core conceptual categories about ELLs and ELL pedagogy for the triangulation of data (Strauss & Corbin, 1987).

Over the course of 1½ academic years (Spring, 2008 - Spring, 2009), I conducted formal interviews and recorded school and classroom observations. I also frequently engaged teachers with informational interviews and casual conversations just after classroom observations so they could explain their intended outcomes and express how they felt about their achievement of those outcomes. This inquiry drew upon the following multiple data sources: (1) documents related to the education of ELLs: national and local newspapers, state documents about curriculum and language policy and planning (LPP), (2) transcribed data taken from formal interviews of the 2 participant teachers, who were interviewed three times with Ms. Clark, five times with Ms. Lewis: at the beginning, middle, and end stages of data collection, (3) classroom observations including lesson plans, teaching materials provided by the teacher, (4) researcher’s field notes of observations conducted in the classroom, at PD courses attended by the teachers, and at the teachers’ meetings, (5) researcher journals, (6) transcripts of audio and videotaped classroom practices, (7) transcripts of debriefings between the researcher and the teachers at the end of research, (8) master’s degree theses written by the 2 participant teachers for their graduate school teacher education programs, and syllabi and writing samples written by the 2 participant teachers in their professional development courses, and (9) DVDs and writing products produced by ELLs. The research questions and data sources used for this study are summarized in Table 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What are the language ideologies circulating and practiced in society, in public school classrooms, curriculum and professional development, and in the pedagogy of 2 ESL classrooms in particular?</td>
<td>Documents (newspapers, LPP, syllabi) Field Notes Journals Observations Interviews Student Work Teacher Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How and to what extent do the language ideologies circulating and practiced in educational contexts, as demonstrated in professional development, curriculum and pedagogy employed in 2 ESL classrooms, support and influence the creation of a culturally relevant pedagogy?</td>
<td>Artifacts Field Notes Journals Observations Interviews Student Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How and to what extent do ELL teachers negotiate/contest/reify these language ideologies in their beliefs and pedagogical practices, particularly in the area of language and literacy instruction, and how and to what extent do those beliefs and practices facilitate/inhibit the creation of a culturally relevant pedagogy in the classroom?</td>
<td>Artifacts Field Notes Journals Observations Interviews Student Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How and to what extent do ELLs participate in the pedagogical space of knowledge production in the classroom?</td>
<td>Field Notes Journals Observations Interviews Student Work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observations

Observational data for this study were collected, approximately from once to four times per month, at a professional development (PD, hereafter) course that the 2 participant teachers attended in order to be trained to teach English language and content literacy for ELLs. Ms. Lewis attended the PD course for 3 years from the fall semester of 2006 to the spring semester of 2009, and Ms. Clark attended the PD program for almost 1 year from the summer semester of 2008 to the spring semester of 2009. I was involved in the PD courses as a research assistant (RA) for 2½ years, and I was present at all the training sessions. My role as an RA was to record all the written and spoken data that were collected during the PD course using digital recorder and video camera, and to analyze those data using primarily quantitative methods, but also with some supplemental use of qualitative methods. Most of the data collected during the PD training sessions consisted of the PPT presentations and printed handouts used by the two professor instructors, the lectures given by the instructors, the verbal interactions between the instructors and the participant teachers, discussions among the participant teachers, etc. These were recorded using a voice recorder or videotaped. From the voice recordings and videos, the data needed for analysis were transcribed verbatim using transcription conventions adapted from Jefferson (2004) (Appendix G).

Regarding classroom observations, the two ESL classes were observed approximately from once to three times a week, depending on the month. I started to observe Ms. Lewis’s ESL class in the spring semester of 2008 (January - April). At that time, Ms. Lewis had already attended the PD course for 1½ years, 2006. After the spring semester of 2008, Ms. Lewis did not teach because of pregnancy, so I started to observe
her ESL class again in November 2008 and continued to observe the class through the spring semester of 2009 (March - April). I observed Ms. Clark’s class for 2 semesters, from the fall semester of 2008 to the spring semester of 2009. In April, 2009, Ms. Clark asked her student teacher to continue teaching her ESL class, but I still continued to observe that class and language arts class that Ms. Clark was teaching.

During classroom observations, I usually played the role of nonparticipant observer, but I became a participant observer whenever the teacher asked me to help her or to help students. Before or after classroom observations, I sometimes observed the school and engaged in short conversations with other teachers in the school. I also observed the school environment, such as students’ pictures, decorations, writings, statements, awards, and trophies on the walls, and observed the students in the hallways.

All the classroom observations were recorded using a voice recorder and most of them were also videotaped. All recorded materials were kept in a safe locker in my apartment office. The recorded and videotaped observational data relevant to this detailed analysis were transcribed verbatim.

Documents

In order to explore the national language ideologies in the US, a literature review of the history of language ideologies was conducted. For the exploration of local language ideologies and discourses regarding ELLs and ELL pedagogy, newspaper articles related to Birch Hill High School and Cedar Grove Middle School were collected using the Internet archive systems.
From the PD course, written materials relevant to the pedagogical development of the 2 participant teachers, including classroom observation rubric protocols, lesson plans, handouts, evaluation and feedback forms, and participant teacher’s written notes of their perceptions about the instructions were collected for analysis. Most of the teaching materials from the 2 ESL classrooms, such as lesson plans, teacher and student memos, and students’ work, including their DVDs and writing assignments, were also collected.

Interviews

I conducted formal interviews at least once per semester, in total five times with Ms. Lewis, and three times with Ms. Clark. Formal interviews were conducted either by email or in person. Each face to face interview lasted 2 hours or more. All the formal interviews were transcribed verbatim. Just after classroom observations, informal and casual conversations were also recorded, and teacher response forms (Appendix C), were collected. In those conversations and surveys, the participant teachers were debriefed about their reasons for using the teaching tactics they used, and about their reflections on the outcome of their instruction.

All formal semistructured interviews were conducted using the following three-stage pattern: (1) an initial stage for gaining general ideas about the participant teacher’s life and her belief framework about ELLs and ELL pedagogy, biographical information about the participants, such as their age, family, years of teaching, and the courses they took for their undergraduate and graduate education, and their experiences with ELLs (Appendix D), (2) a middle stage for probing and collecting more data based on the observed data concerning ELLs and ELL pedagogy, such as beliefs, values, philosophy,
and language and literacy education (Appendix E), and (3) a final stage for triangulating
the analyzed data (Appendix F) concerning the teachers’ life experiences, ideas about
ELL pedagogy, motivations to become a teacher, etc. Ms. Lewis was interviewed five
times; the first and second interviews at the initial stage, the third interview in the middle
stage, and the fourth and fifth interviews at the final data collection stage. Ms. Clark was
interviewed three times, the first interview at the initial stage, the second interview at the
middle stage, and the third interview at the final data collection stage. In order to clarify
and gain the concrete and detailed examples, I asked probing questions many times at the
three different stages, such as “What do you mean by that?,” “Could you provide more
specific example for that?,” or “Could you elaborate more about it?” etc. while
conducting the formal interviews.

All formal interviews were transcribed verbatim, and some of the informal
interviews related to the analysis were also transcribed verbatim. I consider the interview
data to be a co-construction of meaning between me and the participant teachers from the
postmodern feminist perspective, rather than objective data from a positivistic
perspective. The Data Collection Timetable (Appendix H) provides a detailed timeline for
the observations, data collection, and interviews that were used for analysis in this study.

Data Analysis

This discourse-oriented critical ethnographic case study describes, interprets, and
analyzes 2 cases using a combination of critical ethnographic descriptive interpretation,
constant comparison methods, and CDA (Critical Discourse Analysis). Three levels of
analysis were conducted. Level one analysis of all data, including media data,
observations, interviews, documents, materials, and artifacts, was performed using a combination of critical ethnographic interpretive descriptions (Denzin, 1997; Spradley, 1980) and constant comparison methods (Strauss & Corbin, 1987). Level two analysis involved the analysis of classroom observation data using both constant comparison and CHAT (Cultural-Historical-Activity Theory) triangle methods. From level one and two analysis, I selected relevant and significant discourses and interactions for level three analysis, particularly those suitable for contextualized interpretation as defined by Huckin (1995): “Contextualized interpretation should be broad enough and deep enough to take into serious account the fundamental premises of a democratic society: equal justice for all, basic fairness, individual freedoms (within reason), guarantees of human rights, government by popular will, etc.” (p. 110). Once key discourses and interactions were identified, these interactions were subjected to CDA (Critical Discourse Analysis, Fairclough, 1994, 2003; Gee, 2008, Huckin, 1995, 2002, 2010; Luke, 1995). A chart detailing the research questions, data sources, categories of analysis, and analysis method has been provided in Appendix B.

Level One Analysis: Constant Comparison Method

Level one analysis was performed within/across each site in order to elucidate the language ideologies and the reasoning systems regarding pedagogy for ELLs circulating in national and local spaces, in each school and classroom, and to delineate the ways in which those ideologies and reasoning systems connect with pedagogical practices and knowledge systems. Constant comparison methods (Strauss, 1987) were used in order to capture the implicit and explicit meanings, and conceptual relations embedded
in/through/within actions, conditions, processes, products, utterances and the interactions of all of these variables between/among teachers and the students. The abstractive metatheme construction was done through the following recursive cycle: data collection, coding, memo writing, theme development, metatheme, new conceptual position, and new metatheme.

A five step coding procedure (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) was employed: (1) open coding using word-word, line by line, and segment-segment coding systems, (2) focused coding through comparing and connecting the most significant and frequent codes with the larger data sets, such as observations and interviews, materials, etc., (3) axial coding through mapping core categories with relationships and dimensions, (4) conceptual coding through constant comparisons between/among all the coded data and core categories using the interactions of inductive and deductive internal dialogues, and (5) theoretical coding through triangulating and examining the relationships between/among concepts and all the data sources.

The most essential part of the constant comparison method is periodic memo writing, a process in which the data is analyzed while it is still being collected. This memo writing analysis was done weekly in order to compare and contrast similarities and differences in the codes. The memo writing process proceeds through four stages: (1) the initial memos compare and explore the relationships between and among tentative categories, (2) core categories are created in order to describe and analyze the complex conceptual intertextual relations in/among the coded data, (3) a condensed abstract concept mapping connects these core categories with the semantic relationships and properties between and among utterances, interactions and discourses, and (4) a coherent
integration of the conceptual theoretical framework with the memo writing is performed for theorizing concepts.

The implicit and explicit codes relevant to language ideologies and discourses were connected and explored in/across utterances, interactions, actions, activities and practices. Analysis of those codes revealed similarities and differences between the 2 research sites in terms of meaningful metathemes and metaconcepts, which were mapped by tracing the connections between utterances, discourses and the classroom practices of ELL teachers. Metathemes explored at each site were compared with the results of existing research and examined in light of emerging theory, and multiple positions and concepts were explored through recursive processes.

Level Two Analysis: Cultural-Historical-Activity Theory Method

The constant comparison analysis methods used in level one analysis to identify the language ideologies demonstrated by the pedagogical practices in 2 ESL classrooms were combined with CHAT methods in the second level of analysis.

Discursive and nondiscursive practices (action) refer to the pedagogical practices of ELL teachers. Analysis was conducted using CHAT (Cultural-Historical-Activity Theory) (Cole, 1996; Engeström, 1999) in Figure 1, in combination with CDA in order to elucidate how the Spaces of culturally relevant pedagogy is constructed between teacher and students, and among students in/across contexts.

The CHAT diagram (Cole, 1996; Engeström, 1987) is composed of six elements: (1) subjects: actors, i.e, participants in the activity system, (2) objects: purposes and objectives or the product of collective activities on which the activity system acts, (3)
mediating artifacts: primary artifacts (materials tools such as axes, needles, pencils, etc.), secondary artifacts (signs, symbols, ideas, traditional beliefs, norms, etc.), tertiary artifacts (abstractions), (4) rules, norms, values: explicit and implicit norms and conventions community constructs, (5) community: those who share the same general objects and goal-directed activity, and (6) division of labor: power structures among the members of the community.

In the CHAT diagram shown above, the subject-mediational artifacts-objects are interconnected, but “action exist ‘as such’ only in relation to the components at the bottom of the triangle” (Cole, 1996, p. 140), which means that in order for learning to be
internalized through social interactions (externalizations) in a meaningful, goal-directed activity, it must be mediated by semiotic systems such as speech and writing (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Vygotsky, 1986; Wertsch, 1991). These mediating artifacts are critical because not only other elements in the activity system such as rules, norms, and division of labor can become mediators but also these mediators can be helpful or harmful to accomplish the object, depending on what and how mediators are created. In this research, culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP) and culturally relevant discourses encompasses the mediating tools connecting teachers with students in the classroom discourse community of practice.

The following classroom discourse is an example of the ways in which this dissertation research utilized in combination with CHAT triangles. The classroom discourse demonstrates how an African American girl’s identity and subjectivities are articulated and signified in the classroom. The data are drawn from Wortham’s (2005) book, *Learning Identity*. Tyisha is a 14-year-old African American girl, a freshman in a predominantly White high school in Philadelphia. During the first 2 months of the academic year, Tyisha was considered to be a cooperative student, then problematic. Later she was labeled as a *disruptive outcast* from the classroom society, and finally as a *beast*, an analogy drawn from a curricular theme in class. These four different identity categories were subscribed and produced through classroom discourses by her teacher over the course of the academic year. The following excerpt took place during the third, *disruptive outcast*, stage of identification categorization toward Tyisha (Wortham, 2006, p. 165).
1. Teacher: you think that we can beat Tyisha into submission? Make her humble?
2. JAS: you take something like her keys away, like now
3. when we arguing with her, she just says she don’t care,
4. but if we wasn’t talking about this and I just went over and took her keys, she’d have a fit.
5. STS: [3 seconds of laughter]
6. Teacher: well, what if we took away her, her, her pretense or
7. her, her claim, which is her pretense, her claim into a
8. thinking individual whose ideas have merit?
9. STS: [2 seconds of laughter]

In the class discussion detailed above, Tyisha was compared with the conceited character in the text by the teacher, and in this excerpt the teacher, Mrs. Bailey asks the class to beat Tyisha “into submission” and “humble” her. Wortham (2006)’s interpretation is that Tyisha has “some undesirable characteristics that exasperated the teachers”(p. 165), so that other students in the classroom, like Jasmine (JAS) and STS, join this teacher’s attempt at identity formation on Tyisha by using the first-person pronoun “we” referring to all students excluding Tyisha. STS laughed. Tyisha’s classroom social identity is inscribed by the power structures in the classroom, by the power of authority, the authority figure being the teacher. According to Wortham (2006), her generic loud black girl identity was “mediated through local categories of identity that solidified over weeks and months in this classroom and through the emergent organization of particular events” (p. 215). Ultimately, this inscribed identity marker would not allow Tyisha to succeed in academia.

Level Three Analysis: Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

During level one and two analysis, categories of frequent and/or significant discourses and interactions were identified. Level three analysis consisted of subjecting
those interactions and discourses to CDA. CDA was employed as an analytical tool to analyze the streams of discourses and discursive formations (DFs) weaving through circulating power structures, discourses related to pedagogical knowledges and practices for teachers working with linguistically and culturally diverse students.

CDA differs from DA in that CDA is a constitutive problem-oriented, inter/multi-disciplinary, multi-methodological approach to studying social phenomena (Woodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 2). The purpose of discourse analysis (DA) is not to sort out what statements are right and which are wrong, but to explore the discursive patterns in and across the statements and contexts (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2010). DA does not necessarily investigate the construction, deconstruction and reconstruction of the intertwined webs of discursive and historical meanings related to power, ideology, and social problems. On the other hand, CDA is “a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context” (van Dijk, 2003, p. 352). These are the kind of questions that CDA asks:

… how do existing societies provide people with the possibilities and resources for rich and fulfilling lives, how on the other hand do they deny people, these possibilities and resources? What is it about existing societies that produce poverty, deprivation, misery, insecurity in people’s lives? What possibilities are there for social change which reduce these problems and enhance the quality of the lives of human beings? (Fairclough, 2003, p. 202)

The aim of CDA is to gain a better understanding of how discourse (re)produces and challenges the dominant powers (van Dijk, 2003), by linking macrosocial structures with micro discourse processes, using the tools of description, interpretation, and explanation. The main tenets of CDA (Fairclough & Woodak, 1997, pp. 271-280, cited in
van Dijk, 2003, p. 353) are that: (1) CDA addresses social problems, (2) Power relations are discursive, (4) Discourse constitutes society and culture, (5) Discourse does ideological work, (6) Discourse is historical, (7) The link between text and society is mediated, (8) Discourse analysis is interpretative and explanatory, and (9) Discourse is a form of social action.


Fairclough (1992, 2003) focused on the investigation of social change through the interrelated hybrid discourse formations by constructing more detailed linguistic and textual analysis in combination with the macro sociological practices from sociology in the dialectical relationships of discursive practices, social structures and social practices. Fairclough’s (1992) view is based upon the premise that discourse is “both constitutive and constituted” as indicated in the following statement:

Discourse contributes to the constitution of all those dimensions of social structure which directly or indirectly shape and constrain it: its own norms and conventions, as well as the relations, identities, and institutions which lie behind them. Discourse is a practice not just of representing the world, but of signifying the world, constituting and constructing the world in meaning. (p. 64)
For example, teacher-ELL relationships in public schools are determined in the dialectics of discourses, social structures, and practices. Determination of the roles, positions, tasks, dress codes, behaviors, attitudes, and affective expressions of “teachers” and “ELLs” are available in and through the dialectical relationship of discourses, i.e., text and talk with the given school structures, social practices, and vice versa. Fairclough constructed these dialectic relationships in three-dimensional paradigm shown in the following figure using the concepts of text, discursive practice and social practice (Fairclough 1992, p. 73).

In Figure 2, text in the inner square indicates spoken and written text and visual images, or a combination of these. Texts construct a particular version of social realities, relations, and identities by providing particular interpretations to readers and audiences depending on how writers or speakers organize the text at the word, paragraph and
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Figure 2: Three-dimensional Model of Discourse
Adapted from Fairclough (1992, p. 73)
sentence level, what kinds of words are chosen and how they are arranged grammatically. The detailed linguistic features of texts were analyzed using Huckin’s (1995, 2002) 2 elements, i.e., reading text as a whole and reading text sentence by sentence. Reading text as a whole, discourse analysis is concerned with the following seven elements: (1) genre (text type), (2) framing (angles, perspectives of the writer or speaker); (3) foregrounding/backgrounding (the degrees of emphasis on certain concepts); (4) presuppositions (taken for granted ideas); (5) agency (roles of the speaker in the text); (6) ideologies (social, cultural, and political ideologies underlying texts); and (7) multimodal discourse (pictures, signs, symbols). Reading sentence-by-sentence, discourse analysis highlights the following four elements: (1) insinuations (double meanings); (2) textual silences (certain things left out of the texts); (3) topicalization (the front positioning of some elements of text for its emphasis); and (4) registers (a form of language depending on purposes or social situations). A detailed explanation about linguistic feature analysis of text at Huckin’s two levels is provided in Appendix I.

This study utilizes Fairclough’s three-dimensional model that connects text at the micro level with the macro level of social practice through the meso level of discursive practice, based upon Foucault’s power/knowledge /subject production/practice theoretical and conceptual framework.

Discursive practices at the meso level involves processes related to the production, consumption, and distribution of texts from the interpretational perspective (Fairclough, 1992). According to Fairclough (1992, 2003), the interpretational processes for text consumption and production are constrained by both the members’ available discourse resources and the societal conditions in which the discourse members are situated. The
discourses that the members draw on in their interpretational production (speaking and writing) and consumption (reading and hearing) of texts depend on the members’ participation and interactional histories in their discourse communities, such as family, school, community, and society. How the particular individuals summon, ventriloquize, and hail is conditioned by the given societal norms, conventions and social practices.

The interpretative meso level analysis indicating discursive practice in the square above was performed using the following Fairclough’s (1995, 2003) concepts: intertextuality, interdiscursivity, orders of discourse, genre (ways of interacting), discourse (ways of representing), and style (ways of being). All the details of the analysis using these concepts are provided in Chapter VII. In this dissertation, 2 participant ELL teachers’ pedagogical practices are considered as social practices at the outer part of the square, which were analyzed by the selective use of both CHAT (explained above in the level two analysis description) and CDA. The analytical tools of linguistic features and discursive fields are used “selectively, not exhaustively because critical discourse analysis is an approach, a way of looking at texts, not a rigorously systematic method of analysis” (Huckin, 1995, p. 12).

Any artifacts, such as writing samples and video clips, produced by students in class were examined using CHAT and systemic functional linguistics (SFL) using field, i.e., the construction of the subject of the text through language and other semiotic systems, tenor, i.e., the construction of relationship between the author and reader through personalized text, and mode, i.e., the creation of coherence through formatting conventions and graphics using language and other semiotic systems (Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, & Shuart-Faris, 2005; Fairclough, 1992; Gebhard, 2004, 2005). A solid
and concrete linguistic analysis of the materials produced by students is beyond the scope of this study, and so was not conducted.

**Researcher Position**

From the traditional positivist perspective, which is based upon the existence of only one big Truth, a researcher’s bias is seen as a barrier that should be removed in order to increase the validity of the research. In contrast, the constructivist researcher argues that there are multiple truths (Shank, 2002), and that truths are constructed through the researcher’s perspective, so it is critical to reveal the researcher’s world views and biases at the beginning of the paper in order to honestly inform the readers of the researcher’s influence on the construction of the research processes and on the result (Merriam, 1998). The postmodern and feminist perspective conceptualizes situated knowledges (Haraway, 1998), asserting that all knowledge exists only within historical, social and cultural context; therefore, the researcher’s interpretations should also be recognized as legitimate knowledge. This would also be a more honest approach because the researcher does not influence the results secretly.

My postmodern feminism, and a perspective informed by my own experiences will situate and embody every aspect of the present qualitative discourse-oriented critical ethnographic inquiry research study: the design of the study, the shared dialogic inquiry with ELL teachers, the interpretive and interactive processes used, and the representation of the data, as I function in multiple roles as nonparticipant observer, participant observer, teacher, researcher, and learner. I take the position that “Neither data nor theories are discovered. Rather, we are part of the world we study and the data we collect. We
construct our grounded theories through our past and present involvements and interactions with people, perspectives, and research practices” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 10).

To elucidate my position in terms of research processes and products, I explain my subject positions situated in the historical and current social context: I am a nonnative English speaking graduate student who, for 4 years, has been pursuing a doctorate degree in the US. Before coming to the US, I was a high school English teacher in Korea for 14 years. Besides the cultural differences between my Korean Confucian ideology and the individualism that predominates in the US, the different attitudes and O/othering processes directed toward me in cultural contexts created some challenges for me as I socialized myself into Western academia. During these 4 years, I have also had the opportunity to observe ELLs in US middle and secondary public schools, and have come to identify with the linguistic, social, cultural, and identity struggles of adolescent ELLs inside and outside of the classroom context.

As a person coming from an O/other culture and into a new cultural context, I have experienced different ways of thinking, talking, representing, interacting and doing things. Oftentimes, I have seen and experienced how minority students can come to be subjected to social injustice in terms of their schooling conditions and processes because of the ways in which their native language and discourse processes, societal discourses, and educational systems differ from those in the US. These lived experiences have caused me to initiate this research for the promotion of educational quality and equity for linguistically and culturally diverse students. I believe that teachers can and should work as “transformative intellectuals” who will enable their students to take responsibility for themselves, others and the society in order to make an equal and equitable society.
Trustworthiness

The two important issues related to the trustworthiness of qualitative research are researcher’s bias and reactivity, i.e., reflexivity (Maxwell, 2005). It is inevitable that the researcher’s perspectives, theories, and personal experiences will have some influence on the research process because “the researcher is part of the world he or she studies” (Maxwell, 2005, p. 109). In this regard, “validity in qualitative research is not the result of indifference, but of integrity” (Maxwell, 2005, p. 108) and “one of the assumptions underlying qualitative research is that reality is holistic, multidimensional, and ever-changing; it is not a single, fixed, objective phenomenon waiting to be discovered, observed, and measured...” (Merriam, 1998, p. 202). In order to insure the integrity of this study and illuminate the co-construction of meaning between researcher and participants/ settings, the researcher’s epistemological stances and perspectives are clearly explained in the “researcher position” section above, and this discourse-oriented critical ethnographic case study utilizes all of the accepted standard measures used to insure the validity and reliability of research.

The trustworthiness of quantitative research is judged based on five criteria: construct validity, internal validity, external validity, reliability, and objectivity. Construct validity refers to establishing plausibility of the operational concepts; internal validity is accomplished by demonstrating a causal relationship between the dependent and independent variables; external validity demonstrates generalizability to other times, participants, and settings; and reliability indicates a consistency of effect across participants, procedures and conditions. These quantitative concepts were adapted to...
interpretive qualitative inquiry by Lincoln and Guba (1985), who framed them in terms of credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability.

Credibility of qualitative research corresponds to internal validity in quantitative research, and is acquired through triangulating “multiple sources of evidence,” “chain of evidence” (Yin, 2003), “prolonged period of observation” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), and “in-depth descriptions” of the theoretical framework and design (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). This study triangulated several sources of data and chains of evidence: observations of classroom and professional development, formal and informal interviews, discussions among teachers and instructors, documents, transcribed observational data, field notes, researcher journals, memo writings, and email exchanges. I engaged myself in the research settings for a long period of time, that is, 1½ years. Internal validity was also maintained through “explanation building” (Yin, 2003), by doing periodical analysis through memo and journal writings during the iterative processes of data collection and analysis, and by writing detailed explanations about the skills and procedures I used and about the multiple forms of analysis I performed; analyses using constant comparison methods from grounded theory, activity system analysis using CHAT, and linguistic and discursive analysis using CDA.

Transferability, referring to how the research results and domains can be generalized across settings and participants, corresponds to the external validity required in quantitative research. Transferability is achieved through “replication logic” (Yin 2003, p. 34), and in particular, through Yin’s (2003) “theoretical replication logic,” which “predicts contrasting results but for predictable reasons” (p. 47). This study utilized the same modes of data collection and analysis methods in/across two different settings and
participants: 1 ESL teacher in an ESL classroom at Birch Hill High School, and another ESL teacher in an ESL classroom situated at Cedar Grove Middle School, but anticipated different results in/across each site and participant based on differences between the 2 participant teachers and the settings, differences which are predicted by the theoretical framework of this study.

Dependability corresponds with the reliability required in quantitative research. Reliability in quantitative research is assured by using the same experimental designs and tools for all data points collected. The concept of reliability cannot be applied to case study because there are no 2 classrooms or schools with exactly the same situational contexts, and the purpose of case study is not to confirm the results through the repeated research, but to fathom the multiple interactions and realities within the bounded system (Merriam, 1998). Thus, as argued by Yin (2003), this multicase study satisfies the dependability criteria by explaining the data collection and analysis procedures and methods clearly and in a very detailed manner, so that future research can use this study as a starting point.

Confirmability corresponds with objectivity in quantitative research. Following accepted qualitative research practices, this study insured confirmability through “member checking” (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2203) and peer group audits (Merriam, 1998). Participant checking was done by conducting formal, informal, and email interviews in which the analyzed data were discussed, by showing the research participants their writing samples, and by checking the participants’ perceptions and conceptions about their preference for choosing certain words, actions, activities, events, and practices. In this way, the juxtaposition of multiple interpretations, such as the participants’
theorizations of their actions, behaviors, words and the context, would allow these presented theories to be grounded and crystallized. Two peers reviewed the data, analysis, and findings of this study, one outside the education arena whose field is math and science, and another with a Ph.D. in education.

In summary, this study utilized all criteria required for a rigorous qualitative research study, such as credibility, transferability, dependability, confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) through “multiple sources of data,” “chain of evidence,” “prolonged period of observations,” “theoretical replication logic,” “member checking,” “peer reviews,” “thick descriptions,” and detailed explanations about the procedures used for data collection and methods including the more objective detailed textual linguistic analysis (Fairclough, 1992, 2003; Huckin, 1995, 2002, 2010) from CDA framework. Thus, the rigor of this discourse-oriented critical ethnographic research has been verified and confirmed.
CHAPTER IV

DISCOURSES CIRCULATING IN THE NATION,
CURRICULUM AND PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT

This chapter explores and analyzes the discourses circulating in the nation, in the school curriculum, and in teacher professional development. Historical discourses circulating in the nation that promote English-only school language policies are examined through a literature review.

Regarding the discourses circulating in the curriculum about ELLs, there was no language policy toward ELLs or curriculum for the education of ELLs defined by the state at the time this study was conducted. Teachers generally followed the language arts core curriculum and guidelines while teaching ELLs (Interview, 2010), so this paper deals instead with the discourses embedded in the language arts curriculum.

Discourses circulating in teacher professional development (PD, hereafter) were explored using constant comparison methods, through critical discourse analysis (CDA) of a professional development course that Ms. Clark attended for 1 year and Ms. Lewis attended for 3 years during the study period. The dominant discourses circulating in the professional development course were the behavioral/structural discourses of behavioral audiolingualism, with the dominant in vivo codes: “performance,” “formula,” “learning
behavior,” “implementation with fidelity,” and “formulaic language.” The definition of literacy and literacy education used throughout the PD course related only to reading and writing texts, reflecting individual/psychological discourses, and the course made little provision for any interactive meaning-making processes about the intertwined relationship between literacy and the sociocultural context of literacy. The following section is a discussion of the two main discourses that circulated in the PD course: (1) Behavioral/Technical Discourse: “Just memorize this formula and you will be OK”; and (2) Individual/Psychological Discourse: “What’s in your head?”

**Historical English-Only Discourses Circulating in the Nation**

This section is a literature review that investigates the history of the language ideologies of English-only discourses circulating in the United States, and the impact of those ideologies and discourses upon school language policies and on the pedagogical practices of ELL teachers.

The US has a long history of multilingualism and education in languages other than English. In colonial America, colonists of European origin supported schools that taught only in their own native languages, whether English, German, French, Dutch, etc. (Garcia, 2009). The founding fathers chose not to establish any national language in the US constitution (Judd, 2000). The first U.S. Census, conducted in 1790, found that 25% of the population, not counting slaves or American Indians, spoke a language other than English (Lepore, 2002). In 1852, Pennsylvania public school regulations stated that “if any considerable number of Germans desire to have their children instructed in their own language, their wishes should be gratified” (Kloss, 1977, pp. 149-150).
However, this history of multilingualism was gradually eroded through the 19th century, and had been abandoned by the start of the 20th century and World War I (Garcia, 2009). Political leadership at that time feared that multilingualism would create division within the country because immigrants would retain loyalty to their own group if they maintained their own language and culture rather than being assimilated to the language and culture of the host country (Beykont, 1997a). Assimilationist ideologies led to the termination of public funding of private and parochial schools and to the elimination of bilingual programs in public schools. Many states passed English-only laws, and mandated that schools teach students only in English and set as their primary goal the development of students’ English literacy and academic skills (Beykont, 1997b).

Beykont (2005) argued that “since World War I public schools have played a critical role in promoting English monolingualism in the U.S. and have contributed to rapid language erosion...Between World War I and World War II, U.S. school language policies can be characterized as explicitly assimilationist” (p. 109).

In 1919, the state of Nebraska passed a law that stated, “No person, individually or as a teacher, shall, in any private, denominational, parochial or public school, teach any subject to any person in any language other than the English language.” But measures so extreme as those enacted in Nebraska were invalidated by the court system. In Meyer v. Nebraska (1923), the US Supreme Court ruled that the Nebraska law violated the Due Process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment:

The protection of the Constitution extends to all, to those who speak other languages as well as those born with English on the tongue. Perhaps it would be advantageous if all had ready understanding of our ordinary speech, but this cannot be coerced by methods which conflict with the Constitution (Meyer v. Nebraska, 1923)
Nonetheless, the National Origins Act of 1924 placed extremely strict limitations on the number of immigrants from Latin America, Africa, Asia, Southern Europe, and Eastern Europe. When these quotas were eliminated by the Immigration and Naturalization Services Act of 1965, a great immigration from Latin America and non-Western countries began that was unprecedented for Americans living at that time (García, 2009).

The Bilingual Education Act of 1968 was propelled by the civil rights movements of the 1960s, and was intended to help reduce the dropout rate among Hispanic students by providing federal funds to school districts for bilingual programs. Bilingual education was also supported by legal rulings; in Lau v. Nichols (1974), the US Supreme Court ruled that Section 601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 requires that education must be provided to students who do not speak English in a language they can understand, saying, “there is no equality of treatment merely by providing students with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers, and curriculum; for students who do not understand English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education.” However, the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 was actually used as a tool for the rapid transition of immigrant students into the mainstream classes (García, 2009). When the Bilingual Education Act was reauthorized in 1974, it was expanded to include students who were not in poverty, and in 1984 it was expanded to allow maintenance of students’ native language as an alternative to rapid transition to English only (García, 2009).

During the 1980s, anti-immigration and English-only discourses came to be dominant in the US. In 1983, Dr. John Tanton co-founded U.S. English, an organization which sought to make English the official language of the United States. Tanton,
“formerly a national leader in liberal groups, including the Sierra Club, Planned Parenthood, and Zero Population Growth, … has won the endorsement of luminaries across the political spectrum” (Crawford, 2000, p. 5). Tanton created a network of about a dozen organizations to tackle issues related to population control. That control, he said, means curtailing legal and illegal immigration. After a memo written by Tanton in 1986 was leaked to a newspaper by a conference member, many of the directors and board members resigned in protest. Director Linda Chavez said that Tanton’s memo was “repugnant,” and advisory committee member Walter Cronkite called the memo “embarrassing.” Tanton himself also resigned from U.S English. Dr. Tanton’s leaked memo illuminates the intimate link between the hegemonic English only discourses and negative immigration ideologies:

Can *homo contraceptivus* compete with *homo progenitiva* if borders aren’t controlled. Or is advice to limit ones [sic] family simply advice to move over and let someone else with greater reproductive powers occupy the space? . . . On the demographic point: perhaps this is the first instance in which those with their pants up are going to get caught by those with their pants down! (In a memo dated October 10, 1986 from John Tanton to attendees of the WITAN IV conference)

The above quote is directly related to the anti-immigrant public discourses that compared immigrants to animals with “greater reproductive powers” and “pants down” compared with “pants up” Americans, resonating with the metaphor analysis: “The dominant immigrant metaphor used in the Los Angeles Times was IMMIGRANTS ARE ANIMALS” (Santa Ana, 1999, p. 192). Santa Ana (1999) analyzed metaphors about immigrants represented in “the political debate and campaign in California” surrounding Proposition 187 issues using 107 Los
Angeles Times articles. The second dominant metaphor was that “IMMIGRANTS ARE DEBASED PEOPLE, WEEDS, COMMODITIES” (p. 198). Santa Ana’s data and her analysis indicates the identification, (re)articulation, and enunciation of media discourses for spreading and supporting a negative atmosphere about immigrants and their languages to the public through dehumanizing cognitive metaphoric discourse strategies.

The influence of U.S. English declined steadily after 1988, but not before the English-only cause had achieved many successes. The US federal government did not enact any law establishing an official US language, but by 1998, 23 states had enacted laws declaring English to be their official language (Crawford, 2000). Influenced by this dominant English-only hegemonic discourses swirling in the nation, Utah passed the English as the Official Language Law in 2000 with 67% of voters in favor versus 33% opposed, and “became the twenty-sixth state with English as its official language” (U.S. English Internet site, 11/8/2000). The arguments supporting English-only policy legislation in Utah were related to the long lived general public discourses seeking social unity and national identity, as had been expressed in 1919 by the 26th president of the US, Theodore Roosevelt:

We have room for but one language in this country, and that is the English language, for we intend to see that the crucible turns our people out as Americans, of American nationality, and not as dwellers in a polyglot boarding-house.

In the late 1990s, Ron Unz established a national advocacy organization, English for the Children, with the goal of replacing bilingual education with English immersion
throughout the country. Dr. Rosalie Pedalino Porter, chairman of the board of ProEnglish said,

  The only way to rid us of bilingual education was to go over the heads of feckless legislators and appeal to the people. Ron Unz’s leadership and support was essential. The crucial lesson here is that a dedicated group of activists CAN make laws change for the better, even in the face of opposition from both political parties, teachers’ unions and academia. (ProEnglish Internet site, 7/8/2013)

  English for the Children successfully campaigned for English immersion mandates; three states with 43% of the nation’s English language learners have passed initiatives against bilingual education (Crawford, 2003): Proposition 227 in California in 1998 with 61% of voters, Proposition 207 in Arizona in 2000 with 63% of voters, and Question 2 in Massachusetts in 2002 with 68% of voters.

  But English for the Children was stopped in Colorado in 2002 with 44% of voters by English Plus, a political action committee that enlisted bipartisan support in order to defeat the measure. “The defeat of Amendment 31 in Colorado provides hope and evidence that Ron Unz, and others of his ilk, can be defeated.” (Escamilla, Shannon, Carlos, & García, 2003, p. 357). In 2002, Title VII, the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 was replaced with Title III, the English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act through the enactment of NCLB (No Child Left Behind) law.

  Aiming to prepare limited English students for rapid placement into mainstream classrooms, the new law emphasizes flexibility and accountability: “States and local school districts will be able to use federal money to implement a program that they believe is effective for teaching English and will be accountable for demonstrating limited English proficient students' yearly progress on standardized tests” (Beykont, 2002,
p. xxx). However, “the law does little to address the most formidable obstacles to their achievement: resource inequities, critical shortage of teachers trained to serve ELLs, inadequate instructional materials, substandard school facilities, and poorly designed instructional programs” (Crawford, 2004, p. 2) by “setting arbitrary and unrealistic targets for student achievement, this accountability system cannot distinguish between schools that are neglecting ELLs and those that are making improvements. As achievement targets become increasingly stringent, virtually all schools serving ELLs are destined to be branded failures. The inevitable result will be to derail efforts toward genuine reform. Ultimately, a misguided accountability system means no accountability at all” (Crawford, 2004, p. 2).

As demonstrated in the campaigns to establish official English and to mandate English immersion for ELLs, language in the US has become an issue that sets Republican against Republican and Democrat against Democrat. Outside the domain of the usual two-party political debate, the fight against multilingualism and bilingual education has been led by charismatic and eccentric individuals, and has been characterized by emotion and ad-hominem attacks. For example, Dr. John Tanton campaigned for English-only policy out of environmentalist motivations, in order to benefit the cause of US population control by containing and eliminating immigration. He advanced his position by appealing to a widely felt sense of societal insecurity, using displayed themes of social unity, national identity, and economic mobility. Ron Unz promoted mandatory English immersion programs by spreading misinterpreted theories to the public instead of following the results of evidence-based research, as explained by Krashen (1988):
Ron Unz put an interesting paper on his website today, attacking me and Jim Cummins for various things. Here is my response, which includes Unz' entire paper. Comments appreciated! In Ron Unz' recent position paper, there is at least one error in every sentence. I reproduce this paper here, pausing at points to illustrate the misstatements, distortions, and factual errors (p. 1).

To summarize, historical discourses surrounding language policy discourses in the US have been closely correlated with discourses related to immigration and have fluctuated over time, usually motivated from economic, social and political considerations, and, especially recently, have mostly considered immigrants and languages other than English as “problems” (Ruiz, 1984) which lead to social insecurity, Hispanics displacing Blacks from their neighborhoods, rising unemployment and reduced wages for unskilled labor, loss of national identity, etc., rather than regarding immigrants’ languages as “human rights and resources” (Ruiz, 1984). The studies used by Unz that found most bilingual programs to be ineffective did not consider the fact that less than 20% of bilingual students in bilingual programs in California were taught by credentialed bilingual teachers (Cummins, 2003), and thus were bilingual in name only. Despite plethora of research results supporting bilingual education (Collier, 1992; Cummins, 1981; Edelsky, 1982; August & Hakuta, 1997; Krashen, 1981) for the academic and social enhancement of ELLs, promoting organizations (e.g., U.S. English, English for the Children, proEnglish) and legislative bills (e.g., Proposition 207, Proposition 203, Question 2, NCLB) have enacted restrictive language policies repressing minority languages and cultures (García, 1985), following after public opinion that was driven by the dominant, entrenched English-only language ideological discourses which had been, unfortunately, strengthened, if not created, by assimilationist language policies in public education during the early 20th century.
Individual/Psychological Discourses Circulating in the Language Arts Core Curriculum

There was no specific core curriculum for the education of ELLs offered by the Utah State Office of Education during the time when this study was conducted. Thus, ELL teachers usually followed a very general basic core given by the state: “The ELL core covers the four general areas of language development,” such as receptive language (e.g., listening and reading) and productive language (e.g., speaking and writing) (Email Interview, 2010). Ms. Lewis said that she thought that she was responsible for covering language arts just because her class was an ESL class. Thus, individual teachers of ELLs took different approaches depending on their perspectives, lived experiences and knowledge systems about how to teach ELLs. For example, Ms. Lewis chose topics and books related to and coherently connected with what she perceived, based on her own meaning systems, to be her students’ interests and lived experiences, whereas Ms. Clark chose different kinds of topics and materials based on her own judgement about the language level and needs of her ELLs. ELL teachers seemed to look to the language arts to get general direction for teaching ELLs without having any specifically defined curriculum for ELLs. In this regard, this section explores the discourses circulating in the language arts core curriculum which was offered by the state to language arts teachers in 2006, during the time when this study was conducted.

The most common recurring terms and themes in language arts curriculum are individual/psychological discourses focusing on “skills” and “strategies” approached from an individual perspective, equating language arts to “literacy skills,”
“comprehensible skills,” and reading “skills” in “Guidelines Used to Develop the Secondary Language Arts Core” (2006):

1. The Secondary Language Arts should provide a comprehensive and competent literacy education that leads to understanding literacy skills as complex and enjoyable forms of learning and discovery. (Guideline 3)
2. The Secondary Language Arts Core assumes literal comprehension in reading. More sophisticated comprehension skills are addressed and expected as part of the secondary experience. (Guideline 4)
3. The Language Arts Core assumes that reading skills and strategies are foundation piece to a good reading curriculum and that, through the use of these skills and strategies, reading comprehension is achieved and improved. (Guideline 5)
4. The Secondary Language Arts Core encourages students to use language for authentic purposes: to gather information, to enrich thinking, to explore culture and the human condition, and to be more forceful and articulate in using language in their lives. (Guideline 6)

According to the above excerpt, the purpose of literacy education can be said to “provide a comprehensive and competent literacy education that leads to understand literacy skills as complex and enjoyable forms of learning and discovery” (lines 1-4). The secondary language arts core foregrounds “literal comprehension in reading” while backgrounding “more sophisticated comprehension skills” as “part of the secondary experience” (lines 5-7). Reading skills and strategies were highlighted as the “foundation piece to a good reading curriculum;” that “through the use of these skills and strategies, reading comprehension is achieved and improved” (lines 8-12). The guidelines hinted that the authentic purpose of the language arts necessitated the skillful use of language, emphasizing the use of language as a tool to “gather information,” “enrich thinking,” “explore culture and the human condition,” and “to be more forceful and articulate” (lines 13-16).
When the above text is analyzed looking at the text as a whole (Huckin, 1995, 2002), the first implied ideology that can be seen in the text is its narrow definition of literacy as the encoding and decoding of texts, which corresponds to the definition of literacy proposed in the autonomous model of literacy (Street, 1999), which focuses attention toward decontextualized skills and inner mental processes (Cazden, 1994; Gee, 1994, 2000; Health, 1983; Street, 1999) from a cognitive perspective. The second ideology is the technical and mechanical conception of reading seen in the statement that “reading comprehension is achieved and improved” using skills and strategies (lines 7-10), rather than considering literacy practices as meaning-making and sense-making processes occurring within the transactional zone between the reader and the text (Rosenblatt, 1978), or considering literacies as sociocultural-historical practice (Gee, 2000; Street, 1999). The third ideology in the above text is the ideology found in individual/functional discourses about literacy, which is that language is for the purpose of information collection, thought enrichment, cultural exploration, and language articulation to be used in real life (lines 11-13).

The secondary language arts core guidelines text continued to emphasize the functional/individual/technical aspects of literacy, specifying how many minutes teachers need to teach writing in their content area class (Guideline 7: “In secondary schools, students should spend at least 45 minutes writing during the school day”), and enumerating the six traits considered in its rubric for the evaluation of writing skill (Guideline 9: “The Secondary Language Arts Core uses a form of analytical evaluation of writing based on six traits. The state uses a six-trait model for consistency of vocabulary when talking about the development of skill in writing”). The text also stated that “the
language arts core should help students acquire the necessary skills to enter the job market or to seek and succeed in continuing academic training” (Guideline 11). These same individual/technical/functional discourses about literacy are also represented in the Introduction of the Secondary Language Arts Core:

The study and practice of language as a school content area involves the more focused examination of elements, structures, and functions in our language system. We use the term “language arts” to reflect how we develop skills and apply strategies to “craft” language for particular purposes and specific effects. We construct meaning from text we read or hear; we create intended meaning with text we write or speak...(omission)

It involves students’ reflective practice to recognize and value intricacies and idiosyncrasies of language meaning and effect. It also involves their use of language to interpret and connect with the world and to develop their sense of civic responsibility within it. The secondary language arts core curriculum emphasizes purposeful, strategic, knowledge and processes in language applications. Language arts students should be practitioners of language skills, including being able to form literate expressions about learning.

The above text indicates that studying a language means studying the structures and functions of the language system (lines 1-2), which mirrors the theories of structural linguistics and functional literacy. Again, language arts is equated to the development of “skills” and “strategies” “to craft language for particular purposes and specific effects” (lines 3-5), which is also related to individual/functional literacy. Then, meaning making with text (lines 5-6) is related to “students’ reflective practice to recognize and value the intricacies and idiosyncrasies of language meaning and effect” (lines 7-8). The text then goes on to relate meaning making with texts to students’ connection with the world and their “civic responsibility” (lines 9-10). Emphasizing “purposeful, strategic, knowledge and processes in language applications” (lines 11-12), “students should be practitioners of language skills” (lines 12-14).
In the text above, the structural/functional aspects of language and literacy learning are foregrounded. Although it presents the importance of language learning for connecting with the world (lines 5-9), it is not referring to connecting with the world with intentions for social justice, but for “civic responsibility” and for learning about “the intricacies and idiosyncrasies of language meaning and effect” (lines 7-8). The meaning of “the intricacies and idiosyncrasies of language meaning and effect” would refer to the effects of power and language (DFs) on knowledge production if it were within a text addressing sociocultural issues. But the next sentence clarifies that the previous text is not about the intertwined concept of language and power, emphasizing instead “purposeful, strategic knowledge and processes in language application” and students as “practitioners of language skills” (lines 12-13), which is also in accordance with the individual/technical/psychological discourses about literacy.

The secondary language arts core curriculum “Intended Learning Outcomes” (ILOs) also emphasized the importance of inner psychological processes and skills of literacy, stating that “Process skills in language arts domain are critical to the development of high levels of literacy and lead to understanding and internalizing ILOs.” This emphasis on the individual mental psychological processes of literacy is reiterated, rearticulated, and enunciated throughout the text. In Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) are composed of the following six constructs:

1. Demonstrate a Positive Attitudes Toward Language Arts Skills and Processes
2. Demonstrate Appreciation for the Role of Language Arts
3. Demonstrate Understanding of the Nature of Language
4. Understand and Use Receptive and Expressive Oral Language Skills to Communicate
5. Use the Skills and Strategies, and Processes of Reading
6. **Use the Skills, Strategies, and Processes of Writing**

As explicit in the underlined text above, the individual mental processes and skills of reading and writing are foregrounded while silencing the social, cultural, and political dimensions of literacy. The language arts core needs to explain the importance of the linguistic and cultural resources that ELLs bring to the classroom because most ELL teachers look to the language arts core (Interview with Ms. Lewis, 6/10/2010) for their direction. However, there is no statement about ELLs or mention of multilingual students. This silence about literacy for linguistically and culturally diverse students and bilingual literacy in the language arts core curriculum text was criticized by Gutiérrez (2001): “these one-size-fits-all language arts policies and approaches deny the heterogeneity that exists among all children, especially English-language learners, and excludes the rich sociocultural and linguistic experiences that all children can bring to learning tasks” (p. 565).

To summarize, the overarching meta discourses circulating in the secondary language arts core curriculum text are individual/technical/psychological discourses that present a concept of literacy as the development of decontextualized autonomous skills, and deliver silence about *ideological model of literacy*, literacy for social change and human liberation through the connection of reading the word with reading the world in praxis through dialogue (Freire, 1970). Such silences misdirect the attention and can “be used for deception, to hide important information from the reader without good cause, to the advantage of special interests” (Huckin, 2010, p. 420). Teachers who refer to the secondary language arts core curriculum are unlikely to think about literacy as an empowering tool for ELLs because “it’s difficult to analyze something that’s not there”
(Huckin, 2010, p. 419). The secondary language arts core curriculum text demonstrates how schooling and literacy can support the continuation of the status quo through the social and cultural reproduction of society (Bourdieu, 1991) and the perpetuation of social inequity, because “literacy was a double-sword; it could be wielded for the purpose of self and social empowerment or for the perpetuation of representation and domination” (Giroux, 1987, p. 2).

**Discourses Circulating in Teacher Professional Development**

This section explores the discourses circulating in a professional development program (PD, hereafter) which Ms. Lewis attended for 3 years and Ms. Clark attended for 1 year during the study period. The PD program was a 3-year project funded through a US federal government NCLB (No Child Left Behind) grant, purposed with improving the reading ability of ELLs and reducing the achievement gap between ELLs and native English speaking students. Two cohorts of approximately 25 inservice teachers from local middle schools and high schools attended this program. The dominant discourses in the PD program were a combination of behavior/technical discourses with individual/psychological discourses. The training course utilized in the PD program focused on English language learning from a behavioristic/technical perspective, and defined literacy development in terms of reading ability, using a limited definition of literacy that did not consider the sociocultural, historical, and political contexts surrounding the education of ELLs. Thus, it could not make much impact in terms of the transformation of ELL teachers’ pedagogical practices, as reflected in Ms. Clark’s pedagogical practices after she had completed the course.
Behavioral/Technical Discourses: “Just memorize this formula and you will be OK.”

Concerning the nature of language and how to teach language, the two overarching themes circulating in the PD course were behavioral discourses in combination with technical discourses. Dr. Hamilton (pseudonym), who was in charge of creating the protocol for language objectives, adopted Sheltered Instruction Observational Protocol (SIOP, Echevarría, Vogt, & Short, 2008) language and content objectives as part of the training course in 2007. Later, she adapted the SIOP indicators and created a new formula for the language and content objectives that would be included in lesson plans. As in SIOP, all the trainee teachers followed a specific formula for the language and content objectives in their lesson plans and implemented the formula in their classroom teaching.

The language objective formula used in the PD course was based on Bloom’s Taxonomy, which was developed by Bloom et al. (1956) in order to standardize the measurement of cognitive development in educational, curricular and instructional objectives and evaluation. Based on principles of logic, psychology, and educational theory, Bloom’s Taxonomy defined three domains in learning: cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains, and a hierarchical structure of cognitive functions classified in accordance with their complexity and abstraction. The cognitive levels, arranged from the lowest to the highest, are: knowledge → comprehension → application → analysis → synthesis → evaluation. Each cognitive level can be recognized by the action verbs used to indicate the cognitive processes employed in the accomplishment of a specific task. To illustrate,
Knowledge: arrange, check, choose, identify, list, locate, sort, show
Comprehension: describe, explain, extrapolate, infer, interpret, translate, summarize, transform, vary
Application: apply, adopt, employ, experiment, predict, show, solve, use
Analysis: analyze, categorize, classify, compare, examine, investigate, organize, relate, research, uncover
Synthesis: create, design, formulate, hypothesize, originate, produce, reorganize, structure
Evaluation: appraise, assess, conclude, defend, judge, criticize, decide, reject, value, weigh

Bloom’s (1956) definition of knowledge follows:

...think of knowledge as something filed or stored in the mind. The task for the individual in each knowledge test situation is to find the appropriate signals and cues in the problem which will most effectively bring out whatever knowledge is filed or stored. (p. 26)

According to Bloom, knowledge is something “filed or stored in the mind” like information on papers within the layered files in a cabinet, so students need to work to “find the appropriate signals and cues” to draw out knowledge from their brains.

According to Bloom’s taxonomy, knowing is located at the bottom level of cognitive functioning within an individual’s mind. Cognition is needed for the inner processes that make the mind function. On teacher development day, Dr. Hamilton (pseudonym) explained to the PD class how to design lesson objectives, that is, language and content objectives at the lesson planning stage, framed in terms of Bloom’s storage and retrieval concept of learning and development. She distributed the Bloom’s Taxonomy locator, which associates all the different levels of cognition with action verbs. Then she provided instructions about the methods and components for writing language objectives as follows:

1. Write a statement about what you expect the student will be able to do
2. Use action verbs (i.e., verbs like know and understand)
3. Include a phrase about how students will achieve the objective
Include a phrase about mastery and time, if appropriate
and if you have a good indication of the time limit

Consider demands on cognition by using Bloom’s Taxonomy to guide you. Use your Taxonomy Locator for assistance.

Consider how you will know the student can do what you ask him/her to do, i.e., how you will be able to make a formative assessment of performance. Attach each content performance objective to a content concept. (Field note, 2007)

As seen in the above excerpt, the teacher, as the active agent in the classroom, defines the goals and objectives for teaching and learning. Students are not invited to decide what they are going to learn and develop (lines 1-2). The means of achieving class objectives are also determined by teacher: “how students will achieve the objective” (line 3). The mastery of knowledge presumes that knowledge is something that is mastered or not mastered within a given time (lines 4-5), rather than knowledge that is co-constructed by the teacher and students through meaning-making processes within the situated context. At the lesson planning stage, the teacher should determine each student’s cognitive level and write the lesson plan based on the student’s level of cognition (lines 6-7). The cognitive abilities of students are evaluated and assessed based on their performance of certain tasks that the teacher defines (lines 7-11). These lesson plan guidelines exemplify the traditional teacher-centered classroom teaching model.

The implied presupposed assumption embedded in Dr. Hamilton’s guidelines for writing lesson objectives is that everyone has an observable, measurable level of cognition, and that knowledge is something that we need to master. Another assumption is that the teacher’s job is to evaluate each student’s “demands on cognition” and assign each student tasks appropriate for that student’s level of cognition. The third assumption is that the teacher has been given all authority to define the goals, purposes, and
objectives of lessons and to determine the means of achieving the assigned tasks. All agency for teaching comes from the teacher, and students are just the passive recipients of knowledge, and performers following teacher’s directions like actors following a script.

It can be seen that Dr. Hamilton’s approach to teaching ELLs demonstrated in the above lesson plan guidelines is limited to a stimulus-response model based on behaviorism (Skinner), because Dr. Hamilton’s lesson plan formula is based on the assumption that students can perform and master the content concepts that the teacher plans and teaches through the provision of goals, content concepts, and time limits that are found appropriate based on the teacher’s formative assessment of the individual student’s cognitive level. Here, students are treated like the products of a factory, where the machinery is programmed to combine the necessary ingredients and actions in order to produce the predetermined outcome. From Dr. Hamilton’s perspective, school functions as a factory to produce commodities, an idea which is consistent with the banking concept of education (Freire, 1970): that the teacher transmits knowledge to the students, and that students receive that knowledge and store it in their brains. For Dr. Hamilton, cognition is something we have or we do not have in our head, and knowledge is something to master; she never mentioned the inner processes of learning content and concepts from the cognitive psychological perspective, or the sociocultural processes and context for learning from the sociocultural perspective. Dr. Hamilton’s behavioristic model, the original model of psychology from the 1950s, is totally opposite to the sociocultural approach to language learning and literacy development. According to the sociocultural approach, knowledge and cognition are not something we own or master,
but something shared and distributed in discursive communities of practice (CoP). A detailed explanation of CoP is provided in Chapter II.

Dr. Hamilton’s behavioristic conception of teaching and learning was confirmed in the way she taught ELL teachers to write their lesson objectives at the lesson planning stage, and in the way she taught them to realize those objectives in their classroom practices. In 2007, she taught and explained how to create lesson objectives many times (2/15/2007, 3/29/2007, 4/26/2007, 6/11/2007, 6/12/2007, 10/25/2007), but not many participant teachers could understand how she wanted them to create content and language objectives at the lesson planning stage. So, Dr. Hamilton and her research assistant (RA), Rachel (pseudonym) produced for them a language and content objective formula consisting of four constructs: SWBT (students will be able to) behaviors (Bloom’s verbs) , content (what the teacher will assess) , strategy , and conditions. On the 9th of October, 2008, Dr. Hamilton taught her PD class how to write the language objectives formula. Her presentation followed a question and answer (Q&A) format, consisting of only simple “what” questions:

1. Choose one content concept FOLLOWing the FORmula.
2. Don’t look at any note. Just keep those notes away.
3. Just wrack your brain. You have just four to go.
4. You’ll get the general semantic area. You’ll get four other things.
5. There are three. Three are absolutely critical. Ok! Let’s do the first task.
6. Let’s do the different components of performance objectives.
8. What’s the first one? You know that.
9. (One teacher said, “Students will be able to...” in a low voice.)
10. Yes. Students will be able to...Plus what? What comes next?
11. (One teacher said, Bloom’s taxonomy) Ok. That’s learning BEHAVior.
12. Learning behavior is something you focus on for learning.
13. So, that’s VERY, VEry, VEry important. Learning behavior is next.
14. And then what? Yeah, it is your content. And then it’s what? conditions?
15. Ok, it can be in groups or it also can mean what else would it mean?
Dr. Hamilton asked the trainee teachers to choose one content concept from the core curriculum by following the formula, which had been explained in the previous training sessions (line 1), without looking at any notes (line 2). Then she mentioned that there were four elements of the formula, and encouraged the teachers by telling them that they would figure out the four elements of the formula eventually (line 3-4). She then stated that three of those elements were critical, and asked what the first component of “performance objectives” was (line 6). She reiterated “performance objectives” (lines 6-7) and asked teachers to tell her the first component of the formula (line 8). And one teacher said, “students will be able to” (line 9) and Dr. Hamilton said, “Yes” (line 10). This simple Q&A sequence proceeded until the four components of the lesson objective formula had been mentioned.

One assumption embedded in Dr. Hamilton’s statements was that if the participant teachers could remember and write the lesson objective formula, they could teach their classes the way the formula directed them, as evidenced in her statement: “We actually wanna see how these things are translated into practice. So we get to see the implementation pieces, as well.” (Field note, 10/23/2008) Another assumption was that knowledge can be translated into practice if a person would just memorize the formula needed for doing the action they intend to do. She also often emphasized the importance
of “measurable, observable performance objectives” on PD days, which means that students’ performances and actions should be measured and observed by the teacher.

Some questions concerning Dr. Hamilton’s “measurable and observable performance objectives” remained unasked: How can a teacher measure the trust relationship between a teacher and her students that is in the process of teaching and learning? How can a teacher observe and measure ELL students’ construction of identities and subjectivities in the process of learning the second language, English, in class? How can a teacher measure students’ culturally mediated meaning making processes in reading and writing?

Dr. Hamilton followed and modeled typical teacher-centered teaching methods in her class; her assumed role was that of the authoritative figure who knew all the components of the language objective formula, who asked teachers to answer displayed “what” questions. There were no moments provided for meaning-making processes through dialogic heteroglossia (Bakhtin) to form knowledge about the linguistic and cultural resources of ELLs, and how to employ those resources in classroom practice in order to empower ELLs. These repetition based formula memorization events occurred again and again. One month later, Dr. Hamilton repeated the same script to make sure her inservice teacher students had memorized the formula:

Do you remember the formula of content and language objectives? What is the first component in the formula. (one teacher said “SWBT”) Ok! Good. Right. It is “Students will be able to.” Yes it is SWBT. What’s the next one? … GOOD! Yes. Bloom’s action verb. What’s the third one? …(Teachers said “content”) Yes. That’s content concept. What’s the fourth one? … (Teachers said, “strategies”) Yes, that’s strategies to accomplish the objectives. What’s the last one? (Teachers said, “condition”) Yes, condition. That’s IT. Just memorize this formula, you will be OK. (Field note, 11/20/2008)
After this event, the rest of the time was spent on writing lesson objectives in groups based upon the given formula, and presenting those lesson objectives in class. As her inservice teacher students presented their lesson objectives, Dr. Hamilton made sure that they included all four performance objective components and followed her formula properly. Thus, all agency was from the instructor, and none was from the teachers. These repetition based practice sessions for memorizing lesson objective formulas occurred regularly on PD days (6/11/2008, 9/18/2008, 10/23/2008, 11/20/2008). Usually, Dr. Hamilton said, “If you are struggling with the entire formula, you can go back and fill it back.” The way Dr. Hamilton taught teachers how to understand and write language and content objectives was completely based on memorization and repetition. Dr. Hamilton’s teaching practices and utterances provided no moments for the construction of meaning or for the production of new knowledge about the sociocultural contexts of ELL education and the identity issues of ELLs. The discourses circulating in Dr. Hamilton’s statement, framed in terms such as “performance objectives,” “strategies,” “learning behavior,” “demands on cognition,” and “formula,” were all related to behaviorism, which is based on the quantification of inner entities based on observable and measurable behaviors, without considering complex inner processes that ELLs experience and the varied sociocultural contexts that ELLs have lived in/with in the process of learning their second language, English.

Dr. Hamilton’s teaching about how to teach language and vocabulary was also based on structural/technical discourses. She explained formulaic language as follows:

Formulaic language is the thing you say often and students read and see those structures often, so they may not understand all of the pieces about how to break it,
but they kinda understand the formula and understand it and know how to use it. (Field note, 10/9/2008)

Then, she explained the functions of language as follows:

When you learn another language, somebody dumped you in another country. What’s the first thing you need to learn? (One teacher said, “Where is the bathroom?”) Tell me how I can say that sentence in French....I have an idea of what the sentence structure was, but if you don’t know the expression, you will be in trouble. Those FORmulas, it’s also about the functions of language. Ok? If you ask directions, what do you do?” (Field note, 10/9/2008)

When one teacher asked her what grammar was, she answered, “Grammar is the structures, phrases, and sentence of each topic structures.” Dr. Hamilton continued to talk about grammar in connection with formula, “Like small group work does not work automatically, students need to know how to work together. You have to build those formula in and students can actually see all the tasks they need to work together. Here’s what you say, ‘That’s FORmula!’ and verb comes here and noun comes here (writing “v” and “n” with the plus sign on the whiteboard.)” For Dr. Hamilton, grammar is a structure and a formula, which means that she considers language to be a finite set of ideal rules, as seen from a general linguistics perspective (Chomsky).

Dr. Hamilton also taught many other areas related to the instruction of ELLs on PD days, such as “cooperative learning” (1/24/2008, 3/13/2008), “learning strategies in the classroom” (6/13/2007), “formative assessment” (2/28/2008), and “characteristics of teacher leaders” (2/5/2009). When these various topics were taught by Dr. Hamilton, she followed her usual patterns of teacher-centered presentation and learning through memorization, and repeated her common meta themes, such as “skills” and “strategies,” in her utterances and statements. For example, while teaching the definitions and functions of cooperative learning, she explained her categorization of three types of
classroom: “the competitive classroom,” “the individualized classroom,” and “the cooperative classroom” using a powerpoint slide (PPT, hereafter) that included the following guidelines:

If students must compete with each other, make certain they compete with students at the same ability level. Use competition to review previously learned information. Avoid using competition for exams, students perceive such situations as ones of life and death. (Field note, 3/13/2008).

She also explained the distinction between “cooperative learning” and “small group work,” and explained the characteristics of cooperative learning using the following PPT slide:

Cooperative learning focuses on teaching social skills
- Today’s social skills
- Be positive
- Encourage others
- Praise others
- No put downs
- Be proactive

Teaching cooperative learning skills
- Students must ...
- See the need for the skill
- Understand the skill
- Process/practice the skill
- Persevere in acquiring the skill (Field note, 3/13/2008)

All her PPT slides and her explanations concerning cooperative learning were about how to develop skills, such as (1) skills for forming groups, (2) skills for functioning groups, (3) skills for formulating groups, and (4) Strategies and Techniques for grouping. Likewise, in teaching “Learning Strategies in the Classroom,” her explanation and the handout she distributed consisted of “metacognitive strategies” (planning, monitoring, evaluating), “cognitive strategies” (resourcing, grouping, notetaking, elaboration of prior knowledge, summarizing, deduction/inducting, imagery,
auditory representation, making inferences), and “social/affective strategies” (questioning for clarification, cooperation, self-talk) (Handout, 6/13/2007).

In summary, the discourses circulating in Dr. Hamilton’s instructional practices and utterances were all about “formula,” “behavior,” “skills,” “strategies,” “performance objectives,” and “demands on cognition,” learned through memorization moments, and framed in teacher-centered explanations presented in PPT slides, which is completely opposite to the sociocultural approach to language and literacy development. From a sociocultural perspective, knowledge and cognition are not seen as something human beings own or do not own in their heads, but both of them are distributed, situated, and learned in sociocultural contexts by participating in the discourse community of practice (Gee, 2004, 2008; New London Group, 1996; Street, 1984). Language learning and literacy development belong in a participatory metaphor, rather than an acquisition metaphor (Sfard, 1998). The role of the teacher is not to define the goals and tasks, but to participate in constructing meaning making processes along with students, facilitating and organizing the matrix of social organization in/across contexts for students to participate in for their learning and development with their own agency and efficacy in community of learners (CoL).

Individual/Psychological Discourses:
“What’s in your head?”

Another PD instructor, Dr. Parker (pseudonym), mentioned that her theory for reading comprehension was based on cognitive psychology (personal communication, 2008). As she stated, the utterances and statements by her were all about the inner
processes of mind and the knowledge representations in the mind from an individual/psychological perspective (Buendía, 2000).

For example, on February 5, 2009, Dr. Parker distributed a handout about the eight different types of knowledge representation in the mind with the following content: “Define the following knowledge terms and provide examples of each: (1) conceptual knowledge, (2) content knowledge, (3) domain knowledge, (4) strategic knowledge, (5) tacit knowledge, (6) topic knowledge, (7) procedural knowledge, and (8) conditional knowledge.” Then she asked the teachers to think of the different layers of knowledge and define the terminology for 10 minutes. Then she drew several layered square boxes on the whiteboard and started to explain the definitions of each kind of knowledge, and the relationships between each knowledge representation in brain. She explained that domain knowledge means discipline knowledge, like science and language arts:

… to be clear in our teaching of how we organize ideas, so that kids can then organize them. You have to kind of understand that these things are different, but there are some subtle differences. OK, so which kind of knowledge do you think is the overarching outer box of knowledge? (drawing several squares on the whiteboard) OK, so let’s look at the domain knowledge. What is an example of domain knowledge? What is the definition of it, and what is it? Domain is a discipline, like science is a domain. OK. So, it’s bigger than a subject area OK? It’s a discipline. So, an example of that would be science, or history. So there, your content area is your discipline, right? So, we all have disciplines. We teach in a general discipline, ...we want our students to understand that there are different kinds of knowledge that can go across domains, but for the sake of the argument we’re going to talk about domain knowledge being discipline knowledge. So, it’s knowledge contained within a content area. OK, so what goes underneath domain knowledge? (PD Day Transcript, 2/5/2009)

As seen in the first underlined part, Dr. Parker stated that students need to know how to organize ideas and understand that “there are different kinds of knowledge” (the second underlined part). Then she continued to explain the different layers of knowledge
representation, beginning with the outer box and proceeding to the inner box in her
drawing: domain knowledge → content knowledge → conceptual knowledge → topic
knowledge. Then she said, “Let’s move into the conceptual writing piece. This is what I
want to do.” and emphasized the importance of “getting into the students’ heads” in order
to know how students are thinking:

We only know when we get into the students’ heads. Typically, it is so crucial to
know where their thinking is and where their brain is...we’ve talked about, we’ve
shown you this head before. You know this whole head? And you say to kids,
“What’s in your head?” OK. So, we’ve done this, right? You haven’t seen this
head before? I’m so glad you’re here. OK. (Drawing a head and a thinking
bubble.) This is how, this is how you, you can do this with a, a four year old. You
can do this with a sixteen year old. OK, I did it with my four year old. You draw a
picture of a head on your board and you say to the kids, “You’re in charge of the
thoughts that are in your head.” It’s a total epiphany for them. They have no idea.
They think you’re in charge of their head. They have no idea. They think you’re in
charge of their head. So when you say, “OK. Where’s the things that you’re
thinking right now?” OK. One is, “I don’t get it.” OK. One’s “Lunch.” One is “I
hate this.” You know, for sure what goes in their head. Now, they’ll say, “This is
boring.” OK. So, what you do is you show them that these are the thoughts that
are in their head right now. OK? Well, when they read, they’re supposed to have
something in that bubble in their head about what’s on that page. Now, I’ll tell you,
telling kids that they are in charge of their brain is a revelation to them...So, if
you’re gonna teach this lesson to your students, what are you gonna teach them,
and then what do you want them to do? What’s your purpose?” So then I have to
walk through that with undergraduate teachers. But telling kids that they’re in
charge of their thinking is so empowering for them, ’cause it gives them control
and autonomy over their own ideas. And they’re in charge of their ideas. (PD Day
Transcript, 2/5/2009)

As evidenced in the excerpt above, particularly in the underlined parts, Dr. Parker
thought that teachers need to enter into students’ brains to figure out “where their
thinking is and where their brain is.” Dr. Parker thought that students think “teachers are
in charge of their head,” so “telling kids that they are in charge of their brain is a
revelation to them.” And she also said that teachers need to “show them that these are the
thoughts that are in their head right now” while telling that they are in charge of their brain while drawing a head and thinking bubble on the board.

It can be seen that Dr. Parker assumes that all students should take responsibility for their own thinking and actions because of her cognitive psychological approach to human learning and development. Cognitive psychology has made many contributions to the exploration of the inner processes and representations of the human mind, but it has its limitations because it does not consider the social, cultural, historical, and economic forces surrounding human learning and development. If we follow Dr. Parker’s opinion about reading comprehension and learning, we can easily form deficit views about ELLs who fail in school; they should take responsibility for their own failure because “they are in charge of their brain.” Dr. Parker also assumes that it is the teacher’s job to enter into the student’s brain and figure out what they are thinking about and remind students that they are in charge of their mind. The third assumption is that students will realize that they have “control and autonomy over their own ideas” by the teacher “telling kids that they’re in charge of their thinking” (e.g., “telling kids that they’re in charge of their thinking is so powerful for them, ‘cause it gives them control and autonomy over their own ideas”). This third assumption shows that Dr. Parker’s ways of thinking about teaching and learning were somewhat similar to those of Dr. Hamilton’s behavioristic framework. Based upon her statement, students will become autonomous and self-controlled about their own ideas just by listening to the statement that “they are in charge of their brain” uttered by teacher. She does not recognize that students are not computers that process the information they receive and produce the products the teacher designs. Teaching does not lead directly to learning. All of Dr. Parker’s utterances and statements
were about individual/cognitive/psychological processes and representations taking place in the individual’s head, without giving any consideration to semiotic tools and cultural mediating artifacts, and the social, cultural, economic, historical, and language ideological forces surrounding ELLs’ learning and development. There was no statement or utterances regarding learning through dialogic social interactions in community of learners and networked activity systems within the sociocultural context.

Dr. Parker’s explanations about the different types of knowledge continued. At a time when Dr. Parker was explaining the tacit knowledge, one male teacher, Bob (pseudonym) in Birch Hill High School asked whether he could connect newcomer students’ tacit knowledge with content concepts in English because he was teaching newcomer class at that time.

(P: Dr. Parker, professor; B: Bob, ELL teacher; A: Amanda, school district literacy Coach; T: teacher)

1 P: And the thing about tacit knowledge, is it's like inert knowledge. Inert knowledge that you have, but you don’t ever use it. You don't even know that you need it. And kids have a lot of tacit knowledge that they don't even get, that they have it, and they need, or they can use that will help them. So, the explicitness of talking with kids about how to read, and think about what it is they’re reading, and then how to write or communicate what they know from what they’ve read is huge. And the writing piece is how we get them to bring an unconscious level up to a conscious level. Bob.

2 B: So, a clarifying question. So, would tacit knowledge be the knowledge that we try to get kids to link to, especially with newcomers. And so when we're trying to teach them concepts is, in English, the linking is their own tacit knowledge which they already have.

3 P: It may be. I mean, it may be, however, tacit knowledge is knowledge that kids do without even thinking about it. So in terms of English language learners, Cathy might be able to answer this better than I can, is that they have a way of doing things in their own language or in own culture. They
don't even think about doing. And they come to America, and they think, "You do it this way?"
4 T: But, there are certain things that we do the same, too.
5 P: And, there are things that we do the same, so...
6 T: I mean we all eat, we all breathe, we taste, we feel, we touch. And then, so, those things which are the same within the thinking structure, that we need to in English.
7 A: Tacit knowledge, I think, is more like, I really know science. It's so easy! What do you mean, you can't see it? Because your tacit knowledge almost prevents you from understanding where the kid who's lost is lost.
8 P: It’s automaticity. Ok, that’s a very good example, thanks ... Teachers say “I don’t know how to break it down any further” because you do it so often.
9 T: Maybe good readers do think aloud while they read, but they do not know how to teach them about the strategies they do while reading like asking questions, summarizing...
10 A: Yes. We all summarize tacitly.
11 P: Exactly. (PD Day Transcript, 2/5/2009)

In the excerpt above, Dr. Parker linked tacit knowledge with inert knowledge that we have, but “don’t even know” that we need, and emphasized “the explicitness of talking with kids about how to read, and think about what it is they’re reading, and then how to write or communicate what they know from what they’ve read” (turn 1). Then Bob, a high school teacher from Birch Hill High School, asked whether he could connect the “concept in English” with newcomers’ tacit knowledge (turn 2). Dr. Parker used the low level of deontic modality, “may” to indicate that he may connect “concept in English” with ELLs’ tacit knowledge or he may not. Dr Parker explained the meaning of tacit knowledge by saying ELLs “have a way of doing things in their own language or in their own culture” that “they don’t even think about doing” (turn 3). Then Bob said “there are certain things that we do the same” and provided some examples like breathing, tasting, feeling, and touching (turn 4). This was an excellent time for the creation of meaning-
making spaces through collaborative dialogue among the 2 instructors and the teachers about inter/intra cultural similarities and differences, and the sociocultural and political positions and power relations effecting ELLs situated in the United States by expanding and exploring Bob’s opinions about linking content concepts with the tacit knowledge of ELLs. But the discussion went back to the technical meaning about tacit knowledge from a psychological perspective. The school district literacy coach Amanda provided an example and mentioned that teachers’ tacit knowledge prevents them “from understanding where the kid who’s lost is lost” (turn 7). Then Dr. Parker stated that our tacit knowledge is so automatic that it is difficult to break it up (turn 8). Another female teacher supplied another example that good readers use think-aloud strategies while reading without noticing their reading strategies and knowing how to teach them (turn 9). Amanda agreed with the teacher’s statement by saying “We all summarize tacitly” (turn 10). Then Dr. Parker expressed her total agreement by using “Exactly.” Then the research assistant’s statement about the difference between schemata and tacit knowledge followed. Then Dr. Parker distributed a handout titled “Rubric for Conceptual Knowledge.” The handout delineated a six leveled hierarchy of conceptual knowledge as follows:

- Level 1: Facts and Associations: Simple
- Level 2: Facts and Associations: Extended
- Level 3: Concepts and Evidence: Simple
- Level 4: Concepts and Evidence: Extended
- Level 5: Patterns and Relationships: Simple
- Level 6: Patterns and Relationships: Extended (PPT Transcript, 2/5/2009)

As manifested in the above conversations, Dr. Parker’s discussions and explanations were all about the definitions or the meanings related to inner representations of mind or reading comprehension strategies and reading processes about
how to read and write from an individual/psychological perspective addressing the
following topics: levels of knowledge (2/15/007), strategy instruction (3/29/2007), social
collaboration and reward/praise (4/26/2007), cognition strategies (6/13/2007), leadership
typology (6/14/2007), student engagement assessment (10/9/2008), differentiated
instruction (1/24/2008), formative assessment (2/28/2008), conceptual writing
(3/13/2008), reading comprehension strategy (10/23/2008), lesson planning (11/20/2008),
and conceptual writing ( 2/5/2009). There were rarely moments of meaning-making
processes among teachers and the instructors about the sociocultural, economic, political
context of ELL education, and how to connect ELLs’ funds of knowledge with content
concepts. Although the topic of the social context of ELL education did come up
unexpectedly in the discussion, the discussion was not extended to the social contexts of
ELL pedagogy or to culturally relevant pedagogy, and promptly returned to the
individual/psychological discourses of Dr. Parker or to the behavioristic/technical
discourses of Dr. Hamilton.

According to Dr. Parker, there are six principles for reading engagement:
interesting texts, reading-world interactions (RWI, hereafter), choice, collaboration,
competence, and conceptual understanding (Field note, 9/18/2008, 10/9/2008). She stated
that all these elements for reading engagement are theory and research based, resulting in
increased reading comprehension scores for struggling readers and linguistically and
culturally diverse students. However, each element has different meanings and concepts
depending on the lens through which we look, that is, explaining the essential
components and discussing the concepts about reading engagement theory from a
cognitive psychological perspective leads to different conclusions than a discussion of the
same points from critical sociocultural perspective. For example, the definition of RWI was written in the PPT she provided as follows:

- RWIs are often called “stimulus tasks” in the research. RWIs help create “situational” interest which is short-term interest in a particular topic. When students have situational interest, they are curious and generate questions about the topic.
- When teachers provide students with interesting texts immediately following the stimulating tasks, students are motivated to read because they want to find answers to the questions generated during the stimulating task.
- Over time, with many opportunities for RWI combined with opportunities to read interesting texts, situational interests turn into individual interest and curiosity, which is long-term.
- The combination of real-world interactions and interesting texts leads to greater topic interest, situational interest, conceptual knowledge, and reading comprehension. (PPT Handout, 9/18/2008)

In the extract above, RWI corresponds to “stimulus tasks,” which create “situational” interest. Situational interests will then become long-term individual interest if “RWI combined with opportunities to read interesting texts” are provided. Dr. Parker concluded with the writing in PPT that RWI with interesting texts “leads to greater topic interest, situational interest, conceptual knowledge, and reading comprehension.” This RWI was not about reading words through the world (Freire, 1970), but mostly about the physical RWI in science class, like children going out to the playground to touch rain or snow when they study a weather unit (Field note, 6/18/2008, 9/18/2008). For example, on a PD day when teachers were writing their unit and lesson plans, Dr. Parker asked Ms. Clark what her unit was about. Ms. Clark answered that she had been working on values, particularly societal values. Dr. Parker disagreed with Ms. Clark about her choice of topic because she thought that the topic was so subjective and ideological that it could not be taught in class:

(P: Dr. Parker, C: Ms. Clark)
1 P: What are you working on?
2 C: I just picked different values. What does tolerance and caring look like? What happens if people don’t respect their values? Describe the characteristics of each value and discuss value conflicts.
3 P: Values are incredibly subjective.
4 C: How about tolerance? Dr. Martin Luther King’s dream talked about racial segregation and it tells how important tolerance and integrities are.
5 P: SOCIETAL VALUES? (surprised) What happens if people don’t appreciate honest discussions? Ideology drives from culture. Where is ideology from? Content is SO subjective. Content is SO subjective. (Face turned red.)
6 C: I was so intrigued by 9.11. There is something we need to know about what values are there. I can ask students, “What values can you see?” after watching the video together.
7 P: There are parents who disagree with you. You need lesson objectives like SWBT, behavior verbs, content, strategy, and condition.
8 C: You can do this. What are positive values? (Field note, 10/23/2008)

In the excerpt above, Dr. Parker asked what Ms. Clark was working on her unit (turn 1). Ms. Clark answered that she picked different values, such as tolerance and caring and she could talk about value conflicts with students (turn 2). Dr. Parker said that “values are incredibly subjective” (turn 3). So, Ms. Clark asked whether she could choose tolerance (turn 4). Dr. Parker was surprised and said, “SOCIETAL VALUES?” and asked Ms. Clark what she would do “if people don’t appreciate honest discussions” (turn 5). Here Dr. Parker asserted her implicit claim by using free indirect reporting, which is “intermediate between direct and indirect ... but without a reporting clause” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 49). To support her implicit argument, Dr. Parker was talking on behalf of generic people (e.g., “What happens if people don’t appreciate honest discussions?” in turn 5). And Dr. Parker repeated the sentence, “Content is SO subjective” twice (turn 5). Ms Clark mentioned that she was intrigued by 9.11 and that she thought we needed to know what values that event brought up (turn 6). Then, Dr. Parker supported her
argument that ideological issues could not be used as topics in class by saying that parents disagree with teaching values as a topic in class, using *free indirect reporting* again, and then went back to the technical discourse, the formula of lesson objectives (turn 7). Dr. Parker suggested that Ms. Clark could use “positive values” for her unit topic (turn 8).

The above vignette manifests that Dr. Parker thought that societal values cannot be used as content in school because they are so subjective, and people don’t appreciate honest discussions about societal values. This leaves the dominant discourses of schooling focused on technical aspects of language learning and literacy development (Bartolomé & Balderrama, 1994) with the intention of the improvement of high-stakes test-taking skills (Giroux, 2000) as the only possibility. Although Ms. Clark tried to incorporate her content following the RWI principle of engagement theory in her language arts class, Dr. Parker interfered and redirected her plan to mechanical lesson objective formulas from her individual/psychological perspective as an expert in reading engagement theory (turn 7), rather than expanding Ms. Clark’s unit and lesson plan into a more authentic enactment of culturally relevant pedagogical practices related to ELLs’ lived experiences that could encourage ELLs to learn language and literacy through their own agency, using empowering patterns of practices in/ across contexts, as demonstrated in the pedagogical practices of Ms. Lewis.

The above dialogues between Dr. Parker and Ms. Clark reveal that each element of reading engagement theory is just a listing of the essential components for reading engagement at a superficial level using individual/psychological definitions of discourses, not at a meaningful and authentic level. For example, choice, which is one of the
constructs for reading engagement theory, cannot be really be authentically actualized in a real classroom setting if students are not invited to collaborate at the unit and lesson planning stage. But the 2 instructors never asked teachers to plan and write their unit and lesson plans based on input from their students. In the case of collaboration, which is another component of engagement theory, how can a teacher and English learner students construct authentic dialogic collaboration if they are never allowed to talk in class about ideological issues, like the racism that ELLs encounter in their daily lives in and out of school? Competence, as one of the constructs in reading engagement theory, does not address the question of how ELLs can improve their academic and cultural competence in a classroom environment where none of the materials and discussions are related to their ways of being, i.e., their cultures and languages.

Almost 1 month later, another discussion took place between Dr. Parker and Ms. Clark about her topic for a unit plan. Dr. Parker again steered her toward teaching language objectives like the grammar and text structures that will appear on standardized tests, and away from addressing subjective topics in class:

(P: Dr. Parker, C: Ms. Clark)

1 C: And I’m trying to do that in my relationship unit, so I’m saving that till later.

2 P: Yeah, argument’s fine. Oh my Gosh!

3 C: I really like argument, and I wanted that to actually be my theme, was argument. And that’s when it came last time and I said, “No, that doesn’t really work for it being.” And so I kind of morphed it and made it “How do you become a good citizen,” or, yeah. I know you’re not supposed to use subjective language, but I do it all the time and ask such questions. How do you become a good citizen? And so, for the first week, we talked about what is a citizen, and we talked about how there are two different definitions for citizen: there is the legal definition and there is the.

4 P: And that’s the same?
Dr. Parker asked Ms. Clark what she has been working on, and Ms. Clark answered that she had been working on argument as her unit topic. But she said that she was trying to save that to use later when she taught her relationship unit (turn 1). Dr. Parker expressed her enthusiastic approval of argument as a unit topic (turn 2). Ms. Clark mentioned that she knew that subjective language was not encouraged, but that she had
asked students about “what is a citizen” and asked, “How do you become a good citizen?,” and discussed two different definitions of citizen (turn 3). Then Dr. Parker asked whether the two definitions were the same (turn 4). Ms. Clark answered that it was the same by saying, “Yes,” and then she continued to explain how she taught her citizenship unit, and how she plans to use the topic of argument in her class (turn 5). In response to Ms. Clark’s long explanation, Dr. Parker said, “Yeah, I know, I know,” meaning that she understood what she was saying, but wanted to turn around a conversation that was going in the wrong direction (turn 6). Ms. Clark explained some more in order to justify what she has been doing by saying “I’ve got it going” (turn 7). Then Dr. Parker warned that Ms. Clark should not let her teaching “get too far away from what they’re giving a test on,” arguing that “the content objective in an English classroom has to be what the kids are tested on.” Additionally, she said, “what that teacher’s job is, is to teach those kids what the elements of thought are, what the story structure is, what a setting is.” Dr. Parker emphasized again that students will be successful in school if language objectives are emphasized “because they know everything about grammar and textual structures” (Turn 8).

As seen in the above dialogue between Dr. Parker and Ms. Clark, Dr. Parker’s argument is that language arts teachers should teach the content that will be on the test, and that the teacher’s job is to teach “the elements of thought” such as grammar and textual structures. Her assumption is that the purpose of language arts and the language arts teacher’s job is confined to individual/psychological discourses and the development of students’ test-taking skills. Everything uttered and stated by Dr. Parker was about the structures of the individual student’s mind, and the strategies teachers can use to cause
students to acquire language proficiency and learn how to read and how to write texts. This exemplifies the *autonomous model of literacy*, which narrowly defines literacy as a set of cognitive practices and skills. In this PD program, there was no space for a transactional theory of reading and writing based on the premise that readers transact with texts for different purposes, along the efferent-aesthetic continuum (Rosenblatt, 1994), there was no space for an *ideological model of literacy*, which considers literacy as a social practice inevitably embedded in a particular view to dominate or marginalize a certain group of people owing to the networked power relations (Gee, 1996; Street, 1984).

As to the ahistorical, apolitical and decontextualized aspects of this PD program, Ms. Lewis expressed her frustrating feelings by saying “it’s feel good experience, and people were unwilling to address real meaty issues, and talk about truths, and to have discussions that were not always pretty, but important.”:

I think that as soon as someone asks a question that is challenging, they want to make everything feel good, and they don’t want to deal with discourse. They’re afraid of discourse. The whole heart of higher ED is about the dialogue and the discussions that comes around, how we get to the work of it. And what I’ve found with that whole cohort that was frustrating to me is, it’s watered down, it’s feel good experience, and people were unwilling to address real meaty issues, and talk about truths, and to have discussions that were not always pretty, but important. (Interview, 6/10/2009)

Bartolomé and Balderrama (2001) argued that *ideological clarity*, “the process by which individuals achieve a deepening awareness of the sociopolitical and economic realities that shape their lives and their capacity to transform them” (p. 48) is a critical element needed in order to enable teachers to foster academic success among their English language learners. And she contends “that in discussing successful academic instruction for students from subordinate populations, a fundamental issue that needs to
be addressed is that of educator (teacher, administrator, counselor, etc.) political and ideological clarity” (Bartolome & Balderrama, 2001, p. 62).

In summary, the discourses circulating in a PD program which Ms. Clark attended for 1 year and Ms. Lewis attended for 3 years were behavioral/technical discourses combined with individual/psychological discourses which addressed the language and literacy development of ELLs using a very narrow definition of literacy, without giving any consideration to the culturally mediated construction of meaning performed by the reader in the dialogic transactional zone between the reader and the text, and without addressing or acknowledging the role of inevitably intertwined power relations in the meaning making processes.
CHAPTER V

MS. LEWIS

Overview

This chapter describes, interprets, and explains the ways in which Ms. Lewis, a White female teacher in her early 30s who had a strong passion for ELLs and ELL education, (trans)formed her pedagogy, which started out as a borderland pedagogy (Buendía, 2003) that mixed culturally relevant pedagogy with some elements of efficiency oriented pedagogy emphasizing reading strategies and vocabulary instruction, but, during the study period, moved toward a culturally relevant pedagogy, creating and constructing a collective Thirdspace in/ across her ESL classroom through socio-critical literacies. This section also deals with the ways in which Ms. Lewis constructed her knowledge systems about educating ELLs. Ms. Lewis demonstrated her dedication to her work as an educator and leader of ELLs by engaging herself in five different professional development courses, by doing community service and home visits, and by having continuous conversations with ELLs. In order to map out the genealogical discursive construction of Ms. Lewis’s culturally relevant pedagogical practices (Chapter VII), this chapter journals the discourses that circulated in the history of her personal and institutional spaces and the development of her knowledge systems, and explores the
discourses circulating in Birch Hill High School (pseudonym) where she taught, in the ESL classrooms of Birch Hill, and in the communities in which she lived.

This chapter explores the following themes: (1) Discourses Circulating in the Community and School: (a) (Dis)Enabling Discourses Circulating in Histories of Ms. Lewis’s Personal and Institutional Spaces: “I hated to go to school because my classmates made fun of me.”; (b) Agency: Active Involvement in School, Community, and PD Courses; (c) Normalizing/Segregating Discourses Circulating in Birch Hill High School: “The school is challenging because really is a school divided”; and (d) Collaborative Discourses Circulating in ELL Teacher Community: “Oh, that worked? Tell me”; (2) Belief Systems about ELL pedagogy: (a) Discourse of Relationship Building: “You’re teaching people, you are not teaching English”; (b) Discourse of “Being an Educator” and “Community”: “Being an educator is, every child that’s walking on the streets belongs to me”; (c) Resource Discourses about ELLs: “They’re brilliant, they’re brilliant!” and (d) Critical Sociocultural Discourses about Language and Literacy Development: “It’s about creating community of learners.”; (3) Into the English as a Second Language Classroom: (a) During the Spring Semester of 2008: (i) Pedagogy of Reading Strategies and Vocabulary Instruction; and (ii) Promoting Motivation through Scores and Competition: “Extra Points! Extra Points!” (b) From the Fall Semester of 2008 to the Spring Semester of 2009: (i) Shared Knowledge Production in Community of Learners through Sociocritical Literacy: “Let’s be civil rights people. Let’s learn as means of changing the world”; (ii) Empowering ELLs through Discursive Subject Positions: “Yes, you can.”; (iii) Changing roles in/across Contexts: ELLs as Learners, Teachers,
Researchers, and Social Activists; (iv) Expansive Learning Cycles in the Community of Learners from a CHAT Perspective; and (v) Epilogue.

**Discourses Circulating in Community and School**

This section delineates the language ideological discourses and multiple subject positions (re)constructed by discourses in/ across participation histories in Ms. Lewis’s personal and institutional spaces and by the discourses circulating in Birch Hill High School where her ESL classroom was situated. This section comprises the following subsections: (a) (Dis)Enabling Discourses Circulating in Histories of Personal and Institutional Spaces: “I hated to go to school because my classmates made fun of me”; (b) Agency: Active Involvement in School, Community, and PD Courses; (c) Normalizing/Segregating Discourses Circulating Birch Hill High School: “The school is challenging because really is a school divided”; and (d) Collaborative Discourses Circulating in ELL Teacher Community: “Oh, that worked? Tell me.”

(Dis)Enabling Discourses Circulating in the Histories of Ms. Lewis’s Personal and Institutional Spaces:
“...I hated to go to school because my classmates made fun of me.”

Ms. Lewis, now a White female teacher, came to the US from Sweden in the early 1970s, when she was 4 years old. Ms. Lewis’s family was considered to be “living in poverty by US standards.” They lived in the West Side of Salt Lake City, and she grew up in that area. At that time, Caucasians were ethnic minorities in the West Side, so Ms. Lewis’s childhood friends were mostly of “minority status.” Later, the area became “a gateway for immigration.” The atmosphere of racial and linguistic discrimination that
surrounded Ms. Lewis’s environment was reflected in discriminative language
ideological formations filled with terms like “bean eaters” and “coconut heads;” at that
time, mocking a person with a foreign accent was considered to be normal behavior. Ms.
Lewis’s Swedish mother was often mocked because of her “broken English and accent”:

Despite being White, people in the neighborhood would often mock my mother’s
broken English and accent. When teased by kids in the same neighborhood, from
similar economic backgrounds, there was a level of tolerance. However, the same
jokes and teasing from outsiders or people in the area with a little more money or
influence was less tolerated and perceived as much worse. (Interview, 6/10/2009)

Ms. Lewis was subjugated and positioned as a poor immigrant child in society
with limited English proficiency and with a Swedish mother who was mocked by people
due to her “very thick accent.” Ms. Lewis reflected on growing up with a mother who had
an accent, and how people would treat her like she was stupid because she had an accent.
She witnessed how her mother was discounted by people because of her accent, and got a
sense of the circulating discriminative language ideological discourses that are prevalent
in many parts of the US (e.g., “all you’re hearing is an accent”):

I know GROWing up with a mother who had an accent, and that people would
treat her like she was stupid because she had an accent. And because it’s all I
ever knew, THAT’s my mother’s voice that I heard when she spoke, when
people would say things like, “I can’t understand what you’re saying.” And just
sort of throw her, blow her off, or they would talk to me and not to my mother,
things like that, having witnessed to that, I know, even though my mother’s a
White European, she’s Swedish, people treated her like she was an idiot as she was
developing her English. And if the problem is, if you could sit down and talk to
her in Swedish you would understand what you’re missing, because when all
you’re hearing is an accent, you’re missing the person. And that happens WAY
TOO MUCH in this country. (Interview, 2008)
As a daughter of the mother who experienced being ignored by people due to her foreign accent, Ms. Lewis accentuated the importance of heart sharing through listening, rather than correcting English: “LISTEN. LISTEN what she’s saying.” Ms. Lewis reiterated that saying something is more related to sharing thoughts, ideas, and feelings than to sounding things right saying, “She’s sharing her heart,” and mentioned “how stupid does someone have to be understood”:

And I’ve seen it with my mother. My mother with very thick accent, you might have a hard time understanding my mother. If she sometimes gets nervous and embarrassed, but she’ll say things, and what she’s saying, in my heart, is so smart, and then someone will correct her English and it makes me angry, it makes me angry... When someone, like with my mom, when she’s sharing her heart with you, you don’t need to correct her. She’s sharing her heart, and how stupid does someone have to be understood, my mom is going to speak with an accent. She may not sound the words right, so LISTEN. LISTEN what she’s saying. And what she’s saying is intelligent, and important, and valuable. (Interview, /2008)

Like her mother, Ms. Lewis’s early school life experiences in the US as a poor immigrant child were characterized by the struggles and resistance caused by her language and cultural barriers, allowing Ms. Lewis to “better understand the challenges facing ELLs” and to decide to dedicate herself to the education of linguistically and culturally diverse students (Interview, 6/10/2009).

When Ms. Lewis first came to the US, she “hated to go to school” because she was mocked by her classmates, like her mother, because she “could not understand English at all.” One day, Ms. Lewis’s mother told her that her kindergarten teacher could not live unless she brought apples to class for her. That fake story that her mother and kindergarten teacher made up allowed Ms. Lewis to go to school and to become a good student. Ms. Lewis attributed her success both in school and in life to her teacher’s
attitudes toward her, i.e., “bright smiles and warm heart” and she reflected that “my teacher’s attitudes toward me changed my whole life”:

My parents came to the US when I was 4. I went to kindergarten and I could not understand English at all. I hated to go to school because my classmates made fun of me. Every morning, I told my mother, “I do not want to go to school.” But my teacher’s attitudes toward me changed my whole life. My mother and my teacher made up a fake story. My mother told me that my teacher is poor and cannot survive if I do not bring apples for her. I went to school because I needed to give her apples. I did not want my teacher to be hungry and die. Whenever I brought apples to her, she smiled brightly and said, “Thank you.” I could feel her warm heart and love at that time. I was changed with slowly, and finally overcame all the language barriers and conflicts with my classmates. I succeeded in school since that time thanks to her. (Interview, 6/10/2009)

In the text above, Ms. Lewis foregrounded the influence of her teacher’s “warm heart and love” on allowing herself to overcome “all the language barriers and conflicts with classmates….and succeeded in school” while silencing the other factors, such as the changed behaviors of her peers and school structures, or her own efforts toward her success in school and life. The implicit ideology of the above text is that the relational context between teacher and students, that is, how a teacher treats a student, plays a significant role in that student’s success. In the text above, the agency of the relationship between teacher and students belongs to the teacher, which means that the attitudes and behaviors of a teacher can change a student’s ways of being in school and in life.

After overcoming her difficulties and language barriers in kindergarten, Ms. Lewis continued her elementary and secondary education in public schools in the West Side of SLC, where “Caucasians were ethnic minorities in the area.” She graduated with a bachelor’s degree in three majors: English literature, history, philosophy. Later, Ms. Lewis “worked with an insurance company for seven years as a manager while working
as a paid writer and editor” before she became a teacher. In response to the question about the motivations that led her to become a teacher, Ms. Lewis recalled that she decided to go into education because she “just needed to give back to the place where she came from,” i.e., the place where “fairly poor immigrant” people live. She remembers her teachers as those who came into her life to encourage her to think beyond where she was:

I never thought that I’d be a teacher. I was a medical writer for a couple years, and then I did web design, and I think that when I was out in the workforce I’d just saw such a limit of people that came from my background. So, my family were immigrants, and we were fairly poor and I had to work very hard for my education, that when I looked around me, I didn’t see a lot of people who came from where I came from, and as I reflected on that, I started thinking about some people, who came into my life to encourage me to think beyond where I was, and that the majority of them were teachers, and so as I was on an airplane, actually, one day, because I was traveling a lot with my job, and I thought that I just needed to give back to the place where I came from. And so that was a big motivation to go into education. (Interview, 6/10/2009)

As stated above, Ms. Lewis recounted that she overcame all her difficulties and hardships thanks to the help of her teachers, and gradually lost her “Swedish accent” and “succeeded in school and life.” This is the reason why Ms. Lewis considers being a teacher in school as one of the most valuable jobs, more important than other jobs such as manager or college professor. Ms. Lewis mentioned that she “could have made much more money than she is making now” if she “could have worked as a manager in an insurance company” and she “could have worked as a professor at a college,” but she “chose to become a teacher to do something valuable” (Interview, 6/10/2009).

Later, Ms. Lewis went to graduate school in order to get a “masters of education with an emphasis on power structures and diverse, like power structures and communities, specifically communities of learning” (Interview, 6/10/2009). Ms. Lewis explained that in graduate school, she “did look at the problem of marginalized people being, somehow,
brought into and being a powerful participant in academics” (Interview, 6/10/2009) and wrote a thesis titled “Conflicts to Bridging the Gap between Parents/Guardians and Schools” (Interview, 4/6/2009). Ms. Lewis’s thesis was an “action research project” exploring “the influence of positive teacher initiated contact on parent/guardian involvement in a school with a diverse student body, low test scores, and limited parent/guardian participation” (Interview, 6/7/2009).

Agency: Active Involvement in School, Community, and PD Courses

In 2007, Ms. Lewis was hired to teach an ESL class at Birch Hill High School, which had no ESL department at the time. She then continued there as founder, chair, and a teacher in the ESL department. Her relationships with the other teachers and school administration are explained in more detail in the section below titled “Collaborative Discourses Circulating ESL Teacher Community.” Ms. Lewis was also significantly involved in community service. She helped refugees in “a grassroots organization that’s tied to the international refugees, NIRC and catholic community services, CCS.” She mentioned an episode in which she witnessed the birth of the sister of one of her students while doing community service, and she emphasized that sharing lived experiences with students is different from knowing them from “the paper what they wrote,” and that sharing experiences with her students and their families allowed her to “hear stories and start seeing people as people”:

I’ve helped people find apartments, and got them welfare, and helped them find jobs, and helped them. One of my students, I was there when her younger sister was born ‘cause the family needed a ride to the hospital. And during the intimate times, you hear stories, and you start seeing people as people, and you understand that they’re not on the paper what they wrote. (Interview, 6/7/2010)
Ms. Lewis had close relationships with her students, and would visit their homes during summer break. If a student was absent a lot or caused her to be concerned for them, she would also visit their homes during the semester:

Usually I only get around to it during the summer. And then, if a student has been absent a lot, or if I’m watching this student, and I’m concerned because I see a huge change in them, I might just go to the family...what I have to do is, there’s something about face to face, where you can kind of see what’s happening, and you understand what their home is like, and not completely, of course, but I find them, if they’ve seen my face and I call, and I say I’m worried, or I have a trendsetter call, they’ve seen me, and they know who I am, and they know my personality. (Interview, 6/10/2009)

Ms. Lewis invited various guest speakers, including parents, professors and tutors, from “outside the classroom” to help her ELLs learn. Her Vietnamese American friend who is a medical doctor came to the classroom every Friday even though “he can make a lot of money by working every Friday, but he comes to help students” (Interview, 6/10/2009). She invited a refugee student from Somalia, who could not read English when she first came to the United States, but is now a university student, to her class and asked her to talk about “her hard work and how to be successful” and help her ELLs “know about self efficacy.” Ms. Lewis mentioned that her English learner students were very excited about hearing from outside speakers:

I think it’s good thing to get the student outside the classroom, too. So we’re experiencing things out of the classroom. Guest speakers...I’ve had guests come in before, tutors from the university. This year I had a student of mine who was a refugee when she first came, she couldn’t read, and she’s a student at the university now. And she was given a scholarship to do a documentary. So I had her come … and she talked to the students about hard work, and about how to be successful, and different ways of thinking about it where, if I said those thing to my students. you know, I’m in this White woman, but there’s this Somali girl who couldn’t read, you could say, “Don’t always tell yourself, no, and don’t let other people say, no, and don’t say, I can’t because I can’t read, or don’t say I’d can’t because they’re racist.” She was really good about saying. “You have to push
yourself and ask a lot about yourself.” And it’s different when she’s talking. And the students knew her, too, so they were very excited. (Interview, 6/10/2009)

When Ms Lewis could not find the teaching materials she wanted, she would often adapt an existing text to her students’ English level, and rewrote it so that her students could “have access to the ideas.” She has also considered writing her own books dealing with social justice and equity issues for her new English readers to use:

The school provides suggested texts. But I am not not required to use any of them. One HUGE obstacle to finding culturally relevant text for new students new to English is that many of them are emergent readers. The books I have been given to teach my ELLs are often simple, safe and at times condescending. I have never found texts that deal with social justice, equity and race on a beginning English reading level. To compensate, I often take existing texts and rewrite them so that my students have access to the ideas...I have often thought about writing some of my own books for new English readers that deal with social justice and equity issues. (Interview, 2010)

In terms of parental involvement, Ms. Lewis students’ parents came to school for a variety of reasons, as a translator, a helper, a teacher, a supporter, and for discussions:

If we need a translator, then I might call a parent and say, “Can you help us with translation? Or if a child is having problems, then we might invite the parent and talk to them and see what we can do as a support team. If the child’s very successful, we might call home and say, “You might want to see this but your kid is amazing.” We’ve done some community activities to try and build community, so this year we did a documentary where students made documentaries on racism, and then we invited the parents to watch them, and we had a community discussion about racism in the school. And then we had a community service program where students came up with ways to help the community grow, and we invited parents to come and learn about what the students would like to do to help the community. (Interview, 6/10/2009)

Ms. Lewis completed five different PD (Professional Development, hereafter) courses between 2007 and 2009. Her first two PD programs were based on a behavioral/cognitive conception of instruction. The first was titled “Inquiry Learning” and the second, which focused on language and literacy development of ELLs, is explained and analyzed in Chapter IV of this paper. From the fall semester of 2008 through the
summer semester of 2009, Ms. Lewis also participated in three more PD programs: one on family literacy in connection with transformative pedagogy and social justice, another on creating “an intensive writing protocol” for ELLs, and the third on bridging school with community:

I was on a research team. There’s two different research teams I’m working with now at the University. One of them is the family literacy program, and it is: find ways of integrating disenfranchised communities into the systems, empowering them. And the second one is called the standard writing grant. And it is providing academic writing support. We’ve recruited some of our students, and we’re trying to develop a writing protocol that can be integrated into schools that helps students become stronger academic writer. I am developing an intensive writing protocol that can be asking for ELL writing protocol now. (Interview, 6/7/2010)

In contrast to the first two PD programs, which were based on a behavioral-cognitive conception of instruction, the other three PD programs - transformative pedagogy, FSP (Family-School Partnership), and bridging the school with community-were all based on a *funds of knowledge* approach to teaching and learning from the critical sociocultural perspectives. The basic tenet underlying those PD programs is that teachers should recognize and honor ELLs’ *funds of knowledge* and incorporate them into their school curriculum and pedagogical practices by encouraging English learners to speak or make public his or her lived stories and experiences in the form of counter narratives, as explained in detail in Chapter II.

FSP PD was led by Dr. Taylor (pseudonym), a professor in the education department of a local university near Birch Hill High School. Dr. Taylor recruited teachers, particularly White teachers who would like to join the FSP PD program as White allies to accomplish social transformation for social justice. The FSP program connected the volunteer teachers’ classes, which were from 2 high schools and one
middle school near the university, with the university education department’s multicultural education course and with community advocacy programs. Undergraduate and graduate students in the university education courses became involved in ESL classes by assisting and teaching ELLs in order to learn from inservice teachers how to teach English learners in real ESL classroom settings:

We do a liaison where Dr. Taylor needed a classroom to place her students in the Diversity Ed. And because I work with ELL students, that worked out very well. And then they collaborate with us on helping guide us in areas of social justice and, like, they helped us. (Interview, 6/10/2009)

In the excerpt above, Ms. Lewis mentioned the collaborative efforts for social justice undertaken by Dr. Taylor and preservice teachers through the FSP PD program. During the spring semester of 2008, while Ms. Lewis was taking her second PD course, which followed a behaviorist-cognitive conception of instruction, she had been enacting in her ELL classroom a borderland, hybrid pedagogy (Buendía, 2003), despite her strong passion for ELLs and social justice. At that time, her instruction was focused mostly on reading strategies and skills, although she tried to choose books that related to her students’ lived lives, as explained and analyzed in the section “Reading Strategies and Vocabulary Instruction during the Spring Semester of 2008.” After Ms. Lewis became involved with Dr. Taylor’s FSP PD program, her classroom pedagogical practices with ELLs moved from borderland pedagogy (Buendía, 2003) toward culturally relevant pedagogy. A detailed analysis of the discursive (trans)formation of Ms. Lewis’s pedagogical practices will be discussed in Chapter VII. The next section will deal with the discourses circulating Birch Hill High School.
Birch Hill High School is located at the intersection of three roads in the wealthiest part of East Side Salt Lake City, where the population is 95% White. For a long time in the past, this school had accepted only East Side students but, beginning in 2001, the Salt Lake City school district began sending West Side students to Birch Hill in order to pursue diversity. “They wanted to have more diversity in schools, and also to spread their resources…and students get an opportunity to interact with different types of people” (Interview, 6/10/2009). Birch Hill includes 9th grade through 12th grade, each grade having ELL students graded 1B, 2B or 3B to correspond with their English speaking proficiency. The ELL students at Birch Hill are multilingual and multicultural, and come from a variety of countries: China, Somalia, Sudan, Mongolia, Egypt, India, Puerto Rico, Mexico, Algeria, Morocco, Libya, Uganda, and Kenya, etc.; all 38 languages are spoken by students in this school. Despite the fact that ELLs may experience diversity at Birch High School, most ELLs need to ride in a bus for 45 minutes to go to school and another 45 minutes to go home after school because most of them live in the poor West Side of the city.

In order to engage their diverse ELL populations, Birch Hill High School incorporated a multicultural fair to celebrate Martin Luther King Junior’s Day. All kinds of different cultural artifacts appeared on the auditorium stage and it seemed that students enjoyed expressing their own cultures on stage:

The auditorium was packed with hundreds of students. On the stage, 2 black boys are playing guitars. Then, the map of Somalia in Africa appeared on the screen accompanied by African music. Eight black girls appeared on the stage, four
wearing red lap skirts on the bottom and black shirts on top. The other four girls were wearing dark blue skirts and different colors of tops. The eight girls danced according to the African music. Students in the auditorium screamed and shouted, “Jaho,” “Ho,” “Hurrah,” etc. At 10:57 am, girls from Somalia showed fashion show wearing all different styles of clothes. At the end of the show, a little overweight girl threw her scarf of the dress to the audience. The audience shouted and screamed.

At 11:01, a whirling glove appeared on the big screen and showed the map of Tonga. The jumping dolphins in the ocean appeared on the screen. Girls wearing sleeveless red top and white short shirts danced according to Tonga music. The announcers, who are White with blonde hair, mentioned spree after the festival.

At 11:07 am, four couples’ dance began: girls wearing black dress with flower at the bottom of skirt, boys wearing white shirt and black pants.

At 11:11 am, international choirs wearing white shirt and black pants sang the song titled “My Jesus, Savior.” At 11:14 am, ten girls in front and four boys in black pants having a feather on head appeared on the stage to dance. While they were dancing, Ms. Lewis asked me to go back to classroom before the festival ends in order to avoid the traffic in the hallway. So, we came to the classroom before the festival ends. (Field note, 1/25/2008)

It felt to me that the energy and passion that filled the auditorium expressed the hidden desires, dreams, feelings, and passions of those minority youths separated from the mainstream culture and society. The school incorporates such a multicultural fair to celebrate Martin Luther King Junior’s Day. Why? Is there a festival to celebrate mainstream culture in secondary schools in the United States? I am not sure, but I assume there is not. (Researcher’s Journal, 1/30/2008)

This scene represents the typical approach to culture in public schools where “culture is portrayed as homogenous and frozen in time, such as when teachers engage their students in learning about the holidays, food, typical costumes, and art of their own or other cultures” (Amanti 2005, p. 131). This event-based approach to multicultural education is caused by the limited conceptions of multicultural education (Banks, 1993; Nieto & Bode, 2004; Sleeter, 1998) and unintentionally devalues the everyday cultural practices and histories of linguistically and culturally diverse students (Amanti, 2005). Banks (1993) also argued that “multicultural education is a complex and
multidimensional concept, yet media commentators and educators alike often focus on only one of its many dimensions. Some teachers view it only as the inclusion of content about ethnic groups into the curriculum; others view it as an effort to reduce prejudice; still others view it as the celebration of ethnic holidays and events.” (p. 25); thus, Banks (1993) proposed five dimensions of multicultural education in order to describe and explain what multicultural education is and how it should be enacted in everyday pedagogical practices: (a) content integration, (b) knowledge construction process, (c) prejudice reduction, (d) equity pedagogy, and (e) empowering school culture and social structure.

In contrast to this special event-based approach to multicultural education, *funds of knowledge*, i.e., culturally relevant pedagogy approach to multicultural education incorporate and integrate English learner students’ and their communities’ everyday cultural histories, practices, perspectives, and attitudes into curriculum and individual teacher’s daily pedagogical practices. For example, oral history and family literacy projects allow students to ask authentic questions and discuss issues in history and their daily cultural practices, thereby allowing ELLs to use their mother tongue and English in the situated context for communicative purposes, and finally acquire the second language, that is, English, much better than by following the traditional strategy-skill based approach to teaching ELLs (Johnson, 2009; Swain, 2006). In addition, experts in the community or parents can come to school to teach about the histories and cultures of their community, which enriches the learning experiences of students and, at the same time, allows English learner students to construct positive identities (Amanti, 2005; Au, 2009; Gay, 2000; Moll, 1990; Nieto, 2001)
The soldier ceremony that was performed before assembly on the 7th of March, 2008, exemplified the concept of schooling as a means of normalizing students for social reproduction (Bourdieu, 1991). The male-first/ female-behind order of discourse portrayed on stage revealed a school stuck in the big societal and ideological structures and discourses. Students learn in school how to be a normal citizen through the socialization processes, rather than learning how to transform a society that is problematically unequal across race, gender, language, and poverty lines into an equitable society:

At 10:16 am, Ms. Lewis and students went to the auditorium for assembly. Before starting assembly, a boy followed by a girl wearing soldier uniforms and carrying guns, carried the United States flag up the left side aisle of the auditorium, while another uniformed boy followed by a uniformed girl walked up the right aisle. They all reached the front and went up onto the stage. There, they lowered their guns and left the flag on the stage. Then a Hispanic girl sang the American National Anthem. She had a very beautiful voice. As she was singing, everyone put their right hands on their chests. (Field note, 3/7/2008)

The soldier scene is very weird to me. We had such things in South Korea ten years ago, but all those soldier ceremonies were discontinued ten years ago. We still have allegiance to the nation while singing a Korean national song. However, the power country, the US still has this ceremony? Why? Do we really need soldier ceremony in school? (Researcher’s Journal, 3/7/2008)

The assembly continued for almost 1 hour and showed the daily school lives of junior high students and advertised their achievements:

A few male teachers in red shirts with the name of “Birch Hill High” lettered on them stood along the side and back walls of the auditorium. After soldier ceremony, an advertisement screen appeared. The scene depicted a beautiful lady wearing an Arabic hat, bikini top and lap skirt, and a soldier on an island with pine trees and a beach. The lady and the soldier were talking each other in the screen. Then the letters “SOS” appeared on the screen, followed by the message, “Come true your wish at Junior High.”

Approximately 40 students, 20 girls and 20 boys, wearing white shirts and blue jeans sang a song on stage accompanied by an older male teacher who played a digital piano. Then, a Hispanic girl sang a song. Following that was a dance by
eight girls in red shirts and blue jeans. A Hispanic girl in light green exercise pants and a hooded jacket danced solo. Her body movement and facial expressions were like those of a chubby frog who would like to get out of her restful home. Then the president demonstrated a couple dance with a boy who wore women’s clothes and a long black wig. The background music was a song titled “A Whole New World,” a theme song from the Disney movie, “Aladdin.” The presidential couple danced for almost 6 minutes.

As the final scene, a video of 2008/2009 junior class appeared on the big screen, portraying both normal and unique behaviors in their school lives: students cooperating in class, eating lunch together in the cafeteria, eating ice-cream, sitting on the hallway, waiting for the car to come, sleeping and playing in class, talking in the hallway, etc. Next the screen showed their sports teams playing, and their trophies for competitive victories were displayed: basketball, soccer, boxing, female soccer, swimming, wrestling, football, etc. (Field note, 3/7/2008)

The assembly event presented the same typical scenes presented in public schools across the United States (Nieto, 2000). No scenes, stories, or comments were introduced concerning social justice issues such as racism, sexual discrimination, unequal distribution of resources, students’ service work for people in poverty/trouble and community-oriented activities etc. There was no screen showing the connections between students’ in school literacy practices with their out of school literacy practices. All these assembly activities are “hollow activities” for the purpose of societal reproduction and maintenance of the status quo, as Nieto (2000) put it,

“Celebrating diversity” through special assembly programs, multicultural dinners, or ethnic celebrations, if they do not also confront the structural inequalities that exist in schools, are hollow activities. A concern for social justice means looking at why and how our schools are unjust for some students. (p. 183)

The normalizing discourses circulating in Birch Hill High School that are demonstrated in the assembly programs described above are also accompanied by segregating systems. The segregation of students at Birch Hill is maintained through “pull-out” ESL classes (i.e., Structured English Immersion) where ELLs learn most of their content areas and language arts in their own classroom among themselves, and go to
the mainstream classes only for art, gym, and computer classes. In the segregated environment that is maintained within the school structure at Birch Hill, ELLs do not have time to interact much with native English speaking peers. Thus, few ELLs have English speaking friends and “they see them in a way as enemies sometimes” (Interview, 6/10/2009).

Ms. Lewis also explained the division between poor students, mostly ELLs from West Side, and rich students, mainly from East Side, that is caused by the different levels of wealth and power they live with:

Some people think that it’s a bit to be privileged because we have a very, very wealthy population that comes here. But it’s divided. We have 47% minorities and then 53% White, and the Whites...the majority of them are very, very wealthy and politically empowered, and if they have power in the primary religion here, and..when they want something, they will fight to get it. And if someone what happens is some of our class less enfranchised and empowered students, which would include ELLs, they get overlooked. And so it’s been my experience that if you can get that people with that wealth and the power involved, then they’ll come and support and advocate for your students. But if you don’t, they will really struggle...(Interview, 6/7/2010)

Ms. Lewis commented on the isolating school atmosphere and on the fact that “a lot of ELL populations are trying just to get by” in many ways because of their limited English proficiency, and no school support systems exist to help ELLs to enact something for their own education and life:

...it can be so isolating as you probably know. So isolating. And a lot of ELL populations are trying just to get by. They can’t go to the legislator. They can’t go to the schools. They can’t go to the community service. I mean, and if they go, how will they explain if no one understands their English, or I mean it’s so limiting in some ways, so that’s where the school is challenging because really is a school divided. (Interview, 6/10/2009)

In contrast to ELLs, who do not have the English proficiency required to express their opinions and access resources and wealth, English speaking students have “all this
wealth” and “all this access” because they were born into it. But English speaking students do not “understand how privileged they are” and ELLs are treated “as if they have a deficit, as if they were born with something inherently wrong with them” due to their poor command of English:

They all have all this wealth. They have all this access. And all they had to do is to get born into it. And sometimes those kids with that wealth and access do not understand how privileged they are, so they don’t necessarily, they treat, and if this is not every individual, but in general, students get treated as if they have something wrong with them, as if they have a deficit, as if they were born with something inherently wrong with them because they don’t speak English, or because they’re not from America, or they come from a country where there’s a war. (Interview, 2009)

Amid the normalizing and isolating discourses circulating in Birch Hill High School, Ms. Lewis mentioned her collaboration with two other ELL teacher colleagues in the same boat, that is, working toward social justice and equity pedagogy:

I think we all influence one another as colleagues. You hear someone come up with a great idea, something that’s working, something that is meeting a goal, and who doesn’t want to be successful? (Interview, 6/10/2009)

But concerning the question of whether other ELL teachers teach ELLs in the way that she teaches - through sociocritical literacy, Ms. Lewis answered, “Not for the ELL program. It takes a lot of time.” She also expressed her lonely feelings as an educator trying to enact social justice, equity, equality and respect for all human beings: “I’m kind of isolated a little bit. But it was a REALLY, REALLY wonderful experience.” Despite her feelings of isolation because of the different approaches taken by other teachers in educating ELLs in her school, Ms. Lewis continuously worked toward what she believes in and loves to do.
Collaborative Discourses Circulating ESL Teacher Community:
“*Oh, that worked? Tell me.”*

As explained above, Birch Hill High School was a normal public high school located in a wealthy area in the US, which promoted citizenship and celebrated single day event-based multicultural education, rather than integrating individual ELL students’ cultural-linguistic resources and perspectives into the curriculum and teachers’ everyday pedagogical practices. Into this normal public school setting, Ms. Lewis was hired at Birch Hill High School because “nobody wants to work with” ELLs:

...when I said, Ok maybe, because I wanted to go back to the school that I had grown up in. They hired me and I said, I will only work at your school if you let me with ELL population, but what was funny is, I didn’t know the school culture. So they said, no one wants to work with them. You’re hired. (Interview, 6/7/2008)

Since the time when Ms. Lewis was hired as an ESL teacher at Birch Hill High School, she has led as a catalyst for change, particularly for changes in ELL teachers’ pedagogical practices, by holding ELL teacher meetings twice a month as chair of ELL department. But when Ms. Lewis first tried to create an ESL department, there were no volunteers:

when we’re trying to build our department two years ago, I went to the school and said, we need teachers who will teach our ELL classes. Are there volunteers? Nobody would volunteer. It was a wakeup call and it’s kind of broke my heart, too, a little bit, but... (Interview, 2008)

But Ms. Lewis did not give up, and finally found teachers who would join her. Ms. Lewis described the ELL teacher meeting as a place to mutually “influence one another as colleagues” and to exchange great ideas “that worked” about “classroom management issues, individual student concerns, purchasing skill based texts (versus grade based text), further developing the program to best meet the needs of Birch Hill’s ever growing ELL population”:
I think we all influence one another as colleagues. You hear someone come up with a great idea, something that’s are working, something that is meeting a goal, and who doesn’t want to be successful? So, it’s like, “Oh, that worked. Tell me.” (Interview, 2009)

Usually approximately 12 or 13 ELL teachers participated in ELL teacher meetings, including five ESL language arts, three LEP (Limited English Proficiency, hereafter) science, 2 LEP history teachers, and 2 math teachers. Ms. Lewis took the opportunity to announce events and community activities related to ELL education:

Two dates to really be aware of. April fourth there is a multi-diversity ED program at the University of Utah and they are really working at trying to bridge community working with the UNP partnership. I don’t know if you’re familiar with United Neighborhood Partnership down by Heartland, or the former Heartland apartments. The peace garden park, I forget the name of it, and, just, one of their greatest goals, and I hope I’m speaking accurately is to, sorry, is to go ahead and try to bring in underrepresented communities into the school and get and, um, help bridge that gap where we have a lot of individuals who are not in our school system that are being supported by leaders with no communities and family members who needed stuff. And so with that they’ve got two things that they’re working at, well, one thing they’re working on. April fourth, they will be doing East Highland and West High, and they’ll be doing workshops. And I can’t explain it because they don’t put actually on the details of it, but some of our students will be talking about what it’s like to be an international student or also a minority student in the high schools. They’ll try and have parents there and they’ll have workshops on new immigration laws and how the immigration laws affect families and status of immigration. They’ll have some things on how to best, I think, communicate with educators and building that. So, anyway, it’s something that we’ve been invited to be a part of, even if it’s just to show up for a little bit, and I can get you those dates, but. So, that will be April fourth and that’s not this weekend, but the following. (ELL Teachers’ Meeting Transcript, 3/26/2009)

Ms. Lewis also explained how she was involved in those community events with her English learner students in connection with class instructions, and how she wanted her students to “even design and define what communities they want to be”:

...the unit I’m working on with my level two classes right now is on community and how do we build communities? So they’re going to be doing a community fair as a service line project. And it will be on the 25th of April and they are meeting every Tuesday. …I have a lot of ELL students. It’s not just my students
who are coming in. And we’re, we talk about community and how to make Birch Hill High School a better community. And so we read SeedFolks, and then do vocabulary building and reading of stuff, and then, the last twenty minutes, we break into committees. And so right now we have a committee that is doing, like they, one of the committees wants to do at the community fair, teaching children how to dance ethnic dancing and also do some hip-hop. And then there’s, some of the young boys want to do a basketball like game. And then, um, I wanted to bring in the environment. So, how can we make the environment better? (ELL Teachers’ Meeting Transcript, 3/26/2009)

Ms. Lewis encouraged more ELL teachers in Birch Hill High School to be a part of the community activities by emphasizing that the ESL department is supporting the activities and that, at the end, English learner students will become “the ones who would be in charge of it”:

I think the more our students we get involved, and the more we get the department involved, I think the better it can be. And one of our big goals the first year that we came together was to build community and to bridge community and to integrate students and so this wouldn’t just be, it’ll be our department that’s sponsoring it, but it would be outreach to anyone in the community. And it could from there to there but our students would be the ones who would be in charge of it. (ELL Teachers’ Meeting Transcript, 3/26/2009)

Ms. Lewis mentioned that ESL teachers in her school collaborated in a positive way to improve their ESL instruction: “there are a lot of good teachers” that work hard in the classroom, but they cannot get attention because “they are so engrossed in their work, they don’t have time to televise.” Ms. Lewis emphasized that she enjoyed working with the teachers in her school and seeing a teacher “that’s doing great things.”

Yeah, and there are a lot of good teachers that I think sometimes are working so hard in the classroom that you don’t hear about them out in the world. There are a lot of bad ones, too, but those that get the attention. And if those that are working at making education better oftentimes invisible because they are so engrossed in their work, they don’t have time to televise, yeah, and it’s a show what they’re doing and so it’s exciting when you meet someone that’s doing great things. And, for me, I just want to soak it up. (Interview, 6/7/2010)
Ms. Lewis also stated the important role of the school principal in Birch Hill High School: “Since the new principal came to this school in 2007, many things have been changed, including more funding for ELL books” (Interview, 6/10/2009). The principal, Dr. Hopkins (pseudonym) has been considered to have shown himself to be an open-minded person trying to support ELLs and create inclusive classrooms and an inclusive school by providing “late busing to its after-school programs, hiring an assistant principal of student support who is fluent in Spanish and having a college-focused curriculum for all students.” (The Salt Lake Tribune, 5/24/2009) He also promised that he would conduct parent teacher conferences at the middle school located in the West Side for the ELLs from the West Side:

“Our school boundary is as far East and as far West as you can go in this valley. Instead of having all parent teacher conferences here at East, we have one here and have one at the west side, a middle school at the heart of our boundary,” said Dr. Hopkins. "The net result is more parents come. It's a paradigm shift. It's about being inclusive.”

Many schools from both the East and West side have looked to Birch Hill High School to learn how it operates its ELL program because Birch Hill High School is one of only a few schools with preliterate ELL programs, and gets good feedback from people:

I don't know if it's the best, but I know that we have some models at other schools and other places will come in and look to see how they are performing, how they are functioning, how they are using their resources and so, we're getting some good feedback that people are liking what we do. So in your classroom, mostly ELLs here in this class, maybe, or from the west side. From the west side, some on the Eastside, and then some of them have heard about our program and they come from Sandy and Murray and other places, because we are one of the very few schools that gives support for preliterate students, students who've never learned to read in their first language, and I don't know the exact numbers, but in this state of Utah, very few high schools if I did classes for students who cannot read. (Interview, 6/7/2009)
Belief Systems About ELL Pedagogy

Based on discourse analysis of informal and formal interviews and personal conversations conducted with Ms. Lewis over a time period of 3 years, I have found that the in vivo codes circulating Ms. Lewis’s belief systems fall within these main themes: discourses of “being an educator,” “community of learners,” and resource perspectives about ELLs. Thus, this section is composed of the following subsections: (1) Discourse of Relationship Building: “You’re teaching people, you are not teaching English”; (2) Discourse of “Being an Educator” and “Community”: “Being an educator is, every child that’s walking on the streets belongs to me”; (3) Resource Discourses about ELLs: “They’re brilliant, they’re brilliant!”; and (4) Critical Sociocultural Discourses about Language and Literacy Development: “It’s about creating community of learners.”

Discourses of Relationship Building About the Pedagogy for English Learners:
“You’re teaching people, you’re not teaching English.”

I learned that ELL teaching is one where you get to know individuals, and you just get to know a person from the heart, and you definitely have to have certain structure, and you have to have certain ways of teaching, but you’re teaching people, you’re not teaching English, and it’s so when you’re teaching people. You know that the subject is in English, BUT you meet them in the relationship, where you see WHO you are, and you give them what they need to feel good, until they’re, yeah... (Interview, 6/10/2009)

The quote above clearly illuminates Ms. Lewis philosophy of education and her ELL pedagogy. In response to the numerous questions in formal and informal interviews, and personal conversations, Ms. Lewis never forgot to foreground the importance of relationship building, i.e., the importance of the connection between teacher and student for students’ learning and development, while backgrounding the subject matter (e.g.,
English language, reading strategies) that the teacher teaches. A line by line analysis of the above text demonstrates just how much Ms. Lewis emphasizes the importance of relationship:

1 I really learned that ELL teaching is one where you get to know individuals
2 and you just get to know a person from the heart,
3 and you definitely have to have certain structure,
4 and you have to have certain ways of teaching,
5 but you’re teaching people, you’re not teaching English,
6 and it’s so when you’re teaching people.
7 You know that the subject is in English,
8 BUT you meet them in the relationship,
9 where you see WHO you are,
10 and you give them what they need to feel good,
11 until they’re, yeah...

In line 1 and 2, Ms. Lewis foregrounded “get to know individuals” and “knowing a person from the heart” while backgrounding “structure” (e.g., social organizations) (line 3) and “ways of teaching” (e.g., strategies and skills) (line 4) because “you’re teaching people, you are not teaching English” (line 5), which implies that the intersubjective relationships are of primary importance and that “the subject,” i.e., English language arts, is secondary. Ms. Lewis also emphasized that the teacher also gains self realization (e.g., “see who you are”) in a relational context where the teacher meets students as persons and provides them “what they need to feel good.”

In response to the question of the role of teacher in the creation of a classroom environment, Ms. Lewis answered, “I think it’s huge” without any hesitation, and reiterated the importance of a trust relationship between teacher and students to inspire students to work hard for themselves: “So my job is to believe in them, their job is to believe in themselves”:

1 I think that the teacher is as equally important to the students...
I think it’s 50% teacher and 50% students.
And I think that students, you know when someone respects you;
you know when someone is working for you;
you know when people expect great things from you,
and you know when they’re doing the work, too.
If I came in and sat down and told my students to get to work
and then went to my office and did nothing,
they’re not going to respond to me.
But if they see me working hard for them,
if they see me trying,
if they see me talking to them and making an effort,
they reach back with the same.
So my job is to believe in them,
their job is to believe in themselves
But it takes 50% from me and 50% from them.
And my job is to work hard for them,
and their job is to work hard for themselves. (Interview, 6/10/2009)

When the above statement is analyzed in terms of the use of modal verbs and pronouns, it can be said that in the main clause (lines 1, 2, and 3), Ms. Lewis used a mental process clause (Fairclough, 2003), “I think,” to give a low level of commitment to her statement attributing the creation of the classroom learning environment to be 50% due to the teacher’s contribution and 50% due to the students’ contribution. However, by using markers of modalization (Fairclough, 2003), Ms. Lewis made a strong commitment to her statement that students come to work hard as a result of a relational context between teacher and students, using terms such as ‘is’ (lines 1, 2, 4, 14, 15, 17, and 18), ‘respects’ (line 3), ‘expect’ (line 5), ‘see’ (lines 11 and 12), and ‘reach’ (line 13) in the subordinate clauses.

The use of pronouns demonstrates Ms. Lewis’s personal commitment to building trust relationships between herself and her students by moving past general truth statements characterized by third person pronouns, such as ‘teacher’ (lines 1 and 2),
‘someone’ (lines 3 and 4), ‘people’ (line 5), and ‘they’ (line 6), and committing to personal truth statements characterized by first-person pronouns: ‘I’ (line 7), ‘my’ (lines 7, 8, 14, 17), and ‘me’ (lines 10, 11, 12, 13, 16). Ms. Lewis also created dialogicality by weaving assertions like “...my job is to believe in them, their job is to believe in themselves” (lines 14-15) and “...my job is to work hard for them and their job is to work hard for themselves” (lines 17-18) together with a denial set within a hypothetical condition, i.e., “If I came in and sat down and told my students to get to work and then went to my office and did nothing, they’re not going to respond to me” (lines 7-9).

It can be said that Ms. Lewis’s ideology about teaching is that “good teachers join self and subject, and students in the fabric of life. Good teachers possess a capacity for connectedness. They are able to weave a complex web of connections themselves, their subjects, and their students so that their students can learn to weave a world for themselves.” (Palmer, 1998, p. 11) Ms. Lewis’s asserted that students achieve to the degree that their teacher believes in them, in other words, that a teacher’s beliefs about her students are self-fulfilling prophecy (Merton, 1948), which is consistent with Rist’s research (1971) that differential attitudes and treatments resulting from teachers’ beliefs about their students, in this case their perceptions of deficit in inner city African American students of low socioeconomic status, were delivered covertly and overtly to students, and caused the low academic achievement of those students (Rist, 1971), affirming the role of schooling in social reproduction.

Ms. Lewis’s strong belief about the critical importance of mutual trust between teacher and students for students’ academic success is consistent with her authentic interest in human beings and love of “people’s personal narratives.” Ms. Lewis also
mentioned that when she became tired, she could regain her energy by reflecting on her students’ efforts. She was motivated by her students’ hard work, just as her students were motivated to work hard as a result of her efforts and hard work for them:

I love hearing peoples’ personal narratives. I love the stories. So, it helps me develop relationships because I am authentically interested in who they are as human beings, because that feeds me a little bit. That’s one of the reasons I’m here. But I think that I don’t know that I ever call myself are really great teacher, but I would call myself a person who really, really wants to do well, and I’m motivated by my students. When I’m feeling tired and the exhausted, and I just want to give up, and I have a student who’s trying hard, I say to myself, “How can I not work as hard as they are? (Interview, 6/10/2009)

Discourses of “Being an Educator” and “Community”:
“Being an educator is, every child that’s walking on the streets belongs to me.”

R: Who do you think is responsible for ELLs’ learning?
T: I think the whole community.
R: School community?
T: I think all of us, even beyond the school. I think that what I’ve learned, being an educator is, every child that’s walking on the streets belongs to me, in a way. (Interview, 6/7/2010)

As seen in the above statement, Ms. Lewis considered “all of us” to be responsible for ELLs’ learning, even those “beyond the school.” Ms. Lewis foregrounded the importance of community for ELLs’ learning, and was silent about other factors, such as structural issues (e.g., policies enacted by the federal government, or the curriculum designed by states), teaching methods employed by individual teachers, or individual students’ learning abilities. She said that she learned the full meaning of “being an educator” after she became a teacher and that, as an educator, “every child that’s walking on the streets belongs to” her. In the following passage, she said that all of us have a
responsibility not only for ELLs, but also for all children in the world, “regardless of where they come from”:

Before I was a teacher, if I saw a student getting into a fight with someone, I would walk away and think, oh boy, there’s trouble and my husband laughs. Because now, if I see two young boys getting into a fight I’ll walk right up to them and say, “This is my community, and you are a part of my community. What’s the problem?” I think, too often, we just look away and people fall down and they need help getting up, and we say, it’s not my problem. And I think that when we look at children in the world, I wouldn’t even say just ELLs, it’s all of our responsibilities...We have as human beings, we have a responsibility to support, to love, and to create, communities where children regardless of where they come from can thrive. (Interview, 6/7/2010)

Ms. Lewis contrasted her lack of involvement before she became a teacher and her active engagement with children in the community after she became a teacher. She said that before she became a teacher, she would just walk away when she saw two young boys fighting, but after becoming a teacher, she “will walk right up to them.” In this excerpt, Ms Lewis uses the subjunctive mood and progresses from the use of personal “I” statements to the use of plural “we” statements. In doing this, she assumes the authority to represent what people usually think and how they behave in the situations she described, and how people should think (i.e., ..when we look at children in the world, I wouldn’t even say just ELLs, it’s all of our responsibility.) and what people should do in general (i.e., ...we have a responsibility to support, to love...). Her multiple use of “I” statements rather than passivization brings out her implicit belief about her role as an active teacher: to take responsibility and action for her students’ learning. This is in congruence with her stated belief about her role as a teacher, “Real learning takes place, that’s my role.” Her frequent use of “we” statements and her frequent references to “community” indicate that she recognizes that “learning is not a solidarity act, rather it is
an integral part of the social practices of any community” (Norton & Toohey, 2004, p. 94), and that local discourses constitute and construct the forces surrounding the education of ELLs within the situated sociopolitical context (Foucault, 1980).

Ms. Lewis also recalled when she was “moving toward as an educator,” and when she came to realize that her students were not thriving. At first, she was not able to recognize what her students were interested in and why they did not work hard. She did not know if her students improved their reading and writing abilities while taking her class, “why they weren’t turning in their work,” why they “put their head on the desk,” and why they did not pay attention in class:

I’ve learned how to teach ELLs is through the school of life, you know what I mean? I was thrown into the school and I failed horribly. I did OK that building community, my students liked me; we had a lot of fun together. But as far as, were they stronger reading, were they stronger at writing, were they stronger at critical thinking after being in my class? I don’t know. I couldn’t measure it. I had no way of knowing. When they weren’t turning in their work, I couldn’t tell you why they weren’t turning in their work. When they put their head on the desk, I couldn’t say, were they bored? Was it too difficult? Did they just tune out? Was I not motivating educator and I saw my students not thriving. And so what I found is, as I was moving toward as an educator and I saw my student not thriving, I tried to read and I just paid to find more information that was specific to me in my situation. And I think that’s where I started to learn as an educator. (Interview, 6/10/2009)

Ms. Lewis’s statement in the above text, “what I found is, as I was moving toward as an educator and I saw my student not thriving, I tried to read and I just paid...” implies the critical importance of the kind of approach teachers take, rather than the specific strategies and skills they employ in teaching ELLs. In other words, the teacher’s pedagogical framework is more important than her instruction methods, although both are necessary. Depending on whether a teacher approaches teaching with a viewpoint based
on culturally relevant pedagogy or on assimilative pedagogy, students can be engaged or disengaged in their learning and development. This is in agreement with Cummins’ (1996) argument that “good teaching does not require us to internalize an endless list of instructional techniques. Much more fundamental is the recognition that human relationships are central to effective instruction” (p. 73).

Ms. Lewis identified within herself a strong passion for teaching English learner students, and particularly for teaching students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds: “..when it comes to where my heart is, and where my passion is, it’s right with the students that I’m teaching right now.”

1 I could have made much more money than I am making now  
2 if I had continue working as a manager in an insurance company.  
3 I could work as a professor at a college.  
4 but I chose to be a high school teacher  
5 because I wanted to do something valuable.  
6 Even though I liked the manger job,  
7 but I did not love it.  
8 I love my job so much now. (Interview, 6/10/2009)

As seen in the transcript excerpt above, using the subjunctive mood, Ms. Lewis assumed that she “could have made much more money than she is making now” (line 1) if she “had continued working as a manager in an insurance company” (line 2), and she also assumed that she “could work as a professor at a college” (line 3). However, she “chose to be a high school teacher” (line 4) “because she wanted to do something valuable.” (line 5) Ms. Lewis reiterated, “even though I liked the manager job, but I did not love it” (line 6 and 7) and “I love my job so much now.” (line 8) Here, Ms. Lewis’s reiterated her strong passion for and commitment to the education of ELLs and her recognition of the value in “being a high school teacher.”
Ms. Lewis used the contrastive coordinate conjunction “even though” (line 6) and “but” (line 7) in order to foreground her perception of the importance of the teacher’s work in society, “I wanted to do something valuable” (line 5) and how much she loves her current teaching job, while backgrounding that she could have worked as a professor at a college (line 3). Her presented statements also bring with them several assumptions; “what is ‘said’ in a text is against a background of what is ‘unsaid’, but taken as given.” (Fairclough 2003, p. 40) One assumption Ms. Lewis brings is that the work of a high school teacher is more valuable than the work of a manager at an insurance company or the work of a college professor. Another assumption is implicit in her statement that she “could have made much more money” if she had continued to work as a manager in an insurance company, rather than having been working as a teacher: she implies that society does not really value teaching very much, and that this gives her a kind of countercultural position because she considers teaching to be the most valuable work possible.

In line with her strong belief in the value of the teacher’s work, Ms. Lewis believes that teachers should take responsibility for students’ learning rather than blaming students for their failures:

I think that the teachers really do, they have more power than they give themselves credit because so many times, teachers want to quickly say, it’s the kids’ fault that they’re not learning instead of, what am I pulling my weight, am I doing what’s required of me? so in that sense, They’re huge part of the education.

“Why am I here? Why am I doing this?” It doesn’t matter if you’re twelve years old or if you’re 100 years old. You know when you’re not learning, and you’re not progressing, and your time is being wasted. And when I looked at, I had 200 students, a case of 200 students, there are 200 lives at stake. 1 year that could be lost for them because I don’t have the skills. How could I live with myself if I just let that go? Just because I’m getting a paycheck doesn’t mean that I’m earning money, or even earning the respect or the, I don’t know how to put it, you know. So I really feel strongly about to that. (Interview, 6/10/2009)
Ms. Lewis mentioned that many Latino students dropped out of school because students did not feel that they belonged to the school, a feeling invoked by problematic conflicts between students and teachers:

The previous teacher was forcing them to write. Students got stressed about writing and did not try to write at all at first when she first taught these students. Then I encouraged them and just helped them, Right now, they are getting better and better, I think it is important to empower students, not just to force them. (Interview, 1/25/2008)

Ms. Lewis’s teaching philosophy is based on empowering ELLs by giving ownership to each student. She always tried to remember these five things while interacting with students: (a) Everyone is capable of growth; (b) Students will stand up to a challenge if the teacher gives them support; (c) Everyone deserves respect and dignity; (d) Never be mean or cruel to the students; and (e) Say all the time, “I think you can do better.” (Interview, 2008) In alignment with her teaching philosophy, Ms. Lewis believes that the most important part of her role as a teacher to be providing for students a consistent and safe environment that enables them to develop their abilities, and helping her students to challenge themselves. Ms. Lewis said that her role is to equip her students with “the skills they need to be successful,” to give them “access to shared cultural capital,” and to encourage and inspire them to be “individuals who learn and grow”:

I think my first role and the most important role is to provide my students with the skills they need to be successful and competitive in this country and can do with academic peers. And so that’s the first and most important thing is. The second one is to give access to shared cultural capital so that they understand some of the limitations and some of the great benefits of this culture that they live in. And then Lastly I think it’s to encourage them and inspire them to the individuals who learn and grow. And so, those would be the big ones. (Interview, 1/25/2008)
The dominant in vivo codes circulating Ms. Lewis’s stated beliefs and her enacted pedagogical practices were those of a discourse of resource views about English learners. Ms. Lewis always foregrounded how ELLs are “brilliant” despite “some of the trauma from seeing war, and some of the insecurity from being displaced so many times” (Interview, 6/7/2009), while silencing discourses about what ELLs do not have or what they need to learn in school: “They’re brilliant, they’re brilliant and with that comes some of the trauma from seeing war, and some of the insecurity from being displaced so many times.” (Interview, 6/10/2009) Even regarding the question of what kinds of difficulties or challenges she confronted when teaching ELLs, Ms. Lewis chose to point out how “the school doesn’t recognize what an extraordinary group ELL students are” and reiterated how ELLs are international and multilingual, and have extraordinary life experiences: “...some are institutional, where the school doesn’t recognize what an extraordinary group ELL students are. They’re international, they’re multilingual, they have life experiences extraordinary.” (Interview, 2009)

In response to the question about the differences between ELLs and the native English speaking students, Ms. Lewis praised ELLs as “enthusiastic learners” and contrasted them favorably with native English speaking students who were “more interested in grades than learning.” She stated that she had similar expectations toward ELLs and native English speaking students, and emphasized that ELLs do not “think grades,” and thus forced her to “be a better teacher”:
ELLs are enthusiastic learners who just want to learn, whereas native English speaking students are more interested in grades than learning. Most ELLs want to understand and do not think grades, so that they force me to be a better teacher. Native English speaking students tend to just shoot for grades. My expectations toward ELLs and native English speaking students are similar in terms of English, cognition, life experiences, etc. (Interview, 2/20/2008)

Ms. Lewis’s repeated utterances were all about what ELLs bring to the classroom: their lived experiences, values, and perspectives, i.e., funds of knowledge. She (re)emphasized how ELLs bring “such rich experiences to the classroom” with an example from one of her classes:

I love teaching a group of people who have lived in different parts of the world, they bring such rich experiences to the classroom. And, you know you will show a picture, I showed a picture of a scorpion once. And one of my students said, oh I remember, when we were in Kenya, and the scorpions came out. I have never seen a scorpion. (Interview, 2009)

Ms. Lewis again contrasted the “rich” discussions she had with her ELL students with those that she tried “to pull out of” her native English speaking students. She described how creative ELLs are while finding ways to make themselves understand and be understood in English:

The discussions that we have ours so rich! And despite limits in English, they’ll find a way. They’ll turn to someone and say, you know, “How do you say this word in English? or “Get me a book. I want to see what the picture is.” So we have these discussions that I’m trying to pull out of my non ELL students. I can bring up the topic like civil war and my ELL students, from Mexico all the way to Sudan, have opinions; they have ideas about it. (Interview, 6/10/2009)

Ms. Lewis criticized the American “sink or swim” school system that fails ELLs despite the fact that they work “double, triple as hard.” She said that if ELLs are not successful at learning English, they get no recognition from the school system. Speaking
of the American school system, she said that “they don’t necessarily understand the
difficulties and intensity of learning a second or third language,” and that ELLs are
“competing against people who have been speaking this language their entire life and are monolingual”:

And when you’re working in ELL, you see, students working double, triple as hard because in the American school system, you come in, you don’t speak English, we don’t cater to that. We say, “Go to the math class. Go to the science class. Go to the history class. And, even though you don’t necessarily speak the language and it’s not your fault that your parents moved here, but even though you don’t speak it, it’s sink or swim.” And you’ll see students who are intensively learning the language that they, if they are not successful at it, will not get recognition academically by the system, and if they’re competing against people who have been speaking this language their entire life and are monolingual, so they don’t necessarily understand the difficulties and intensity of learning a second or third language. (Interview, 6/7/2010)

Ms. Lewis also noted that one of the greatest difficulties ELLs are confronted with is a societal deficit perspective toward ELLs, which causes them to lack a sense of belonging. Such a deficit discourse within the educational system regarding the “ELL Problem” makes it impossible for ELLs to succeed in school:

...in general, students get treated as if they have something wrong with them, as if they have a deficit, as if they were born with something inherently wrong with them because they don’t speak English, or because they’re not from America, or because they come from a country where there’s a war....They’re human beings, We’re all human beings. And so sometimes students will complain about feeling misunderstood or feeling marginalized based off of someone’s very narrow perspective of what they know about an entire continent like Africa. (Interview, 2008)

I am VERY sensitive to the fact that my ELL students are in an impossible system that often does more damage than good. Many of ELL students are demoralized by the impossibility of a school with over 2000 students riddled with teachers who discuss the “ELL program” like it’s an educational scourge or plague. (Interview, 6/10/2009)
Critical Sociocultural Discourses About Language and Literacy Development: “It’s about creating a community of learners”

Good ELL program recognizes a diverse population, recognize diverse needs, and does what it can to support all types of students in the program, and also it’s not just about language, it’s about inclusion. It’s about success in life, and it’s about creating community of learners that doesn’t exclude the nonimmigrant population. (Interview, 6/10/2009)

The above quote clearly demonstrates Ms. Lewis’s awareness of the importance of sociocultural discourses for language and literacy development. As to the question about the factors that make a good ESL program, Ms. Lewis described the various lived experiences of her diverse English learner students and their expectations toward school in order to emphasize the need for a dynamic and flexible educational program: “I just think that it’s so multifaceted. I think that it needs to be a flexible dynamic program that recognizes changing needs of ELL students. We have students who are refugees, We’ll have to post-traumatic stress disorder, have limited formal education, and are dealing with a lot of emotional difficulties. We have students who come, and if they would be in AP classes and college classes if they had stayed in their home countries, and they need the support to prepare for college and get into those highly competitive academic programs and we have everything in between.” She also pointed out that a “good ELL program recognizes a diverse population, recognize diverse needs” and includes all students, including nonimmigrant students, in the ELL program, saying that “it’s not just about language, it’s about inclusion. It’s about success in life, and it’s about creating community of learners that doesn’t exclude the nonimmigrant population.” It can be clearly seen that Ms. Lewis believes in the critical importance of the community of learners (CoL) for ELLs’ learning and development, which is in agreement with the
sociocultural theorists’ concept that learning occurs through mutual interactions between/among people with similar goals or interests within a community of practice (CoP) (Engeström, 1987; Leonti’ev, 1981; Wenger, 1998). Human beings learn the knowledge, skills, and dispositions they need to engage themselves in the world by taking part in the community of practice (CoP), where they can progress from being peripheral participants to being legitimate full participants in society (Wenger, 1998) by appropriating the semiotic tools, such as language and sign systems, which are necessary in order for them to achieve the purposes and goals of their actions (Vygotsky, 1978).

For Ms. Lewis, the point of teaching reading is not to “teach books,” but to help students learn to question and develop opinions, to learn a process of meaning making (Bruner, 1990) and meaning taking (Heath, 1983) through the connection of text with “internal dialogue” so that students will develop self, and develop “a different sense of the world” she lives in:

...it’s interesting because there are a lot of teachers out there that teach books. They don’t teach how to get into a text. How do I ask questions about this text? How do I develop an opinion? How do I develop an opinion taking things from the text, the external text and then the internal dialogue for myself, how do I use this to develop a different sense of the world I live in? That’s the exciting stuff about reading. (Interview, 6/7/2010)

The statement, “how do I use this to develop a different sense of the world I live in?” refers to the connection of reading with the world, i.e., reading words through the world (Freire, 1970). Reading is not about learning decontextualized reading strategies, word definitions, phonemic awareness or vocabulary, but learning about the connections between self, text, and the world. This knowledge is embodied in critical literacy, that is, literacy for human liberation and social change through reflection in/on actions and
praxis (Freire, 1970). Ms. Lewis again reiterated the concept of critical literacy when she said that in order to become a good teacher, a teacher needs to know not only the content and the objective of the lesson, but also the philosophy behind her teaching in order to help students go “beyond the classroom doors”:

I don’t think it’s a single tiered thing. I don’t think it’s a single. I think you definitely need to know the content that you’re trying to teach. You definitely need to have an objective about why you want to teach this content, but the philosophy also as to, when your students come to you and say, “Why do we have to learn this? It needs to go beyond, “because the state told us so.” It needs to go beyond, like what you are doing, why are you being able to help me? You as a teacher better know what exactly you’re teaching, why you’re teaching and how is that going to help your students beyond the classroom doors. (Interview, 6/10/2009)

Ms. Lewis recalled a discussion among the language arts teachers in her school concerning which books they would choose for classroom teaching. She disagreed with another teacher’s idea of using William Shakespeare’s play “Romeo and Juliet” for teaching, because that teacher could not identify the intended purpose and result of teaching the book. And she did not think “teaching is as simple as pull out a book that someone else has designed, open up to page 27, reading the book and answer the questions. “:

I think that there’s this sort of push to fulfill a state requirement, or some sort of core curriculum requirement, but, like for example, this school in the language arts department, we were having a discussion about Shakespeare teaching Romeo and Juliet. And when I asked, “What purpose does teaching this book serve? Why are we teaching the book? And by the time you’re finished teaching that book, what do you want to see differences in your students? How will they think different, act different, read different?” And, you know, they kept going back to, “he’s a famous author, and we’re really need to teach him because he’s famous.” And I just think, “Well what research do we have that our students will be more cognitively prepared, more socially emotionally prepared, or even more prepared just in literacy by just simply teaching this book.” And so I think that I agree with
you that I’ve seen just to this superficial look at education, and I think that sometimes people think teaching is as simple as pull out a book that someone else has designed, open up to page 27, reading the book and answer the questions. And if that’s teaching, anyone can do it, so why gets a degree? Why call yourself a professional? So it does disconcert me when I speak with peers, and it’s not all, but when I do speak with those peers that are comfortable doing that, I’d become worried about their purpose and about, if I get the student that they taught, that students going to struggle in my class because I’m going to ask them to do more than just open a book and to answer questions. You know what I’m saying? (Interview, 6/7/2010)

The above underlined part, “What purpose does teaching this book serve? Why are we teaching the book? And by the time you’re finished teaching that book, what do you want to see different in your students? How will they think different, act different, read different?” reveals that Ms. Lewis views literacy as a social practice associated with power, identity, and agency (Lewis, Enciso, & Moje, 2007, p. xi). Literacy should result not only in the enhancement of the individual, but should also result in social actions that make a difference in society. Teaching literacy is not only asking and answering questions about book content, but is teaching ways of knowing, thinking, acting, and interacting, as elucidated in Gee’s (1999) explanation of the New Literacy Studies:

The New Literacy Studies approach literacy as part and parcel of, and inextricable from, specific social, cultural, institutional, and political practices. Thus, literacy is, in a sense, “multiple”: literacy becomes different “literacies,” as reading and writing are differently and distinctively shaped and transformed inside different sociocultural practices. Additionally, these sociocultural practices always have inherent and value-laden, but often different, implications about what count as “acceptable” identities, actions, and ways. (p. 356)

In the same vein, Ms. Lewis explained that “Learning a language is rarely as simple as building a new vocabulary or giving students a pronunciation guide. Language learning is complex. Language development is not a sequential process, like moving from reception phase to a production phase” (Interview, 6/10/2009). Here Ms. Lewis clearly
positions herself as an adherent to the sociocultural perspective of language learning and
development. Language learning, as seen from a sociocultural perspective, does not occur
according to Piaget’s developmental stages: development occurring first, followed by
learning. Human learning and development understood from a sociocultural perspective
does not take place in sequential steps. Learning occurs through social interactions via the
mediational tools in community of practice (CoP) in/across activity systems (see Chapter
II: Sociocultural Approach for a more detailed explanation). Ms. Lewis further supported
the nonsequential nature of language learning by explaining that what might be perceived
as the silent period of language acquisition can actually be explained in terms of the
learner’s individual personality:

Another example, while the textbooks indicate that people first acquire a language
through reception and then move into a production phase, I have found this
inaccurate. Many of my highly extroverted students attempt English production
within seconds of entering the class. On the other hands, some of my highly
introverted students can rarely coaxed to say a word, even after years of exposure.
However, their silence does not mean that they are still in a receptive stage of
language learning. They simply prefer using non-verbal modalities of expression.
(Email Interview, 7/24/2010)

Ms. Lewis was familiar with theories of learning and development, and the
scholars associated with those theories, such the cognitive constructivism of Piaget, the
sociocultural approach of Vygotsky and the transformative pedagogy of Cummins, and
the language acquisition theories of Steven Krashen and the LAD (Language
Acquisition Device) of Chomsky:

A lot of people think that Piaget and Vygotsky have similar ideologies, but
Vygotsky goes more into the social constructs, while Piaget goes much more into
the cognitive constructs. (Interview, 6/10/2009)
I’m familiar with Chomsky, I’m familiar with Steven Krashen, I’m familiar with Cummins, and I try to keep abreast of the information that comes in. (Interview, 6/7/2010)

Ms Lewis defined language acquisition (LA) as “the ability to communicate in a language clearly” with an understanding of the “cultural nuance that comes with the language, and the flexibility of language;”

I think with language acquisition, it is the ability to communicate in a language clearly, and within that language, understanding things such as cultural nuance that comes with the language, and the flexibility of language, and the fluidity of language. And you approach that with strategies and skill bases, and it speaks nothing toward a person’s intelligence, it just speaks to what kind of support they’re given in developing the skill. (Email Interview, 7/24/2010)

In the excerpt above, Ms. Lewis recognized that the connotative meaning potentials of language in context and the ability to speak language is not so much related to the learner’s intelligence as it is reflective of “what kind of support they’re given in developing the skill.” She explained why the strategies and skills approach to language acquisition cannot fully address the cultural nuances of meaning of language in context and the environmental factors of language acquisition: Language learning and literacy development is not an issue of what is inside the head of the learner, but about the kinds of environment and the social interactions the language learner experiences. This is in agreement with with the concept of a situated/sociocultural approach to learning and development, as set forth by Gee (2008):

A situated/sociocultural viewpoint looks at knowledge and learning not primarily in terms of representations in the head, although there is no need to deny that such representations exist and play an important role. Rather, it looks at knowledge and learning in terms of a relationship between an individual with both a mind and a body and an environment in which the individual thinks, feels, acts, and interacts. (p. 81)
Ms. Lewis noted that the last 10 years had brought huge changes to the systems and means of multimodal communication among her students. Her constant efforts to bring the funds of knowledge of her individual English learner student’s, i.e., their cultural practices, resources, interests, and perspectives into her classroom teaching and learning processes are clearly manifested in the following statement about how she is going to use multimodal literacies in her future teaching:

I can’t rely on experiences I’ve had 10 years ago to inform me today of what’s happening. And I mean like one of the big pushes that I’m working for next year is how to use social networking in my classroom, such as how can I, every student has a cell phone. And I can look at this as a deficit like, “You’re distracting yourself with a cell phone,” or I can say, “Hmm, can I create a tweeter or a blog or something, where I can ask a question to my students, put the LCD projecting up on the board, have them take out a tool that I’m asking them to hide, I’m fighting against. Why fight? Take it out and say, “Ok, here’s your question. Go ahead and tweet your answers. Working groups, them up there.” Or, kids are using facebook and myspace, “Why not create a space for academic discussions?” Show them productive uses for these social networking because it’s out there, and it’s a part of our existing culture, so why are we so afraid of it? (Interview, 6/7/2010)

In summary, this analysis of Ms. Lewis’s statements and utterances clearly indicate the alignment of Ms. Lewis’s beliefs about ELL pedagogy with the critical sociocultural perspective: that all learning occurs out of social interactions (Vygotsky, 1978), that good teaching cannot be reduced to techniques or strategies, but can only be accomplished in relational contexts, that is, in interrelated, layered activity systems, and that in the process of teaching and learning, the teacher (re)constructs his/her own identities in and through mutual interactions with students in a discourse community of learners. Also, Ms. Lewis’s statement about giving students “what they need to feel good” (in line 10 of the first transcript excerpt of this section) implies that she believes creating an environment in which students “feel good” is an essential element for learning.
According to CHAT theory, emotions are an integral ingredient for human learning and development and “reflect relationships between motives (needs) and success, or the possibility of success, of realizing the action of the subject that responds to these motives” (Leont’ev, 1978, p. 20 cited in Roth & Lee, 2007). Additionally, her statements about the structural and systematic impossibility for ELLs to succeed in US schools manifests her strong belief in the critical importance of societal conditions and discourses on human learning and development, and that she understands all the intertwined issues of power, identity, agency from a critical sociocultural perspective. The teaching methods chosen by Ms. Lewis clearly demonstrate her belief that that language learning and literacy development is not just a transfer of information from one brain to another brain, but must be learned and acquired by human beings as they participate as legitimate full participants within an authentic interactional matrix of moving dynamic activity systems through a process of changing roles in/across contexts (Engeström, 1997; Gutiérrez, 2008; Gutierrez & Stone, 2000; Wenger, 1998)

Into the English as a Second Language Classroom

As soon as I arrived at Ms. Lewis’s classroom at the right side of the three connected buildings arranged in a rectangle shape, I could see the writing above the door. “Ms. Lewis’s ESL classroom: Challenge yourself to new knowledge and understand it.” Entering the classroom, I saw on the white wall, a picture of Mahatma Gandhi, who was dressed in white clothing, had a very skinny body, and was squatting on his heels. Below appeared his quote, “An eye for an eye will make the whole world blind.” On the dark green board in the back of the classroom near the door, there was a poster of Albert Einstein with his quote, “I have no particular talent. I am merely inquisitive.” Next to the poster, there was a painting of a handshake between a black hand with a white hand, with the name of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. below, and his quote: “Life’s persistent and most urgent question is, ‘what are you doing for others?’” (Field note, 1/28/2008)
These classroom descriptions in my field notes were written on the day I first visited Ms. Lewis’s class, and I reflected on them: “Based on these posters and the sentence on the door, I could draw some conclusions about Ms. Lewis’s teaching philosophy and her life philosophy. Gandhi represents the ethical mind, Albert Einstein symbolizes the creative mind, and Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. represents the mind that is respectful to all people who are minority persons. If we combine all of the minds of these three figures, we can become a whole person” (Researcher’s Journal, 1/28/2008). These images described above, in themselves, served as a set of signifiers representing Ms. Lewis’s pedagogical discourses, and as semiotic representations of her teaching philosophy.

Above the whiteboard in the center of the front of the room were six pieces of paper, each a different color, which proclaimed six elements of writing and explained each element: voice in yellow, sentence fluency in red, ideas and content in orange, connections in green, organization in blue, and word choice in pink. On the left side of the white board there was a bookshelf, and on the right side of the whiteboard there was a television. On the left side of the classroom was the teacher’s room, with the teacher’s computer, books, desks, chairs, and crayons, pens, pencils, and notebooks, and with two computers that students could use. There were 36 desks grouped in sets of four, three sets of desks in a row and three sets of desks in a column. (Field note, 2/20/2008)

The color coding of writing elements above the front blackboard of the classroom - “voice in yellow, sentence fluency in red, ideas and content in orange, connections in green, organization in blue, and word choice in pink” - were used for writing instruction over time. The arrangement of the desks and chairs in groups of four represented the multiple interactions among students and teacher in the classroom learning community in the classroom discourses and interactions.
In the back of the classroom, there was a shelf with four file boxes with summary charts and participation sheets inside indicating what levels of students Ms. Lewis is teaching this semester: 2A ELL (ESL), 1A 9th grade language arts, 3A ELL (ESL), and 3B ELL (ESL). On the playground side of the back of the classroom, there were two bookshelves with various Spanish and English books and English-Spanish bilingual dictionaries. Next to the two bookshelves, there were two computers. (Field note, 2/20/2008)

The four computers, the English-Spanish bilingual dictionaries, Spanish and English literature books, and the summary charts in the back of the container box were also used as mediating resources for the creation of classroom learning community over time.

Ms. Lewis, who said that education should “influence society and communities in wise and reasonable ways,” empowered students by connecting ELLs’ life experiences and interests with in-school literacy practices, and by creating expansive learning cycles that encompassed the whole community of parents, other teachers, university and graduate students at the local university near Birch Hill High School. The dominant and overarching thematic discourses circulating in Ms. Lewis’s utterances, actions, and interactions in her ESL classroom during the time period from November 2008 to May 2009 were: (1) During the Spring Semester of 2008: (a) Pedagogy of Reading Strategies and Vocabulary Instruction; (b) Promoting Motivation through Scores and Competition: “Extra Points! Extra Points!” (2) From the Fall Semester of 2008 to the Spring Semester of 2009: (a) Shared Knowledge Production in Community of Learners through Sociocritical Literacies: “Let’s be civil rights people. Let’s learn as a means of changing the world”; (b) Empowering ELLs through Positive Discursive Positioning: “Yes, you can”; (c) Changing Roles in/across Contexts: ELLs as Learners, Teachers, Researchers,
and Social Activists; (d) Expansive Learning Cycles in Community of Learners from a CHAT Perspective; and (e) Epilogue.

During the Spring Semester of 2008

Over the course of the study period, the pedagogical practices of Ms. Lewis evolved, beginning as a pedagogy consisting mostly of reading strategies and vocabulary instruction and later, during the fall semester of 2008, maturing into a truly culturally relevant pedagogy. During the spring semester of 2008, the pedagogy of Ms. Lewis was characterized by what is termed a *hybrid-borderland pedagogy* (Buendía et al., 2003), drifting between assimilative pedagogy and culturally relevant pedagogy, in and across the continuities and discontinuities of the overarching discourses. The visible parts of Ms. Lewis’s pedagogy, the materials she used for teaching and the objectives on the blackboard, demonstrated the possibility for culturally relevant pedagogy. The two texts Ms. Lewis used for teaching ELLs were Martin Luther King Jr.’s 1963 speech, *I have a dream*, which argues for the freedom and equality of all people, and Ishmael Beah’s *A long way gone: Memoirs of a boy soldier*, which describes the author’s experiences as a 12-year-old child soldier during the decade-long civil war in Sierra Leone. These two texts relate to English language learners’ lives because most of the ELLs in Ms. Lewis’s class were students of color, and some of them were refugee students who experienced civil war in their native countries before coming to the US.

However, the interactions between Ms. Lewis and her students and the discourses that she used in the process of teaching were quite different from what was seen from the visible elements. The texts were connected to the student’s experiences, but the ways in
which Ms. Lewis led the class during instruction were more focused on teacher-centered explanations about reading strategies and vocabulary instruction, focused on linguistic aspects and displayed questions, rather than connecting with the individual student’s interests and lived experiences and inviting them into classroom teaching. The discourses dominating Ms. Lewis’s ESL class during the spring semester of 2008 (January, 2008 - May, 2008) were composed of (1) Pedagogy of Reading Strategies and Vocabulary Instruction and (2) Promoting Motivation through Scores and Competition: “Extra Points! Extra Points!”

**Pedagogy of Reading Strategies and Vocabulary Instruction**

During the spring semester of 2008, Ms. Lewis usually started class by saying, “Ok, let’s look at our objectives today. We are going to examine the language and content objectives today,” and then read the objectives written on the blackboard in front along with students, such as:

Objectives: By the end of the class, SWBAT (Students Will Be Able To) use image strategy by creating image during reading, decoding strategy by linking vocabulary to get the meaning. (Field note, 2/20/2008)

The lesson objectives on March 30, 2008 were also focused on reading comprehension strategies and vocabulary instruction as follows:

By the end of class, SWBAT...
- identify 3 reading strategies that improve reading comprehension
- decode vocabulary to increase comprehension of the text by discussing vocabulary on the vocabulary sheet
- predict future events by listing guesses on graphic organizer
(Field note, 3/20/2008)
Ms. Lewis’s first statement in class was normal teacher talk between teacher and students, introducing the language and content objectives directly in a detached manner without connecting the theme of the lesson to students’ experiences and funds of knowledge, and reciting the lesson objectives using the third person pronoun, “students” in the sentence, “By the end of the class, students will be able to....” As explicitly demonstrated in the lesson objectives above, Ms. Lewis focused on teaching reading strategies and vocabulary instruction in a noncontextualized way. The lesson objectives on January 25, February 18, February 20, March 3, March 7, April 11, April 21, and April 25 were also performed following the same pattern: “SWBT identify 3 reading strategies that improve reading comprehension” and “decode vocabulary.”

On February 20, after reading the lesson objectives listed above, Ms. Lewis asked, “Who can tell me the purpose of image strategy?” Students answered, “Imaginary.” The Hispanic boy answered, “Picture going through your mind.” Then, Ms. Lewis played some hip-hop music, and all the students got up and danced with the music. Ms. Lewis demonstrated a dance for her students and asked them to follow her lead. I reflected about having the class dance to hip-hop music:

*Ms. Lewis had demonstrated a hip-hop dance, but the dance was not an African dance; it was just a normal westerners’ disco dance. I could read her efforts to activate students’ background knowledge about Africa through music before reading the book. The students did look a little excited after moving their bodies and listening to music. From the cover picture of the book, I could tell what the book was about: the life of an African boy who suffered amid a civil war! (Researcher Journal, 2/24/2008)*

After dancing together for 5 minutes, Ms. Lewis showed the book entitled “*A long way gone: Memoirs of a boy soldier*” to the students and asked, “What’s the first thing happening in this setting?” Students answered, “He does not go to school.” Ms. Lewis
said, “Ok, bring your books.” The students went to the book closet under the window and brought out their books. On the cover of the book was a picture of an African boy walking leaned over to the right side, walking on light brown soil. On his shoulder, he carried a wooden pole, from which dangled a water bucket. The author was Ishmael Beah.

Ms. Lewis started to explain how to activate their image strategy as follows:

1. We put ourselves in the real world experience.
2. This is what I am going to do fun things.
3. You write down the words on your notes and you can find the definition of words.
4. and learn the decoding strategies.
5. I’m going to lose my voice.
6. Listen to the book and read along.
7. I want you to see something like I do when I read. (Field note, 2/20/2008)

Ms. Lewis mentioned “We put ourselves in the real world experience” (line 1). But rather than connecting the text with students’ “real world experience” (line 2), Ms. Lewis asked students to “write down the word on their notes” and stated that students could “find the definition of words” and “learn the decoding strategies” while reading (lines 3-4). Ms. Lewis also asked English learner students to decode words, just as she does while listening to the book; that is, she wanted students to learn to decode the text while listening to and reading along in the book (lines 4-5). After students listened to the tape for ten minutes, Ms. Lewis stopped the tape and asked.

1 T: What kind of family did Ishmael have?
2 S1: Divorced family.
3 T: What’s the problem with his father? I want you to pay attention to page 11.
4 S2: Many stepmothers.
5 T: Right. He has many stepmothers. Three divorced family lived together. This part is very impressing to me when Ishmael asked his mother about his father, Ishmael’s mother answered, “That man does not love me anymore.” Use this one as imagery strategy, he is a pretty sensitive boy.
6 Ss: Teacher! Teacher! [shouting] Is he rich? What job does his father have?

7 T: He is a miner. We need to be decoding the words we don’t know. If there is a word you don’t know, remember the page numbers. (Class Transcript, 2/20/2008)

Ms. Lewis asked students about what kind of family Ishmael had and students answered (turns 1-2). Ms. Lewis asked students to pay attention to page 11 and to find the information about the problems of Ishmael’s family (turn 3). Her students seemed to be interested in finding out whether Ishmael’s father was rich or not and what he did for a living, and they asked their questions in a noticeably excited voice (turn 6). However, Ms. Lewis answered without any explanations or questions, “He is a miner” and then redirected the students’ attention toward the decoding strategies for reading (turn 7) that she had listed.

If Ms. Lewis had not focused so much on reading strategies, she could have invited her students to explore their own opinions about the questions they asked regarding the cultural values defining marriage and family, and could have expanded the conversation to explore the sociocultural, historical and political contexts of the civil war in Sierra Leone and in other African countries. Ms. Lewis missed critical teaching moments by providing direct answers, and then promptly moving on to the decoding strategies listed out for her text-based teaching, saying “We need to be decoding the words we don’t know” (turn 7). Ms. Lewis could have made her class a Thirdspace for dialogic meaning making if she had invited a boy and a girl who had lived in a refugee camp into the classroom discussion, and allowed them to talk about their lived experiences in Africa. In that way, lived experiences of English learner students could have been situated in the classroom context for meaningful learning in connection with
the text, and students could have been more involved personally and motivated to learn academic knowledge and skills with higher interest, as has been demonstrated in research studies about culturally relevant pedagogy (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Valdés, 1998).

Ms. Lewis turned on the tape again and students listened to the tape for ten minutes while reading the text silently. Ms. Lewis turned off the tape and asked questions.

(T: Teacher; S: Student; Ss: Students)

1 T: Ok! Could you tell me the word you don’t know?
2 Ss: malnourished, mesmerized, capacity, fatigue, exaggeratedly, simultaneously, wharf, Mogobwemo, translucent, junction
3 T: What is “malnourished”?
4 S1: Hungry.
5 T: “mal” is a prefix and “ed” is suffix. See the word on page 5. “A number of dead people in Africa are malnourished.”
6 T: What is “mesmerize”?
7 S: (silent)
8 T: Something that captures you. How about “capacity”? 
9 Ss: Ability?
10 T: Ability to do something. For example, “Daniel has a great capacity for soccer.” How about “exaggerated”? 
11 Ss: (silent)
12 T: To add a lot more than there really is. I exaggerate when I talk about my car. Translucent? (Class Transcript, 2/20/2008)

As shown the class transcript above, Ms. Lewis’ pattern of instruction was comprised of two stages: (a) allowing students to listen to the tape while silently reading the text, and (b) after a short time, Ms. Lewis stopped the tape and asked several questions about the meanings and linguistic features of the vocabulary in IR (Initiation-Response) format, demonstrating traditional lesson structure (Cazden, 2001). She initiated the questions and her students answered her questions, following the pattern of the traditional teacher-centered class, with the typical I-R patterns (Initiations-Response)
without proceeding to the E (evaluation) or F (feedback) parts. The questions were initiated by Ms. Lewis, the students responded to her questions, and then Ms. Lewis asked another question related to reading strategies or vocabulary instruction. The majority of interactions were between the teacher and the whole class, and consisted predominantly of display questions, i.e., questions with predetermined answers already known by the teacher, which prompt learners to display their knowledge of language. The students did not have opportunities to initiate questions. Even when the students asked questions, their questions were not appreciated by the teacher, and sometimes not even acknowledged. The teacher knows everything and transfers her knowledge to ELL students, who, like empty vessels, just sit in class and respond to her simple questions.

On March 3, 2008, Ms. Lewis started the class by talking about what she did during the weekend, without inviting students to participate in her talk or asking students to talk about what they did during the weekend. As usual, the main teaching lesson was begun by reading the following lesson objectives on the blackboard:

Objectives: By the end of the class, SWBT...
- identify 3 reading strategies that improve reading comprehension
- decode vocabulary to increase comprehension of the text by discussing vocabulary on the vocabulary sheet.
- predict future events by listing guesses on graphic organizer

The lesson was focused on reading strategies, including decoding vocabulary and predicting. As explicit in the following excerpt, Ms. Lewis linked comprehension and understanding of text only with reading strategies and vocabulary decoding, rather than making the texts connect in a contextualized manner with her students’ own lived experiences and interests. The teaching lesson started with Ms. Lewis’s question:

T: What is the purpose of this book?
Understanding what it is saying is comprehension and decoding. Who can tell me what the strategy/strategies mean and the comprehension mean? This is a good time to get five extra points. Five extra points! Take a look at your notes or think of what the strategy/strategies mean.

Strategies? Take a guess

Imagine what you’re reading.

Decoding a vocabulary.

Imagining is strategies and decoding is a strategy. What do you think strategy means?

(silent)

Something you do to try to understand.

Something you plan to do.

Great. What does comprehension mean?

Great. We are looking at a plan to understand.

Imaginary

What’s going on in your mind while reading? We learned the second strategy. Who can tell me?

Decoding.

Prefix, suffix, and root. What’s another one?

Predict

Prediction. (At this time, Ms. Lewis wrote the definition of “predict” on the whiteboard.) It’s very hard to stand on the reading. As soon as you think of the text, the prediction helps you to keep on focus. If you read English books for a long time, prediction helps you. Today, we’re gonna to study decoding and predicting. Take out the vocabulary sheet. Amy! I have only two or three sheets. I have to make copies. Take a look at. Let’s a look at.

malnourished?

Decoding strategies. What is our prefix?

mal…

What’s our suffix?

...ed

What is our root?

nourish?

What does “nourish” mean?

Well fed. Nourish
(At this time, Ms. Lewis wrote the definition of each suffix, prefix, and root on the whiteboard.)

T: One of the good things, we, Spanish people study this word, we have a similar word in Spanish.
S1: People are skinning and skinning.
T: Someone who is unhealthy and needs food.
S3: How can I call a very fat person?
T: That is “well-nourished.” Rosa! Do you have your word?
S8: Yes. “feverish”
(Ms. Mary wrote the feverish on the whiteboard.)
T: Ok. The suffix is “ish,” right? What’s the root?
S10: fever
T: ok. Another word?
S6: clearing
T: Let’s get two more words and finish. And Jane! What’s the last word? (Jane is a black girl with a very curly hair.)
Joann: taut
T: This “taut” does not have prefix and suffix. Amy and I go fishing and he was holding the rope taut. “Taut” means “Keep it tight.”
T: “Feverish” Can you see the suffix here?
S2: Yes. “ish”
T: What does “ish” mean?
S3: condition
T: Next one, “clearing.” Can you see “suffix” here?
S1: “ing”
T: Clearing is an action to clear up. If you have a messy room, What do you have to do? My husband has a lot of books. And I said, “You need to clean these things.”
T: Do you guys know this word? Is there a suffix or prefix here?
S8: “inter…”
T: If you feel like your teacher is interrogating, have you ever have the experience in being interrogated by your parents and your teachers?
S3: Being attacked by questions
T: I like Michelle’s definition. Ok! “Susan,” what does that mean?
S9: “Pass out”
T: Right. Fainting is usually very sick.
S7: I had an experience in being fainted with a boy.
T: Is there a suffix?
The class continued to focus on prefixes, suffixes, and roots of vocabulary words.

The students did not have a chance to think, reflect analyze, synthesize, evaluate, and create knowledge; they just responded to Ms. Lewis’s questions. The factual linguistic features of vocabulary knowledge were being transferred from teacher to students. After teaching vocabulary decoding strategies, Ms. Lewis taught prediction strategy:

T: Who can remember the previous story?
Ss: (silent)
T: What’s the rebel group?
Ss: RUF
T: Rebelling United Front
Ss: (silent)
T: Who was selected?
S: He was selected but his brother was not selected. Shaking! They were too much trembling
T: Trembling. Right! What’s happening next?
S: Predict!
T: Yes. Predict! We’re on page 34, the second paragraph. Does anyone need a reading leader? (Field note, 3/3/2008)

During the exchange above, the students’ nonverbal responses were silence, shaking/nodding heads, note-taking, different levels of smiling, and sleeping. The students’ verbal responses are fragmented/simplified sentences, one or two words, “Yes”
or “No” responses, and talking with peers. Second language acquisition theory (Swain, 1985) emphasizes that correction or revision of ELL’s sentences within communicative and meaningful conversational contexts through the teacher’s scaffolding processes can improve their communicative performance. A barrage of questions about reading strategies and vocabulary instruction in the form of “what...?” does not allow students to think critically and creatively. ELL students’ frames of minds are being set up for reciting basic factual knowledge like prefixes, roots, and suffixes, rather than for transforming given knowledge and creating new knowledge.

Ms. Lewis never mentioned the social, political, historical, and cultural issues faced by Ishmael Beah, who had suffered from civil war in Sierra Leone and had been forced to become a child soldier at the age of 13. Even when explaining the meaning of civil war to ELLs, Ms. Lewis explained the meaning of civil war using her own personal story about when she was a junior high student. Ms. Lewis did not invite her students into the formation of her lesson, and did not expand her lesson to the contextual political and historical level where some of her students who had lived in refugee camps could make connections with their personal lived experiences:

1 T : What does the word “civil” mean?
2 Ss: (silent)
3 T: “Civil” means nice, responsible, and respectful. Nice war? Have you ever known a nice war? Pay attention to me. Think of your teacher last time. Think of your mom and dad you got mad about. Think about your sister and brother you got mad about last time. Civil war is like fighting with your family. When I was a junior high, I would like to wear my older sister’s pretty, luxurious sweater although my mom told me not to wear it. One day, I wore my sister’s sweater inside my coat and went to school. When I arrived at class, I took off my coat and walked along the hallway. Unexpectedly, I met my sister, who was a teacher at the school. She grabbed my neck (Ms. Lewis showed the motion of grabbing
her neck with her hand.) and took me to the principal’s office. My mother was called to come to school. My mom arrived at the school. Do you think there is anything the principal could do in this situation? There was no way. He asked us to go home and decide. This is civil war. What causes the civil war?

4 Ss: (silent)
5 T: They fight against each other for the control of the political power. Here’s your assignment. Imagine that you are in a war. You are going to write two paragraphs describing your life in a war. Some of you might have an experience about war, but not others. What do you do in your two paragraph writing?

6 Ss: Indented.
7 T: Good. If you are doing your homework, you will get extra points. EXTRA POINTS! If you did not turn in our participation sheet last time, turn in now. I would like you to write in your journal using the five words we learned. Ok! (pointing out the group on the left with the curly haired Hispanic boy). This group go the best points today. Journals are TWENTY points. Journals are TWENTY points! (Field note, 1/25/2008)

As explicit in the text above, Ms. Lewis defined civil war to be “like fighting with your family” (turn 3) and stated that people or countries cannot do anything about it: “There is no way” (turn 3). Ms. Lewis did not expand the causes of civil war in historical context and did not allow ELLs to think and explore their locations and the relationships between human agency and societal forces situated in a war. The focus on teaching about language structures, reading strategies, writing forms took up the whole learning space, and disallowed her students to be engaged in their own learning and development in a meaningful way.

**Promoting Motivation Through Scores and Competition: “Extra Points! Extra Points!”**

Another characteristic of the lessons during the spring semester of 2008 is that the class was operated as a collection of individuals, rather than as a community of learners
where everyone participates in activity systems, holding their own roles and responsibilities within their own ZPD (Zone of Proximal Development). ELLs self-segregated themselves in a seating pattern that corresponded with their skin colors, reflecting the segregation of real world society. Ms. Lewis did not interrupt the way the students in her class chose their seats, so their self-segregated seating pattern was maintained throughout the entire semester:

At 11:42 am, class started. There were 11 students. There were one Asian girl, one Asian boy, four Hispanic girls, one Hispanic boy, two Black girls, and one White girl. They chose which set of desks to sit at based on their skin color: two Hispanic girls on the left, the Asian and Hispanic boys in the front desks in the middle row. The White girl sat alone. Two Black girls, a Black boy, and a Hispanic girl sat in the middle desk in the middle row, and the Asian girl and a Hispanic girl sat at the back in the middle row. (Field note, 1/25/2008)

In the front row, three Black boys and one White boy took a seat in the set of four desks in the front left corner of the classroom. Two Hispanic boys and one Hispanic girl took a seat in the set of four desks front and center. In the second row, an Asian boy and a Hispanic girl took a seat. (Field note, 2/20/2008)

Students entered the classroom and took seats. As usual, one Black boy named Jackson and two Black girls took the same set of four desks in the second row and second column. A Mongolian girl named Jane, another Asian girl, and a White girl took their seats at the set of four desks in the second row of the same second column where I was sitting. Two Hispanic girls took seats at the set of desks in the first row and first column. Then a White girl from Eastern Europe and a Chinese boy took seats in the front row of the second column. (Field note, 3/7/2008)

In addition, desired students’ behaviors were rewarded with points and grades, rather than students being intrinsically motivated and engaged in their learning. In all classes, Ms. Lewis never forgot to mention how many scores and points would be provided when the task was done in a quite excited voice:

If you are doing your homework, you will get extra points. EXTRA POINTS! (pointing out the group on the left with the curly haired Hispanic boy) This group got the best points today. Journals are 20 points. Journals are 20 points. Journals are 20 points. (Field note, 2/20/2008)
Extra points for your participation sheets. This is a good time to get extra points. Miranda, remember? Marci, remember? (Field note, 3/3/2008)

If you don’t do well on your presentation, your grade will be bad. Half of your grade is dependent on the presentation. March 17 is the portfolio due date. I hate to give you bad grades, guys. I can’t give you a passing grade if you can’t do well. (Field note, 3/7/2008)

I’ll give you 5 extra credits for your participation. Tell me words you are not sure. (Field note, 4/11/2008)

The third theme could be called competition based learning. On March 7, 2008, English learner students were asked to play a vocabulary game composed of four students, as shown in the excerpt below:

Students created their own group names in response to Ms. Lewis’s request. The screen displayed the word definitions including pictures. The group with the word card matching the definition on PPT could get the points. After students came up with several vocabulary cards, Ms. Lewis asked students to write the definition of the word just by looking at the pictures on the PPT screen. The group leaders came to the front and wrote the definition of the word corresponding to the picture on the PPT screen. At the same time, each individual member in the same group wrote the same sentences that the group leader wrote on the front white board up front, and held the board to gain the score. After the leaders of each group wrote the sentences, Ms. Lewis corrected their sentences to conform with normal writing conventions and grammar with a red pen. The group could gain scores based on correct use of vocabulary and grammar in the sentences. It seemed that students did their best to win the game. They shouted and talked each other loudly. But the problem was that only the group leaders were allowed to write the definitions, and students were too focused on winning the game, rather than learning vocabulary. (Field note, 3/7/2008)

Students were too competitive to concentrate on learning new vocabulary. The group leader and the members of the group did not talk or explore the topics or the meanings of the vocabulary words. They were just busy raising their hands in order to
answer the questions to be on the winning team. This game-based instruction usually caused competition rather than inspiring a spirit of community for learning. In this game-based vocabulary learning, the group leaders, who had the best English proficiency of all the group members, always wrote the sentences on the whiteboard. The group member with less English proficiency did not have a chance to write any word definitions. In this way, unequal learning opportunities were provided to the individual student based on their English proficiency.

This game-based class was characterized by a dominant/passive interactional patterns, which Storch (2001, 2002) has found to be ineffective for language learning. Storch explored the nature of collaborative dialogues among ELLs with differing language proficiency by analyzing transcribed pair talk in a classroom. Based upon the distinction between mutuality (i.e., level of engagement with each other’s work) versus equality (i.e., control over task), Storch characterized four types of interactional patterns: (1) collaborative, (2) dominant/ dominant, (3) dominant/passive, and (3) expert/novice. Students in collaborative teams were willing to share ideas and were highly involved; thus they completed the task. Students in dominant/dominant pairs were unwilling to share ideas, even though they were highly engaged in tasks. In dominant/passive pairs, the dominant student took control of the task as an authoritarian and the other student was passive; thus, little negotiation of meaning occurred. In the expert/novice pair, students worked together as long as the expert encouraged the novice and was highly involved in the task. This study showed that the most productive interactional patterns are within collaborative or expert/novice teams, and highlighted the importance of collaboration in collaborative dialogue for learning.
From the Fall Semester of 2008 to the Spring Semester of 2009

Shared Knowledge Production in Community of Learners
Through Sociocritical Literacies: “Let’s be civil rights
people. Let’s learn as a means of changing the world”

I’m happy, and I can see some of you’re happy, too. So, let’s do the important
work today. Let’s be civil rights people. Let’s learn as a means of changing the world. All right, so, today’s lesson is an important lesson because we’ve learned the idea that the Black man can become president. And we’ve come a long, long ways, but racism is still something that is a problem in our country. And learning about racism, and seeing what racism is will change racism. And the people that get hurt the most is, who do you think? It’s a trick question. Who do you think is hurt the most by racism? (Class Transcript, 11/5/2008)

This is a quote from Ms. Lewis’s ELL class on November 5, 2008, just after Barack Obama was elected as the first African American president in the United States.

The topic of the class, racism, had been chosen by her ELLs. At the beginning of the semester, students had been asked to write out the questions they would like to conduct research on. They wrote their questions on the whiteboard in front of the class, and then they voted among the various questions. Racism was selected to be the first question for conducting research on. Two other themes (i.e., community and leadership) were also chosen by Ms. Lewis and her students in order to develop themes that were related to each other (Interview, 2009).

A line by line interpretation and explanation of the quote above follows:

1 I’m happy, and I can see some of you’re happy, too.
2 So, let’s do the important work today.
3 Let’s be civil rights people. Let’s learn as a means of changing the world.
4 All right, so, today’s lesson is an important lesson
5 because we’ve learned the idea that the Black man can become president.
6 And we’ve come a long, long ways,
7 but racism is still something that is a problem in our country.
8 And learning about racism, and seeing what racism is will change racism.
9 And the people that get hurt the most is, who do you think?
It’s a trick question.
Who do you think is hurt the most by racism?

A linguistic analysis of the pronouns and modality of the text above at the word
and vocabulary level (Fairclough, 2003; Huckin, 1995, 2002) explicates the ways that
language in use created classroom community in the dialogic relationships, demonstrating
the linguistic aspects of the community of learners.

Regarding the use of pronouns, Ms. Lewis first stated the goals of teaching lesson
by expressing her own feelings, using the first-person pronoun, “I” with an affective
adjective, “happy” (line 1) about Barack Obama being elected as the first African
American president. Then Ms. Lewis invited students into her narrative statement by
using the second-person pronoun “you” along with the same affective adjective, “happy”
and agreement adverb, “too,” which indicates that Ms. Lewis identified her feelings with
her students’ feelings about the election result. In line 2, Ms. Lewis used “Let’s” twice
(i.e., “Let’s be...” and “Let’s learn...”), which is the contracted form of “Let us,” and then
stated “we” twice (i.e., in “we’ve learned...” and “we’ve come...”) and “our” once (i.e.,
“... in our country”). The multiple use of the personal pronouns (e.g., “Let’s,” “we,” or
“our”) refers to an inclusive ‘we’ - community of common experience (Fairclough, 2003, p.
181). And the use of active verbs with present perfect tense (i.e., “We’ve learned” and
“We’ve come”), instead of using the passive verb forms indicate the collective life
experiences from the past as social actors. The use of these inclusive pronouns (i.e., “we,”
“our,” “us”) in combination with active verb forms demonstrated that both students and
Ms. Lewis belonged to the same community as social actors in learning “the idea that the
Black man can become president” and in having experienced racism.
Concerning the use of modality, by using the modal verb “can” (line 5), Ms. Lewis indicates the certainty that an African American can become a president of the United States. By using the *epistemic modality* verb “will” (line 8), Ms. Lewis mentioned the *authoritative truth statement* (i.e., “...learning about racism and seeing about racism will change racism”). These two modal verbs (i.e., “can” and “will”) refer to *epistemic modality*, which allows the speaker to exchange knowledge by expressing his/her opinion about the truth or about a proposition (Fairclough, 2003). Modality can “be seen in terms of what authors commit themselves to with respect to what is true and what is necessary” and “what people commit themselves to the texts is an important part of how they identify themselves, the texturing of identities” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 165). Ms. Lewis connected herself with her students interpersonally, politically, and epistemically regarding racism in the textual relationship by using epistemic modal verbs (e.g., “will” and “can”) as well as the personal pronouns (e.g., “I,” “we,” “Let’s,” “you”).

At the textual level (Huckin, 1995, 2002, 2003), the stated goals of this class are different from those of a typical ESL class, where the teaching is mostly focused on language instruction (Cummins, 2000; Delpit, 1995; Gee, 1996; Purcell-Gates, 2007). The goal statement (i.e., “Let’s be civil rights people. Let’s learn as a means of changing the world”) indicates that Ms. Lewis’s class is not just a place to learn about how to read and write texts, but also a space in which to “change racism” through “learning about racism and seeing what racism is.” The literacy lesson was not limited to individual academic literacy or functional literacy, but expanded to the community and society, that is, to sociocritical literacy. Analyzing the above statements on the basis of the use of tenses (lines 3-6), the present perfect tense revealing experiences (lines 5-6) is connected
to the present tense (line 4 and line 7) indicating current learning, and with the future
tense, “Let’s” (line 3). It can be said that the ideology of Ms. Lewis for teaching is based
on the premise that literacy learning should be connected to social transformation for
social justice (Freire, 1970; Giroux, 1983; Pennycook, 2001) in *syncretic literacy*
(Gutiérrez et al., 1995), which connects the present practice with the past experiences and
the future actions as social actors. Literacy learning and development in the classroom
setting is not just for personal growth, but for social transformation.

Although this class foregrounded critical pedagogy for learning, this does not
mean that instruction about academic literacy and cognitive development by presenting
the specific procedures and objectives in class was abandoned. Ms. Lewis never forgot to
write and communicate the specific objectives for contingent cognitive development with
students in the typical form of SWBAT (Students Will Be Able To...) on the blackboard in
the front left side and made sure what kinds of specific tasks students needed to do in
order to accomplish the objectives and goals of the lesson. The following specific
conceptual objectives were written on the blackboard:

Objectives: By end of the PowerPoint, students will be able
- to define 6 new words reflected to racism by adding them to their notes
- to analyze their own ideas about race and racism by completing a series of
  partner activity
- to identify examples of each type of racism by completing a class activity (Field
  note, 11/5/2008)

Ms. Lewis communicated the objectives above with her students and allowed
students to “think” about and “analyze” their own ideas, not just learning reading
strategies and memorizing the skills and strategies directed by the teacher:

OK. So, let’s look at our objectives. By the time we finish our power point you
should be able to define six new words that are related to racism. And you’ll do
that by adding them to your notebook. Also, by the time we were finished there’s
this word here, analyze. You should analyze your ideas. We need to be good at
thinking about our ideas about race and racism by doing some partner activities,
so everyone needs to have a partner today. And the last one is, by that time we’re
done with class today, we’re going to try and identify examples of each type of
racism by completing a class activity. (Field note, 11/5/2008)

In response to Ms. Lewis’s question in the class transcript above, “Who do you
think is hurt the most by racism?,” students answered:

1 T: Who do you think is hurt the most by racism?
2 S1: All the people who’s not from America.
3 T: All the people not from America? Who do you think, Calvin? Who
gets hurt by racism?
4 S2: The colored.
5 T: The people that have color, Kuwaku?
6 S3: Yeah.
7 T: Should I tell you who? Ok, Julita?
8 S4: The people who, the people who’s talking to, the other people
who’s saying something to another people they feel bad.
9 T: I agree, You’re good. Julita, Today’s your brilliant day. It is. Here
is who else gets hurt by racism: everybody. Everybody. EVERY
everybody. (Class Transcript, 11/5/2008)

In line 1, Ms. Lewis asked a question and S1 answered (line 2). Ms. Lewis asked
again by repeating the statement of S1 and S2 answered. Ms. Lewis repeated S2’s
sentence by transforming the sentence into a new linguistic form with relative pronoun,
“that” (line 5) and called on Kuwaku. S3 (i.e., Kuwaku) agreed with S2’s answer by
saying “Yeah” (line 6). Then, Ms. Lewis asked again and finally Julita raised her hand
and answered the concept that everyone hurts by racism, which is the concept Ms. Lewis
wanted to teach.

Ms. Lewis provided the inquiry space with the contingent questions using the
reasoning verb, “think” (e.g., Who do you think? in lines 1 and 3) in the interrogative
form and calling on a student’s name (i.e., Kuwaku? in turn 5), in order to allow students
to explore and figure out the concept that racism hurts everyone. Ms. Lewis asked the contingent questions four times (lines 1, 3, 5, 7) depending on the students’ responses and finally, Julita answered the concept. In response to Julita’s answer, Ms. Lewis stated, “I agree” and empowered Julita by discursively positioning Julita as a good student through the statement, “You’re good. Julita, today’s your brilliant day” (line 9), rather than saying directly, “You’re right.” In this dialogic exchange of talk, the voices of each student were heard and speakers can orient themselves to one another. Also, the power relationship between Ms. Lewis and students are not authoritative, but reciprocally equal.

The following excerpt clearly illustrated how Ms. Lewis’s ESL classroom community of learners constructed the production of shared knowledge that “racism can be a good thing in meaning, and not a good thing, that people can say what seems to be nice, what seems to be nice but it’s really racist, and people can say things that are not nice, that are racist” through the mutual verbal interactions, asking questions and responding to the questions between teacher and students and among students using “bad examples and good examples of racism” that ELLs had experienced in their lives. All class participants, that is, 19 students and the teacher, Ms. Lewis, participated in the production of knowledge. Knowledge was not just delivered from teacher to students directly, but co-constructed among students through dialoguing between Ms. Lewis and students, and teacher’s contingent questions in the collaborative and exploratory talk. Knowledge is constructed in and through mutual asking and answering processes based on students’ lived experiences and their talk, rather than directing students what to do and how to do the task in class. Collaborative dialoguing in COL (Community of Learners) occurred in class:
T: Now, I want you to talk with your partner about racist comments that you have heard that are good. What are things you said or you heard that are nice, but are like those examples we saw? And, write down these ideas on your same piece of paper. You want to get a conversation card. So, when I see you talking, I’ll come and give you a conversation card. Be prepared to discuss your ideas with the class. OK, go ahead and start talking now. Start talking now, OK?

(Students talk with each other while teacher goes from pair to pair discussing the topic.)

T: of bad things, too, and that’s a great example for bad. That’s a great example for bad, yeah. Let’s see what else has something. Amy, what was one good thing that you heard?
S1: Some people say people from Asians [sic] are smart.
T: Ah, did you hear what she said, Jessica? What did she say?
S2: Umm, hmmm.
T: listen, listen carefully. Say it again Amy, again.
S1: people from Asians are smart.
T: So, people from Asia are smart. Have you heard that before?
S3: What?
T: That people from Asia are smart.
S3: No.
T: What did you come up with?
S4: When people told me that Black people, they are good at rapping.
T: At rapping. Yeah, OK, OK. Forsythia, What’s one good thing that you and Tom came up with?
S5: (inaudible reply)
T: OK. Jessica, what’s something you and Mary came up with?
S6: me? Black people are better than White people.
T: Black people are better than White people? OK, OK. Rex, Betsy, what’s something your group came up with?
S7: um, when uh, when you ask uh, about you.
T: when they ask about you? Is it a good thing or a bad thing?
S7: it’s good.
T: it’s a good thing? OK, OK. How about Justin and Calib, gentlemen, what is one thing you heard that’s a good thing?
S8: (inaudible reply)
T: What?
S9: *(inaudible reply)*
T: All right. So, if you didn’t have something, Tom, do you have one?
S10: yeah.
T: OK. Amy, listen carefully. Betsy, hold on, go, OK.
S10: In basketball, White people can shoot better than Black people.
T: Oh, you’ve heard that?
T: Oh, boy. OK. (laughing) OK, let’s go ahead. Let’s go ahead and move on. Let’s look at now, now remember racism can be a good thing in meaning, and not a good thing, that people can say what seems to be nice, what seems to be nice but it’s really racist, and people can say things that are not nice, that are racist. So, let’s take a look at this, here’s some examples of that. He is White. He must think he’s better than everybody else. Or, he is Black. He must be in a gang. Or, he is from Mexico. He must be in an illegal immigrant. Or, he is Jewish. He must hate Muslims. Have you heard things like this before, Reece?
S12: Oh, uh, yes, on my Monday, on my geography class there was this kid that said, racism, Mexicans only come ‘cause they want out those things and stuff and like he was gonna say not. We just came because we want to like be in a gang and stuff.
T: did that feel or sound racist to you?
Sts: yeah.
T: OK, OK. Now, you already have your first example, I don’t remember, OK. So, here’s what you’re going to do now. You’re going to talk to your partner about bad racist comments, things that are bad.

*(Students talk to their partners about the task. Teacher goes from pair to pair asking questions and encouraging them to stay on topic.)*

T: all right, let’s finish up your ideas, finish up your ideas. So, Ailia and Tom, what is a bad example that you’ve seen or you’ve heard? So, Michelle, just one second, let’s listen to Cosmos. Go ahead, daisy.
S13: White people are lazier than other people.
T: oh, White people are more lazy than other people, huh? Have you heard in this before?
Ss: No. What did she say?
T: that what, OK, I’ve heard that. I’ve heard that before. Yeah, that’s, that’s a good one. All right, gentlemen. Wants something you have heard that might be bad?
Ss: (inaudible mumbling)

T: Yep, something bad that you have heard, uh huh.

S14: (inaudible mumbling)

T: Daniel, I make time to listen. He’s talking very quietly. So, go on Joseph.

Ss: (inaudible mumbling)

T: okay. June, what’s something you’ve heard?

S15: White people are kraker, gringo.

S16: What?

T: Yup. Did you hear what she said that? White peoples are – say the words agan.

S15: Kraker, gringo.

T: Cracker, gringo, yeah, OK? That’s a good one. April, have you heard some things?

S17: Why do they call them and crackers?

T: What’s some things you heard?

S18: I really. OK, when I was coming in America what people was talking about to me and I didn’t listen to them. So, they look away.

T: OK.

S19: You didn’t listen to them?

T: Betsy, is an example you have?

S18: I say, ah, I don’t like, the Black don’t, anybody racist.

(Students and Ms. Lewis continued to talk about their experiences about racist statements.)

S19: When you come from Meck Chico, and some people, like White people, call you wet bag.

T: Oh, you heard that before?

S19: and if they call you beans, too.

T: beans and wet bags.

Ss: That’s why we call them White crackers.

T: I heard that, so Ok. We’re gonna learn about what that’s called, ‘cause there’s a name for that. It’s called reciprocal racism. We’ll learn about that. (Class Transcript, 11/5/2008)

As explicit in the excerpt above, all 19 English learner students’ life experiences about racism “entered through concrete utterances (which manifest language) and concrete utterances enters through life as well” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 63) and their

“utterances are heteroglot in that they are functions of a matrix of forces practically
impossible to recoup” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 426). In Ms. Lewis’s ESL class, “Everything means and is understood, as a part of great whole – there is a constant interaction between meaning, all of which have the potential of conditioning others” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 428) and finally produced the meaning of “reciprocal racism” in the inductive processes of talking mutually in the dialogic exchange of life experiences about racism.

In order to study the concept of the second unit, community, ELLs studied two essential questions, “What is a community?” and “What makes good community and what makes a bad community?” in order to “solve problems around racism.” On March 5, 2009, for the co-construction of the definition of community, “one group of person who work together,” 12 students and Ms. Lewis were engaged in exploratory talk, questioning and responding to those questions in the excerpt below:

1 T: Yup. You got it. You got it. OK. Now, the question I have is, have you heard of the word “community” before?
2 Ss: Yeah.
3 T: If you’ve heard of the word community, I want you to turn to your partner. Turn to your partner and say, “This is what I think community is.” So, turn to your partner and tell your partner what you think that community is.
4 Ss: This is what I think the community is. (laughing) (Students tell their partners about their definition of community.)
5 S1: It’s like community service.
6 T: Huh. Community service. That’s how you heard that word that way before, right?
7 S2: Heard about it, but.
8 T: You don’t know what it means? Yeah, but you’ve heard it. You’ve heard of community service. Have you heard it in a different way? (Students laugh.)
9 S3: Yeah. Community. Uh, something. Community. That’s college I’ve...
10 T: Was it community college?
11 Ss: Yeah.
12 T: Good. I like that one. Do you guys know the difference?
13 S4: I don’t know what it means. What does it mean?
14 T: You’ve heard it before. Yup? What do you think that word means?
15 S5: You work. You work outside?
16 T: You work outside?
17 S6: You use community service in, like, different parts of the community?
18 T: Yup. Yup. OK. Five. Four. Three. Two and one. Now, I’m hearing you have some understanding of the word community. Where have you heard community before? Mike, where was one way you’ve heard it?
19 S7: Community college, community service, and I don’t know.
20 T: You’ve heard community college. You’ve heard community service. Has anyone heard it in a different way?
21 S8: I know what is community service mean.
22 T: Yup. Julie.
23 S8: Ah, well like community like people are like your neighborhood and...
24 T: Ah. Like you’ve heard it as far as people in your neighborhood?
25 Ss: Yeah. Yeah.
26 T: Yeah? Good. Have you heard it other ways? Have you heard in other ways? Now. I heard Alberto say when he thinks of community, he thinks of people. Yeah? Are there other things that you think of when you think of community?
27 S9: Places.
28 T: Places is something you think of. Houses is something you think of. What else might you think of when you think of community?
29 S10: Work.
30 T: What’s that?
31 S10: Work.
33 S11: I’ve got it.
34 T: What’s that, Alberto?
35 S11: Nothing.
36 T: You mentioned good and I.
37 S12: Country? Country?
38 S11: I already got a definition.
39 T: You have a definition? Let’s get there. You know what I think of. *Teacher writes on board*
40 Ss: School.
41 T: That’s a big community for me. So, Alberto, you say you have a definition. Let’s use what you know to make a good definition. What’s your definition, Alberto?
42 S11: Um. One group of person who work together.
43 T: I love what you’re saying. Did you hear what he said?
44 Ss: Yeah. No.
45 T: Say it one more time so Valente can hear it ‘cause it’s so good.
46 S11: One group of persons who work together.
47 T: I love it. I love it. I’m gonna use part of your definition. Turn your card over on the back side. And let’s say. Alberto, I’m just gonna use it. That’s great. We have a group of people who work together. (Class Transcript, 3/5/2009)

As explicit in the text above, through 47 exchanges between Ms. Lewis and students, ELLs co-constructed the definition of community, “a group of people who work together.” Ms. Lewis used multiple different ways of questioning, which encouraged ELLs to be involved in the exploratory talk and demonstrated shared knowledge production between and among students and teacher. Rather than directly giving answers to the concepts or question, Ms. Lewis used multiple forms of contingent exploratory questions using reasoning words, such as “think” and “mean.”

At first, Ms. Lewis encouraged ELLs to activate their life experiences related to community by asking, “Have you heard of the word, ‘community’ before?” (turn 1). Then Ms. Lewis encouraged students to talk about what they think community is with their partners for a while (turn 3). S1 said, “It’s like a community service.” (turn 5). Then Ms. Lewis asked again, “That’s how you heard that word that way before, right? (turn 6) and S2 said, “I heard it, but.” (turn 7). Ms. Lewis asked again, “You don’t know what it means?” and asked, “Have you heard it in a different way? (turn 8). S3 responded to the question by saying, “communit. That’s college I’ve” (turn 9). Ms. Lewis responded to his
answer again, “Was it community college.” Students said, “Yeah” (turn 11). In turn 12, Ms. Lewis asked again, “Do you guys know the difference?” Then S4 stated, “I don’t know what it means. What does it mean?” (turn 13) and Ms. Lewis asked students to answer, rather than giving the answer directly to the student 4, “What do you think that word means?” S5 mentioned, “You work outside?” (turn 16) and S6 “You use community service, like, different part of the community.” (turn 17). Ms. Lewis called on Mike and asked, “Mike, where was one way you’ve heard it?” (turn 18) and S8 answered, “I know what is community service mean” (turn 21). In turn 27, S9 included the “places” and S10 also expanded the concept of community with “work” (turn 29). Then Ms. Lewis asked “What’s that” (turn 30) and repeated S10’s answer, “Work. Ah. you know” (turn 32). In those processes, Alberto came to realize that meaning of community and mentioned, “I’ve got it.” (turn 33) and finally the classroom community co-constructed the definition of community, “a group of people who work together” (turn 47) through mutual verbal interactions.

These questioning and answering (Q&A, hereafter) processes continued for 2 more minutes and finally reached the definition of community, “We’ll say a group of people who work together, help each other, and they have common interests, meaning they like some of the same stuff, like they like to play soccer together.” Then Ms. Lewis asked, “I want you to talk with your partner about the communities that you are a part of. Now is the time to talk with a partner across the room.” And Ms. Lewis walked around the room talking with individual students and students talked with each other about the communities they belonged to for 5 minutes. Then Ms. Lewis asked student to share their discussions with their partner:
T: All right. I want to hear some of the communities you came up with, and I’m hoping that they’re good. So, raise your hand if you have a community that you’d like to share with the class.

Ss: I do. (almost shouting)

T: So.

Ss: I do. (almost shouting)

In the conversation in the excerpt above, all English learner students were so engrossed in their lesson that they were all eager to present their communities they belonged to by almost shouting, “I do, I do.” After sharing the individual students’ communities they belonged to in class, Ms. Lewis asked students to “write on the big paper that their list of communities” and to discuss the 10 characteristics of good and bad community in pairs while using Spanish-English dictionaries. Regarding students’ use of Spanish dictionaries, Ms. Lewis mentioned, “Yeah, I love that you’re getting a dictionary.” While sharing the characteristics of good community, one student said the good community is “that the community is not being racist.” Then Ms. Lewis said,

T: Ah, Yup. No racism. And you know, I love that you’re doing that in there cause we’re just finishing our racism unit. We’ve learned that racism destroys communities. Yeah.

S1: Know how to solve problem.

T: Ohhh. Say that one more time?

S1: Know how to solve the problem.

English learner students defined the community and the characteristics of good and bad communities and finally connected the community unit with the racism unit on their own. In addition, they came to realize that good community “knows how to solve problem” in those processes of exploratory Q&A. Ms. Lewis’s life experience based instructional class took “into account both what each member brings by way of past experience at home, at school, and in the wider community - their values, interests, and aspirations” (Wells, 2001, p. 174) within the classroom community. Individual English
learner students’ experiences and values are expressed and exchanged in mutual and equal verbal interactions. In such a social interactional matrix, “knowledge and intelligence reside not solely in heads but rather are distributed across social practices (including language practices) and the various tools, technologies, and semiotic systems that its given ‘community of practice’ uses in order to carry out its characteristic activities” (Gee, 2000, p. 196). Through these mutual interactions, on March 20, 2009, English learner students recognized their own life lessons, and concluded that “everyone is in the community of people that try to be somebody in life because well, they have some reasons to be someone”:

S1: Well, I think that I belong to a community of people trying to do something in life.
T: Nice.
S2: I think well, everyone is in the community of people that try to be somebody in life because well, they have some reasons to be someone.
(Class Transcript, 3/20/2009)

Ms. Lewis asked students to “understand the ideas” and “analyze the ideas” (11/5/2008) rather than “write down everything” written on the whiteboard: “Ok, you don’t have to write down everything, you just have to understand the idea” (3/5/2009). It was also expected of students that they were “going to be able to verbally defend, verbally defend important parts of history that have created poor communities” (3/18/2009). In addition, Ms. Lewis never forgot to ask students to wait for their peers who had not finished their task to finish his/her task before starting to teach another concept. In this way, Ms. Lewis demonstrated and created the social conditions for an inclusive classroom, a community of learners, by including all students in class:

Michael, do you have your notes all done? Ok, all right. Betsy, can I go on? Ok, here we go. Leslie, may I go on? (Students continue writing in their notebooks)
When a new student came to Ms. Lewis’s class on March 18, 2009, Ms. Lewis and her students co-constructed their attitudes about how they should treat the new students in the following dialogic verbal interactions:

T: Now. I want to say is we have a new student in class. He’s a new participant, a new member of the community. So, Debby, if I get your attention. Ok, Mike will I get your attention. So, Tonga is new to our class. And what that means is, Tonga is new to our school. So, if you see Tonga out during the hall, what are you gonna say? If you see Tonga at the lunch room, what are you gonna say?
S1: Sit right here.
S2: What’s up?
S3: Copy if you want.
T: ..You all know is, when you are new from community, it can be very stressful. (Class Transcript, 3/18/2009)

Ms. Lewis always emphasized the importance of group work by awarding more points for group work than for individual work - “the biggest part of your grade was your group work.” The way students collaborated for their group was considered to be the most important part of class:

...I was so serious when I said the biggest part of your grade was your group work. The biggest part. Every time you you got up and you walked away from your group, I made a check about you got less points. (Class Transcript, 3/9/2009)

Ms. Lewis clearly understands the critical impact of community on the individual students’ motivation to learn and develop themselves:

If you have a whole class, they are taking risks and you can see the first person taking the risk. We are going to only this part but ... as soon as one student does that and the other student does that... As soon as he shows what he did and then the other students do that. (PD Day Transcript, 4/2/2009)
In Ms. Lewis’s class, English learner students verbalized, spoke and dialogued for the production of shared knowledge related to making a better society with social quality and equity. In those dialogic processes of talking, students learned language (Lantolf, 2004; Swain, 2006), (meta)cognitive and concept development, knowledge construction (Smagorinsky, 1998; Vygotsky, 1978; Wells, 1999), self-regulation (Palincsar et al., 1993) and ideological becoming (Bakhtin, 1981). Through the meaning-making processes of intertextuality, the perception of text in light of context, teacher and students shared and constructed their own meaning "against the background of other texts, and the discourses of other occasions" (Lemke, 1992, p. 257) and the immediate situation took on different meanings, based on the emergent situated contextual meanings found across time and space. Simultaneously, these reconstructed contextual meaning making processes were appropriated within/across the emerging meanings of the co-existent contextual formations, and created new communicative environments for classroom discourse.

The shared knowledge production in community of learners through sociocritical literacies that were demonstrated in Ms. Lewis’s class are socially, culturally, historically, politically, ideologically constructed situated practices that must be interpreted in accordance to the context (Fairclough 1992; Gee, 2008) and in light of the “meaning of context” (Erickson & Schultz, 1981), implying “a dialectic of both linguistic form and social communicative practice” (Hicks, 1995, p. 51). Beyond the discourse of written and spoken language, Ms. Lewis’s sociocritical discourses were produced in the productive processes of shared knowledge in/through “a socially accepted association among ways of using language, of thinking, feeling, believing, valuing, and of acting that can be used to identify oneself as a member of a socially meaningful group of ‘social network,’ or to
signal (that one is playing) a socially meaningful role” (Gee 2000, p. 143). Discourse such as has been demonstrated in Ms. Lewis’s ESL discourse community of learners “does imply participation in an activity system about which participants share understanding concerning what they are doing and what that means in their lives and for their communities” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 98) by sharing experiences, expectations, rules, interest, vision as well as language patterns, showing the inherent nature of a discourse community, not in a way of transmitting their traditional and conventions to new members; but rather, challenging and transforming the usual habitus (Bourdieu, 1991) of people and society (Lave & Wenger, 1991), as a vital part of continuing and developing discourse communities of learners.

**Empowering ELLs Through Positive Discursive Subject Positioning: “Yes, you can”**

Yes, you can. You know he reminded us of all that difficulties in America. FORTY years ago, my friends, FORTY years ago, some of you would not have been able to go to a White school, most of you wouldn’t. FORTY years ago, it would be difficult for you to go to college, and today our president, his father was born in Kenya. His dad is a Black man from Africa and he’s our president. I’m so happy and I thought, Oh, no, when I see my students again, I’m gonna start to cry. Because the work we’re doing MATTERS. What we do matters. And now when you’re getting an education, it MATTERS. My friends, the work you do in this class, learning, THAT is power. And one day I want to see guys there just like Obama saying, Yes, you can. (Class Transcript, 11/5/2008)

Ms. Lewis mentioned the quote above in the morning of November 5, 2008, 1 day after it was announced that President Obama was elected as the first African American president in US history. Ms. Lewis was impressed and more than happy with the fact that an African American man was elected as the president of the US for the first time (Personal Conversation, 2008), and she continuously emphasized the critical impact of
what they were doing in class on making a better society, and that students could accomplish as much as president Obama did by reiterating the sentence so many times, “Yes, you can,” which was an adaptation from president Obama’s inaugural speech, “Yes, we can.” These empowering statements for ELLs through positive discursive subject positioning were the overarching discourses spanning Ms. Lewis’s class.

Just after Ms. Lewis mentioned the sentence in the aforementioned class transcript, the questions and answers among students and teacher proceeded. (All names are pseudonyms.)

1 S1: Yes, I can. (*smiling brightly*)
2 T: Yes, you can. Yes, you can. Frida, you know what else I’m thinking? - That, Hi, Julita - (*Julita entered the classroom and took a seat.*) the reason he became president, what’s the number one thing that you think helped him became president? The number one thing that helped him get to be where he is now?
3 S2: Who?
4 S3: Barak Obama.
5 T: Uh huh. What you think is the number one thing that helped him?
6 S4: the government.
7 S5: a good coalition
8 S6: the African American vote.
9 S7: free college
10 T: Kwaku, you said a very important word to me.
11 S8: WHAT is that? (*turning around his head to the class*)
12 T: He said, free college. Kwaku is a man who has researched his politicians. He’s NOT duped at all. Now it’s college, Kuwaku! (*Teacher smiled at Kuwaku.*) He needed to go to college, and EDUCATION is powerful. The work we do here is powerful and important. This is your TICKET, my friends. I am so excited. I’m happy. I’m not gonna cry. I told you I wasn’t going to cry. But I thought, when I saw you today, when I see you back … (*Ms. Lewis showed tears in her eyes and made crying sounds. All students were smiling.*) (*Class Transcript, 11/5/2008*)

In the transcript above, S1, a short Black female student wearing a white Muslim head covering and sat at the back of the classroom, appropriated Ms. Lewis’s sentence to
her position saying, “Yes, I can” while smiling brightly (turn 1). Then Ms. Lewis invited a Hispanic student, Frida into her question, while greeting Julita, (“Hi”) who was entering the classroom a little late (turn 2). Inviting students into her questions or explanations was the most important way Ms. Lewis taught her students in class. Ms. Lewis herself mentioned that she always made sure that all students were included in the class community of learners (Interview, 6/10/2009).

As seen in the transcript above, Ms. Lewis provided an inquiry-based collaborative dialogic space for her students, in which they could ask or answer questions, rather than giving a prompt direct answer to questions. In the dialogue above, more than half of the students, 8 students of the 15 students in class, participated in shared knowledge production, as Ms. Lewis impressed upon her students that “education is very powerful” and “This is your ticket” for societal change and social mobility in the US by exemplifying president Obama as a role model.

Multiple Q&A cycles among students and teacher took place: Student 2 asked a question and student 3 answered it (turns 3-4), and then four students (S4, S5, S6, S7) participated in answering the teacher’s question (turns 6-9). Then student 8 asked questions, “WHAT is that?” (turn 11). Ms. Lewis responded to the student’s question by creating discursively empowering patterns of encouragement for Kuwaku, who was a skinny, small, Black, male student from a refugee camp in Somalia (turn 12). Ms. Lewis positioned Kuwaku as a researcher who had been “researching his politicians” and was “not duped at all” and who was going to go to college with the statement, “Kwaku is a man who has researched his politicians. He’s NOT duped at all. Now it’s college, Kuwaku!”
Kuwaku’s social identities and subjectivities were (re)constructed in a positive way as a “researcher” and an excellent student throughout the academic year. He was positioned as a model presenter in public for the parents’ night (3/5/2009), and Ms. Lewis mentioned him as an excellent model student that other classmates should exemplify, doing all of his school assignment and preparing for class in advance (3/18/2009).

T: By the way, did you see how good Kuwaku looked on, uh, at the thing? You looked good, Kuwaku. You dressed up. I’ll show you.

T: Now, if you have typed up your paragraphs, as Kuwaku has, and who else has theirs typed up and ready to turn in? (Class Transcript, 3/5/2009)

T: Now, do you see how Kuwaku has out his checklist? Please, right now, go ahead and, whoops, that’s not it. Go ahead and take out your checklist for today. Take out your checklist. Yes, that’s exactly what we’re going to do. (Class Transcript, 3/18/2009)

Ms. Lewis gave her students a writing test, for which they were to write five paragraphs. She had originally expected that test to count as 50 points, 10 points for each paragraph, but “most of students ended up doing three paragraphs,” so she “made it worth 30 points.”

T: I want to say two things. One: We took a big test last class, and that test was worth 30 points. I made it worth 30. At first it was gonna be worth 50, 10 points for each paragraph, but most of us ended up doing three paragraphs. Can I say a couple things about your writing.

Sts: Yup.

T: Number one. Wow! You should feel proud of yourself. When I saw the writing and I think about how you were writing at the beginning of the school year. Friends, you have made growth. You have made progress. You were paying attention to things that you didn’t pay attention to before. You were indenting your paragraphs. You were using capitals. You were ending with periods. But more importantly, the ideas. Every paragraph you wrote had a different idea. Your thinking was strong. You were
using strong English words. And those of you that struggle with spelling, I could see you thinking how we worked on sounding out sounds. I could see that in your writing. And it made me feel VERY, VERY, VERY proud of you. You should feel good about yourselves. And some of you that I thought, “Aargh! They’re gonna get scared. They’re not gonna finish. It’s not gonna work out.” I was so wrong? I was so wrong? Mike, lemme tell you, some nice writin’ from you, thank you, thank you, smart young man. I was so impressed! I was so impressed! I really loved reading your writing. And so, the reason I tell you this is because you need to know that you’re gittin’ better. You’re gittin’ good. And it’s only gonna get more and more, the more you practice. So, you need to take a minute and just go ahead and (clapping) congratulations, you did really good. So that’s my applause to you. OK. (Class Transcript, 3/18/2009)

As seen in the quote above, Ms. Lewis used multiple statements to encourage her students to trust themselves and their capabilities by repeating positive discursive statements, as shown in the underlined statements. Likewise, whenever students did some work or answered questions in a way that could be relevant to the questions in the situated context, Ms. Lewis empowered her students in a positive discursive positioning by making multiple forms of encouraging statements: “I want to talk about the videos. You guys did an excellent job, an excellent job on your videos.” (3/5/2009), “From what I can see, you’re doing good thinking” (3/5/2009), “You’re a fast learner” (3/10/2009), “Today’s your brilliant day” (11/5/2008), “I like how you’re taking care of yourself” (11/5/2008), “You should be proud of yourself” (2/20/2008), “That was impressive” (2/6/2009), “You are so smart!” (4/11/2008), “Nice job” (3/20/2009), “You look good today” (3/8/2009), “You are so smart and too youthful” (3/18/2009), and “She’s perfect” (3/18/2009).

Outside of class time, like after class, during lunchtime, or after school, many English learner students came to see Ms. Lewis to ask for help. One day an African girl
student came to Ms. Lewis ESL class to ask Ms. Lewis to help her to fill out her health form during lunchtime (Field Note, 2/20/2009). And on another day, a male Hispanic student with big tattoos all over his body named Alberto (pseudonym) came to see Ms. Lewis to inquire about his grade. He wasn’t passing a single class, but Ms. Lewis emphasized that she did not give him the grade, but Alberto gave himself the C grade.

1. I'm NOT gonna give up on you.
2. You can't hide from me.
3. You are too smart and too youthful.
4. I'm not giving up on you.
5. I don't care. I know that your parents aren't around,
6. but I'm not giving up on you.
7. You know, I wouldn’t give you a C,
8. I wouldn’t do it.
9. That is something you earned. (Field note, 12/5/2008)

The linguistic analysis at the vocabulary level, that is, in terms of the use of pronouns and modal verbs indicates the ways in which Ms. Lewis positioned Alberto positively and empowered him to allow himself to take responsibility for his own learning. At first, Ms. Lewis emphasized that she will “NOT give up on” Alberto by using the first-person pronoun, “I” and using the future tense, “gonna” (line 1), which indicates the authoritative truth statement with certainty. Then Ms. Lewis connected Alberto with herself using the second-person pronoun “You” and the first-person pronoun “me” (line 2) and encouraged Alberto by saying the strong points of Alberto, “You are too smart and too youthful” (line 3). The use of the personal pronouns, “I” and “you” connects herself with Alberto. And the use of epistemic modal verbs such as “am gonna” (line 1), “can” (line 2), and “wouldn’t” (line 7, 8), indicates the certainty of her strong will, which means that she would not “give up” on Alberto and did not “give” him the grade C, but Alberto himself got the grade C.
An analysis of the above-mentioned text at the text level reveals that Ms. Lewis foregrounded that she would not abandon Alberto, and foregrounded that Alberto himself got the score C by backgrounding the fact that Ms. Lewis gave Alberto the grade C. Later, Alberto passed all his grades and said to Ms. Lewis, “I did it ‘cause you said to me, you knew you wouldn't give up on me, and I didn’t want to let you down.” and finally Alberto graduated on time as planned. Ms. Lewis related how she applied herself to empowering Alberto through positive discursive positioning during the whole semester:

So, every day his class of the day, so I'd say “You're not going anywhere Alberto,” and at first he'd resist and get angry, and we even got him to passing with a C, and I pulled him in and two weeks ago, and really real emotional, but here's this big kid with a tattoo, and I say, "You know what your grade is?" and he says "No,” and I pulled it up, and I showed him that C, and I said, "you know I wouldn’t give you a C, I wouldn’t do it. That is something you earned." And he was hurt by it; just started to cry. This big, tough, and I could have, "You OK?” and he's like, ... He said, "I did it 'cause you said to me you knew you wouldn't give up on me, and I didn’t want to let you down, 'cause you never gave up on me." And he wasn’t reading at that point because of anything outside of the fact that there's that relation. (PD Day Transcript, 4/2/2009)

The way that Ms. Lewis empowered Alberto is clearly demonstrated if we explore the classroom discourses constructed between Ms. Lewis and Alberto in the classroom. Alberto actively participated in class discussions and activities by responding to questions with meaningful answers. On March 5, the whole class was trying to construct the definition of “community.” After a long exchange of forty five dialog turns, on the forty sixth turn, Alberto smiled and said, “I have a definition.” Then Ms. Lewis said,

1 T: Alberto, you say you have a definition. Let’s use what you know to make a good definition. What’s your opinion?
2 A: Um. One group of persons who work together.
3 T: I love what you’re saying. Did you hear what he said?
4 Ss: Yeah....
5 S: No.
6 T: Say it one more time, so Melisa can hear it ‘cause it’s so good.
7 A: One group of persons who work together.
8 T: I love it. I love it. I’m gonna use part of your definition. ...Let’s say Alberto, I’m just gonna use it. That’s GREAT!!! We have a group of people who work together. (Class Transcript, 3/5/2009)

In the excerpt above, Ms. Lewis empowered Alberto by providing her personal affective evaluation (line 3, “I love what you’re saying”) and inviting all the members of the classroom community to recognize Alberto’s insightful definition (turn 3, “Did you hear what he said?”). Then Ms. Lewis rearticulated how much she liked Alberto’s definition by using the strong personal affective verb “love” twice (turn 8), and expressed again how much she was impressed with his definition by using the affective adjective “GREAT” (turn 8). Through mutual streams of discursive empowering practices, a trust relationship between Ms. Lewis and Alberto was being established. Alberto, who did “not care and was apathetic,” engaged himself deeply in class discussions, provided for the class a useful and insightful contribution, and went on to graduate from Birch Hill High School on time. And currently, he has extended his engagement in academics beyond his relationship with Ms. Lewis, and has been encouraging his “big old buddy” to “git to work” like him:

Maybe you can’t do that with every student, it's not going to work every time, but it was so interesting to see the definition of thinking, those thing that we have to admit we have in the back of our head: "He doesn't care, or he's being apathetic."I was so surprised, and now we're in the fourth term, and he's got this big old buddy that he's like, "Git to work, man. I'm not gonna give up on you," and when I hear that I'm like, OK, so what happens now is his motivation is beyond the relationship with me, this knowledge that he can do it, and now showing other people. (PD Day Transcript, 4/2/2009)
In the subsection titled *Shared Knowledge Production in Community of Learners through Sociocritical Literacies*, I described how Ms. Lewis created a collaborative dialogic inquiry space between herself and her students in the ESL classroom over the period of 1 academic year, and in the section titled *Empowering ELLs through Positive Discursive Positioning*, I have described how she empowered ELLs through positive discursive positioning during that time. Another dominant metatheme of Ms. Lewis’s pedagogical practices is the creation of Thirdspace for ELLs, in which every person present plays multiple roles in and across contexts as learners, teachers, researchers, and social activists.

During the course of 1 academic year, from the fall semester of 2008 and throughout the spring semester of 2009, Ms. Lewis directed her pedagogical practices toward three thematic topics (i.e., racism, community, leadership) which related to her English learner students’ lived curriculum. Classroom instruction about racism was directed by three thematic questions: “What is racism?,” “What are the different types of racism?,” and “Why does racism exist, and how can we solve problems around racism?” Her other two themes, community and leadership, were developed through collaboration and consensus among Ms. Lewis and her ELLs in their explorations within the framework of three defining questions: “What is a community?,” “What makes a good community and what makes a bad community?,” and “How can we create leaders, and help build a community that ends racism?”
The social interactional organization for learning in Ms. Lewis’s class was patterned in the following cyclical way: teacher-whole class → pair work → group work→ presentation in class → embodied practice in public based on the shared curriculum. At the beginning of class, Ms. Lewis taught students three teaching concepts (i.e., racism, community, leadership) in the collaborative dialogic space in COL (Community of Learners, hereafter) by encouraging and making space for all students to participate in Q&A teaching format. Then students were asked to group into pairs and discuss those concepts with their partners in order to make a space for students to expand those learned concepts using their own lived experiences, which was called as “partner activity.” Students received a conversation card or a conversation slip when they were talking with their partner about the topic they were learning. One conversation card counted for 10 points toward their classroom participation scores. This conversation card functioned as a mediating tool encouraging students to talk more with their partners.

T: Let’s move on. Here is your partner activity. So, pay attention to your instructions. take out a clean piece of paper. (Student were looking for blank papers in their backpacks.) (Class Transcript, 11/5/2008)

T: Now, I want you to talk with your partner about racist comments that you have heard that are good. What are things you said or you heard that are nice, but are like those examples you saw? And, write down these ideas on your same piece of paper. You want to get a conversation card. So, when I see you talking, I’ll come and give you a conversation card. Be prepared to discuss your ideas with the class. Ok, go ahead and start talking now. Start talking now, OK? (Class Transcript, 3/5/2009)

T: Number two, talk with your partner about how looking at race can be good, or how it can be bad. So, for example, when you talk with your partner, you are going to say, here are some good things about race. Maybe you are proud of where you are from, and maybe because of your race you feel good about it. And you say, I like walking into the room and saying, “I am an African woman with Black skin, and that’s a good thing. That might be an example of something good. Something bad might be that you feel
maybe that people treat you differently they sometimes, or you think that sometimes life is harder for some races. This is conversation you’ll have. You’re gonna talk to your partner. Partners who are having good conversations will get a conversation slips by the time you go out the door for your participation today. (Class Transcript, 3/20/2009)

After finishing partner activity, students were required to form groups of three or four to discuss, write, and create a documentary DVD about “racism research.” The documentary was required to include interview movie clips with more than three people representing three different races, and students would present their research projects, first in class, and then at a parents conference in the school auditorium.

Ms. Lewis’s classroom instruction was interconnected and intertwined coherently through the interactions of internalization with externalization (Moll, 1990; Vygotsky, 1978) in/across contexts. Her students externalized their internal verbal thoughts when they expressed what they had experienced (i.e., about racism, community, and leadership) in pairs, in groups, in class, and in public, as well as when students did interviews and presented them. Their externalized expressions were materialized in the form of DVDs and publicized when the DVDs were presented in the school auditorium. When their presentations about racism in school were featured in the local newspaper, their antiracist discourses were spread and publicized in the community and the whole society. In those processes in and out of the classroom setting, students were situated in changing participation structures by playing multiple roles: asking and answering questions in the teacher-whole class interactions, participating in discussions in pairs and in groups, presenting their conclusions in front of the class at the end of class, and finally presenting their research projects, with DVDs, to a larger audience that included parents, teachers, other peers, professors, university students, and newspaper editors. The way in which
ELLs changed their roles and responsibilities in and across contexts was dynamic, and embodied practices in the interconnected vertical and horizontal connections of their past experiences, present actions, and future possible selves.

In the classroom setting, ELLs worked as students and teachers by learning and teaching mutually through dialogic conversations and discussions in a community of learners. ELLs became researchers when they interviewed friends, teachers, parents, and community members concerning their racism experiences and views about racism, and when they synthesized their interviewed data based on the emerging themes and created their DVDs in a group of four. ELLs became social activists, not only at the time when they presented their DVDs about racism in school (3/10/2009), but also when they helped the community clean the city park (4/25/2009) after studying the definitions and concepts of community. Helping the community to become a better community by cleaning the city park is an embodied practice of what they had learned, that is, the concepts of community and leadership. After studying leadership with the essential question, “How can we create leaders, and help build a community that end racism?” 200 English learner students out of 700 ELLs expressed their isolated inner feelings and experiences in the United States in art, which included drawings, paintings and some writings in order to “show that our identities are like pieces of puzzles”:

Yeah, and what we did is, we took their art work and we cut them out like puzzle pieces, and we put the different puzzle pieces together to sort of show that our identities are like pieces of puzzles. We’re complex and you can’t just look at one part and get to the whole; you have to look at all parts. And when…(Interview Transcript, 6/10/2009)
Later in 2010, all their individual artwork composed the 200 pieces of a mural. The mural was exhibited at the local international center in the Salt Lake City. This exhibition was reported in the local newspaper as follows:

Fifteen-year-old Subaru Moshen (pseudonym) takes the microphone with trepidation. He cringes a little, torturously aware of his classmates' stares, as he pulls a tightly rolled scrap of paper from the pocket of his oversized fleece jacket and tries to smooth out the creases. The microphone, shaking in his hand, goes bump, bump, bump.

"Nobody know me; nobody can judge me," the Birch Hill High School (pseudonym) freshman, who immigrated to Utah from Thailand eight months ago, says in uncertain — but clear — English. "They push me down. They don't give me a chance. I am strong. I don't care about what they say."

Subaru is one of about 90 teenage immigrants who shared poetry and artwork last week at the International Center (pseudonym) in Salt Lake City. The students, all part of Birch Hill High School (pseudonym) English Language Learners' program, come from a kaleidoscope of different countries and speak more than 38 languages. Their voices, describing their experiences dealing with discrimination and stereotyping, illustrate the growing diversity of Utah's schools. (4/23/2010)

On March, 2010, English learner students participated in a rally titled “Still We Rise” held in front of Capitol Hill for the purpose of fighting against legislation against immigrants, such as anti-affirmative action bill, health amendment for legal immigrant children, repeal of in-state tuition for undocumented students, etc:

Los Brown Berets de SLC (Salt Lake City) led a large group of students and community members on a historic rally on the steps of the Utah State Capitol this past Thursday. The rally called “Still We Rise” took place on the last day of the Utah legislature and included, among other groups, Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlan (MEChA), Mestizo Institute of Culture and Art (MICA), Family School Partnership (FSP), and the Utah Coalition of La Raza (UCLR). The purpose of the rally was to protest a series of Utah legislative bills that are extremely detrimental to the state’s racial and ethnic minorities. “Still We Rise”
outlined 7 bills that diminishes the quality of life of marginalized communities that include Mexicans and other Latinos, Polynesians, American Indians and other minorities in the state of Utah. (Retrieved July, 2010 from http://groups.yahoo.com/group/iraqcrisis/message/18167)

From CHAT (Cultural-Historical-Activity-Theory) perspective, changing roles, responsibilities and interactions in various social contexts are essential for human learning and development, and particularly for language and literacy development. ELLs in Ms. Lewis class learned language and developed literacy by engaging themselves in multiple roles in the activity systems by appropriating semiotic tools, that is, the most powerful psychological tool, language (Cole, 1996; Engeström, 1995; Rogoff, 2003; Vygotsky, 1978) by languaging/verbalizing (Swain, 2006), materializing (e.g., creating DVDs about racism) and publicizing in authentic contexts (e.g., classroom, school, local international center, in front of Capitol Hill), as demonstrated in the data above.

The transformative capacity of individual ELLs was accomplished through dialectic relationships between collective activity (e.g., presenting their racism research project) individual action (e.g., creating their own art to describe their own feelings and emotions about racism and their own identities), and the conditions (e.g., the social organizations in and across different contexts) that operate those actions (Leonti’ev, 1981). Ms. Lewis’s ESL class demonstrating CRP was a discursive community of practice (CoP), where linguistically, culturally diverse ELLs and their teacher were united in their pursuit of similar goals and concerns, i.e., teaching and learning ways with words in connection with real world issues and real world problems, that is, racism. Learning sociocritical literacy occurred through embodied practice in the situated sociocultural context. In this discourse community of practice with the common goal, that is, changing
the world by learning and studying about racism, all students and the teacher would construct internally convergent persuasive D/discourses rather than divergent authoritative D/discourses, through which ELLs could socialize and be socialized into the target speech community as legitimate English speakers, while representing and publicizing their linguistic and cultural identities they formed in their first language. It can be said that ELLs in Ms. Lewis’s class learned the second language, i.e., English, and developed “the disposition to engage appropriately with texts of different types in order to empower action, feelings, and thinking in the context of purposeful social activity” (Wells 1999, p. 14).

Through the process of changing roles and identities, they created dynamic participation structures of synchronic and diachronic, culturally relevant, polycontextualized, embodied multiliteracy activity systems as legitimate participants (Gutiérrez & Stone, 2000), uniting social speech with their inner speech via private speech, in the interconnected relational space of text-intertext-contextual construction, guided by the teacher to those discourse (re)constructions that would be appropriate to the text and ELLs’ linguistic/cultural resources. ELLs in Ms. Lewis’s class “learn language, learn about language and learn through language” (Halliday, 1980) through the real world issues in/through such critical, dialogic, inquiry-based, culturally relevant classroom D/discourses and embodied practices in and across contexts. ELLs become ideological becoming through engaging themselves in the real social issues with actions in the multilayered systematic activity systems. In accordance with Ladson-Billings’ (1995) definition of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy (CRP), Ms. Lewis enacted CRP by creating the social organizations for ELLs to improve in three essential areas: (1) academic
competence, (2) cultural competence, and (3) sociopolitical or critical consciousness in classroom discourse community. Both teacher and students entered into Thirdspace dialogic inquiry in the cultural community of practice to accomplish the three criteria of CRP.

Expansive Learning Cycles in the Community of Learners from CHAT Perspective

CHAT (Cultural-Historical-Activity-Theory) was initiated by Vygotsky (1978), was further developed by Leont’ev (1981), and was evolved as an expansive cycle of activity systems by Engeström (1999). The first generation of CHAT introduced the concept of mediation for human learning, which solved the disconnect between Cartesian individuals and societal cultures/discourses/structures. Humans do not learn directly, but through mediating tools and sign systems, primarily through the tool of language, and physical and semiotic tools (Leont’ev, 1999; Vygotsky, 1978). Learning occurs through connecting human agency with tools and sign systems within a sociocultural context. The mediational concept was at first applied to individual goal-directed action, activity and operation, but was later expanded to apply to activity systems and was given a graphic visualization (Figure 3) by Engeström (1987), whose work is considered to be the second generation of CHAT and the primary unit of analysis for learning (Cole, 2000; Engeström, 2001; Gutiérrez & Stone, 2000).

Engeström (1999) expanded second generation CHAT in order to apply it to collective activity systems within interconnected networks of activity. Basic to the third generation of CHAT is the concept that individual subjects share common goals and perform object-oriented actions by taking part in interrelated, dynamically moving
collective activity systems through practice in/through/across contexts. Applying this model to Ms. Lewis’s pedagogical practices, the elements constituting activity system (i.e., as subject, object, mediating artifacts, community, rules (norms), and division of labor) interact with each other and through the networked activity systems, as depicted in Figure 3.

In Figure 3, subjects are participants in the activity system and objects are the products or the purposes of actions in/through activity systems. In Ms. Lewis class,
subjects were diverse and dynamic social actors who became objects and subjects interchangeably depending on the situated social context. For example, in a teacher-whole class instructional format in class, the subject was the teacher, Ms. Lewis, and the objects were her English learner students. But the objects, that is, ELLs, also became subjects, not only through pair work and group work in class, but also in the presentation of DVD racism research documentaries to community members. In addition, two or three students from the education department of a local university became subjects when they assisted ELLs in class, and became objects when they tried to learn how to teach ELLs by observing Ms. Lewis’s instructional practices in the class. Parents and guest speakers also became subjects and objects; they became subjects when they came to class to teach about their life experiences and their cultural practices, but they became objects when they listened to ELLs’ presentations in the school auditorium. In summary, the subjects in Ms. Lewis’s class were not only ELLs and Ms. Lewis, but also diverse community members including university students, parents, guest speakers, and other teachers who would like to learn how to teach ELLs. In Ms. Lewis’s ESL class, subjects and objects alternated their roles in interconnected multiple activity systems in and across contexts.

The mediating artifacts in Ms. Lewis’s classroom were not only printed texts like books, bilingual dictionaries and handouts, but also included multimodal and digital media, such as videos, cameras, props, pictures, PPT presentations, computers. More importantly, multiple forms of participation structures in various social context with peers and more knowledgeable others (e.g., teachers and university students from the education department of a local university), and the activity systems in themselves, all served as mediating artifacts. ELLs learned how to read and write through interactive reading and
writing with peers, mediated by digital tools (e.g., computers, cameras, videos, pictures, etc.), while analyzing, evaluating, and synthesizing the topics for their interviews and their interview data, and creating a documentary video about their racism research. In these processes, social interactions occurred through the mediating tools, that is, digital technologies in manipulating cameras, computers, and microphones. When ELLs presented their racism documentary film in the school auditorium (3/10/2009) and when they presented their original artworks and poetry in the local international center (4/23/2010), they learned how to communicate with and present to an authentic audience within a real context. Here, ELLs were not merely consumers of existing cultural products like youtube videos or movies, but they became the creators of multimodal literacies including written texts, music and images (Lankshear & Knobel, 2006), and creatively advocated a culture of social justice.

Division of labor refers to the kind of power structures among members of the community. In Ms. Lewis’s class, the teacher was not an authoritative figure who knows about everything and controls students, but acted as a facilitative social organizer, organizing various participation structures in/across contexts. ELLs were active participants in the classroom community, with their own power and agency as students, teachers, researchers, and social activists, as described in more detail in the “Changing Roles in/across Contexts” section.

Rules indicate the explicit and implicit rules, norms, values, and conventions operated in the community. Rules in Ms. Lewis’s class were as follows: (a) consensus: The components of the activity systems, such as the objects (e.g., topics for learning, DVDs, arts, and poetry) and the means (e.g., digital technology) were discussed by ELLs,
the community members, and decisions were reached by consensus, as shown in the “Shared Knowledge Production” section; (b) integration of ELLs’ *funds of knowledge* into curriculum: ELLs’ cultural practices, lived experiences, thoughts, perspectives, and interests were integrated into classroom topics and discussions for learning, which is congruent with the socio-culturalist concept that learning occurs in the dialectic interactions of everyday concepts with scientific concepts (Vygotsky, 1978); (c) opportunities to learn: ELLs had the multiple opportunities to talk, write, and present their knowledge as legitimate English speakers in/across authentic social contexts; (d) critical dialogicality: All voices of ELLs were heard in *Thirdspace* (Bhabha, 2005; Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López & Tejeda, 1999; Soja, 1996) in the form of *internally persuasive discourses* (Bakhtin, 1981), with no possessors or authoritative figures to enforce and centralize ELLs’ views about the world. All class members’ voices were shared to enact goal-oriented actions, in this case, actions for social justice through critical dialogic inquiry; (e) embodied practice: The lessons (e.g., racism, community, and leadership) dialogically produced by all class members were embodied by ELLs through action in authentic community settings.

Community is defined as “groups of people who share a concern, a set of problems, or a passion about a topic, and who deepen their knowledge and expertise in this area by interacting on an ongoing basis” (Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002, p. 4). Community of practice (CoP, hereafter) is composed of three main constructs: domain, community, and practice (Wenger et al., 2002): Domain indicates the topic or the domain of knowledge that is shared among the community members. Community is a space where each member tries to learn from other members of the group in a trusting relational
context, and with a sense of belonging and mutual commitment. Practice refers to developed repertoires of knowledge and ways of thinking, doing, and seeing things that are developed among community members. From a CoP perspective, Ms. Lewis’s class is seen to be a critical discourse community of practice (CoP) with all three elements of CoP. Ms. Lewis’s class members shared a common goal (i.e., social justice) in a mutually collaborative dialogic discourse community, and practiced their shared knowledge in a real community.

The knowledge produced by ELLs in class did not stay only within the classroom, but it spread into the community and society through multiple interconnected dynamic activity systems. For example, just as stated by Ms. Lewis, “Learning about racism, and seeing what racism is will change racism.” The interviews that students conducted while composing their racism research documentaries functioned in themselves as a tool for providing an opportunity for the interviewees, as they were being interviewed, to reflect on who they are, what racism is, and what they should do to eliminate racism in society.

Ms. Lewis’s students created racism research documentaries as a class project. Each team of four students interviewed four or more people representing three or more different races, asking each person three questions. The three questions that Kuwaku’s group asked were: (a) Have you ever felt unwelcome here at Birch Hill High School?; (b) What can we do to make other races feel welcome here at Birch Hill High School?; and (c) How can Birch Hill High School help students of all races feel more welcome? Kuwaku’s group interviewed 8 people: 4 students, 2 teachers, a janitor, and the father of a student. The students who were interviewed were Hispanic, Black, White, and one was from the Dominican Republic. One of the teachers was White teacher and the other was
Hispanic. The janitor was Hispanic and the student’s father was from the Dominican Republic. When ELL students were asked whether they felt unsafe in Birch Hill High School because of the color of the skin or their race, they expressed their feelings as follows:

Yes, I did. Because when I go to class, I see only White people. I don’t see Black when I look around. I’m like the only Black girl.

Yes. I did. Because when I first came to Birch Hill, I see only White people. I don’t see Black or Latinos.

Yes. Because I, I don’t even speak English.

Yes, sometimes because I was not born in the United States.

Everybody hang out with their own race and I think that’s supposed to mean we’re not welcome in this school (DVD Transcript, 3/0/2009)

As mentioned previously, not only English learners in Ms. Lewis’s class, but other racially and culturally diverse respondents in Birch Hill High School and the community had an opportunity to have their lived experiences about racism heard in the process of being interviewed, rather than just hiding them inside. English learner students’ voices about their life experiences were heard and used as a mediating tool both for learning and for accomplishing social justice. When the question, “Are you ashamed of your race?” was asked to a White male language arts teacher, he answered:

YES, yes I do. I am ashamed and EMBARRASSED about my race. Sometimes, when I look at history like, umm, in this country, uh, the White people came from Europe and there were already Native Americans living here in this country and we killed SO MANY Native Americans. And I still to this day don’t feel like the full weight of what we did. I feel EMBARRASSED right now for the support that, uh, our White government that we have right now is giving to Israel, who is bombing Palestine, and we are supporting Israel, and I’m SO ASHAMED of my own race that is represented in my government right now. (DVD Transcript, 3/10/2009)
The excerpt above indicates how the interviewing process can provide an opportunity for the White male teacher to reflect on his own White privilege. His multiple use of the underlined “we” statements indicate that he is talking about White privilege on behalf of the White people in general. When his ‘we’ statement about White privilege was presented to the community people in the school auditorium, the audience could have had a chance to reconsider their own racial identities and their concomitant (dis)privileges in society they might not have ever thought of in the past.

Regarding the third question, “How can Birch Hill High School help students of all races feel more welcome?” A variety of ways about how to create a more welcoming atmosphere in Birch Hill High School were suggested by students and teachers:

Hispanic science teacher: I think one of the important things, the most important things that we can do is always listen to people. And always make ‘em feel that they are important. What they say to you, how they talk to you, always let ‘em know that you care about ‘em, And the other part is that never be afraid of learning about other cultures. And never be afraid of asking questions about other culture because we come from different parts of the world. And I think it would be important to just always keep open mind and understanding of the different cultures.

White language arts teacher: I think an important thing to make students feel welcome is to get to know them, find out who they are, find out their name, find out where they’re from, find out what things they like to do, what things they don’t like to do, and then they feel like someone here is really interested in them.

Hispanic boy student: Do try to, the other people with respect. If you want other people to respect you, you have to respect for the other people. And try in the best way to the other people.

Girl student from Dominican Republic: Make clubs that make students of all race do activities. (DVD Transcript, 3/10/2009)

As seen in the above data, the community members representing different races and positions in life provided some suggestions as to how to eliminate racism in school
(e.g., listening to other people with “open mind and understanding of different cultures,”
letting other people feel they are loved, respecting other people, and “making clubs that
make students of all race do activities”). All the interview responses could be heard along
with the appropriate pictures, sounds, and images in the text screen. The final text screen
appeared as follows:

My research team and I learned students don’t feel welcome because some
students from the US A. say things that other races, skin color, country of origin,
language and religion.

My research team and I understand why students don’t feel welcome here at Birch
Hill High School. Some students drop out from the High School because they feel
like they don’t belong here and they feel unsafe.

My research team and I understand why students don’t feel welcome here at Birch
Hill High School. “Students need to feel welcome to have a better education?” (DVD
Transcript, 3/10/2009)

As explained in the above section (i.e., Changing Roles in/across Contexts),
English learners became social activists when they participated in a rally (3/10/2010) and
cleaned the city park with community members (4/25/2009). Those activities enacted by
them evolved from learning for self to learning with others in/through community of
practice for the purpose of achieving equity and social justice; thus finally creating
expansive learning cycles in/through interconnected activity systems that reached not
only the local community members they belonged to, but also beyond the community
when their objects (e.g., the videotaped presentation of ELLs about their racism
documentary film, and the 200 mural paintings about their feelings and identities caused
by living in the US that were exhibited in the local international center) were featured in
the newspaper (4/23/2010). ELLs’ academic outcomes, i.e., the racism concept they
learned in class, made a difference in their community through the complex web of relationship of the society they lived in for the purpose of transforming society into a better place, one without racism.

Epilogue

I have now conducted classroom observations in the US for 1½ years, classes in elementary, middle, and high schools taught by five different American teachers, and I have never seen ELLs more engaged in their learning than they were in Ms. Lewis’s class. English learner students were eager to answer the questions and present their discussed ideas with their partners in class, by almost shouting “I do, I do, I do!” I think this active participation in classroom literacy activities is caused by the connections of individual students’ primary discourses with the secondary discourses (as in Gee’s theory of literacy as social practice) based on ELs’ lived curriculum. This lesson illuminates how essentially critical it is to connect individual student’s personal real life experiences into the in-school literacy practices in a community of learners, as argued by the funds of knowledge approach to teaching. (Researcher Journal, 3/8/2009)

This quote was written in my reflection journal after I observed Ms. Lewis’s class (3/5/2009). I was astonished by ELLs’ amazingly meaningful engagement in their classroom activities, which was quite different from other research results, which revealed culturally and linguistically diverse students as counterscript maker underlife in a classroom (Gutiérrez et al., 1995), silent objects (Delpit, 199), rote memorizer (Valdés, 1998), outsider in class (Wortham, 2006), and uninvited guests (Yoon, 2010) in/across classrooms and schools.

As mentioned by Ms. Lewis in the third interview: “I do not teach to the test. But my students showed growth and development despite this” (Interview, 6/10/2010). Ms. Lewis did not “teach to the test” as shown the data in the previous sections of this dissertation paper. Ms. Lewis neither used the texts recommended by school nor taught
the rigid detached subject matter (i.e., reading strategies and vocabulary instruction) in her teaching lesson separately in class from the fall semester of 2008 throughout the spring semester of 2009. But Ms. Lewis integrated all the elements of teaching points like reading strategies and vocabulary instruction into the whole curriculum based on ELLs’ lived experiences, and in that way, Ms. Lewis covered the Utah State Core Language Arts Curriculum. Ms. Lewis empowered ELLs by providing them the authority to choose what they want to learn and conduct research on, and allowing them to use language (i.e., reading, writing, speaking, listening to English) in a way that their inner voices could be heard in public.

Rather than imposing or teaching what they should do and learn, Ms. Lewis guided ELLs to become agents for their own learning and provided multiple spaces for them to choose, explore and express what they thought, felt, valued and believed, that is, to make their identities represented in public to change the society into a better equal society regardless of race, class, gender, and sexual orientation. In those processes, ELLs were empowered and engaged themselves truly and meaningfully in their own learning and development by changing their roles and responsibilities in/across the authentic contexts. The authentic learning occurred, which is involved in much more than merely the mechanical skills of decoding words and producing written texts. Those processes of authentic learning by moving across activity systems allowed Ms. Lewis to be awarded as the a “Highly Effective Teacher” in 2012 due to her students’ performances on the standardized test. Ironically, Ms. Lewis did not teach to the test, but her students outperformed even in their standardized test scores.
I can say that the current urgent issues about the academic and educational gap between ELLs and the native English speaking students, high dropout rates of English learner students, and the split between theory and practice can be overcome by culturally relevant pedagogical practices, like the one enacted by Ms. Lewis, who allowed ELLs’ voices to be heard and let them create their own curriculum and construct their own collective zones of proximal development, rather than just telling ELLs what to do and enforcing them how they should learn.

Ms. Lewis continued her culturally relevant pedagogical practices in her classroom, school, and community as working as a transformative intellectual by providing the tools that ELLs need in order for ELLs to “push against that power structure and, at the same time, not let that power structure eat them up...” and to make ELLs’ voices “to be louder” than her in the constant self-reflections in/on action, as stated in the excerpt below:

I want to give my students that tools that they need to push against that power structure and, at the same time, not let that power structure eat them up, Because people will treat you like you are stupid, or that you don’t matter, or that your voice doesn’t matter, and I’ve seen it, and I’ve experienced it. ... I’m very aware of the experiences that my students have, and I need to ask myself as a White woman with a lot of privilege, “am I the right person to be teaching this class? Where do I have shared experience with my students?” and if I don’t have shared experience with my students, I need to take a huge step back and let their voices be heard. I need their experiences to be louder than mine, and I need to give space for that. Because their reality is going to be different from mine, because you don’t look at me and the sea and immigrant, because I’m White, you know what I mean? (Interview Transcript, 6/10/2009)
This chapter describes, interprets, and explains how Ms. Clark, a White female ELL teacher in her late 20s, came to form reductive and subtractive belief systems about ELLs and ELL pedagogy, and enacted pedagogical practices and processes consistent with those belief systems. The understandings presented in this chapter were gained by exploring, examining, and “connecting the dots” of discourses circulating in/across the histories of Ms. Clark’s personal and institutional spaces, in Cedar Grove Middle School and the community, in the preservice and graduate education programs she completed, and in professional development programs that she attended. Chapter VI includes the following subsections: (1) Discourses Circulating in the Community and School: (a) Discourse of Indifference Circulating in the Histories of Ms. Clark’s Personal and Institutional Spaces: “Uh, yeah. I just was never around anybody”; (b) Procedural Display: Passive Involvement in School and Community; and (c) Assimilating/Segregating Discourses Circulating in Cedar Grove Middle School: “They’re segregated, yeah”; (2) Belief Systems about ELL Pedagogy: (a) Individual/Functional/Technical Discourses about Language and Literacy Development: “If you can read a book, then you are literate”; and (b) Discourse of Deficit and Exclusion about ELLs: “Not only are they
still learning English, but a lot of them need to learn the school social skills”; and (3) Into the English as a Second Language Classroom: (a) Discourse of Assimilation: “Let’s have everybody try and say bloody!” (b) Teacher Scripted Lesson and ELLs’ Hybrid Language Use: “I want you to copy” - “Podemos copiar la cosa de otra persona.”; and (c) Assimilative Pedagogy Analysis from a CHAT Perspective.

Discourses Circulating in the Community and School

This section describes, interprets and analyzes the language ideological discourses that circulate in Ms. Clark’s personal and institutional spaces, analyzes the multiple subject positions that are (re)constructed by those discourses in/across their participation histories, and, in particular, explores the discourses circulating in Cedar Grove Middle School where Ms. Clark’s ESL classroom was located. The following subsections describe the three main themes of discourse observed: (1) Discourses of Indifference Circulating in Ms. Clark's Personal and Institutional Spaces: “Uh, yeah. I just was never around anybody”; (2) Procedural Display: Passive Involvement in School and Community; and (3) Assimilating/Segregating Discourses Circulating in the School and Community: “They’re segregated, yeah.”

Discourses of Indifference Circulating in Ms. Clark's Personal and Institutional Spaces: “Uh, yeah. I just was never around anybody”

Ms. Clark was a White American, middle class, 27-year-old teacher who taught ESL and language arts at Cedar Middle School. Ms. Clark was born and raised in a middle class household. Her parents were White Americans of European ancestry; her
father was a banker and her mother was a nurse. Ms. Clark attended a private elementary school located in the East Side of the city, and attended secondary schools located in a high income suburban area just outside the city. Ms. Clark mentioned that she went to “segregated schools,” in which about 90% of students were White and about 10% of students were Hispanic. In retrospect, Ms. Clark recognized that the “separating” of Hispanic students from regular classes that was the standard pattern when she was a student was probably something that “they would get in trouble for now.” Ms. Clark recalled that although she sometimes saw students from diverse backgrounds, she did not interact “with any of them except for a couple.” Ms. Clark attributed her lack of contact and friendship with students from diverse backgrounds to the school environment, saying, “I just was never around anybody”:

I went to school, there was about probably 90% that were White, and there was about a 10% Hispanic group. But it was a very, like segregated school at the time. Hispanic students were in ELL English development, ESL classes, that sort of thing... We just, I just don't know if I ever really interacted with any of them except for a couple... Or, it could have been just in general, discrimination – not necessarily discrimination, but you know, separating. At the time, I did not even notice. Yeah, now that I look back, though yeah, they probably were doing some things that they would get in trouble for now by, like, office of civil rights. For the most part, I had a couple friends who were Hispanic, and I had two friends that were Black, and then for the most part, everybody else was White. (Interview, 12/1/2008)

R: So, you could not have much contact with friends from diverse background?
T: Uh, yeah. I just was never around anybody. (Interview, 12/1/2008)

Ms. Clark expressed a strong motivation to change the kids in her class: “I may not be changing all the world, I may not be changing every kid that comes into my class, but I know that I make a difference for some of them at least.” She was inspired to be a
teacher by one of her teachers who died while she was in high school, who had devoted his life to his students and the community, and whom she respected very much:

When I was younger, I wanted to be president of the United States, because I wanted to change the world, and make a difference, and do all of that; and then when I was in high school, one of my teachers died, and I realized how much difference he had made to so many people in the community and I realized that if you’re in a community working with them every single day you have much more ability to change the world than you do if you’re a leader up high like a president, and so I decided that I wanted to do that, and I think that beliefs still there you know, that I may not be changing the world, I may not be changing every kid that comes into my class, but I know that I make a difference for some of them at least. (Interview, 10/10/2008)

Ms. Clark got her bachelor’s and master’s degrees in history, and then got her certificates to teach history and English by taking “another year of class”: one multicultural class, language arts teaching classes offered by English department, “one on educational theory class,” “one on secondary education,” technology class, research and practicum classes. But Ms. Clark said that she did not enjoy her education classes, which seemed to be mostly “busywork and common sense,” so she got her master’s degree in world history rather than education:

I didn’t actually like most of my teaching classes. I don’t know if it was because I wasn’t teaching at the time, so it didn’t really, like, fully apply, but it just seemed like a lot of the time it was busywork and common sense. So, I wasn’t a big fan of the teaching ones, that’s why I got my master’s in history instead of education just ’cause, yeah, I don’t know, I didn’t enjoy the education classes as much. (Interview, 6/8/2010)

Ms. Clark wrote her thesis about the comfort women system enacted by the Japanese government toward Korean women during the 36 years of Japanese colonization of Korea leading up to World War II. Her thesis “takes a closer look at the United States’ accountability in the silence of the comfort women” and argues “that the United States had knowledge of the comfort system, and even participated in a similar system during
the occupation. United States officials failed to address the comfort system in the postwar trials because of their own military prostitution problems. Because the US possessed this knowledge and because of their participation, the US should be required to take a more active role in the resolution of the comfort women atrocity” (Clark, 2006, p. 11).

After graduation, Ms. Clark became a teacher in a high school. During her 1st 3 years as a teacher, she taught five different high school subjects: English, US history, government and citizenship, financial literacy, and study skills. Her students were diverse youths in custody - in foster care or detention programs - who were also English language learners or students with special needs. She left that high school and went to Cedar Grove Middle School 1 year before the beginning of this study because she did not like the nonsupportive school environment there. This year is Ms. Clark’s 5th year of teaching. During her 1st year at Cedar Grove Middle School she taught math, but this year she is teaching language arts and ELL classes.

After moving from the high school to Cedar Grove Middle School, Ms. Clark regretted her decision because “the students are harder here sometimes.” She found that high school students had been easier for her to deal with because “they are mature and they’re not quite so awkward as middle school students” (Interview, 6/8/2010). Ms. Clark also noted about teaching middle school:

I never thought I would be a middle school teacher; I used to go “Why in the world would anybody be teaching middle school,” but I moved here because I just wanted a job that was different from the one that I had, and the students are harder here sometimes, BUT with the teachers that I work with, they give me enough support that it makes it OK. (Interview, 10/10/2008)
While working as a teacher, Ms. Clark participated in two professional development programs. One was “inquiry training with Jeff Wilhelm” and the other was the behavioral and cognitive based program for the language and literacy development of ELLs that was explained and analyzed in Chapter IV of this paper. Ms. Clark attended inquiry training PD sessions “four times during the school year” for 3 years, and attended PD for the language and literacy development of ELLs for 1 year beginning in the summer of 2008. She said that she found that the two professional development programs were not in congruence each other, and that she was confused when she tried to implement both of them because of their different approaches to instruction:

I’ve done the inquiry training with Jeff Wilhelm for 3 years. There were about four times during the whole school year, and then the 1st original year I did it, though, it was a summer institute where you went for 5 days and stayed at a hotel, and did it all the time. (Interview, 6/8/2010)

I just was doing both at the same time - I think that’s always confusing, too, ‘cause their little bit different, and then it’s hard to try like apply one without applying the other and that sort of thing. (Interview, 6/8/2010)

At the time of this study, Ms. Clark lives in the West Side, in a mostly Hispanic low income neighborhood. Ms. Clark also attends a church in the West Side, where she teaches English to anyone who would like to learn English. Her husband, who is a fluent Spanish speaker and was a missionary in Guatemala for 2 years, also teaches Spanish at their church once a week. Ms. Clark said that she is trying to learn Spanish because her students would like her to speak Spanish.

In summary, it seems that Ms. Clark’s discursive subject positions of indifference toward issues of social justice for ELLs were constructed by growing up with societal discourses that did not pay much attention to the structural inequality toward ELLs in
school and society when she was young. As stated, she rarely encountered anyone from a diverse linguistic and cultural background owing to an institutional environment that separated ELLs from native English speaking students in a pull-out ESL program, that is, SEI (Structured English Immersion). She spent most of her personal and school life in a setting where more than 90% of people were White, so she did not have much lived experience with people from diverse backgrounds. This is typical of the segregation of American teachers that Frankenberg (2006) found:

White teachers comprise an overwhelming majority of the nation’s teachers. Yet, our data indicate that White teachers were the least likely to have had much experience with racial diversity and remain remarkably isolated. Not only did White teachers, on average, attend schools when they were elementary school students that were over 90% White, they are currently teaching in schools where almost 90% of their faculty colleagues are White. (p. 3)

Procedural Display: Passive Involvement in School and Community

Procedural display is a term used by Bloome, Puro, Christian, Otto and Shuart-Faris (2004) to refer to “the interactional and academic procedures that count as doing a lesson and the cultural meanings and values associated with doing a lesson” (p. 272). Procedural display does not necessarily enable the social actors doing the display, in this case, the teacher and students, to understand what they are doing or to lead students to be engaged in the teaching lessons (Bloome et al., 2004). Ms. Clark practiced procedural display by doing “being an English language teacher,” meaning that she tried to follow the routines and procedures that she was taught teachers should follow, and she tries to act the way teachers should act in class and school. Her procedural display extends to her classroom practices (see the section entitled “Into the English as a Second Language
Classroom” in this chapter), to her development of teaching material for her ELLs, to her acquisition and use of ELLs’ cultural resources, and to her interaction with ELLs’ parents.

Regarding her strategies for gaining and using resources appropriate to ELLs, Ms. Clark noted the severe paucity of books and materials for ELLs, in contrast to the abundance of books for regular students. She said that, owing to her lack of resources for teaching ELLs, she took teaching materials from the Internet, from special education level grammar books, and from picture books:

We have tons of like regular, mid level English textbooks. I think this one is, but as far as our school on a whole, we don’t have very many resources for ELL students, which is surprising, considering that our school is so highly ELLs. (Interview, 1010/2008)

In lesson planning, I use my textbooks, although this is really the first year I’ve ever pulled off of textbooks, but I use text book. I have a lot of children’s books that I like to pull off of, and a lot of different picture books and that sort of thing. I got a special Ed level grammar book that I find my students really like, and I didn’t really pick it because it was special Ed, that wasn’t actually my means of doing it, but because the vocabulary is a lot clearer, so we use that one, and they like that, and I also pull resources off the Internet a lot of times. (Interview, 10/10/2008)

Ms. Clark said that she was “relatively familiar” with the cultures of ELLs. She did not visit students at home or in the community, but identified students’ cultural and linguistic resources through registration cards that students filled out at the beginning of the year, from the content of their completed assignments, or during telephone calls with their parents. Ms. Clark pointed out the difficulty of communicating with the parents of ELLs due to language barriers:

I do assignments that the students talk about their original culture or that sort of thing, but as far as “Does the school provide me with that information?” No. The only information that I know is - I could go look; I could do that, but I don’t have enough time, but I do assignments where I learn more about my students cultures and backgrounds, and that helps. I don’t make home visits; I don’t do that sort of
thing. I try to make phone calls, which language barriers can sometimes be a problem with that. (Interview, 12/1/2008)

We have a registration card that all the students have to fill out at the beginning of the year, and I keep those in the office, and if we have a question we can go down, and it talks about things like language spoken at home. It’s not incredibly informative, so we can go look at those if we want to, but most of us, it’s more so just by the assignments we give and the conversations we have with students, and that’s how we learn more about them. (Interview, 10/10/2008)

In regard to parents’ involvement in students’ schooling processes, Ms. Clark said that parents visited school for “parent–teacher conferences three times a year” and were “invited for Parents Night event.” Ms. Clark would like to ask parents to come to school more often, but she has “never been brave enough to have enough time for preparation for that sort of stuff.” Ms. Clark also mentioned that parents usually visit school “for disciplinary reasons rather than positive reasons”:

We have parents night just once, but we have parent-teacher conferences three times a year. We also do parent nights for a lot of our different clubs, so AVID had a parents night just like three weeks ago. I would love to invite more parents to come talk every once in a while, but I’ve never been brave enough to have enough time for preparation for that sort of stuff, but we do have meetings with parents quite often, more so for disciplinary reasons than we do for positive reasons. (Interview, 10/10/2008)

Applying textual level analysis to the above except: Ms. Clark foregrounded “parent-teacher conference three times a year” and “meeting with parents quite often” while backgrounding “parents night just once” and “never been brave enough to have enough time...” by using the contrastive conjunction, “but.” Ms. Clark’s propositional assumption in the underlined sentence is that a teacher would need to be brave in order to make enough time to prepare for inviting parents to school, and that she was prevented from inviting parents to school, not due to her lack of interest, but by her lack of bravery. As manifested in her next use of the contrastive conjunction, “but,” it can be seen that Ms.
Clark’s conception of parental involvement in their children’s schooling processes seems to be satisfied by parents visiting school once or twice a year for parents nights or teacher-parent conferences. Owing to her lack of agency, Ms. Clark was unable to encourage her students’ parents to be more involved in their children’s learning.

Ms. Clark also mentioned the need for language support to enable communications with the parents of ELLs: “I think it would be nice to have more specifically language services available, so for instance, if I want to talk with a parent in Spanish, we have some resources at our school; but some schools don’t and if I wanted to send a note to parents, I want to make sure I could get it translated into multiple languages.” (Informal Interview, 2008)

In summary, the way Ms. Clark gained materials and cultural resources of ELLs, and the way she interacted with the parents of her ELL students is not aligned with a funds of knowledge view of students and their families. Ms. Clark demonstrated procedural display by playing a passive role in the identification of the cultural resources of ELLs, drawing them from registration cards and from her students’ written assignments, and by gaining her materials from story books, textbooks, or the Internet. Ms. Clark’s interactional patterns with parents were restricted to parental visits to school for disciplinary reasons or for participation in teacher-parent conference or parents night, rather than for the presentation of their linguistic, familial, communal, and cultural resources in their children’s schooling processes.

By contrast, in the funds of knowledge approach, the teacher plays multiple roles as ethnographic researcher, curriculum developer, unit planner, creative thinker, teacher, and learner (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & González, 2005). Teachers function as mediators
between home and school, not just maintainers of school discipline. Teachers experience the “pivotal and transformative shifts in teacher attitudes and behaviors and in relations between households and schools and between parents and teachers” (González & Amanti, 1992; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & González, 1992, cited in González, Moll, & Amanti, 2005) through systematic and intentional inquiry-based home visits (Lytle & Cochran-Smith, 1990), escaping from teaching practices derived from the ahistorical, atheoretical, andapolitically motivated research conducted within the hierarchical educational systems of asymmetric power relations (Amanti, 2005). Through funds of knowledge, parents of low SES students are engaged deeply in their children’s education, and are empowered through the presentation of their knowledge and abilities (Hensley, 2005).

Assimilating/Segregating Discourses Circulating in Cedar Grove Middle School:
“They’re segregated, yeah.”

It was a sunny, beautiful Thursday afternoon. I arrived at Cedar Grove Middle School at around 1:15 pm, which is 10 minutes before the scheduled interview time. I looked around the school area, which is quite different from the east end of the city where most of middle class White people live. Houses in this area look small and in despair compared with the houses in the east side. This school is a new two-story building made out of red brick with big windows. Next to the middle school is a big elementary school. Near the parking lot is a big soccer game field surrounded by the plastic fence. By the entrance, there was a rock shaped like a mountain, painted with bands of all colors, which one of my classmates had explained were meant to indicate the different cultures and languages. (Field note, 10/10/208)

I wrote the above field note to express my desolate feelings whenever I visited Cedar Grove Middle School. Cedar Grove Middle School is located in the poor, high-crime West Side area of Salt Lake City, Utah, which has a mostly Hispanic immigrant population. Almost two-thirds of the students in this school are Hispanic ELLs. On the
State Department of Education website (2009), Cedar Grove Middle School ranked 3 out of 10 on the Great School rating, which ranks schools within the same state against each other by using students’ standardized test scores. All students in Cedar Grove Middle School were the recipients of free discounted lunch. In contrast to the East Side with its beautiful houses and clean streets, the West Side is filled with small, old houses, and a desolate atmosphere. Ms. Clark said that the West Side was considered to be a “really scary area” by a lot of people, and that “some people are intimidated by it because of the diversity and because of like the lower economic level.” (Interview, 10/10/2008)

Ms. Clark noted the inequitable disparity in resources between schools in the East Side and those in the West Side. Schools in the East Side could have better facilities and equipment because of higher taxes, bigger donations, and more sponsors in the East Side. Ms. Clark thought that there was also more parent involvement in East Side schools, and that many teachers might not want to work in a West Side school teaching diverse students or ESL, recalling her own nervous feelings when she first started to work at Cedar Grove Middle School.

And that’s why it’s a little bit inequitable. Plus, sometimes there are teachers out there that won’t work at schools that have a lot of diversity ‘cause they think it’s harder. (Interview, 6/8/2009)

There’re probably are quite a few teachers that wouldn’t want to work here just because they’re afraid of teaching ESL, they’re afraid of - Before I taught it, I was really nervous about it. I didn’t know what I was doing. I was afraid I was - in the beginning it was scary. I was afraid I couldn’t do it, and then found out that, yeah, you can. (Interview, 7/1/2009)

Although almost 90% of the students at Cedar Grove Middle School were linguistically and culturally diverse, and 65% of the students were Hispanic (National Center for Education Statistics, Dept. of Education, 2008-2009), all the teachers except
two and all the school staff except for the principal, a quasi-administrator, and a custodian were White. Ms. Clark was aware that this disparity was a source of frustration within the US Department of Education (ED), and that ED had concerns about how White teachers and students of color could relate to each other:

Most of the teachers here are White. The custodian is Hispanic. The principal is Hispanic. One of our kind of quasi-administrators is Black, And that’s about - there’s not a lot of diversity, and if that’s one of the things that I know education gets frustrated with because they say it’s all a bunch of White teachers teaching diverse kids, and how can they relate to each other and that sort of thing.

(Interview, 10/10/2008)

Cedar Grove Middle School operated a “Newcomers’ Program,” an English immersion program for newly arrived non-English speaking refugee and immigrant students. Newcomers spent most of the day, except for ceramics, music, physical education, drama, and dance classes, in portable classrooms located outside the main school building. A Hispanic community activist had argued “that the program isolates kids and constitute a form of institutional racism” and “filed a complaint with the US Department of Education’s Office of Civil Rights” in 2008 (The Salt Lake Tribune, 3/1/2009). In order to avoid a lawsuit, the school moved their newcomers’ program inside the main building. However, the dispute was not solved because one of the “newcomer classes has returned to a portable.” (The Salt Lake Tribune, 9/30/2009). The Hispanic social activist suggested moving some elective classes such as algebra and geometry to the portable classroom, but in vain because of disagreement from the school.

The school district superintendent stated, “We were being a little overprotective at Cedar Grove. We need to nudge them out of the nest quicker,” and “Our tendency to wait until we felt they would do well in a regular English class may have slowed down their
English acquisition” (The Salt Lake Tribune, 9/30/2009). Also, the principal said that a portable classroom is better for learning and has a more welcoming atmosphere for parents compared with the large main building with its winding halls. Mr. Bontorno (pseudonym), a veteran teacher with 15 years of teaching experiences in the newcomer program, also stated about the portable classrooms that “they were roomy, comfortable and more accessible to parents, many of whom shy from school authorities. They could just drive up and get status reports on the kids.” He stated that he has spent most of time on “basic cultural courtesies” and that the turnover rate was 50% in the newcomer program:

“They came directly from refugee camps where there was no running water or toilets,” said Mr. Bontorno (pseudonym) who spends a lot of instruction time on basic cultural courtesies. About half his students are undocumented immigrants from Mexico. The rest were uprooted by war or genocide from homes in Tonga, Somalia, Burma, Kenya and Burundi. Some have never been to school before, and many won't finish out the year at Cedar Grove; the program has a 50% turnover rate. “You come in and really work hard every day with these kids,” said Sorensen. “And when it's goodbye, I tell them, 'You never know when you're going to be back.'” (The Salt Lake Tribune, 9/30/2009)

From the excerpt above, we can see why the veteran teacher at Cedar Grove Middle School, the principal, and the school district superintendent all supported the isolation of the newcomer program outside of the main building. Their support for the separation of the newcomer classrooms from the main school building was based on an efficiency model, that is, to get immigrant students to acquire English and to assimilate into American culture as quickly as possible. Their goal was not the creation of a community of learners where mutual trust and a caring heart exists in the interconnected relational contexts between teachers and students and among students, with the purpose of accomplishing equal opportunities, equity and social justice for everyone. Another
assumption within the statement of the veteran teacher, Mr. Bontorno (e.g., “They could just drive up and get status reports on the kids.”) is that parents visit school to get “status reports,” not to be a helper, supporter, discussant, translator, or teacher of cultural resources in order to help their children gain a meaningful education.

In addition to the segregation and the assimilative discourses circulating in Cedar Grove Middle School caused by the efficiency model, Ms. Clark mentioned a racial conflict between Tongan students and the Hispanic students and self-segregated seating in class based on ethnicity:

In our school, we have a problem where the Tongan kids and the Hispanic kids sometimes clash or they fight, yeah, it can be a problem sometimes, and they can be racist towards each other a lot of the times, and this year has not been so much of a problem, but if you go in the classroom and let the kids sit where they want, they still sit separate from - they’re segregated, yeah. (Interview, 10/10/2008)

In summary, both segregational institutional structures termed as “two schools in one” school (Valdés, 1998) and assimilative discourses are common in US secondary schools. The English learner students are usually segregated both by school through the “pull-out” ESL program and by classroom through tracking and grouping systems for the purpose of having them acquire English as quickly as possible. However, research results showed that students in ESL classes turned out to be much lower academic achievement and much higher dropout rate than the students in regular classes, particularly Hispanic students (Cummins, 2000). Additionally, students in ESL classes have been considered as a problem or cognitively deficient (García & Kleifgen, 2010), and the social category, ESL (English as a Second Language) or ELL (English Language Learners) functions as academic stigma to diminish ELLs’ opportunities to learn (Varenne & McDermott, 1998). The dominant assimilative discourses in society encouraged students of color to
accomplish academic success “at the expense of their cultural and psychological well-being” (Ladson-Billings, 1995, p. 475).

**Belief Systems About ELL Pedagogy**

This section analyzes Ms. Clark’s belief systems about ELL pedagogy, particularly her views about ELLs and her theories about how to educate and teach ELLs and foster their language and literacy development. The dominant in vivo codes underlying the utterances, statement, actions, and interactions of Ms. Clark were based on what ELLs do not have, such as their lack of English ability, from a deficit perspective rather than what they have, such as their diverse lived experiences in/across various contexts. Relating to how to teach language and literacy, the frequent codes and themes in Ms. Clark’s utterances were all about strategies, skills, practices, scaffolding, reading and writing, and communicating from an individual/technical perspective. None of her statements addressed contextual factors of power, identity, or agency issues in relation to language learning and literacy development. Thus, this section is composed of the following subsections: (1) Individual/Functional/Technical Discourses about Language and Literacy Development: “If you can read a book, then you are literate”; and (2) Discourses of Deficit and Exclusion about ELLs: “Not only are they still learning English, but a lot of them need to learn school social skills.”
Individual/Functional/Technical Discourses About Language and Literacy Development: “If you can read a book, then you are literate.”

In multiple formal and informal interviews and conversations, Ms. Clark talked only about functional literacy, linking literacy with “competence a lot of times ... like your ability to use something well,” “being able to function in a written society” and “reading and writing and speaking and just basically communicating information”:

1. Literacy applies to say reading and writing.
2. If you can read a book, then you are literate.
3. If you can write an essay, or a letter, or something of that sort of thing, you are literate.
4. But it doesn't just specifically go with those skills.
5. If you're able to do a math problem, I believe that incorporates literacy.
6. If you're able to read a recipe, and make a recipe, that requires literacy.
7. If you are able to read a web page, or an e-mail, or maneuver around the Internet, that requires literacy, so that's what it is. (Interview, 12/1/2008)

In the excerpt above, using the modal verb indicating possibility, such as “can” and the verb phrase, “are able to” in the subjunctive mood (lines 2, 3, 5, 6, 7), Ms. Clark associates literacy with the ability to “read a book” (line 2), “write an essay” (line 3), “solve a math problem” (line 5), “read a recipe” (line 6), and “read a web page or an email, or maneuver around the Internet” (line 7). She foregrounded the functional literacy of the individual, and never made any mention of multiliteracies, that is literacy as social practice, which include ways of thinking, interacting, valuing and believing in connection with linguistic texts within the intertwined relationships among power, identity, agency, and context.

In line with a modernist conception of literacy as functional literacy, Ms. Clark defined literacy as “all about reading and writing and speaking” and “being able to
function in a written society” and likened literacy to a kind of “competence.” Regarding the question of her thoughts about her role as a teacher of ELLs, Ms. Clark emphasized the difficulties in teaching ELLs content and language simultaneously caused by of ELLs’ low English ability (e.g., “their language level is low enough that it’s really hard.”) Ms. Clark drew a distinct line between teaching language and teaching content (e.g., “It’s really hard to try and teach the core at the same time as teaching the language skills.”):

1. Hmm, well, you know that’s actually something I struggle with,
2. because we have this core and all these things
3. that we’re supposed to be teaching ELL students,
4. but their language level is low enough,
5. that it’s really hard to try and teach the core at the same time
6. as teaching the language skills,
7. but what I found is that I’m doing a lot better with it this year
8. than I was the last couple of years,
9. and with language arts it makes it a lot easier
10. because you’re more teaching strategies and skills than content,
11. and so it makes it a lot easier, because you can teach skills like reading
12. strategies while you’re teaching basic language skills,
13. whereas, if I were teaching like history,
14. and had to teach the US revolution, or something like that,
15. I would have a really hard time teaching language skills
16. at the same time as teaching the US revolution,
17. it seems like it’s a lot harder to put together.
18. But I’m doing a lot better this year teaching language arts
19. and teaching language skills at the same time. (Interview, 10/10/2008)

Analysis of the underlined pronouns in the excerpt above is very revealing of the way Ms. Clark perceived the distance between herself and her ELL students. Ms. Clark’s use of pronouns started with the second-person pronoun “you know” (line 1), which indicates that she thought that it is perfectly natural that ELL teachers would understand her struggle. She then used the first-person pronoun, “I” (line 1) to tell about her own
struggle, and used the first-person plural “we” on behalf of the collective of ELL teachers, who also must teach both content and language skills at the same time (lines 2-3). Then Ms. Clark revealed the distance between herself and her ELL students by using the third person possessive pronoun, “their” (line 4) in connection with them, as opposed to her use of “we” when referring to ELL teachers in general (lines 2-3). It can be seen that she subconsciously or unconsciously holds an us/them attitude toward her ELLs (lines 2-4), which could explain the implicit discourses of exclusion that circulated in her ESL classroom. Ms. Clark generalized her difficulties in teaching both the core and language skills at the same time in her omission of the agent of the action verb, “teach.” (lines 5-6) She again returned to the first-person pronoun “I” as a social actor with the contrastive conjunction “but” when she reflected how she is better than she was a few year ago (lines 7-9). Ms. Clark normalized the concept of teaching language arts as “teaching reading strategies” and “basic language skills” using the general second-person pronoun, “you.” (lines 10-12) She then used the first-person pronoun “I” in the subjunctive mood in order to portray the difficulties she would have trying to teach language skills and the US revolution (lines 13-17) at the same time. She finally returned to the first-person pronoun, “I” as an actor for her action in combination with the contrastive conjunction when she said that she is doing better this year because she is teaching language arts and language skills together (lines 17-19)

It can be seen that Ms. Clark struggled with what her role was (line 1) as a teacher of ELLs because it was very hard for her to teach language and the core content at the same time (lines 5-6) owing to ELLs’ low language ability (line 4). Although she thought that she was supposed to teach both language and content to ELLs (line 3), Ms. Clark
presumed that her difficulties were due to ELLs’ low English ability (line 4) rather than to any inability of her own, or to a lack of school or state government support. Using the contrastive conjunction, “but,” Ms. Clark emphasized that she is better this year than she was “the last couple years” because she is teaching language arts now (lines 7-9). To Ms. Clark, teaching language arts means teaching “basic language skills and reading strategies” (line 10-12), which is the narrow modernistic view of literacy: reading and writing skills taught by a teacher and learned by each individual student. In order to explain her difficulties in teaching both content and language, Ms. Clark used as an example the difficulty of simultaneously teaching the US revolution and teaching language skills. (lines 13-19) The following is an analysis at the textual level in terms of the concepts of foregrounding/backgrounding, presuppositions, ideology, and agency:

**Foregrounding/backgrounding**

Ms. Clark foregrounded the difficulty of teaching both language skills and content at the same time owing to the low English ability of ELLs, while backgrounding the challenges faced by ELLs, the challenge of learning content while still in the process of acquiring English proficiency.

**Presuppositions**

Ms. Clark’s first supposition is that the English level of her ELLs is so low that teaching both language and content simultaneously to them would be hard. Her second underlying presupposition is that, generally, teaching both language strategies/skills and content at the same time is very difficult. This presupposition arises from the fact that she
does not acknowledge how language exists in a connected organic triangular system, i.e., form-meaning-use, and that language learning occurs best in environments where form-meaning-use are connected and produced in varied, meaningful, and authentic contexts in/across real contexts.

Agency

Ms. Clark perceives her own agency more when teaching language arts class for ELLs, and perceives diminished agency while simultaneously attempting to teach both content area and language skills. She does not mention anything about the agency of ELLs to activate their own L1 literacy abilities, background knowledge, interests, and cultural practices.

Ideologies

It can be said that Ms. Clark has an ideology that encourages deficit views about ELLs, as demonstrated by her blaming ELLs’ low English ability for her difficulties in teaching both language and content at the same time, rather than considering other factors, like her own practices or systematic structures issues (e.g., lack of bilingual support for ELLs to understand language and content at the same time) Here, we can see that Ms. Clark focused on what ELLs do not have, rather than what they have by silencing ELLs’ cultural resources and multilingual abilities. And she silenced school structural issues (e.g., pull-out ESL program) to make it impossible for ELLs to succeed in school. Her ways of thinking about educating ELLs are congruent with those found in most research studies: Teachers usually blame students from diverse backgrounds when they fail (Gay,
Ms. Clark never mentioned that these Hispanic ELLs, who have been staying in the US anywhere from 8 months to 5 years, own abundant cultural resources, life experiences, and literacy abilities in their L1, Spanish, are so resourceful that she needs to activate and build on their L1, and their other cultural resources for optimal learning and development.

The second ideology that Ms. Clark expressed is that the role of an ELL teacher is confined to teaching students how to speak English and demonstrate academic achievement in the classroom setting, rather than developing and building personal and emotional relationships with her students, ELLs living in different cultures and languages that traverse home, school, and society, and empowering them to form their own positive identities with academic competence, cultural competence, and critical consciousness about the world they live in (Ladson-Billings, 1994) for a better society. Ms Clark’s ideologies about the role of the teacher put serious constraints on the strategies available to her regarding how to teach.

Ms. Clark’s limited view about the definition of literacy was illuminated by her conceptualizations about the best practices in teaching ELLs, which were all about strategies, skills, techniques, and classroom management. The most frequent and common words in Ms. Clark’s utterances are “strategies,” “practices,” “skills,” “scaffolding,” “repetition,” “graphic organizers,” and “vocabulary.” Ms. Clark considers the best practices as “...just making sure you build in definitions, and just practice reading, practice speaking, practice writing” and “The strategies for ELLs are the best practices a lot of time”:
A couple of things I do, well I try to use best practices in most of my classes, so being repetitive in my language use, having set procedures, checking for understanding on a regular basis, but the one thing I do notice is I speak slower when I am in my ELL classes of course, than my regular English classes. (Interview, 10/10/2008)

I think teaching ELLs, like the strategies for ELLs are the best practices a lot of the time, they seem like they’re the same. I’ve never actually had a class that taught me the best practices specifically. (Interview, 10/10/2008)

Well, it’s the whole idea of differentiating as much as you can, building in strategies of more scaffolding for the basic learners, and more challenges for the advanced, all at the same time using TPR where, you know, basically what you’re talking about while you say it. I think a lot of the management techniques are similar, no matter if they’re ELL, special ed, or gifted, challenged or anything of that sort using reading strategies that benefit all levels, those sort of things. (Informal Interview, 2008)

I think the biggest thing is making sure that their readings aren’t too hard, making sure that you’re not using too high vocabulary in your lectures or whatever, just making sure you build in definitions, and just practice: practice reading, practice speaking, practice writing. (Interview, 12/1/2008)

In the excerpt above, there is no statement concerning the social organization of learning in collective activity systems in/beyond the classroom doors and embodied practice in Thirdspace among the members of a discursive community of learners (Gutiérrez, 2008; Moje et al., 2004) and no utterances about “the academic discourse of the various school subjects” (Fillmore & Snow, 2000, p. 12) and “how language functions in various modes of communication across the curriculum” (Fillmore & Snow, 2000, p. 13). Rather, she emphasized practice and repetition, slow speech, and lowering the vocabulary level in order to allow ELLs to gain access to the language. All these measures come from behavioristic audiolingualism, which is in accordance with the banking concept of education (Freire, 1970). It can be assumed that Ms. Clark’s ideologies about teaching and learning are based on the premise that knowledge transfers
from teacher to students through practices by “checking for understanding on a regular basis” and by speaking English slowly.

In a similar vein, Ms. Clark’s conceptualization about writing is based upon a linear demarcated thinking. In an informal conversation, she mentioned that her “ELLs are not ready to write a paragraph,” and in the following excerpt, she said that she does not require ELLs to write essays “until the very last quarter of the year”:

At the beginning it may just be drawing something, and then you go from there to writing a couple words, then you’re writing a sentence, then to writing three sentences, then so on. So, my ELL students that I have, they will not be writing essays until the very last quarter of the year. (Interview, 12/1/2008)

... writing, I think it’s important, like, with middle school age, you have to get them very comfortable with, like, formulaic writing, and then you build it from there. So, you have to give them the form and say, “OK, this is what an essay looks like. These are the things you need in an essay.” And then once they can get that structure down, then they have the structure and they can go from there and actually make it more poetic language and more...(Interview, 6/8/2009)

As demonstrated in the excerpt above, Ms. Clark believes that writing ability occurs through the step-by-step procedures in a linear fashion, from drawings to words, words to sentences, from sentences to paragraphs, and from paragraphs to essays, and tries to guide her ELL students on their way by “showing them proper formats, like I do use graphic organizers all the time for their writing and I think that helps.” (Interview, 12/1/2008) Her modernistic behavioristic approach to language and literacy development has confined her to a concept of literacy learning that leads her to teach writing by giving her students writing patterns to practice. She never recognized that her English learner students are already literate in their L1, and that they have abundant knowledge about a world that they have navigated and lived experiences across multiple contexts, which she
could activate and build upon as resources for writing instruction. It can be assumed that she was never taught that by bringing the individual student’s *funds of knowledge* into the classroom, ELLs would be more motivated and engaged in their learning, as has been demonstrated in research study after research study (Au & Jordan, 1981; Gay, 2006; Heath, 1983; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Moll, 1990; Valdés, 1998).

For Ms. Clark, the purpose of education is the provision of the communication tools that people need in order to read, write and communicate with people in power, and participate in the decision making processes. Ms. Clark expressed her view about the functional value of education in this direct quote:

> I think education is important because, well, if we didn’t have it we’d have major problems: people wouldn’t be able to read and write, communication would be a major problem, as far as government or anything of that sort, it would be pointless, because most people wouldn’t be able to participate, and, therefore, whoever had the most education or the most power would be the ones in charge and making all the decisions, and we have so many advances because of education, that we’d be really sad without it. (Interview, 10/10/2008)

Ms. Clark acknowledged the importance of culture as a connection through which teachers and their students can build trust relationships, and that the way a perspective informed by cultural diversity can be a catalyst for the creation of new ideas and “powerful understandings”:

> Well, culture can be a very powerful thing because if you can connect with your students, if you understand a little bit more about their culture, and if you ask more, it gives you a starting point to build a relationship, and it shows that you value them, and so it can be very beneficial as a way to build relationships with students, and to build background knowledge, and build discussions because a lot of the time, say, you’re reading a story, somebody from an Asian culture, somebody from an African culture, somebody from a South American culture is going to see it a lot differently than me, and so we can pull all those ideas together, and really build some powerful understandings. (Interview, 10/10/2008)
Despite Ms. Clark’s recognition of the potential benefits of culture in the classroom and in society, she never recognized any relevance of culture and context for the foundations of language and literacy education, for her classroom pedagogical practices, or for students’ learning. Just saying something at a superficial level is totally different from understanding the concept with our whole mind and soul. In conclusion, Ms. Clark’s belief systems are congruent with a modernistic behavioral perspective characterized by individual/functional/technical discourses about how to teach language and literacy to ELLs.

**Discourse of Deficit and Exclusion About ELLs: “Not only are they still learning English, but a lot of them need to learn the school social skills.”**

*Um, my thing that I have the hardest time with is, at the beginning, it was that I was afraid that we wouldn’t be able to talk; now I don’t worry about that. Now there’s too much talking. I think the biggest difficulty now is that not only are they still learning English, but a lot of them need to learn the school social skills like sitting in their desks during class and not talking while the teacher’s talking.*

(Interview, 10/10/2008)

The above excerpt is Ms. Clark’s response to the question of what were the most difficult challenges that confronted her while teaching ELLs. Without any hesitation, Ms. Clark attributed her difficulties in teaching ELLs to what ELLs do not have (e.g., their lack of English ability) from a deficit perspective, rather than looking toward the challenge of building on what they already have from a resource perspective. A line by line analysis of the above interview data follows:

1. Um, my thing that I have the hardest time with is, at the beginning,
2. it was that I was afraid that we wouldn’t be able to talk;
3. now I don’t worry about that. Now there’s too much talking.
I think the biggest difficulty now is that not only are they still learning English, but a lot of them need to learn the school social skills like sitting in their desks during class and not talking while the teacher’s talking.

Seen through the lens of Ms. Clark’s use of pronouns in the excerpt above, her point of view toward her relationship with her ELLs is evident in her use of “I” statements (lines 1-4) and “They” statements (lines 4-6), a linguistic demonstration of the distance between herself and her ELLs. Ms. Clark did not usually make statements or utterances using the collective “we” when talking about herself and ELLs; the one time she did use the word “we” in this example, it was used only within the context of a hypothetical situation which, even then, did not involve them doing the same thing at the same time. Ms. Clark identified the two kinds of difficulties that she faced related to teaching ELLs: her fear before she began teaching that she would not be able to talk with ELLs (lines 1-2), and, after she began to try to teach, the problems she had trying to get her ELL students to stop talking. (line 3) The following is an analysis at the textual level in terms of foregrounding/ backgrounding, presuppositions, ideologies, and agency:

**Foregrounding and Backgrounding**

Using a coordinate conjunction sentence structure, (e.g., not only … but ...) Ms. Clark foregrounded the lack of social skills that her ELLs demonstrated in the classroom, while backgrounding the fact that ELLs are in the process of learning English. At the same time, Ms. Clark silenced all the other factors like the lack of materials appropriate to ELLs’ language level, the lack of a bilingual teacher aid, and a school system that designates a group for exclusion, such as this pull-out ESL class.
Presuppositions

Ms. Clark presupposes that in order to learn in school, students must sit still at their desks and be quiet. Another presupposition is that her difficulties in teaching ELLs are caused by the fact that ELLs are in the process of learning English and that ELLs are lacking in social skills, and not by the fact that she cannot motivate ELLs to work hard by connecting her teaching lesson with their cultural resources.

Agency

It can be seen that Ms. Clark does not have much ability to control a class with the skills that she has and with the strategies she is using.

Ideologies

Ms. Clark’s ideologies are based on a deficit view about ELLs, based on her perceptions that ELLs lack both English proficiency and social skills. Rather than valuing the bilingual/bicultural abilities of ELLs, who speak two languages and traverse two cultures at home and school, as resources for learning in a multilingual/multicultural classroom environment, Ms. Clark viewed ELLs merely as students whose English proficiency is poor compared with that of native English speaking students, and who exhibit in class an unacceptable lack of social skills and bad attitudes.

The above excerpt of Ms. Clark’s fear of teaching ESL corresponded to her statement in the dialogue with me (R: Researcher / T: Ms. Clark):

T: There’re probably quite a few teachers that wouldn’t want to work here just because they’re afraid of teaching ESL, they’re afraid of...
R: Teachers are afraid? [looking surprised]
T: Uh huh. I know. Before I taught it, I was really nervous about it. I didn’t
know what I was doing. I was afraid I was...
R: But you have taught a lot of diverse students before, right? like students in foster care, so you have experiences about that.
T: Yes, but in the beginning it was scary.
R: It’s getting better?
T: I was afraid I couldn’t do it, and then found out that, yeah, you can. It was.
(Interview, 6/8/2009)

In the dialogue above, Ms. Clark spoke about the hesitance of “probably quite a few teachers” to work in Cedar Grove Middle School because of their fear of “teaching ESL.” (turn 1) Then she used the third person pronoun “it,” which may be in reference to ESL class or ESL as a subject, when she talked about her own nervousness about teaching ESL (turn 3). Her use of the third person singular “it” implies that she had an impersonal and detached attitude toward ESL (English as a Second Language) issues, and perhaps toward ESL students. Her attitude matches that seen in Sleeter’s (1994) research about the beliefs of pre/inservice teachers about the education of language minority students, which revealed that most White teachers felt nervous about ELLs and were not competent in teaching ELLs.

As explicit in the excerpts above, Ms. Clark focused, from a deficit perspective, on what ELLs and ELL families need and what they do not have, rather than recognizing what they have from a resource perspective. In the following excerpt, she mentioned that there was a science teacher who provided her students with packets on science topics, which were “worded in such a way” that neither ELLs nor ELL parents could “get the information from them.” So she integrated studying those science packets into her ESL class:

We have a science teacher here who’s an amazing science teacher. But one of the things she does is gives the students packets every quarter on science topics. And those packets are worded in such a way the ELLs just can’t get the information
from them. And so all the time I have my ELL students coming to me with these science packets, and I’ve even worked it into my curriculum now, because I know they need extra support on it. Most of the ELL parents that I have worked with are actually lower in their English level than the students and so aren’t able to give the same support because they can’t access the information as well, either. (Interview, 2009)

The above excerpt shows the contrast between Ms. Clark’s view of the science teacher and her view of ELLs and their parents. Her use of the affective adjective “amazing,” underlined in line 1, reveals the personal and strongly positive attitude that she held toward the science teacher. Ms. Clark’s ideologies caused her to perceive that the science teacher was such an “amazing” teacher that she prepared packets of science information every quarter for ELLs, but that both ELLs and their parents had such poor English abilities that they could not understand the information. How can a teacher become an “amazing” teacher by providing information that her students cannot access?

Ms. Clark never forgot to blame ELLs or ELL parents for the academic failure of ELLs, and never examined her own practices and the prevalent structural and societal inequalities toward ELLs; this is in congruence with research that shows that the academic struggles of linguistically and culturally diverse students are often perceived to be caused by problems in their culture, language, and home environment (Cummins, 2000; Nieto, 2000; Valenzuela, 2004).

Naming is a political act. “The namer isolates the named, explains them, contains them, and controls them” (Ndebele, 1995, p. 4). Hunter (1997) examined the development of children’s literacy in a multilingual elementary classroom in urban Canada, and found that “labeling often allowed for reinforcement of the school’s label for them as ‘deficient’ in language and literacy.” Leung, Harris, and Rampton (1997) pointed
out classroom practices in bilingual students’ classroom in England that negatively inscribed categories for ESL students in society. For these reasons, Thesen (1997) argued against the usefulness of naming, and for the need of co-constructing naming with the learner.

In this vein, the most repeated utterance by Ms. Clark is “ELLs,” which is then followed by an explanation of the problems caused by the fact that her students are in the process of learning English as their second language. Her most frequent in vivo code is “ELLs” (English language learners). Ms. Clark repeatedly pointed out what ELLs need, like “… they need the structures, they need the sentence sounds, they need those sorts of things” (Interview, 6/8/2009) and pointed out what ELLs lack, that is, English ability. Ms. Clark said that ELLs’ “language level is so low enough and that is really hard to try and to teach the core at the same time as teaching the language skills” and noted that “most honors students are native English speaking students.” The term “ELL” is given a negative metaphoric role, such that ELLs would not be expected to be honors students, as shown in Ms. Clark’s use of the word “even” in the following quote:

(R: Researcher; T: Teacher, Ms. Clark)

R: How many ELLs do you have?
T: Actually, last year, most of my students were not ELLs. But it looks like this year, even most of my honors class even is ELLs, so that is 13 out of 22 honors students that are still ELLs, so that half of them are.” (Interview, 12/1/2008)

Labeling students in the low income area “ELL,” similarly to the term LD, implied that Ms. Clark and other teachers considered ELLs to be a great burden to the teacher, as shown in following interview excerpt:

R: How do people think of students here?
T: It differs. My guess is that there is still a negative connotation to our students. The teachers here definitely have higher expectations for the kids, and expect things, learning to take place, and then that sort of thing, but some teachers in other areas probably are not used to coming to teach here, especially from up higher on the East side, that I think those teachers would probably not want to switch. (Interview, 12/1/2008)

In conclusion, Ms. Clark’s philosophy about the value of education, and her perceptions and conceptions about ELLs and language and literacy development are based upon a combination of functional/individual/technical discourses and discourses of deficit and exclusion. In her utterances and statements, she never mentioned the social context of education, the interactional processes of learning in/across contexts, or the intertwined relationships among identity, agency, and power issues in the education of ELLs. Ms. Clark viewed literacy primarily as an ability to function in society, rather than relating it to the formation of positive identities among ELLs and to the production of societal change for equity and social justice. Her conception of second language acquisition as a linear process allowed Ms. Clark to teach single sentences for 1 semester, to teach paragraphs for the next semester, and so on. Both her deficit perspective toward ELLs (e.g., focusing on what ELLs lack and need, rather than finding out what ELLs already have and know) and her linear demarcated thinking about education and teaching ELLs clearly limited Ms. Clark’s ability to understand ELLs and their education. For Ms. Clark, teaching language and literacy meant merely transferring language ability and knowledge from one brain to another brain through the use of best practices and scaffolding by teachers. This has no resemblance to Ms. Lewis’s view of language and literacy teaching as shared knowledge production through interactive meaning-making
processes within changing activity systems and the expansion of learned lessons to community and society for a better world.

**Into the English as a Second Language Classroom**

I entered the building and walked up to the second floor. Outside of the classroom wall a little above head level, was a sign indicating that this classroom is Ms. Clark’s class: *Ms. Clark 8th grade, Language Arts.* Under this sign, the school motto was posted: *Respect, Responsibility, Family, Trust,* and *Caring.* I entered the classroom and was immediately disappointed by the arrangement of desks and chairs, which were all facing forward. I felt there could be no interactions between and among students with such an arrangement of the classroom. On the front wall above the whiteboard, there were many posters with colorful pictures and captions: from left to the right, a female athlete running on a track with the caption “*You are not finished when you lose, you are finished when you quit*” in the center, a picture of two green frogs staring at each other captioned “*There was homework?*” underneath, a picture of a yellow light bulb that said “*Welcome to class. Turn on your brain,*” the word *voice* displayed on a cloud shaped paper, “*Sentence fluency*” on a musical note, the word “*Conventions*” with four wheels, the Uncle Sam recruiting poster “*I WANT YOU FOR U.S. ARMY,*” and a girl feeding chocolate to a boy captioned “*A kiss for you: HERSHEY’S SWEET MILK CHOCOLATE KISSES*” (Field notes, 9/25/2008)

As I wrote the above field notes, I was very disappointed with the classroom environment, not only because the seats and chairs were all arranged facing the teacher, but also because I felt there were too many humorous posters like the Hershey’s chocolate advertisement and the Elvis Presley BLVD license plate. The retro art decor seemed to be trying to make me think I was in some kind of mainstream American café, rather than in a classroom for linguistically and culturally diverse students. Not only were all the posters printed in English, but there were no books to be found in any other languages, not even a bilingual dictionary. All the books in the classroom were written entirely in English. Here are some examples of the reading materials I saw: books
Human beings are not just empty vessels, but socio-cultural-historical beings. Semiotic mediations are central to human learning and development (Engeström, 1999). The higher order mental processes are developed through mediating psychological tools or signs, and knowledge is not internalized directly, but through the use of psychological tools such as language, pictures, gestures, and mnemonics. Despite the important roles that semiotic mediations play in literacy learning and development, Ms. Clark’s ELL classroom contained no books written in any languages other than English, no bilingual books or dictionaries, and no stories related to Hispanic cultures even though 65% of the students at Cedar Grove Middle School were Hispanic. The postings on the wall and the books on the bookshelf were all written in English and all contained only stories about American culture. And Ms. Clark’s classroom practices turned out to be consistent with the English monolingual and monocultural classroom environment.

Discourse of Assimilation: “Let's have everybody try and say bloody!“

On October 30, 2008, 12 students - 5 Hispanic girls, 6 Hispanic boys, and 1 Black boy from South America - were seated in Ms. Clark’s ESL classroom facing the teacher in individual desks arranged 6 in the front row and 6 in the back row. These ESL students had lived in the United States for a period ranging from 8 months to 5 years, and they belonged to group C, which was the second highest English proficiency level at Cedar Grove Middle School. Ms. Clark was writing the class goals on a large whiteboard that
was on the front wall of the classroom. But she did not change the date, so the date appeared as Monday Oct 27, 2008. In the meantime, the students were talking with each other very loudly in Spanish. The goals and objectives for this class were on the far right of three columns written on the board as follows:

**Monday Oct 27, 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are we working on?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal: Complete homework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.W.: Due tomorrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5th Period</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal: Halloween Stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.W.: Finish Story Retell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish pictures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal: Reading and Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.W.: Bring journal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How can “complete homework” or “Halloween stories” be a goal? There is no use of a cognitive tool. Goals define the content and concept knowledge that students need to attain; objectives describe the means that will be employed in order to reach those goals. This is an ESL class; therefore, two kinds of objectives like language and content objectives should be connected and laid out in the context of culturally relevant pedagogical content and materials. Based upon the written lesson goals, I could already predict how Ms. Clark would lead this class. (Researcher’s Journal, 10/30/2009)

As I wrote the above journal entry, I was thinking about the seating arrangement and the goals on the whiteboard. This was the fifth class period of the school day. Ms. Clark started this class by checking homework from the previous class, i.e., finishing up drawing a picture about a Halloween story:

1 T: Guys! All right. OK... *(inaudible because of loud chatting in Spanish among students)* Ok, let's talk about it, then. Here's what we're gonna do; since there's some people that didn't get done, you're gonna have to add something to your planners; everybody pull your planner out. If you did your story, you just have to ______ write
this stuff, but if you didn't get your story done, you need to add one more thing.

(Teacher points to a line on the board that says “Finish pictures.” Students talk with each other in Spanish.)

2 T: OK. So, if you did not have picture story done, you need to take that home and finish that, too. OK. If you're not done with your picture story, you’ll need to write it.

3 S1: Ms. Clark, this look like …(A girl student on the left side stands up and shows her paper to the teacher.)

4 T: OK, uh-huh, that's OK.
5 S1: I did my story. (telling to the class in low voice, smiling)
6 T: If you didn't do your story, you can put this here. If you did do your story, you can turn it in today. If you have names on it on the back, and turn it in.

(Diego on right side of room in the back throws something, like folded paper to Felipe in the left side of room and gets up to pick it off floor.)

7 S2: WHAT STORY? (in a very loud voice, sounding like he is very upset)

(A Hispanic boy at the back of room has tipped his chair back and is leaning his head against the back wall, with his feet on the desk and his collar pulled up over his face.)

8 Ss: (talking in Spanish)
9 T: Uh, we won't have time to do that. It's, you would have had to do that last, yesterday.
10 S2: ToMOrrow
11 T: OK, What we're going to do tomorrow, tomorrow I think we're going to have some fun on Halloween.

(Teacher begins putting one photocopied packet on each student's desk.)

Ms. Clark started class by summoning her students with “Guys!,” “All right,” “Ok” (turn 1), using the discourse markers “All right” and “OK” to indicate her decision to transition to a new topic without spending too much time talking about homework issues, similar to the way a medical doctor would use “OK” to get past unproductive topics and
move a health survey along (Beach 1995). Then Ms. Clark stated the obligation of students who did not finish their homework: they “have to” write the goal “Finish pictures” on their planners, while students who had finished the picture “have to” write the goal “Finish Story Retell” on their planners. Ms. Clark used the deontic markers of modalization “have to” and “need to” (turn 1), but the students were not following her directions. Thomas (pseudonym), a Black-skinned boy from South America was reading a book and all the other students were talking with each other in Spanish.

In turn 2, Ms. Clark again used the discourse marker “OK” to indicate her decision to proceed, and then stated students’ obligations using the deontic markers of modalization “need to” with the hypothetical mood using “if...” (turn 2). Reneta (pseudonym), who sat in the front left of the classroom, showed her homework assignment to Ms. Clark (turn 3-4) and got Ms. Clark’s evaluation that her homework was “OK” (turns 3-4). Here Ms. Clark used the word “OK” twice, fitting in a double meaning each time: she communicated her nonspecific but somewhat positive impression about Reneta’s homework and then verified her judgement, while at the same time signaling that she was interrupting her conversation for one cursory acknowledgement of Reneta’s homework and then moving instantly back to student’s obligations (turn 4). Then Reneta told to the class in a low voice, smiling, that she had finished her homework. In turn 6, Ms. Clark reiterated what students “can” do, declaring the two and only two possibilities for student actions using the conditional hypothetical mood, “if” (turn 6): students who did their homework could turn it in today, while students who did not finish their homework could write “Finish pictures” in their planners. While she was talking, Diego (pseudonym) in the right back of the room threw a folded up piece of paper to
Felipe (pseudonym) in the front left, who opened it and read it. Then Ms. Clark reminded students to write their names on the back of their papers before they handed them in.

While Ms. Clark was enumerating what students could do depending on whether they had finished their story homework or not, Diego, a Hispanic boy who had tipped his chair back and was leaning his head against the back wall, with his feet on the desk and his collar pulled up over his face (turn 6) shouted, “WHAT STORY?” (turn 7) in a loud, angry sounding voice. In response to his question, Ms. Clark stated that we “won’t have time to do that,” expressing her high level of commitment to a future truth by using the epistemic modality, “won’t” and explained what Diego “would have had to do,” referring to Diego’s past obligation by using the deontic markers of modalization, “had to” (turn 9). In the meantime, all the students were talking in Spanish with each other. Then Felipe said, “Tomorrow” (turn 10) and Ms. Clark stated that “we’re going to have some fun on Halloween” (turn 11), again expressing her strong commitment to a future truth by using the markers of modalization, “are going to do.”

Modality indicates “the tone of statements as regards their degree of certitude and authority” (Huckin, 1995, p. 102). Analyzing the above excerpt in light of Huckin’s definition of modality, it can be seen that Ms. Clark repeatedly expressed her position of authority in the classroom, directing what English learner students “have to do” (turn 1), “need to do” (turn 2), “would have had to do” (turn 8), and deciding what “we’re going to do” tomorrow (turn 11). There was no agency on the part of the students; Ms. Clark preordained their future based on their past actions by using the hypothetical mood. All the things that ELLs “need to do” are foregrounded, while silencing what they have and what they have done. There was no empowering discursive positioning through the use of
encouraging and verifying statements about what they have and what they have done.

The implicit ideology of the class is that the teacher decides what students “would have had to,” “have to,” and “need to” rather than following a democratic type of arrangement in which students and teacher negotiate the rules and norms about how the class should operate. Modality also refers to “what authors commit themselves to, with respect to what it true and what is necessary,” which also applies to “texturing identities” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 164). The way Ms. Clark textured herself in relation to her students using one way communicative mode utterances, as seen above, is consistent with a relationship between an authoritarian teacher and students acting in accordance with the teacher’s demands.

If we look at the above excerpt as a whole using Huckin’s (1995) concept of genre as “a characteristic set of formal features serving a characteristic purpose” (p. 98), Ms. Clark’s classroom practices aligns with the typical classroom genre known as “being student and teacher” (Mehan, 1979): the teacher exists as an authoritative figure who checks homework, starts the teaching lesson, and decides what students will do in class. But if we look at the excerpt above with some social and cultural background knowledge about this literacy event, we can understand the situation more clearly, for utterances are always formed within contexts of multiple relations (Bakhtin, 1980). In the previous class, Ms. Clark had asked students to write a Halloween story in English, to draw a picture of one of the events in their story, and then write an explanation of their picture in English on the back of the paper. The students were supposed to present their story to the class in English today. The intention of this kind of homework would seem very good in terms of having English learner students develop their English writing ability.
However, celebrating Halloween is part of Ms. Clark’s, that is, American cultural practices, and the Halloween holiday did not relate to the lived experiences and cultures of these Hispanic immigrant ESL students. Most Hispanic immigrant students lived in the West Side of the city, where the population was predominantly Hispanic, and did not have many American friends from whom they could learn about traditional American customs and holidays. How could they relate Halloween to their life experiences and write about it in English? Even though Ms. Clark knew that there is a holiday similar to American Halloween in Mexico, she did not integrate the students’ lived experiences into her teaching practices and curriculum. When Ms. Clark was asked if there is a holiday like Halloween in Hispanic cultures, Ms. Clark said, “They have what they call ‘noche de bruja,’ which is night of the witches, and its not necessarily the same as Halloween but it’s pretty close, and in some churches, like Mexico, they have like the day of the dead” (Interview, 10/30/2008). Although Ms. Clark seemed to be aware that her ELLs had their own cultural resources, it also seems that she never thought to integrate her English learner students’ *funds of knowledge* into her teaching practices.

Then the class proceeded as follows: Ms. Clark announced that they were going to have fun tomorrow on Halloween and distributed a handout with 18 Halloween stories. The students asked what the handout was about and Ms. Clark answered that this handout was all about Halloween stories, and said they could choose the stories they wanted to read. But Ms. Clark actually chose what they were going to read on her own and told her students to follow. Ms. Clark wrote a list of story titles on the board: Ghost w/Bloody finger, Dead Man’s Brains, New Horse, White Wolf, and The Thing. Ms. Clark chose Ghost w/Bloody finger to be the first story to read in class and said,
Here’s what we are going to do; we’re gonna read the Bloody Fingers first, Vallen Didie’s on the very back page. So everybody flip the back page. The very back page, page 86. You should have a picture of, flip it over, yep. Ok ready? Go Amelia.

A businessman are in a hotel... (Amelia continues reading the text.) (Ms. Clark walks down center aisle to the back of the classroom.)

Ah, actually, let’s stop there and talk about it real quick. OK, let’s practice saying the words real quick, let’s practice saying “hotel.”

Hotel

Hotel, very good (Ms. Clark walks back to front of classroom)

.................(omission).................

OK Yep, Ok but hold on, let’s talk about some other things I heard somebody else ask haunted, what does haunted mean?

(All talking at once)

(making howling sound) Ghost! Haunted. Haunted, yep. OK, Amelia’s gonna keep reading the rest of page for us, so everybody follow along. We’re now at that bottom paragraph.

The man went up to the room.....(Amelia continues reading)

Moaning

What is that? (Ms. Clark walks to back of room)


When the men saw the ghost... (Amelia continues reading)

OK. Very good. So, what happened?

(all talking at once)

(speaking too quickly to be understood) So you heard Ameila, who says she remembered the book, Let Kate tell me, what happened in that?

Ummm,

She cut her finger.

Shhh.

She saw the ghost uh, with that hand fly, with um mum, ah heh.

OK

(laughing)

Now next part. Oh...

Me! (Santiago raised his hand)

Let’s let Santiago, and then we’ll have...

.................(omission).................
T: Ok, before we finish this story, let’s talk about a couple of things. Very quickly. Let’s have everybody try and say bloody.

Ss: Bloody.

T: Bloody. Good!

S: Blotty?

T: Bloody.

Ss: Bloody.

T: Almost like you got hit in the stomach; ughhh, bl-ughhh-dy

(Ms. Clark hits her stomach)

D: Bloody.

F: Bl-ughhh-dy

Ss: (lots of snarling and grunting sounds)

T: Yep. now you got to go and do it again that way. Ok, and then the other one I want you to practice: arrived.

Ss: Arrived

T: Arrived, uh...

S: Came

T: That’s it: came. Yup.

T: Arrived! (Class Transcript, 10/30/2008)

Ms. Clark decided what they were going to read, “Bloody Fingers ... on the very back page,” and asked students to “flip the back page.” Then she called on Amelia to read the text (turn 1). While Amelia was reading the text, Ms. Clark walked down the aisle to the back of the classroom (turn 2). Then Ms. Clark asked Amelia to stop and directed the whole class to practice saying the word “hotel” (turn 3). So her students repeated her pronunciation of the word “hotel” (turn 4) and Ms. Clark said “hotel” again, and then “very good” (turn 5). Ms. Clark stopped Amelia’s reading again to talk about the word “haunted.” When she asked the students to tell her about the meaning of the word (turn 6), all students began talking with each other in Spanish without paying attention to Ms. Clark (turn 7). Ms. Clark said, “Ghost! Haunted” while making a howling sound, and then told everyone that Amelia was “gonna keep reading” (turn 8). Amelia continued reading (turn 9) until Ms. Clark said “moaning” (turn 10). A student asked about the
meaning of the word (turn 11) and Ms. Clark made a wailing sound to explain the
meaning. (turn 12). Students made wailing sounds while saying “Bloody fingers. Bloody
fingers” (turn 13). Then Amelia continued reading the text (turn 14) and, again, in the
middle of her reading, Ms. Clark interrupted, complimenting Amelia’s reading and asking
the class a question about what happened in the story (turn 15). The students all talked at
the same time, so nothing they said could be understood (turn 16). Ms. Clark called on
Kate and asked her to answer the question about what happened in the story (turn 17), but
Kate could not answer (turn 18). Michael answered, “She cut her finger” (turn 19).

The rest of the class consisted of the same pattern of round robin reading (RRR),
students reading Halloween short stories turn by turn, and Ms. Clark interrupting the
reading and asking students to stop reading in order to talk about a vocabulary word, to
repeat her English pronunciation of a word, or to read the definition of the word from the
textbook. The whole class, in chorus mode, repeated her pronunciation of the following
simple English words: “clerk,” “hotel,” “arrived,” “bloody,” “guest,” and “awful.” This
routine of students repeating Ms. Clark’s English pronunciation is one of the most
common literacy events that took place in class (9/25/2008, 9/28/2008, 10/22/2008,
repetition in a decontextualized context and ELLs’ passive participation mode were again
being repeated on September 25, 2008, when Ms. Lewis and her class were studying four
vocabulary words. The words were “brain power,” “figure out,” “improve,” and
“intelligence”:

1 T: Let’s go back to our vocab words real quick and say them all. So, the first one is brain power. Everybody try it. Brainpower.

2 Ss: Brain power, brain power
In the excerpt above, Ms. Clark suggested that the class go back to the four vocabulary words to “say them all,” and asked everybody to say the word “Brain power” (turn 1). So, the students repeated her pronunciation of the word “Brain power” (turn 2). Ms. Clark called on Amelia and Nate because she did not hear them, and asked everyone to repeat her pronunciation of “Brain power” again (turn 3). The students repeated again, “Brain power” (turn 4) and Ms. Clark said, “Good.” She then called on Nancy because she did not hear her repeat the word (turn 5), so Nancy said, “Brain power.” Ms. Clark expressed her satisfaction, “Very good,” reminded the class that from now on she expected to hear everyone repeat after her, and then pronounced the next word, “figure out” (turn 7). Students repeated after her sound, “figure out” (turn 8) and Ms. Clark said, “Perfect” (turn 9). This simple interactional cycle was repeated: Ms. Clark’s modeling of the pronunciation of the word → the whole class’ repetition of the sound after her in chorus mode → her evaluation of the students’ sound repetition → calling on a student who did not repeat after her → providing another vocabulary for repetition of the sound.
Apparently, Ms. Clark believed that teaching English is just teaching ELLs how to sound like perfectly monolingual and monocultural American students. There were no triangular interactions of form-meaning-use, and no socio-cultural-historical activity systems for concept development processes. No collaborative dialoguing and languaging (Swain, 2006), or grammaring (Larsen-Freeman, 2007). No purposeful use of language or academic discourse was involved in this classroom, although research has shown that language is learned best when lessons focus on meaning and content by using language for authentic purposes, rather than focusing on technical aspects of English (Freedman & Freedman, 2001).

Not only was Ms. Clark’s ELL class lacking in authentic purposeful language use, but it also lacked collaborative co-construction of discourse between teacher and students. The class was totally controlled by Ms. Clark regarding what they were going to study and talk about, who was going to read, and when they would read or stop reading, as shown in the underlined parts of the two excerpts above (turns 1, 3, 6, 8, 17, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28, 37, 41 & turns 1, 5, 7, 9) and the excerpt below (turns 1, 6, 7). All the rules, procedures, and studying topics were all determined by Ms. Clark, using future markers of modalization such as “are going to” and “Let’s.” There was no agentic moment for English learners to express their cultural identities, lived experiences, or inner voices.

1 T: Shhh. Let’s go to our next story. What we’re gonna do is we’re gonna read a few stories, and I’m gonna give you a chance to act some of ‘em out. So, let’s do our next one; the Shed Mack story. It’s on page 55.
2 S1: Ms. Clark?
3 T: Yes?
4 S1: Can we get...(inaudible)
5 S3: Oh, yeah! Do that; then the old...
6 T: Oh, no, no! So, OK, everybody turn to page 55. 55, and you’re looking at the one “From the Dead Man’s Brains”

...........(omission)........

7 T: Shhh. Let’s go on the next story. We are gonna read three more stories, the we’re gonna put our fun and games. OK, I got a couple people. Michelle (pseudonym) gets to start this one because I told her she could. Amelia will be next, then Brian, the Emily. We’ll do that. So Ok, our next one, and then Kate.

Another meta theme of Ms. Clark’s classroom teaching was asking students to copy the definition of words directly from the textbook (9/25/2008, 10/30/2008, 11/25/2008. 12/1/2008). On September, 25, 2008, Ms. Clark had each student read four vocabulary words and copy a one sentence definition for each word from the textbook. One student read the first vocabulary word, “brain power” and the definition of “brain power,” and then Ms. Clark explained the meaning of the word. Another student read the second vocabulary word, “figure out” and its definition from the book. This pattern of activity continued until they finished the fourth word, “intelligence.” Then almost 20 minutes was spent on copying those four vocabulary words and their definitions directly from the textbook in a decontextualized context: “You're going to write the word, good. Then you're going to copy the definition. So, copy that there, and start with that.” For 20 minutes, Ms. Clark walked around the classroom, teaching students individually when they raised their hands or when she felt that they were having difficulties copying the one-sentence definitions from the book. In the meantime, the other students chatted with each other in Spanish or sang Spanish songs.

(looking at Natasha’s paper in the front left of the classroom)
1 You're going to write the word, and the definition, all of it, great.
2 So, you’re going to write the word “brainpower,” yep.
3 Then, you’re going to copy the definition, so start with that.
(looking at Katie’s paper, who is sitting in front)
4  Yes, Katie. It's very good! OK, so, very good.
5  You may need to erase these,
6  because I think you're going to need more room,
7  but OK, you're going to write the word, good.
8  Then you're going to copy the definition.
9  So, copy that there, and start with that.

(looking at Tan’s paper in the back)
10  So, still - Oh, don't copy what I put there, that was an example.
11  Be nice to each other. OK, you're gonna copy this word here.
12  Yep, and then you're going to copy this definition,
13  so do that first. I have a hard time thinking you're writing
14  if you're talking all the time. Amelia, leave him alone.
15  Casey, do this on your own. He's trying to focus,
16  and so should you. Shhhh - Let's see yours then. “Figure out,”
17  and we're going to practice saying all of them, too. “Figure out!”

(Class Transcript, 9/25/2008)

If we look at Ms. Clark’s statements above in terms of her use of modality and
pronouns, Ms. Clark spoke to her students using a future marker of modalization with the
second-person pronoun, “You’re going to” (lines 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12) and once with a low
level of deontic modality combined with the obligatory marker of modalization (i.e.,
“may need to”). What English learner students were going to do was defined by Ms.
Clark, and what she told them to do was to copy the definition of the word directly from
the textbook, and no more or no less than that. Thus, no spaces were allowed for English
learner students to think, explore, or discuss concepts in Ms. Clark’s class.

Ms. Clark scheduled a game day for her students every other Friday. The most
important rule for game day was that “ELLs have to talk only in English the whole time”
while they played games; if Ms. Clark caught them using any language other than English,
they had to go up to the board and write sentences about the name and rules of the game
in English. Ms. Clark said that they “played Monopoly last time, and so it required talking about numbers, talking about money, talking about property, talking about buying and selling, talking about the game rules, talking about moving around the board.” Ms. Clark thought that this game provided a great opportunity for ELLs to “practice English” and develop “the comfort level with being able to talk out loud in English”:

Well it just gives them a chance to practice, and then they get into different topics, and of course start talking about their friends, or what they’re doing over the weekend, and they usually don’t have a hard time coming up with something to talk about, and I think here even though it’s not academic language necessarily, it’s still language practice, and it’s developing the comfort level with being able to talk out loud in English. (Interview, 12/1/2008)

Both Ms. Clark’s monolingual instruction and the English only game she had her students play on Fridays demonstrate that her goal of English education for ELLs was the production of perfect, monolingual English speakers. Her well-meaning attempts to encourage her students to practice English at their own individual comfort level were actually not helpful because research has shown that prohibiting English learner students from using their first language is detrimental to their self-worth, their cultural identities, and the improvement of their academic abilities (Au, 2009; Cummins, 2000; Fillmore, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1994). These English learner students would find many opportunities to speak at a simple functional level of English outside the classroom setting just by living in the United States. If ELLs do not have an opportunity in the classroom to learn and develop academic content and language, and the ability to think about, explore, critique, and create knowledge systems about the world surrounding them, where can they learn new ways of thinking, knowing and being? This problem of ELL classes focused on language acquisition rather than mastery of academic content was
identified by a national panel research on ELLs 10 years ago (August & Hakuta, 1997) and was still seen more recently in a review conducted by the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth (August & Shanahan, 2006).

I had a chance to observe Ms. Clark’s honors language arts class. The way Ms. Clark taught honors language arts class for native English speaking students was totally different from the way she taught her ESL class. “On the large hallway in front of the classroom, students were lying on the floor and writing something on sheets of paper. Ms. Clark was in the classroom. Students were writing compliments about themselves and their friends. After 5 minutes, students entered the classroom. After reading the autobiography of Hellen Keller, Ms. Clark asked students to write a creative writing with the purpose of the enhancement of individual’s and others’ self-esteem (Interview, 2008). Ms. Clark asked her students how they felt about this activity and asked them to write three compliments for people outside the class, and to use those compliments today. She finished by emphasizing the importance of saying good things about themselves and others. On the board, the goals and homework were written as follows: Goals: Respect & Compliment /HW: Hellen Keller Questions, which contrasted greatly with the goals of ESL class: Goals: Vocab & Prediction/ HW: Write Three Predictions.” (Field note, 9/25/2008)

In another regular language arts class for native English speaking students, Ms. Clark split up the class into groups of four students, and tasked each group with making a values magazine. Each group put together a magazine containing articles, advertisements, quizzes, poems, stories, comic strips, and advice columns that taught something about important values. Ms. Clark said that each group member must write an essay about his
or her most important value and then, “Once each group member completes the article, the articles written by each group member will be filed as a group value magazine and posted in class and school.” (Field note, 10/20/2008). When I asked Ms. Clark why she did not teach ESL students the way she taught in language arts class, particularly, by having them make values magazines, she stated,

I did not do the value unit for this ELL class, ‘cause I was too, uh - like I was thinking I would adapt the one I planned for them, but it was way too above their level. So, I abandoned the value unit with them.

The above statement demonstrates Ms. Clark’s low estimation of the abilities of her ELLs and how she did not teach ELLs the same way she taught native English speaking students. The following is an analysis of the above excerpt performed by viewing the text as a whole (Huckin, 1995, 2002), and using the concepts of foreground/backgrounding, presupposition, ideology, and agency:

Ms. Clark’s opinion that asking ELLs to make values magazine would be “too above their level” is foregrounded, while the fact that she “did not do the value unit for this ELL class” is backgrounded using the contrastive conjunction “but.” Additionally, Ms. Clark’s strong confidence that asking ELLs to make value magazines would be “too above their level” is manifested by her use of the marker of modalization “was,” which is used to indicate a strong commitment to the truth of a statement.

Ms. Clark attributed all agency for teaching ELLs to herself, the teacher, who “planned for them.” Ms. Clark’s presupposed assumption was that ELLs could not make values magazines because that would be too difficult for them. Ms. Clark framed her conception of ELLs based only on their capacity in English, not on their ability to speak and use their mother tongue, in this case, Spanish, fluently and accurately. She never
thought of engaging the cultural resources and lived experiences that her ELLs had gained living in and across different parts of the world; instead, she treated her ELLs’ lack of English proficiency as if it were a cognitive deficit. This deficit view toward ELLs led Ms. Clark to enact a subtractive and assimilative banking concept of education, which envisions literacy learning as merely a transferral of language knowledge from one brain to another brain through repetition and practice. Labeling students as English language learners (ELLs) caused Ms. Clark to think that ELLs do not have the literacy abilities, cultural resources, or cognitive abilities to learn academic content and concepts (García & Kleifgen, 2010), and thus creating a values magazine in a group would be “way too above their level.”

However, Ms. Clark’s deficit views about the abilities of her ELLs were later shown to be incorrect. During the spring semester of 2009, Ms. Clark allowed her student teacher to teach her ESL class, and I observed Ms. Clark’s language arts class and her ESL class as taught by her student teacher, Ms. Smith (pseudonym). The way Ms. Smith taught English learner students was very different from the way Ms. Clark taught them. For example, Ms. Smith read the book “Grandfather Chan and Little Sue” together with Ms. Clark’s ELL students, and then studied the elements of story writing, such as setting, plot, and characterization. Then she asked the students to write their own stories, individually or in pairs. Half of them wrote almost one page within 30 minutes with only a few errors (Field notes, 3/20/2009). This was a great contrast to what Ms. Clark had students do, such as copying one sentence definitions for four words from the textbook. While they were writing their stories, the students were engaged in their writing and some
of the students asked me to help them, which was quite different from their prior behavior.

The following story was written by Amelia (pseudonym):

This story happened at Lincoln Elementary School and me and my friend’s were in the classroom my best friend ceci was making fun of my other friend amy because when my teacher asked her a question she said can you give me a chance to think and that’s when my best friend ceci started laughing, and it was winter day and when we went outside to play, me and my friends were playing snowball and my other friend got hit by a snow and she got so mad and she heart [hurt] my best friend ceci and ceci was still laughing at amy because amy was about to cry and that’s why ceci was laughing and me and my friend amy, mary, want [went] in our class and we had a party and my teacher tell mary to call ceci and she said no and my teacher said why and mary said because the party is only for us and amy said I will go and call her and she called her and she came and we all join the party and we all went back in the classroom. THE End

This example shows how the approach a teacher takes can have a tremendous impact on students’ learning and development. When the teacher presents lessons that students can relate to their own lived experiences and cultural practices, students will be motivated to contribute to the discussion, and will find a way to make the connection between their own funds of knowledge and the concepts presented by the teacher.

Engaging students’ meaning-making processes makes it possible for students build on their everyday experiences to learn more abstract concepts (Vygotsky, 1978).

Teacher Scripted Monologue and ELLs’ Hybrid Language Use

Although Ms. Clark tried to control what her ELLs were going to do and talk about all the time in class, her English learner students usually ignored her and talked among themselves only in Spanish, and sometimes disrupted her presentation by throwing paper, walking around the classroom, reading other books, putting on lipstick,
etc. Students only used English when they talked to Ms. Clark. It seemed that her students had a secret rule that they must talk among themselves only in Spanish, and they talked in Spanish among themselves freely most of the time in class. The following scene demonstrates how Ms. Clark and her English learner students spent their class time in two different worlds.

During one whole class period, Ms. Clark drew upon only two pages of a textbook, *Hampton-Brown: High Point*, in order to teach four vocabulary words and to present the reading strategy of prediction. The topic was “*Many People, Many Intelligences.*” A one-page picture showed adolescents doing different activities: a Hispanic boy writing, a Hispanic boy playing the guitar, a White girl painting, a White boy, a Hispanic girl, an African American girl acting, and a White girl measuring a fence. Ms. Clark began the class time by checking homework and setting out the goal for the day. She spent almost 10 minutes on turning in homework and talking about the goal of the lesson and the preparation of the blank paper and teaching the format of the page heading:

1 T: OK, here is what we are going to do today. We’re going to talk about two things. We’re going to learn some vocabulary, and then we’re going to talk about making predictions. What are predictions, does anybody know?
2 S1: Something like, if you … Prediction is like you think something like…
3 S2: Is going to happen.
4 S1: …is something like…
5 T: Very, good. So, both of those are the same. So, what it is, is a prediction is what you think is going to happen next. So, can you make a prediction about what you think you are going to do tomorrow?
6 Ss: Yes.
7 T: Yeah. 
(Students all talk at once with each other in Spanish.)

8 T: Some other things. Let’s say you’re reading a story, if you’re reading a story, can you make a prediction about what you think is going to happen at the end of the story?

9 Ss: Yes.

10 T: Yep, one thing that really good readers do, is they make predictions while they read. So they, as they’re reading, they say, "Hey, since this is what is happening now, later, I think this is going to happen." So we’re going to work on making some predictions today, and we’re going to go over some vocabulary, so what I need everybody to do is I need you to go back and get a Highpoint book, so if you will, get one of your books, the big one with the blue front, and actually, Amelia (pseudonym) and Benjamin (pseudonym), if you would hand them out to everyone, that would be wonderful. 
(Students talk among themselves in Spanish.)

11 T: All three of you can hand them out. 
(Students talk among themselves in Spanish.)

12 T: So, everybody needs their… 
(Students talk in Spanish so loudly that teacher cannot be heard.)

13 T: Shhh. Calm down! 
(Students continue talking in Spanish.)

14 S3: Sara (pseudonym), ...(inaudible)

15 T: That is true. But OK Jamie, thank you for bringing a book, but OK, everybody’s got this book right here. I want you to open up to - I think it is page 36, 36. 
(Students continue talking in Spanish.)

16 T: Yep, page 36 
(Students continue talking in Spanish.)

17 T: OK, everybody needs to open to page 36. 36 
(Students continue talking in Spanish.)

18 T: Also, please pull out a piece of paper. So, page 36, and then you need a piece of paper. 36, and you need a piece of paper. (Teacher takes a paper off student's desk) No, because I’m going to have you turn this in. So, normally we do these things in the journals, but since you turned your journals in today, you’re just going to do it on a piece of paper, so if you need one, borrow one from somebody around you.
Students continue talking in Spanish.

19 T: OK, on the piece of paper . . .

Students continue talking in Spanish.

20 T: Shhh . . .

Students continue talking in Spanish.

21 T: OK, on the piece of paper . . . I’m gonna move this board over, ‘cause we’re gonna use this board

Students continue talking in Spanish. Teacher erases whiteboard.

22 T: OK, first thing: since we haven't done this in a little while, where your name supposed to go on the piece of paper?

23 S4: Top?

24 T: Yep.

Students chatter as teacher draws on board

OK, here's your piece of paper - I know, this’ll do for your piece of paper - what I want you to do, make sure your name goes here, our first and last, and then you're going to put the period.

25 S4: What period? (murmuring)

26 T: The period is period five, fifth period, and 9:45 to eight, very good, so everybody needs the proper heading - you got yours, good. I know, some of you do a great job of always doing that. So, here's what we're going to talk about today. We have four vocab [sic] words that we need to know, so first thing we're going to do is go through the vocab. On page 36, there are four vocab words in yellow on the left side of the page. Does somebody want to read the first one for me?

27 S5: Me!

28 T: OK. Amelia, what's the first one there?

29 S5: (mumbling)

30 T: Very good, so brainpower, we talked about that yesterday. Does anybody remember what types of brainpower we talked about yesterday?

31 S: Face to face

32 T: Face to face was one, good.

33 S7: Musical

34 T: Musical.

35 S8: Art.

36 T: Art.

37 S9: On your own.

38 T: On your own.

39 S10: Math

40 T: Math. Good, I think you guys just got all of them. So, there you are; there are a lot of different types of brain power. Let's do the
Is there someone who will read the next one for me?

Me!

Michael?

Figure out.

Figure out? Good. So, when you figure out something, you learn how to do it. OK, so yesterday did you figure out anything about your own brainpower?

Yes

Yeah, you figured out what kind of brainpower you had. OK, and how about the third word. Who wants to read that? Jamie (pseudonym), we'll give someone a chance who hasn't read anything yet so, Jamie, and then Amelia will do the next one. So, Jamie, what's this next word?

Improve.

Improve. Good.

When you improve, you get better.

When you improve, you get better at something. (To student leaning over another student's desk) All the way over, thank you. OK, and Amelia, will you read us the fourth word.

Intelligence.

Intelligence. OK, a little bit louder.

(Students reads too quietly to understand.)

Very good. So S--, what does the word intelligence mean?

Like you're smart.

Well, what you're smart at, but you can read the definition one more time, too.

(Students reads definition. Other students talk to each other quietly in Spanish. Teacher takes a lipstick from a student and puts it in her pocket)

I'm going to take that because I told you to put it away and you didn't do it. Yup, so we've gone through - Put this stuff away, Jenna (pseudonym)? It's good that you're getting organized, but there's too much stuff out there. So, we've talked about our four vocab words. We talked about a few of these already. We talked about brainpower, and we talked about intelligence. Remember when we did the vocab model? Where you had to do your square about intelligence? OK. What I want you guys to do right now, and Jamie and Cathy, you're not going to hear if you keep talking, what I want you to do right now is I want you to label one, skip a couple
lines, two, three, four, on your paper. We're gonna do two things with these vocab words. First thing is you're going to write the word and the definition. So our first word is brainpower, so you're going to write brainpower, then you're going to put a little dash, and then you're gonna write the definition, the meaning, of that word, yup, of those four words. Yup. Once you've written the word and the meaning - you don't want to write "meaning," you want to actually write what the definition is in your book - you're also gonna use it in one sentence. (murmuring while teacher writes on board)

57 T: So, you're gonna write the word, the meaning, and use it in a sentence. So, everybody go ahead right now and, by yourself, write down the word, the meanings and the sentences.
(Students are murmuring to each other in Spanish while teacher writes on board.)

57 T: No, by yourself today. For this one, I want you to write by yourself, you're gonna do predictions later with somebody else, but for right now, by yourself.
(Students are chatting, laughing and swatting at each other. The teacher walks around and explains to individual students.)

The underlined verbal phrases in Ms. Clark's statements indicate defined future action by combining the markers of modalization “going to” or “gonna” with the collective pronoun “we,” and demonstrate that Ms. Clark’s intention was to direct what her students do, say and think. In other words, Ms. Clark had her own predetermined script for the class period, and she led the class based on her plan, regardless of her students’ behaviors or attitudes in class. Linguistically, students played a passive role in their interactions with Ms. Clark, like medical patients, and Ms. Clark told them what they were going to do using the linguistic forms “we’re going to...,” “I want you to...,” etc.

Turn 1 : We are going to do ..We are going to talk.. We’re going to learn..We’re going to talk … (4 times)
Turn 10: We’re going to work...We’re going to go over...what I need everybody to do..I need you to go (4 times)
Turn 12: everybody needs..
Turn 15: I want you to open...
Turn 17: Everybody needs...
Turn 18: You need...You’re going to...
Turn 21: We’re gonna
Turn 24: what I want you to do
Turn 26: everybody needs... we’re going to do... We’re going to talk...(3 times)
Turn 40: Let’s do..
Turn 46: we’ll give
Turn 56: I want you guys to do...you’re not going to. hear...what I want you to do..I want you to do.. I want you to label..we’re going to...you’re going to..you’re going to write..you’re going to put..you’re gonna...you don’t want to...you want to.. you’re also gonna.. (13 times)

However, while Ms. Clark was directing her students what to do, read, write and say, her students were talking among themselves in Spanish, usually in an audible voice, and sometimes in a loud voice. In the preceding example, Ms. Clark started the class by stating what they were going to do, “learning some vocabulary” and “making predictions,” and asked students whether they knew what predictions were (turn 1). Amelia said, “Something like, if you..Prediction is like you something like...” When she could not articulate what she wanted to say, Felipe said “is going to happen” and then Amelia said again, “is something like?” Amelia was not articulating her sentence well enough to explain the meaning of prediction on her own. But Ms. Clark said, “Very, good,” following the IRE (Initiation- Response - Evaluation) pattern (Cazden, 2001) typical of traditional classroom discourse. Until the class finished, students’ responses were only “Yes” (turns 6, 9, 45), a few simple words (turns 23, 27, 41, 54), or items from a list that students read directly from the textbook (turns 31, 33, 35, 37, 43, 47, 51). And they talked all the time in Spanish among themselves while the class was being led by Ms. Clark.

As shown by the data above, Ms. Clark and her students were in two different worlds most of the time: Ms. Clark directing the class in English based on her script, and
the students ignoring her and talking among themselves in Spanish, throwing paper, walking around the classroom, or swatting each other (9/25/2008, 10/10/2008, 10/30/2008, 11/25/2008, 12/1/2008, 3/19/2008, 3/20/2008). In the classroom context where all action, speech and ideas were defined by Ms. Clark in English, her students created their own world by talking with each other in Spanish. This separation of the classroom into two different worlds continued for the entire academic year; the conversation between Ms. Clark and her students was all in English, while the conversation among her students was all in Spanish.

Students used Spanish in order to help each other understand Ms. Clark’s directions and to maintain solidarity among themselves. For example, when Tan (pseudonym) did not understand Ms. Clark’s directions and explanations, she asked Michael (pseudonym), “¿Qué ella dijo?” (“What did she say?”) (Field note, 12/1/2008). And when Amelia could not figure out what she needed to do, she asked Felipe, “¿Qué necesito?” (What do I need?), or “¿Qué tengo que hacer ahora mismo?” (What shall I do now?) (Field note, 3/20/2009). When Ms. Clark asked students to copy the definition of the four words directly from the textbook (9/25/2008), Diego said to the class in a loud voice, “Podemos copiar la cosa de otra persona,” which means, “We can copy other’s work.” All the students understood what Diego meant, and they all laughed together. Ms. Clark did not understand what they were talking about, so the class continued following her script. One time, Felipe tried to talk to Diego in English, and Diego said to Felipe, “Don’t talk to me in English, talk to me in Spanish” (Field note, 3/19/2009). The secret rule enforced by the students was that speaking English was not allowed among peers,
even though this ESL class was specifically intended to be a place for ELLs to learn and acquire English proficiency.

Ms. Clark’s students regarded Spanish to be their social language among students in class, while English was reserved for academic purposes. Because of this, Ms. Clark had difficulties whenever she tried to engage them in their own learning, or tried to get them to talk to each other in English, as stated by Ms. Clark as follows: “The hardest thing with the ESL was just getting them to speak in English versus any other language. Ah, just ’cause they need to practice in English.” Ms. Clark and her ELLs, in their own separate worlds within Ms. Clark’s classroom, were engaged in an unending socio-cultural and linguistic conflict, as Ms. Clark tried to teach English language based on her standard language and English-only ideologies, and her Mexican origin immigrant students tried to maintain their own meaning systems with their own cultural and linguistic resources. If her ELL students continued to refuse to assimilate themselves into the mainstream American language and culture, they could continue to experience subtractive schooling (Valenzuela, 1999) and finally end up lending credence to the concept of schooling being merely a means of social reproduction (Bourdieu, 1991). These Mexican origin students demonstrated their resistance to Ms. Clark’s English-only rules and classroom culture by talking in Spanish or by doing disruptive behaviors in class; this effect has also been observed by Salazar (2013), who noted that “Mexican American students engage in disruptive behavior such as raised voices, disrespectful comments, gestures of disdain, defiance of classroom expectations, and huelgas (strikes) to resist practices that exclude their native language and culture from their learning” (p. 123). Salazar further stated that “Mexican immigrant students use boundary maintaining
mechanisms (Fordham & Ogbu, 1986) to pressure their peers to resist English in an effort to maintain their cultural affiliations and resist the white stream because blurring the boundary might signal to others a sense of shame in one’s heritage, language, and culture” (p. 123).

It is urgent to create spaces for mutual engagement and learning. However, in Ms. Clark’s class, there was rarely a moment of Thirdspace, when the world of the White American teacher and the world of the English learner students intersected together in a collaborative dialogic space for achieving their common goals. Ms. Clark articulated and embodied her English-only standard language ideologies in classroom practice while ELLs tried to maintain their own Spanish linguistic and cultural world. According to sociocultural theory of literacy learning and development, human beings learn and develop themselves in and through changing participation structures (Rogoff, 2003) through appropriation of cultural tools and through interactions of internalization and externalization of their second language in cyclic intersections of horizontal and vertical relationships within the triangular activity settings created in classroom contexts.

However, the English language learners in this classroom, all of whom were Spanish speaking students, played passive roles as learners, positioned by the power dynamics of the classroom through the teacher’s scripted monologues, in a classroom learning environment where there are no culturally relevant materials, textbooks or artifacts relevant to ELLs. This combination of learning conditions and learning processes was perfectly optimal for preventing ELLs from being engaged in their own learning and development.
Departing from the traditional definitions of literacy, Gutiérrez (2008) argued for hybrid and multiple literacies, emphasizing that learning occurs within a rich interactional matrix that includes a range of horizontal and vertical embodied language practices. However, Ms. Clark always organized social conditions for learning based upon the traditional teacher-directed model. Most social interactions took place between the teacher and the whole class or between the teacher and one individual student, and the transmission of knowledge was based on a few simple ‘what?’ questions prompting short, simple explanations while reading short stories or learning vocabulary words in a de-contextualized environment. ELLs had few opportunities for meaningful interactions, or for co-constructing meaning with self and others within authentic social contexts. ELLs’ language and culture, Spanish in this case, were not used as semiotic tools for concept development and L2 learning in the process of English language learning.

**Assimilative Pedagogy: Analysis from a CHAT Perspective**

This section explores Ms. Clark’s assimilative pedagogy through the lens of cultural-historical-activity theory (CHAT). The CHAT activity triangle consists of the following elements: subjects (participating actors in the system), object (goals and purposes, or products of actions), mediating artifacts (physical and semiotic tools that mediate between the subject and the object), rules (norms), and division of labor (the power structures within the activity system). A graphic depiction of the CHAT system was presented in Figure 1.

Subjects are the actors within the CHAT activity triangle system. In dynamically moving interconnected activity systems, subjects become objects and vice versa in/across
settings by changing their participation structures within a community of learners (COL), in which expansive learning cycles are created and mutually influence each other, with interconnected activity systems between community members both close and far away, as seen in the section about Ms. Lewis’s culturally relevant pedagogy in Chapter V.

However, in Ms. Clark’s classroom, the subject is only Ms. Clark, who is the sole actor in the classroom activity system. In Ms. Clark’s classroom, English learner students cannot be considered to be subjects because they had few chances to exercise their own agency or to express their interests, cultural models, perspectives, languages, and voices. Students existed as subjects in their own activity system, from which the teacher was excluded.

Objects are the goals and purposes of the activities performed by the subjects, and the products of those activities. The stated goals of Ms. Clark’s English teaching lessons related to learning a few vocabulary words and reading strategies, and her unspoken ultimate goal seemed to be to train ELLs to sound like perfect monolingual English speakers by leading them through repetition of her English pronunciation in a decontextualized setting. In the process of following after the direction of the teacher all the time for 1 academic year through simple repetitive pronunciation practice and answering simple “what” questions, without having much cognitive thinking and mapping, students internalize the other-controlled rules and bodily practices, and become a schooled person with a schooled body, without any higher-order cognitive thinking or actions based on critical thinking. Thus, the implicit and unintended ideology of the lesson is the production of powerless subjects and docile bodies (Foucault, 1980) who obey the societal rules and norms without any critical consciousness about the world they
live in. It is the hidden object and invisible purpose of this class that makes schooling a means of social reproduction (Bourdieu, 1984).

Mediating artifacts connects the subject and object in the activity system to make a space for learning with many forms of tools: physical materials, semiotic tools, perspectives, discourses, shared cultures and so on. In the classroom context where no materials, artifacts, or teaching tools were related to ELLs’ cultures, family and community resources, Ms. Clark talked only in English, which cannot be considered as a mediational means for learning and development. Tools should be created based on the agreement among members of the community in order for the tools to be regarded as a mediational means for learning and development (Engeström, 1999). There was no network of activity systems, so there were no mediating activities in this triangle to accomplish the purpose and goal of the lesson. There were few visual aids or discussions to support students’ understandings and concept development. Higher-order thinking skills were rarely called for in this class.

Community refers to the group who shares the goals and activity in the mutual collaborative environment. In Ms. Clark’s classroom, there were two communities: the teacher’s community, which shared norms and ways of being and acting found among monolingual English speakers, and the ELLs’ community, which shared Hispanic language and cultural models. In order for the schooling experiences of ELLs to bring them to learn, develop and form positive identities through a trust relationship between the teacher and themselves and among themselves, these two communities would need to be merged into a Thirdspace through mutual collaboration and teacher facilitation of culturally relevant pedagogy.
Rules are the norms and procedures operating within the activity system. The rules operated in Ms. Clark’s class follow: (1) teacher scripted lessons: Ms. Clark chose the topic, directed the turn-taking, and regulated the pace regardless of students’ responses; (2) one-way mode of interaction between teacher and students or teacher and the individual student; (3) ELLs’ passive participation mode: All the directions and rules were defined by the teacher and the students practiced copying definitions and repeating English pronunciation; and (4) ELLs talked in Spanish among themselves all the time for authoring self and maintaining their culture and language.

Division of labor indicates the power structures in community. Ms. Clark tried to hold all the authority and power to define the meaning of the words and decide who should read, talk, and write. All the class topics and procedures were all decided by Ms. Clark. In the meantime, students enjoyed practicing their power by doing disruptive behaviors or talking Spanish among themselves all the time in class.

Finally, not only did the activity triangular system in Ms. Clark’s class not extend beyond classroom door, but also the elements of one activity triangle did not connect with the elements of the other activity triangle. Two activity systems existed in one setting; none of the elements of those two activity systems, such as subject, object, mediating artifacts, community, rules, and division of labor existed in both systems connected, so that Ms. Clark’s class contained two separate worlds. Combining those two worlds could bring internal conflict between teacher and students, but conflict can be a catalyst for learning and development when subjects, that is, the community, share a common ground (Engeström, 1999). In order for her ELLs to develop their academic abilities, the White American teacher, Ms. Clark, and her ELLs need to enter into Thirdspace, a place where
all voices, cultures, and identities are negotiated within one collaborative dialogic heteroglossic space (Bakhtin, 1981).

In conclusion, Ms. Clark’s ESL classroom discourses of assimilation, revealed in classroom activities such as decontextualized skill-drill, classroom context and lesson content inconsistent with the experiences of multicultural ELLs, ELLs’ passive participation mode in lessons defined by the teacher, and scripted lesson based on behavioristic audiolingualism. There was a disconnect between ELLs and the classroom learning environment, where there were no culturally relevant materials, books, semiotic mediators of learning language and literacy development. ELLs were often continuously asked to repeat English words over and over out of context, regardless of whether it was time to read a story or study vocabulary. The instructional patterns embedded in classroom discourses were teacher-centered: repetition, students’ copying practice, simple ‘what’ questions, instruction in English only, and little integration of ELLs’ culture into practice. Analysis of language data (Appendix J) demonstrates that most of the class time was comprised of Ms. Clark’s one-way talk in English only, and students talking among themselves in Spanish, mostly off topic and usually unrelated to the class content and skills. There were no triangular interactions of form-meaning-use, and no sociocultural activity systems for concept development processes.

In alignment with Ms. Clark’s belief framework, Ms. Clark’s pedagogical practices demonstrated the reproduction of inscribed codes, i.e., discourses, and illustrate the social reproduction function of schooling. This interactional pattern is the typical construction of teacher script and students’ counter-scripts (Gutierrez et al., 1995) in the classroom. In the deep and wide psychological, social, linguistic, and cultural divide
between ELLs and their teacher English language students became the victims of societal and culturally inscribed codes by being engaged in such meaningless schooling processes. The dual encoding systems, the culturally irrelevant learning conditions, and the learning processes that disallow thinking contribute to the production of powerless subjects in high poverty urban areas, as argued by Buendía and Ares (2006):

… codes underpinned by local knowledge, or what we will frame as discourse, that index racial and classed meanings of people as well as construct places within institutional and city spaces. We further argue and show how city educators are also involved in the production and maintenance of these codes and knowledge about city space and group identity. (p. 1)

Human being are the products of socialization processes, and are social, cultural and historical beings (Vygotsky, 1978), who have an intrinsic need to create meaning from their personal experiences (Bruner, 1990). Ms. Clark, a White female teacher constructed her belief systems from her own experiences, in this case American culture and English, embedded in the dominant educational discourses and ideologies. These eighth-grade English language learners were biologically and psychologically at the height of adolescence, and wanted to create their own meaning making space drawn from their own working cultures and languages, in this case, Spanish language and culture in the classroom. This classroom became a site of struggle between an English speaking monolingual White female teacher’s complex and multilayered internal networks of meaning systems and English language learner students, who wanted to define themselves, through their own agency, in their own cultures and languages, rather than accepting a self authorized by their teacher.
To accomplish quality and equity of education, especially in light of the current increase of linguistically, culturally diverse students in classrooms in US public schools and the wide achievement gap between these ELLs and their English speaking peers, the integration of communities’ *funds of knowledge* into the curriculum, instruction (Moll, 2004), and assessment at the macro level, and into Thirdspace at the micro process level, is urgently needed. In Thirdspace where “no possessor, no privileged place, no superiors or inferiors, no repressive activity or dogmatism” (De Certeau, 1984, p. 46; Foucault, 1977) is allowed, different cultures can reiterate the process of negotiating, (re)constructing, losing and gaining between the dominant mainstream cultures and less dominant cultures. In Thirdspace, both the teacher and English language learners are engaged for ELLs’ literacy learning and development through the empowerment patterns of activity practices accomplished through the intersections of horizontal and vertical activity systems. In the reclaimed mutual interactional dialogical social classroom learning environment where individual students’ cultures and languages are valued and legitimated by an authentic caring teacher who understands individual students’ personal and academic needs and actualizes culturally relevant pedagogy, and who teaches in order to improve students’ *academic competence, cultural competence, and sociopolitical or critical consciousness* (Ladson-Billings, 1995), English language learners can enjoy their own learning through their own agency and power, and find belonging, and joy and, ultimately, form positive identity, and see the social transformation of education and the accomplishment of social justice.
Epilogue

I was very disappointed with the classroom atmosphere. Only one word can describe this class. Sadly, that is CHAOS. Nobody was engaged in the teaching content and Ms. Clark’s directions. Students were doing just in the way they wanted to do, and Ms. Clark was just doing whatever she wanted to do based on her teaching script regardless of the fact that most ELLs were ignoring or resisting her instructions all the time by talking in Spanish each other or doing interrupting behaviors. How stressful it is for both the teacher and the students! It is a mutual disadvantage for both of them. (Researcher Journal, 10/30/2008)

As I wrote the above reflection after observing Ms. Clark’s ELL class on October, 30, 2008, I could see the wide and deep linguistic and cultural gap between Ms. Clark and her ELLs. There was rarely a moment of Thirdspace. It seemed that Ms. Clark did not have much desire and passion for ELLs and ELL education, but was more interested in teaching at the college level, as demonstrated in interviews (e.g., “I never thought I be a middle school teacher; I used to go, “Why in the world would anybody teach middle school?”) and her teaching practices (e.g., repetition of English pronunciation, copying practices, and a lot of use of “OK” in class). But is this her personal way of thinking and acting? All utterances and discourses exist in the multiple intertextual and interdiscursive relations (Bakhtin, 1986; Foucault, 1978, 1980), which will be analyzed in more detail in Chapter VII.

I met Ms. Clark on her last day of school because of her baby’s birth. She talked about the reform plan for Cedar Grove Middle School, which involved changing the principal, transferring teachers around, adding 12 days to the schedule, and requiring mandatory professional development every day for the next 3 years, and said “it’s kind of a good thing that I’m leaving”:
It will be huge, so it’s kind of a good thing that I’m leaving ‘cause I don’t know how to be stressed about all the changes that are coming. It’ll end up being about probably closer to 20 teachers that are gonna be changing for 3 years. Supposedly, the 1st year it’s going to be voluntary. So this year, it’s only if you want to change. And if there are some people that want to change because they’re extending the school day, making it longer hours for teachers. They’re adding 12 days to the schedule. They’re having mandatory professional development every day. (Interview, 6/8/2010)

She mentioned that she was going to move to a suburb of the city, and she was happy because “it’s a new thing” in her life, and that she would like “not to have to work” for money:

I’m actually moving to, probably, in like about 3 months. It’s kind of bittersweet. I mean, I’m happy because it’s a new thing in my life and I’m kind of happy not to have to work. But, At the same time, I’m gonna miss a lot of it and, let’s see. (Interview, 6/8/2010)

Ms. Clark has not gone back to teach in a classroom since she left Cedar Grove Middle School in 2010. She had another baby, and has been staying at home, taking care of two babies and teaching online history classes for community college students.
CHAPTER VII

THE DISCURSIVE (TRANS)FORMATIONS

OF PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICES

This chapter describes, interprets, and explains the discursive (trans)formation of culturally relevant pedagogical practices, as demonstrated by Ms. Lewis (Chapter V), as opposed to assimilative pedagogical practices, as demonstrated by Ms. Clark (Chapter VI), by connecting the nodes of language ideological discourses circulating in the nation, and their subject positions in their personal and institutional histories, belief systems, pedagogical practices in/across ESL classrooms by using the concepts of CDA: orders of discourse (genre, discourse, and style), intertextuality and interdiscursivity from the perspective of Foucauldian power/knowledge/discourse in action/practice. Chapter VII consists of the following subsections: (1) Assimilative Pedagogy: the Intersection of the Discourse of “Being an English Language Teacher” with Individual/Technical Discourses and Deficit Discourses; (2) Culturally Relevant Pedagogy: the Intersection of the Discourse of “Being a Humanizing Educator” with “Community of Learners” Discourses and Resource Discourses; and (3) Culturally Relevant Pedagogy versus Assimilative Pedagogy. Subsections (1) and (2) are an analysis and explanation of each case individually, providing within-case study results, while subsection (3) provides cross-case study results, comparing and contrasting the pedagogical practices of Ms. Lewis and Ms.
Clark in order to better explain the features of culturally relevant pedagogy versus assimilative pedagogy the differences in the (trans)formations of the 2 participant teachers’ pedagogical practices.

**Assimilative Pedagogy: The Intersection of the Discourse of “Being an English Language Teacher” with Individual/Technical Discourses and Deficit Discourses**

R: What are your thoughts about the role of interaction among students in class?

T: I think it’s important, especially middle school age kids, they want to talk anyway. You got to git’em talking. The hardest thing with the ESL was just getting them to speak in English versus any other language just ‘cause they need to practice in English.

R: So, how do you feel when your ELLs were talking in Spanish in class?

T: It doesn’t bother me except that I, like I said, I want’em to have that practice. (R: Researcher, T:Ms. Clark) (Interview, 6/8/2010)

As demonstrated in the above excerpt, it is obvious how much Ms. Clark was obsessed with having students practice English just because “they need to practice in English.” Even when she was asked about how she thinks of her role as an ELL teacher, she stated, “It’s really hard to try and teach the core at the same time as teaching the language skills.” She never forgot to state her belief in the importance of having students practice English repeatedly. It seems that Ms. Clark was too absorbed in teaching English language even to think of ELLs as multilingual and multicultural beings with their own native language and culture, beliefs, values, attitudes, and identities. Thus, none of her utterances and statements addressed the intertwined relationship of language, literacy, power and agency, and there was no moment in her ESL classroom for ELLs to articulate their cultures and identities as she performed her English-only monolingual teacher
scripted lesson delivery (Chapter VI). Why did Ms. Clark enact assimilative pedagogy in the education of English learners, and why did she never mention concepts of inclusion, empowerment, identity, and equity issues in social contexts?

According to Foucault (1980, 1990), discursive practices constitute and reconstitute objects of knowledge, and establish the positions of subjects and bodily practices within structures of power networks. Reasoning systems (discourses) are (re)produced through the exercise of power relations and privilege, positioning certain types of knowledge and meaning over or beneath others. These discourses are constructed and practiced in social contexts, and are reconstructed during the process of interacting with other discourses (interdiscursivity) and texts (intertextuality) (Fairclough, 1999). Discourses are created by/in/through the effects of power while, at the same time, discourses create power by linking power with knowledge and subject production/practice (Foucault, 1980). In/across multiple layers of discursive contexts at the local, institutional, and societal level (Fairclough, 1995), the subjects in society create and reflect power relationships through their ways of being (style), ways of representing (discourse), and ways of interacting (genre), which are termed orders of discourse. The dialectical relationship between discursive contexts and orders of discourse can be understood using Figure 4.

Figure 4 illustrates three domains of discursive contexts: “local,” “institutional,” and “societal” (Fairclough, 1995). The societal domain represents metanarratives about language ideologies, that is, the implicit and explicit assumptions about a particular language, users of the language, the nature of language (Gal, 1987) and national language policies. The institutional domain represents the regulations, norms, and discourses
circulating in the school district and school. The local domain represents the discourses, i.e., the pedagogical discourses and practices circulating in the classroom setting. Orders of discourse - genre (ways of interacting), discourses (ways of representing), and style (ways of being) - are embedded and (re)articulated, enunciated, and embodied through the power relations situated within each context. The domains of discursive contexts are not distinctly separated, but merge into one another, as indicated with dotted lines in Figure 4. The interconnected domains of multiple discursive contexts bring about the construction of a certain type of knowledge about ELLs, ELL pedagogy, and impart particular meanings to language ideologies and embodied practices.
At the macro-societal level, the powerful hegemonic English-only language ideological discourses circulating in the general public became formal knowledge (Foucault, 1980), were legitimated by various organizations (e.g., *U.S. English, English for the Children, proEnglish*), and were then voted or legislated into law (e.g., NCLB, *Propositions 203* in California, *Proposition 207* in Arizona, *Question 1* in Massachusetts, and *English as an Official Language Law* in Utah) as related in Chapter III. The overarching dominant English-only language ideological discourses circulating in US society permitted the NCLB law to be enacted in 2002, which replaced the *Bilingual Education Act* of Title VII with the *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act* of Title III. NCLB provided flexibility for the state and local school districts to utilize federal funding, while establishing school accountability systems for the promotion of ELLs’ rapid acquisition of English (Beykont, 2002). The establishment of English-only societal discourses into formal knowledge and then into law demonstrates the operation of Foucault’s *apparatus* and Althusser’s *ideological state apparatuses* in which beliefs, attitudes, practices, and epistemologies of people are negotiated through consensus, as in voting and legislation of laws.

At the meso-institutional level, the NCLB act, with its rigid, punishment based school accountability system, motivated and justified the school district, in order to improve their ELL students’ English and literacy abilities, to use federal funds to support a PD program that was framed in behavioristic/individualist/psychological concepts, which could have been driven by their need to increase the standardized test scores of their ELLs (as explained in Chapter III) in order to avoid an unsatisfactory rating. In the community setting, Cedar Middle School was considered by teachers to be a scary place
because of its location in the low income area in the West Side of the city, where the population consisted of mostly Hispanic immigrants: “Some people are intimidated by it because of the diversity and because of like the lower economic level” (Interview, 10/10/2008). In conformity with the atmosphere of assimilating/segregating discourses circulating in the school (Chapter III), and in its attempt to satisfy state mandated language policy, Cedar Grove Middle School operated “pull-out” ESL classes, so that its English learner students were separated from the mainstream native English speaking students. English learner students were confined within their structurally separated ESL class, and generally viewed as having a deficit by the public and by teachers who were afraid of teaching them (Chapter VI): “There’re probably quite a few teachers that wouldn’t want to work here just because they’re afraid of teaching ESL” (Interview, 7/1/2009).

At the micro-classroom context, Ms. Clark enunciated the most prevalent model of ESL classroom practice (Cummins, 2000; Valdes, 1998), that is, assimilative pedagogy, subscribing and enunciating the two PD instructors’ pedagogy: Dr. Hamilton’s behavioristic memorization and repetition-based teaching and Dr. Parker’s cognitive psychology based reading strategy instruction (Chapter III). Without having any moment of self-disrupting meaning making processes about her location in society as a teacher with White racial identities and her concomitant privileges in the US socio-cultural-political context (Chapter VI), Ms. Clark’s style, that is, habitus or ways of being, could not oppose the dominant discourses and construct counter-hegemonic pedagogical discourses and practices in the classroom, because “the pervasiveness of the psychological/individual discourse as a socio-cultural theme in American society makes it
difficult for white, middle-class, preservice teachers to conceptualize any other pedagogical discourse.” (Buendía, 2000, p. 148).

As explained above, Ms. Clark’s assimilative pedagogical discourses and practices were constructed through the interdiscursive and intertextual discursive formations (DFs) of English-only language ideological discourses and practices that circulate within/across the interconnected and multilayered discursive contexts. The dominant English-only language ideological discourses and language policy (NCLB) at the societal level and the inscription of behavioristic/individual/psychological discourses through the curriculum and the PD program at the institutional level dialogically produced and supported Ms. Clark’s deficit-based individual/technical/functional belief systems about ELLs and her skill-drill based assimilative pedagogical practices at the local level.

In addition to the interdiscursive and intertextual connections of the macro-semiotic English-only language ideologies and policies with meso-institutional-English-only regulations by the state, Ms. Clark’s indifferent disposition toward ELLs, that is, her ways of being (style), living in and through the dominant English-only discourses circulating in the histories of personal and institutional spaces, also co-produced and supported her assimilative pedagogical discourses (ways of representing) and her deficit oriented teaching genre (ways of interacting) when faced with languages and cultures other than English White American. The linguistic and cultural resources of ELLs could not enter into Ms. Clark’s mind or pedagogical practices because of the manipulative textual silences (Huckin, 2002, 2010) about ELLs’ cultural and linguistic resources present in the printed and spoken media, in the texts of the PD program, and in the texts
of her curriculum. Discourses produced by relations of power naturalize, reiterate, reconstruct, and constitute those things that are familiar and natural, through articulation, enunciation and utterances (Foucault, 1980, 1990), and also through textual silences (Huckin, 2002, 2010), and the silencing of incompatible discourses (Buendía, 2003): “While relations of power legitimate, they can also interconnect to silence, or relegate as inconceivable and unarticulatable, particular pedagogical conceptions. Relations of power can align themselves and be aligned, under certain spatial conditions, such that the only discourses available are those that are produced and sanctioned by dominant relations” (Buendía, 2000, p. 148). Thus, for Ms. Clark, the meaning of being a teacher of ELLs was all about English language teaching, with an emphasis on “skills,” “strategies,” and “scaffolding,” and letting ELLs practice English language through rote memorization methods. By considering ELLs only through the lens of their English language ability, having deficit views toward ELLs became quite natural and normal for her. The relations of power embedded in multiple discourses in/across the layers of discursive contexts (societal, institutional, and local) interconnected, intertwined and merged to legitimate Ms. Clark’s reasoning systems and embodied practices, that is, English-only language ideological discourses combined with behavior/technical and individual/psychological discourses about language and literacy education resulted in deficit discourses toward ELLs dominating her classroom.
Culturally Relevant Pedagogy: the Intersection of the Discourse of “Being a Humanizing Educator” with “Community of Learners” Discourses and Resource Discourses

The subsection is a within-case study of the transformation of Ms. Lewis’s pedagogical practices observed over the course of the study period. Within 1½ years, Ms. Lewis’s pedagogy progressed through two different stages, moving from a borderland-hybrid pedagogy, and moving toward culturally relevant pedagogy. From the spring semester of 2008 through the spring semester of 2009, Ms. Lewis’s belief systems toward ELLs and passion for ELL education remained unchanged, as stated by Ms. Lewis: “My belief has never been changed.” However, Ms. Lewis’s pedagogical practices did change, moving from a hybrid-borderland pedagogy mostly focused on reading strategies and vocabulary instruction, and moving toward culturally relevant pedagogical practices. This would indicate that an individual teacher’s belief systems about language and literacy, and her desire and passion for the education of linguistically and culturally diverse ELL students can be a triggering motivation for utilizing some portions of immigrant students’ linguistic and cultural resources in classroom teaching, yet not be fully practiced as culturally relevant pedagogy in the real classroom context, in agreement with the research finding of Buendía et al. (2003) that one Senegalese-American middle school ESL teacher of color demonstrated hybrid-borderland pedagogy, a pedagogy consisting of some elements of culturally relevant pedagogy mixed with elements of assimilation pedagogy, because “his political desires for immigrant students were modified by institutional structures and disenabling discourses about immigrants” (Buendía et al., 2003, p. 291). Thus, it is critical to examine the relationship between context and desires
(Buendía et al., 2003), so this section focuses on the dialectic relations of context and the orders of discourse, especially style, diagramed in Figure 4.

The discursive formations (DFs) of Ms. Clark’s assimilative pedagogy were explained above using the concept of intertextuality and interdiscursivity of the three-layered discursive contexts diagrammed in Figure 4. Like Ms. Clark, Ms. Lewis lived in and through the similar discursive contexts surrounded by English-only language ideologies at the societal level (Chapter III), deficit-based normalizing/ segregating discourses in Birch Hill High School, and the skill-based behavioristic/ individual/ technical discourses circulating in the curriculum offered by the state and in the PD offered by the school district (Chapter III) at the institutional level. However, at the local level, Ms. Lewis’s pedagogical discourses and practices were quite opposite to those of Ms. Clark. Their different ontological and epistemological stances toward English learners and ELL pedagogy were produced by their different ways of being (styles), and their ways of being (their personal and social identities) were constructed by living in and through very different discursive contexts, as explained in Chapters V and VI.

Ms. Lewis’s ways of being in the world, “being a humanizing educator” were constructed through her participation histories within the discursive contexts of her personal and institutional spaces, and are demonstrated in her linguistic style of using the collective pronoun “we,” in her discourses about “community of learners,” and in her discourses regarding her ELLs’ cultural resources. But her style, her desire to integrate the linguistic and cultural resources of ELLs into her teaching and her passion for social justice could not fully actualized during the spring semester of 2008, when she had been attending for 1½ years the PD program that was framed in behavior/technical/individual
conceptions of language and literacy instruction for ELLs, which conformed with the historically rooted model of language and literacy education (Cummins, 2000) that subscribes to the narrow definition of literacy as merely the encoding and decoding of printed texts. Such instruction for teaching print-based English monolingual literacy cannot make much impact on the pedagogical practices of ELL teachers.

However, during the summer semester of 2008, Ms. Lewis was able to merge dialogically and dialectically her previous experiences and her desire to create a counter-hegemonic funds of knowledge discursive context in her classroom and community into her presentation and interactions within the classroom and in her school, and improve the intertextual and interdiscursive connections between her personal style of life and her classroom practices, once she was situated within the non-dominant discursive contexts of three PD programs centered around culturally relevant pedagogy: Family-School-Partnership (FSP), Transformative Pedagogy, and Bridging School with Communities. Reading comprehension strategies and speaking proficiency can be valuable tools, but can be most effectively mastered and employed within a socially relevant context, so that “every utterance participates in the ‘unitary language’ (in its centripetal forces and tendencies) and at the same time partakes of social and historical heteroglossia (the centrifugal and stratifying sources)” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 272). Out from a classroom characterized by culturally relevant pedagogy, the centrifugal discourses that foreground the linguistic and cultural resources of ELLs can be interjected into the dominant English-only social structures and discourses. After participating in culturally relevant PD, Ms. Lewis was naturally and quickly able to recontextualize her pedagogical practices, since “texts (and the discourses and genres which they deploy) move between spatially and
temporally different contexts, and are subject to transformations whose nature depends upon relationships and differences between such contexts” (Wodak & Fairclough, 2010, p. 22). Ms. Lewis was then able appropriate the state mandated English only language policies and the hegemonic English only discourses circulating in society to use in her her situated classroom context, and bring her pedagogical practices out of the hybrid-borderland and into culturally relevant pedagogy, as described by Ms. Lewis herself:

The greatest change in my practice came when Dr. Talyor (pseudonym) invited Dr. Soto (pseudonym) to workshop with the classroom teachers involved in FSP. Dr. Soto led us in the use of our own research to influence our instruction. It was this research that was the basis for my work on the Voices mural I created with my students and a local artist. It was the students’ reports of feeling invisible as individuals, all the while feeling as if they had nowhere to hide due to skin color, religious and culture, dress or differences that influenced my pedagogical choices. (Interview, 6/7/2010)

Dr. Soto provided information from Banks, Freire and other such social cognitive models. He encouraged us to use our own teacher driven research to approach our classroom instruction. We presented our findings at a group workshop and discussed its implications to our instruction. I attended three or four workshops over a 1 year period. (Interview, 6/7/2010)

By engaging herself in the “community of learners” framework, that is, by founding and holding mutually collaborative ELL teacher meetings, inviting community members (parents, teachers, university students and professors in education department, guest speakers, local artists, her medical doctor friend) into her classroom pedagogical practices, Ms. Lewis created counter-hegemonic resource discourses toward ELLs and integrated ELLs’ funds of knowledge (i.e., ways of being) into her pedagogical practices in and beyond her classroom setting. This transformation of Ms. Lewis’s pedagogical practices illuminates the dialectic relations of orders of discourse with the multilayered discursive contexts (see Figure 4). In other words, the ways of being (styles) can be
realized only when situated in the enabling discursive context where those desires and styles are promoted and encouraged.

Ms. Lewis’s resource perspectives toward ELLs and her belief in the critical-socio-cultural approach to language and literacy were not changed between the beginning of this study, when she was enacting hybrid-borderland pedagogy, and the end of the study, when she was practicing culturally relevant pedagogy. This study illuminates that the dialectic relations of discursive context with orders of discourse, “social structuring of semiotic diversity” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 58) can explain the transformation of pedagogy. In other words, Ms. Lewis’s passions and desires for the education of ELLs was not sufficient, but required multiple interweaving elements, that is, the intertwined intersections of discursive formations (DFs, hereafter) to make it possible for her to enact culturally relevant pedagogical practices. This study reveals that funds of knowledge-based counter-hegemonic interfering discursive formations (DFs) in the dominant hegemonic English-only language ideological discourses combined with the ways of being of a teacher with a strong desire to realize those DFs can allow teachers of ELLs to enact culturally relevant pedagogical practices in/through the streams of empowering practices with English learners in/across contexts.

Culturally Relevant Pedagogy Versus Assimilative Pedagogy

This section is a cross-case analysis that compares and contrasts the pedagogical practices of Ms. Lewis and Ms. Clark, explaining the features of culturally relevant pedagogy by contrasting it with assimilative pedagogy and examining the discursive (trans)formations of pedagogical practices in one case, and the absence of transformation
in the other. The somewhat opposite pedagogical practices and belief systems of the two study participant teachers have been presented above in Chapter V: MS. LEWIS and Chapter VI: MS. CLARK.

Multiple interconnected discourses within the layers of discursive context, that is, at the societal, institutional and local level, contributed to the construction of the belief systems and pedagogical practices of Ms. Lewis and Ms. Clark, as explained above. Despite the fact that they were both White female teachers of ELLs confronting at the same time the same dominant hegemonic English-only language ideological discourses, and teaching in the same school district with similar years of teaching experience (e.g., Ms. Lewis: the 3rd year of teaching; Ms. Clark: the 5th year of teaching) and at a similar age (e.g., Ms. Lewis: early 30s; Ms. Clark: 27 years old), their orders of discourse, that is, their ways of being (styles), ways of representing (discourse), and ways of interacting (genre) with cultures and languages other than American English were quite opposite. The different epistemological and ontological stances toward ELLs and ELL pedagogy followed by Ms. Lewis and Ms. Clark were a result of the effects of power-related interweaving network of discursive formations (DFs, hereafter). The discourses they were exposed to (ways of representing) and the way they interacted with other cultures and languages (genre) were evidence of the different trajectories of their participation histories in their personal and institutional spaces, which contributed to the formation of their different styles (ways of being). Their ways of being then defined their repertoires of member resources (MR, Fairclough, 1995). MR supply a mental map that “people have in their heads and draw upon when they produce and interpret texts - including their
knowledge of language, representations of the social world they inhabit, values, beliefs, assumptions and so on” (Fairclough 1989, p. 24)

For example, Ms. Lewis, as an immigrant and a daughter of a mother having experienced linguistic discrimination against her and her mother in her daily life at a young age, was situated in a subject position such that she could come to understand the intertwined relationship among power, language, and identity issues within the situated social context. Her discursively constructed ways of being motivated her to hold a strong desire for returning to the place where she came from with a genuine heart for teaching ELLs (Chapter V). Thus, her reasoning systems underpinning her ways of being were situated to debunk and interject the dominant English-only and deficit meta-discourses toward immigrant students into her ways of being and teaching. Her habitus, the dispositions to structure her practices could be a driving force for her to recontextualize and appropriate the discourses she encountered in the PD program focusing on ELL instructing from the individual/technical/cognitive perspective, teacher education programs, and in society, and also motivated her to participate in ELL teacher PD programs framed in terms of counter-hegemonic critical pedagogy, such as Family-School-Partnership, Transformative Pedagogy, Bridging School with Community, and to recontextualize her pedagogical practices to fit her situated emerging context:

I do not believe that there is a single cookie cutter system that will be most effective for students. I get concerned when educators attempt to sell a single idea as the “end all-be all” solution for educating youth. While I walked away appreciating many of the instructional strategies and skills presented, I have not used any of it with fidelity. Instead, I take bits and pieces that I liked and integrate them into my current pedagogical practices. (Interview, 6/7/2010)
By contrast, Ms. Clark, who had never been positioned in a subordinate subject position in society, either as an immigrant, or as a person in lower socioeconomic class, or needing to learn another language, just believed what she heard from her PD instructors and tried to follow what they directed her to do, and enunciated and subscribed the dominant societal English-only language ideological discourses in her belief systems and implemented in her classroom the script prescribed by the English-only monolingual and monocultural language ideological discourses in society. Ms. Clark’s ways of being, constructed through the dominant English-only discourses circulating in her personal and institutional spaces (Chapter V), did not lead her to imagine challenging the institutionally inscribed behavior/individual/technical discourses that surrounded her.

By comparing and contrasting the features of these two different and quite opposite pedagogies, that is, culturally relevant pedagogy versus assimilative pedagogy, we can come to understand what culturally relevant pedagogy means, how culturally relevant pedagogy can be enacted in and out of classroom settings, what the effects of culturally relevant pedagogy on the linguistically and culturally diverse students’ school lives, their whole lives, community members, and the society, and we can understand why culturally relevant pedagogy needs to be enacted. Additionally, readers can see that culturally relevant pedagogy can be applied to promote real learning, not only for ELLs but also for all students.

A detailed point by point comparison about the different trajectories of DFs for the culturally relevant pedagogy versus assimilative pedagogy is provided in Table 7.
Table 7: Comparison and Contrast Chart: (Trans)Formation of Pedagogy: Culturally Relevant Pedagogy Versus Assimilative Pedagogy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Ms. Lewis Culturally Relevant Pedagogy</th>
<th>Ms. Clark Assimilative Pedagogy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourses Circulating in the Nation Curriculum</td>
<td><strong>English-only Ideology</strong></td>
<td><strong>English-only Ideology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual/Psychological Discourses</td>
<td>Individual/Psychological Discourses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourses Circulating in the History of Personal and Institutional Spaces</td>
<td>(Dis)Enabling Discourse “I hated to go to school because my classmates made fun of me” Under(graduate) School - bachelor in philosophy, history, and English literature - master in education focusing on power structures and inequity</td>
<td>Indifferent Discourse “Uh, yeah. I just was never around anybody” Under(graduate) School - bachelor in history and English with teaching certificate - master in world history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourses Circulating in PD Courses</td>
<td>- Behavioristic/Individual/ Cognitive Discourses - <em>Funds of Knowledge</em> Discourses</td>
<td>- Behavioristic/Individual/ Cognitive Discourses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD Courses</td>
<td>Five PD Programs - inquiry learning - language and literacy instruction for ELLs from behavioristic/cognitive conception of language and literacy instruction - creating “intensive writing protocol” for ELLs - FSP (family-school partnership) - bridging school with community</td>
<td>Two PD Programs - inquiry learning - behavioristic/technical/ psychological conception of language and literacy instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Ms. Lewis Culturally Relevant Pedagogy</th>
<th>Ms. Clark Assimilative Pedagogy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourses Circulating in Community &amp; School</td>
<td>Normalizing/Segregating Discourses “The school is challenging because really is a school divided.”</td>
<td>Assimilating/Segregating Discourses “They’re segregated, yeah”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views about the Role of ELL Teacher</td>
<td>Humanizing Educator “You are not teaching English, you are teaching people.”</td>
<td>English Language Teacher “It’s really hard to try and teach the core at the same time as teaching the language skills.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views about ELLs</td>
<td>Discourse of Resources “They’re brilliant!!! they are brilliant!!!”</td>
<td>Discourse of Deficits “Not only are they still learning English, but a lot of them need to learn school social skills”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief Systems about Language &amp; Literacy Development</td>
<td>Critical Sociocultural Discourses “It’s about the creation of community of learners.” “It’s not about language, it is about inclusion.”</td>
<td>Individual/Functional Technical Discourses “If you can read a book, then you are literate.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ms. Lewis activated her own agency and enacted culturally relevant pedagogy by participating in five different professional development programs, by constructing her school’s ELL department, by engaging in daily conversations with her ELL students, by living in and through her students’ community, by performing community service with her students, and by involving herself in her school and community as a catalyst for change. In order to promote parental involvement, Ms. Lewis invited parents to work as presenters, translators and helpers, to participate in classroom discussions, and to generally support their children’s educational processes and support the teachers in the classroom. Ms. Lewis lived in her students’ community, visited her students’ homes in order to build trust relationships with her students and their families, and learned about her students through her community service. Her teaching materials were not confined to the books offered by the state or to graded textbooks; they were not even defined in advance before meeting her students but, rather, were created and invented by her and her students together through a democratic process based on consensus. Ms. Lewis’s classroom practices exemplify the processes of culturally relevant pedagogy, demonstrating what kinds of knowledge are produced in class and the ways in which that shared knowledge is produced. Knowledge was not defined by the teacher at the start of class and then acquired by students following the teacher’s instructions, but knowledge was produced through dialogic heteroglossic classroom discourses in Thirdspace, as individual students’ voices and lived experiences were heard and appreciated. That knowledge was then presented to the community, so that the knowledge produced in the classroom was introduced into society and into the public discourse. Ms. Lewis empowered her ELLs by positioning them as positive discursive subjects in class, leading
them to play multiple roles in multiple changing dynamic participation structures in activity systems in and across contexts as learners, researchers, teachers, and social activists.

By contrast, Ms. Clark demonstrated assimilative pedagogy, a pedagogy based on procedural display. She gained information about her ELLs from registration cards, telephone calls, and students’ completed assignments, and confined her involvement in the school and community to school parents’ nights and parents’ conferences, and parental school visits for disciplinary reasons. She did not visit the families of students at their homes or invite parents into the classroom to help with their children’s educational processes or to share their linguistic and cultural resources. The teaching materials that Ms. Clark used were confined to the books offered by the state, special education books, picture books, graded textbooks, or materials from the Internet. She did not create materials or adapt those books to fit the level and interests of her English learner students. The classroom practices of Ms. Clark exemplified the practices found by numerous research studies to be prevalent in ESL classrooms: repetition of English sounds, copying texts (Valdés, 1998), and skill-drill practices (Valdés, 1998). In the meantime, her ELLs demonstrated their resistance toward Ms. Clark’s English-only monolingual and monocultural instructions by creating their own meaning systems and practicing hybrid language use, using only Spanish with their classmates and using English only with the teacher.

A detailed point by point comparison is provided in Table 8.
Table 8: Comparison and Contrast Chart: Features of Pedagogy: Culturally Relevant Pedagogy Versus Assimilative Pedagogy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Ms. Lewis - Culturally Relevant Pedagogy</th>
<th>Ms. Clark - Assimilative Pedagogy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Involvement in School &amp; Community</strong></td>
<td>Active involvement in school, community and five PD courses</td>
<td>Passive involvement in school and community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parental Involvement</strong></td>
<td>Parent-Centered - school visit as a translator, teacher, discussant about current social issues, helper and supporter</td>
<td>School-Centered - school visit for disciplinary reasons, parent conferences, and parents night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ways of Gaining ELLs’ Resources</strong></td>
<td>Active - home/community visits for trustworthy relationship building</td>
<td>Passive - registration card, Internet and telephone, assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material Use</strong></td>
<td>Invention-centered - creation of materials drawing from students’ interests and working culture</td>
<td>Convention-centered - material from core curriculum, level books, Internet, or special ed books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom Practice</strong></td>
<td>Production of Shared Knowledge: - shared knowledge production in Thirdspace - empowering ELLs through discursive subject positioning - changing roles in/across contexts: ELLs as learners, teachers, researchers, and social activists - expansive learning cycles in community of learners</td>
<td>Teacher Scripted Lesson - monologic teacher scripted lesson delivery - skill-drill instruction - repetition of English sounds, - copying practices - ELLs’ hybrid language use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSIONS

One of the teachers who participated in this study put into practice the behavior/technical and individual/psychological discourses that circulated in her institutional spaces, and enacted assimilative pedagogy, in conformity with the English-only and standard English language ideological discourses that dominate US society. However, another teacher, after participating in professional development that emphasised social justice and power-related issues, was able to progress beyond hybrid-borderland pedagogy and adopt culturally relevant pedagogy in her classroom and community.

The conclusion of this study is that both assimilative pedagogy and culturally relevant pedagogy are formed and transformed through the effects of power-related discursive formations (DFs). Ms. Clark enacted assimilative pedagogy by subscribing to and reflecting the English-only and standard English language ideological discourses and the behavior/technical and individual/psychological discourses that circulated in the personal and institutional spaces transversed by the trajectories of her subject positions. Within-case analysis of Ms. Clark’s classroom indicates that the pedagogical practices of ELL teachers are associated with the societal and institutional discourses and structures that the individual teacher has lived in and through.
However, despite the hegemonic English only and behavioral/individual/psychological discourses dominating the teacher education and professional development landscape, Ms. Lewis was able to become a “transformative intellectual” and enact culturally relevant pedagogy, leaving her hybrid-borderland pedagogy behind as soon as she was situated in a social relational context that enabled her to connect her classroom practices with the wider community practices for the purpose of social justice and equity. Within-case analysis of the transformation of Ms. Lewis’s pedagogical practices indicates that the attainment of culturally relevant pedagogy was not so much related to her individual desires, passions or endeavors toward the education of immigrant students, but resulted from the power relations, sociocultural discourses, and practices she experienced as she participated in a community of learners.

In conclusion, transforming the existing historically-rooted behavior/technical discourses and the individual/psychological pedagogical discourses and practices, and moving toward culturally relevant pedagogical practices will not be accomplished by one individual teacher’s knowledge or efforts. But it can be achieved in conjunction with a community of learners that includes members from all parts of society: other colleague teachers, principals, university professors and students, community advocates, parents and students all engaged in the discursive community of practice. In other words, the integration of diverse individual English learner students’ funds of knowledge into curriculum and everyday pedagogical practices in the classroom will be possible when opportunities are provided to ELL teachers that will enable them to connect their classroom practices with the practices of the wider community beyond the classroom.
Discussion

Ignoring the politics of knowledge at the level of what is regulated as reason and true/false is one of the major weaknesses of reform efforts. We need to shift the focus from the conventional notions of socialization of teachers to the systems of ideas embedded in the organization of teaching that construct and normalize the teacher who administers children. It is the rules that construct the social spaces in which we problematize the world and self that must be interrogated. (Popkewitz, 1998, p. 122)

Ms. Clark’s assimilative pedagogical practices and her ways of being within the classroom, that is, a combination of “being an English language teacher,” individual/technical discourses, and deficit discourses toward ELLs, are not just entities of her own private inner psychological makeup, but come out of her styles (ways of being) and discourses (ways of representing), which are the products of collective discursive formations (DFs), because all utterances exist in multiple social relations (Bakhtin, 1986; Foucault, 1980). Blaming Ms. Clark for her deficit views toward ELLs and her poor teaching practices would be like blaming the victim. Thus, educational reforms based on the establishment of reward based or punitive school accountability systems that focus on the efforts of individual teachers to improve their students’ academic scores on standardized tests (e.g., NCLB) cannot improve the pedagogical practices of teachers and reduce the achievement gap between ELLs the native English speaking students.

Educational reform is urgently needed that replaces English-only and standard English language ideological discourses that lead to deficit views about ELLs and equate
ELLs’ lack of English language with cognitive deficit and restructures segregating school systems, educational reform that promotes culturally relevant pedagogy and emphasizes awareness of the multilingual and multicultural resources that bilingual students bring with them into the classroom. At the institutional level, PD programs based on a behavior/individual/psychological framework need to be replaced with PD programs that take a *funds of knowledge* approach to the education of ELLs in order to transform the pedagogical practices of teachers at the micro classroom interactional level and engage ELLs in real learning and development.

Without a pedagogy that recognizes the cultural and lingual resources of diverse students and classroom practices based on ELLs’ lived curriculum, educational reform efforts are just cycles of reform without any real reform. Teacher education that promotes culturally relevant pedagogy would not exclude the teaching of “skills” or linguistic forms, but rather add instruction about the *power of codes* (Delpit, 1995) so that teachers are equipped to utilize the authentic context surrounding ELLs’ personal life experiences, cultural practices, and interests by connecting in-school literacy practices with out-of school practices and integrating the *funds of knowledge* that ELLs and community members can bring into the classroom, as was demonstrated by Ms. Lewis. True school and classroom reform can be achieved and ELLs can be empowered by creating a hybrid Thirdspace that integrates the D/discourses of ELLs into the pedagogical D/discourses within and outside of the classroom, by connecting ELLs’ ways of being with the practices of wider community, and by protecting the voice of ELLs and making sure they can be heard over the voice of the teacher. Effective ELL education is not just about teachers collecting recipe knowledge about instructional skills and techniques. Effective
ELL education is about the creation of a community of learners and empowering streams of activity systems that make ELLs’ voices heard in and across contexts so that ELLs can develop *academic competence, cultural competence, and sociopolitical consciousness* (Ladson-Billings, 1995).

Cummins (2010), in his book review titled “Bilingual education: the only option to teach all children in the 21st century in equitable ways,” argued that the adoption of two-way bilingual education is urgently needed to accomplish real social justice and equitable society. Additionally, ELLs best develop their linguistic, cognitive, social, emotional, cultural competence, and critical thinking abilities as they participate in hybrid forms of learning that combine socio-cultural-historical-activity practices familiar to the students situated within authentic discourse communities, rather than English-only forms of instruction. (August & Shanahan, 2006; Collier & Thomas, 1989; Crawford, 1995; Cummins 1981, 1987, 2000)

Mexican origin immigrant students in Ms. Lewis’s class indicated their resistance to her English-only print-based literacy instruction and their desires for authoring their linguistic and cultural identities in the classroom environment through their hybrid use of language. However, in the mutual collaborative bilingual space where bilingual students teach their native languages to native English speaking students and native English speaking students teach English to ELLs, all students are empowered to appreciate their own linguistic and cultural identities as bilingual or multilingual students. Bilingual education “is good for the rich and poor, for the powerful and the lowly, for Indigenous peoples and immigrants, for speakers of official and/or national languages, and for those who speak regional languages” (García, 2009, p. 11). In the complex multilingual and
multicultural society of the 21st century, characterized by an unprecedented movement of people around the world and a global availability of information, it is difficult to imagine English-only monolingual schooling that does not take into consideration the multilingual socio-cultural-historical-political forces and phenomena in the United States.

Implications

Theoretical Implications for ELL Teacher Education

In light of the results of this study, I offer seven suggestions for the future direction of ESL and ELL teacher education:

First, it is crucially necessary to provide spaces for preservice and inservice teachers to experience self-reflective and self-disruptive meaning and sense making processes about their own racial, cultural, personal and social identities as a teacher, and their own (dis)privileges in society as opposed to the linguistic, ethnic and cultural identities of their immigrant students, and to give teachers insights into the dynamics of classroom linguistic and cultural diversity through participation in communities of ELL teacher researchers. Just as Ms. Lewis was situated in a network of multiple social relations through the ELL teacher community in her school and community, ELL teachers need to be connected with ELL teacher communities in and out of school. According to Tharp and Gallimore (1988), helping teachers to conduct self-interrogation about themselves, students, and schooling systems “can be seen as one of creating and supporting instructional conversations, among students, teachers, administers, program developers, and researchers. It is through the instructional conversation that babies learn
to speak, children to read, teachers to teach, researchers to discover, and all to become literate” (p. 111).

Second, teacher education programs for ELL teachers, including both preservice teacher education courses and the inservice PD (professional development) programs, need to have a common overarching thread that connects each program coherently and cohesively. Ms. Clark mentioned that she was confused, and struggled with which conceptions and framework she should follow, because of the different conceptual frameworks presented in the two PD programs she attended. That common thread needs to be the use of a critical sociocultural framework, that is, a *funds of knowledge* approach to teaching ELL teachers and teaching ELLs, because almost half century of research results have proven the track record of culturally relevant pedagogy in delivering academic success and positive identity formation for diverse students (Au & Jordan, 1981; Au & Kawakami, 1985; Diamond & Moore, 1995; Gay, 1975, 2000; González et al., 1995, González, 2001; Heath 1983; Krater et al., 1994; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Michaels, 1981; Moll, 1990; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). Currently, preservice teachers are required to take one multicultural education course (interview with Ms. Clark, 2008), which is not sufficient at all. And a more problematic issue is that all other education courses are operated from different epistemological and ontological perspectives. Without connecting all the courses in the education department within one overarching theoretical framework, it is not possible for ELL teachers to fully understand what and how they should teach ELLs and why they should enact culturally relevant pedagogy. It does not mean that we need to teach only about issues related to power and social justice, but in light of this postmethod (Kumaravadivelu, 2006), postprocess and postcognitive era (Atkinson, 2003),
characterized by a multilingual, multicultural and globalized society, the educational programs for teachers preparing to teach L2 and ELL in K-12 US public school settings need to be brought into the 21st century, (re)conceptualized and (re)constructed through a negotiation among the multiplicity of voices and models that have developed in education of research and practice, and also from among other disciplinary areas, such as anthropology, psychology, sociology, philosophy, cultural studies, and communications.

Third, it is time for a departure from the top-down PD model that treats ELL teachers like passive knowledge receivers and technicians, and sends them out with a thick package full of skills, strategies and procedures, like Drs. Hamilton and Parker did. ELL teachers are “users and creators of knowledge and theorizers in their own right” (Johnson, 2006, p. 241), so teachers deserve to “have multiple opportunities to connect their ways of knowing to theory, both emic and etic, through modes of engagement that lead to praxis and, more importantly, when they are deeply embedded in communities of practice that seek to ask these more substantive questions” (p. 242). Redrawing the boundaries will be accomplished through escaping from the top-down professional development program model, and entering into collaborative, inquiry-based, and self-directed professional development in the classroom and beyond. Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, and Yoon (2001) proposed that effective professional development that produces change in teachers’ beliefs and practices is characterized by three core features: focus on content knowledge, opportunities for active learning, and coherence with other learning activities and that these underlying structural features can predict the success of the program: the form of the activity, collective participation of teachers from the same school, grade or subject; and the duration of the activity.
Fourth, professional development needs to be ongoing, continuous, dynamic, and embedded in teachers’ daily lives, so that teachers will have complex and interrelated learning opportunities that will allow them to construct the generative change they need, to appropriate their personal pedagogical knowledge (PPK), and to adopt the concepts presented in the PD program to their diverse situated classroom contexts. Ball (2009) argued that teacher change among teachers of students from diverse backgrounds occurs through “teachers’ strategic engagement with challenging theoretical perspectives, integration of action research in the professional development curriculum, ongoing work with diverse student populations” (p. 48). Ms. Lewis emphasized the importance of a dynamic, flexible, and ongoing community of ELL teachers that highlights the “social activist” for teacher development:

Classroom teachers need continuous opportunities to collaborate with one another, receive up to date research and connect with social activist to continue the arduous and emotionally draining work involved in social justice. However, the real challenge is balancing new learning with the demands of full time teaching. It takes a lot of time and effort to do research and shift an approach to teaching. I have a sincere complaint to the lack of follow through that is provided after PD to determine its efficacy. (Interview, 6/7/2010)

Fifth, teacher education and PD programs should provide the spaces for preservice and inservice teachers to interrogate and discuss the concept that teaching “influence and are influenced by the histories, economics, and cultures of societies in which they exist, particularly, by competing views of the purposes of schools and schooling” (Cochran-Smith, 2000, p. 165) for “the successful academic instruction for students from subordinate populations” (Bartolomé & Balderrama, 2001, p. 62). Many research studies have demonstrated the importance of political and ideological clarity of
teachers for the enactment of culturally relevant pedagogy and the real academic success of ELLs (Bartolomé & Balderrama, 2001, p. 62; Cochran-Smith, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995). According to Ladson-Billings (1995), “Not only must teachers encourage academic success and cultural competence, they must help students to recognize, understand, and critique current social inequities. This notion presumes that teachers themselves recognize social inequities and their causes” (p. 477). Cochran-Smith (2000) also argued for a public and political debate concerning teacher education:

Like it or not, more of us in teacher education and in the educational research and policy communities will need to engage in these public and political debates if we are to have a real voice in framing the questions that matter for the future of teacher education. It may well be that the future of teacher education depends as much on how we critique and enhance the professionalization of teaching within the educational community as it does on how we engage in the public debate about privatization, regulation, and deregulation. (p. 165)

Sixth, ELL teachers should be provided with the inquiry space to answer the following questions: What is the nature of language? What is the nature of L2 and literacy instruction as it applied to ELLs? Who are ELLs? Why do I teach this language for whom? Rather than explaining the nature of language and language/literacy education from the dominant framework of behaviorist and cognitive psychological perspectives like Drs. Hamilton and Parker did in this study, multiple views about the nature of language and literacy education need to be provided for ELL teachers: Saussure’s structural linguistics, behaviorism-based ALM (Audiolingualism), cognitive psychology-based CLT (Communicative Language Teaching) and IIO (input-interaction-output), CHAT-based concept of changing roles and participation structures in/across activity systems, postmodern/structuralism-based identity and subjectivity formations of L2 learners, etc. The study of L2 variability requires both sociolinguistic and
psycholinguistic perspectives along with a consideration of social structural, cultural, and historical forces. The actualization of the organic triangular system of language, i.e., form-meaning-use within the specific socio-cultural context through dialogue (Bakhtin, 1981) and systemic functional linguistics (SFL, Halliday, 1978) in an ELL teacher/student discourse community of learners is essentially crucial for teaching and learning second language and literacy.

Lastly, the belief systems, pedagogical discourses and practices of Ms. Lewis are an excellent example of CRP (Culturally Relevant Pedagogy). Thus, ELL teachers or ELL teacher educators who wonder about what CRP (culturally relevant pedagogy) is, what it means, and how ELL teachers can enact CRP can refer to Chapter V of this dissertation study for a demonstration of the theory and practice of CRP. Additionally, I have included for ELL teachers and teacher educators a passage of critical self-reflection and self-inquiry offered by Ms. Lewis regarding how to approach and teach ELLs:

I don’t think it’s a single tiered thing. I don’t think it’s a single, I think you definitely need to know the content that you’re trying to teach. You need to have an objective about why you want to teach this content, but the philosophy also as to, when your students come to you and say, “Why do we have to learn this?” It needs to go beyond, “because the state told us so.” It needs to go beyond, like the what exactly you’re teaching, why you’re teaching, and how is that going to help your students beyond the classroom doors. And then, I think, there’s the social emotional part, where every learner feels like there’s part of creating an environment of safety, of security, of community, where every learner feels like they’re of value, and you’re a facilitator, their intelligence, that funds of knowledge, some people call it. other people call it a capital, cultural capital.

But how do you created a value added classroom, where you’re seeking out what your students know. You see the value they bring and you see how that adds to the learning rather than the deficit model which is, “What don’t you know that I have to teach you?” You definitely need to find out, you definitely need to help your students progress, but don’t we all progress better when someone sees our strengths and builds
on our strengths rather than telling us, “You can’t do this, you can’t do this.” That defeats anyone, right? If someone were to come in here and say, “I see what you’re not doing as a teacher. You’re not doing this, this, and this, and this.” Ok, help me get there, but don’t help me get there by telling me that I can’t and I’m not. Tell me what I’m doing right, and then show me how what I’m doing right can reflect about what they’re learning, that metacognitive piece, I’m reflecting about what I’m learning, and I’m reflecting about who I am as a human being because it’s a position of power, and it’s a position that is, that power is important and we need to be mindful of how we’re treating other human beings. (Interview, 6/7/2010)

Methodological Implications

This methods employed in this study introduce both methodological strengths and weaknesses. The methodological strengths of this study are:

First, this study provides detailed contextual interpretations and analysis of power relations embedded in utterances, interactions and actions by situating CDA within an ethnographic case study through the use of textually-oriented critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 2003; Huckin, 1995, 2002). Because “the positivistic paradigm that had long positioned teachers as conduits to students and their learning was found to be insufficient for explaining the complexities of teachers’ mental lives and the teaching processes that occur in classrooms,” and that “rather, an interpretative or situated paradigm, largely drawn from ethnographic research in sociology and anthropology, came to be seen as better suited to explaining the complexities of teachers’ mental lives and the various dimensions of teachers’ professional worlds” (Johnson, 2006, p. 236), this study employed discourse-oriented critical ethnographic case study to describe, interpret, and analyze the power-related societal and institutional discourses in pedagogical actions/practices and belief systems.
Second, this study demonstrates the combination of three analytical tools: the constant comparison method from GT (grounded theory) was used for its data-driven concept and for theory development, cultural-historical activity theory (CHAT) was used for the analysis of nondiscursive aspects of learning in and out of classroom, and CDA was used for the detailed analysis of the linguistic and discursive interactions in the research settings. By utilizing activity systems as a unit of analysis, the dichotomous concepts, such as mind/body, subject/object, theory/praxis, and content/form, in behavior and cognitive learning theory were collapsed and combined to understand ELLs’ literacy learning and development in a relationship between self and self, self and O/others, and self and the environment.

Third, This study links the discourses of three different discursive contexts, the macro societal level, the meso institutional level, and the micro classroom level in a conjunctional analysis of the constitutive and constituting effects of power on the discursive (trans)formations (DFs) of two ELL teachers’ pedagogical practices by mapping the dialectic relationship between discursive contexts and orders of discourse (genre, discourse, and style). By linking the macro societal discourses and meso institutional structures and discourses with micro social interactions between in a classroom, this study shed lights on the discursive construction of ELL teachers’ pedagogical practices, rather than blaming teachers for their poor ELL teaching practices and deficit views toward ELLs.

The weaknesses of the methods could be that language ideological discourses were explained holistically within their situated social settings in terms of a Foucauldian framework rather than in a detailed linguistic analysis. So future research could focus on
the detailed sociolinguistic interactional analysis or conversation analysis combined with ethnomethodology about the societal English-only language ideologies and their impact on the local interactional pedagogical discourses and practices.

Pedagogical Implications for ELL Teachers

This study illuminates the crucial importance of the enactment of culturally relevant pedagogy, so that linguistically diverse students can experience real learning and form positive identities and subjectivities. In culturally relevant pedagogy, language and literacy development is a social practice (Gee, 1999, 2000, 2004; New London Group, 1996; Street, 1984), and is more related to ways of knowing (epistemology), ways of being (identity), and ways of doing (practice) within the situated sociocultural contexts, by debunking and reconstructing the existing knowledge systems and unequal power structures through collaborative dialoging from a culturally relevant pedagogical perspective, rather than learning how to encode and decode texts, following a narrow definition of literacy. Thus, language learning and literacy development is not about transmitting linguistic structures, skills, reading strategies, and knowledge systems from teacher to students using top-down methods, but more related to providing opportunities for ELLs to contribute to embodied practices and the reconstruction of knowledge. In this regard, the role of teacher is critical for the creation of learning environment in and out of classroom settings, so this subsection focuses on explaining the role of teacher from a critical socio-cultural perspective in light of Ms. Lewis’s pedagogical practices described in Chapter V.
In the typical US classroom, the role of the teacher is that of an expert specialist, transferring knowledge to students following an Initiation-Response- Evaluation (IRE) pattern (Cazden, 2001). However, the critical social constructivist approach positions the teacher as a facilitator, involving both the teacher and students in a variety of teaching-learning activities, and encouraging democratic participation by students in the classroom learning community. The teacher prompts discussions and reflections by posing problems and initiating problem solving activities, and by encouraging students to share their knowledge and lived cultural experiences; thus the teacher creates the context for learning. Students develop higher order thinking skills, understanding of complex cognitive academic concepts, and the proficiency in the second language through the process of agreeing with or arguing against each other in/through discussions about content, concepts, strategies and language, using intertextual utterances in context.

In sociocultural thought, the teacher’s role is essential for the creation of productive classroom learning D/discourses. According to Rogoff (1990, 2003), the teacher’s role in a classroom should be to provide guided participation in the developmental process. The process of guided participation entails three main activities: constructing from known to new, structuring situations, and transforming responsibilities for learning. These activities are not performed separately or sequentially, but take place concurrently as integrated elements of the apprenticeship process, and take place in the context of the classroom discourse community.

The first phase of guided participation allows students to transition from lower level thinking to a higher level, where new, more complicated learning opportunities open up for them. This is similar to the child’s apprenticeship situation at home, where parents
build bridges that facilitate advancement of their children from known to new situations. Ms. Lewis demonstrated this first phase of guided participation in her interactions with her students in a teacher-whole class format during the beginning of her classroom sessions. Based on the research topic agreed upon through consensus with her students, Ms. Lewis shared the lesson objectives of each class and taught her students in an interactive teaching environment using a Q&A format.

The second phase of guided participation, structuring of situations, involves coordination by the teacher in choosing tasks, levels of work, and proper educational materials along with students. To be more specific, when structuring situations, teachers collaborate with their students in problem solving activities by choosing the task most suited for promoting the student’s independence and allowing students to take an active and self-directed role in choosing activities (Rogoff, 2003). Demonstrating this phase of guided participation, Ms. Lewis encouraged students to discuss the concepts they needed to learn in pairs and groups, and to discuss research questions, themes and interviewees for their racism research project and to present their works in class and in public.

In the third phase of guided participation, students gain independence through collaboration. At the initial stages, the teacher controls activities, but, little by little, students take ownership of their activities as their competence and independence increase. Both teacher and students learn to position themselves to do challenging work in the process of constructing their collective ZPD (zone of proximal development). Rogoff’s recommendation regarding guided participation (1990) is that teachers, in addition to orchestrating activities and peer collaboration, lead by “modeling, contingency management, providing feedback, instructing, questioning, and cognitive structuring”
(Tharp & Gallimore, 1988, p. 9). Modeling, offering behavior for imitation, is a powerful educational method; both expert teachers and peer models are highly important in assisting performance. Contingency management is a system of rewards and punishment; rewards, praise, and encouragement following desired behavior support development through the zone of proximal development. Demonstrating the collaborative phase of guided instruction, Ms. Lewis never forgot to empower students through positive discursive subject positioning, and created the spaces for ELLs to present their learned concepts in public social spaces beyond classroom, as shown in Chapter V.

In addition to teaching student through Rogoff’s guided participation framework as explained above and through legitimate peripheral participation to legitimate full participation (Wenger, 1998), the important role of a teacher does not reside within activities defining and evaluating students’ abilities or in lesson plan objectives and contents, but is more related to constructing students’ zones of proximal development through collaborative dialogic heteroglossia in a classroom community of learners by encouraging students to enjoy taking ownership for their learning and development. Unlike task-based instruction, which focuses on teachers’ instructional procedures and intended learning outcomes (Lantolf, 2010), culturally relevant pedagogy emphasizes the importance of the community of learners (Ladson-Billings, 1995), encouraging that English learner students’ voices be made heard in the dialogic interactions within selves and with others in authoring/authored social spaces in and out of the classroom, and providing changing roles and responsibilities in and across contexts based on English learner students’ lived curriculum, as demonstrated in Ms. Lewis’s culturally relevant pedagogical practices in and out of classroom settings.
In order to accomplish scaffolding, guided participation, apprenticeship, and the gradual release of responsibility for learning from teacher to students, and in order to form connections between teacher and students and among students using signs, texts, and dialogues, both the teacher and students need to enter into an inter subjective relationship (Rogoff, 2003) in a relational context, i.e., Thirdspace. Thirdspace is a hybrid space characterized by cultural, social and epistemological change, in which the competing knowledge of different spaces is brought into conversation, challenging and reshaping both academic and everyday D/discourses (Moje et al., 2004). Students learn and develop themselves in and through changing participation structures (Rogoff, 2003) in the (re)constructed Thirdspaces (Bhabha, 1994; Gutiérrez, 2008), i.e., collective, collaborative, and interdependent zones of proximal development (Gutiérrez, 2008; Vygotsky, 1978). ELLs gain literacy ability through appropriation of cultural tools, and through interactions involving internalization and externalization of their second language, in multiple intersections of the horizontal and vertical relationships created in the triangular activity settings (Cole, 2000) found in classroom contexts.

Hybrid and multiple literacies need to be created (Gutiérrez, 2008), so that learning occurs through a rich interactional matrix that includes a range of horizontal and vertical language and embodied practices, departing from the traditional definitions of literacy exemplified in Ms. Clark’s monologic scripted lesson delivery. In Thirdspace, a hybrid space constituted of multiple synchronic and diachronic activity systems, immigrant ELLs become engaged in meaningful literacy and grammatical development through various semiotic meditational means, drawn from their own cross-contextual sociohistorical lived experiences. In Thirdspace, individual students become active agents
who are motivated to resolve tensions or dilemmas in a democratic manner, and to
produce individuals’ ownership and emancipation with a philanthropic mind (Bhabha,
1994; Soja, 1996). The potential for creating the intersubjective Thirdspace exists when
the teacher and students can move from their rigidly scripted and exclusive social spaces,
and when all students’ discourses, identities, roles, and epistemologies are valued
(Gutierrez, 2008) by connecting the formal with the informal, the official with the
unofficial, the everyday concept with scientific concept (Vygotsky, 1978) in dynamically
changing, interconnected activity systems, and by providing spaces for immigrant
students to connect themselves with themselves, O/others, and the surrounding
environment through their *languaging* and *translanguaging* practices (García, 2009).

**Limitations**

Like all research, this discourse-oriented critical ethnographic research inevitably
has some limitations. First, these study results cannot be generalized to all ELL teachers
with the same characteristics as the participant teachers in this research. In other words, it
cannot be said that all White female teachers surrounded by the dominant English-only
ideological discursive formations (DFs) will enact assimilative pedagogy, like Ms. Clark
did. At the same time, it cannot be said that all White female teachers who experienced an
immigrant subject position, who have have a strong passion and desire for ELLs and ELL
education, and who participate in PD programs framed in a *funds of knowledge* approach
will enact culturally relevant pedagogy like Ms. Lewis did. Several research studies have
found teachers with professional development experiences framed in culturally relevant
pedagogical approaches to teaching ELLs who dismissed their learned concepts and
practices when they returned to their classrooms (Sleeter & Delgado Bernal, 2004).

However, this two-case study provides crucially important insights concerning the ways in which the pedagogical practices of 2 teachers of English learners were (trans)formed discursively by analyzing the dialectic relationship between the discursive contexts and orders of discourses identified within these two particular and complexly situated cases using a combination of multiple analytic tools: constant comparison methods from grounded theory, CHAT and CDA.

Second, concerning the data collection methods, data about the discourses circulating in the history of the subjects’ personal and institutional spaces were mostly drawn from stories that were recalled and related by the research participants. Thus, the data could be incomplete in that “studies in narrative have long recognized that a story is shaped by history and institutional forces, as well as the listeners present at the time of its telling” (Rymes, 2001, p. 23). Additionally, daily observations of the two schools and classrooms including data about other teachers’ pedagogical practices and direct interviewing principals and staff members in each school setting could have provided more detailed data, which might have yielded more nuanced research interpretations and results.

Third, concerning the role of the researcher, the researcher’s presence within the research setting might have influenced the participant teachers’ ways of teaching and their students’ responses to them in the classroom. On the other hand, for 2½ years I was always present as a research assistant in all the sessions of the PD training program that was framed in behavior/technical/individual/psychological conceptions of teaching language and literacy for ELLs, as described in this study (Chapter III), but my presence
was hidden. No moment was provided to allow me to express my opinions and thoughts about how to teach English learners as a research assistant, even though I disagreed with what and how the two PD instructors were teaching most of the time. The power structure in which Dr. Hamilton, the PD instructor professor, and I as her student existed prevented me from expressing my honest opinions about her limitations and prevented me from introducing the critical sociocultural approach to language and literacy education for ELLs, which illuminates the effects of power on the construction of discourses and on the privilege of certain meanings over others (Foucault, 1980).

In addition, in contrast to the way Ms. Lewis always asked me to help her and her students in class, Ms. Clark always refused my constantly repeated offers to help her and her students. It seems that my position as a non-native English speaker could have justified Ms. Clark’s refusal to my help based on her language ideological discourses related with English-only and standard English. However, now that I reflect on those events, I might have been using my powerless position as an excuse to justify myself for not making much of an impact within my research settings. I could have tried to create Thirdspace, utilizing my knowledge and lived experiences about ELLs and ELL pedagogy even though I was situated in a disenabling position, the way Ms. Lewis did. In the future, I plan to compensate for the limitations of my role as a researcher by purposefully conducting participatory action research (PAR) in order to promote ELL teacher change for an equal and equitable society.

Finally, despite employing all the required criteria for research rigor in this study, my postmodern, feminist epistemologies and ontological histories as a person from other cultural context, Korea might have impacted on the whole process of this discourse
Future Research

This study provides the contextualized particulars of two cases, so that these two cases “can be compared to the particulars of other situations. In this way, ‘truths’ or assumptions can be extended, modified, or complicated” (Dyson & Genishi, 2005, p. 116). This study analyzed the discursive (trans)formation of pedagogical practices of two English as a second language (ESL) teachers who lived in and through different discursive contexts, but who shared similarities in many aspects such as race, age and teaching experience, and who worked in the same school district. Research contrasting and comparing the pedagogical practices of ELL teachers who are from linguistically, culturally and economically marginalized social groups with the pedagogical practices of typical White, female ELL teachers in the same school and attending the same PD programs would also be an enrichment of the literature of teacher change.

Additionally, learning to teach occurs dynamically, implicitly and explicitly in the interconnected horizontal and vertical spaces of the past, present and future. According to Borko (2004), “For teachers, learning occurs in many different aspects of practice, including their classrooms, their school communities, and professional development courses or workshops. It can occur in a brief hallway conversation with a colleague, or after school when counseling a troubled child. To understand teacher learning, we must study it within these multiple contexts, taking into account both the individual teacher-
learners and the social systems in which they are participants” (p. 4). Thus, further research is needed to explore the trajectories of epistemological, axiological, ideological and ontological change and development among ELL teachers, and the positioning practices that they implement in the classroom as they construct their professional identities as teachers, learners and researchers.
APPENDIX A

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK MAP WITH EXPLANATIONS
The above figure was created to represent the discourses in the ESL classroom of this dissertation study. As seen from a Foucauldian poststructuralist perspective, classrooms are not neutral places, but are the site of struggle between the language ideologies situated within webs of circulating power relations that encompass the nation/community/school/classroom. These competing discourses are relevant to second language and literacy education, curriculum, standardized testing systems, regulations, and procedures.

In this complicated classroom setting, culturally relevant pedagogy, as illustrated in this diagram, plays a mediating roles between teacher and students, connecting them with each other and enabling them to enter into Thirdspace, which “displaces the histories that constitute it, and sets up new structures of authority, new political initiatives…The process of cultural hybridity gives rise to something different, something new and unrecognizable, a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation” (Bhabha, 1990, p. 211).
APPENDIX B

RESEARCH QUESTIONS, DATA SOURCES,
CATEGORIES OF ANALYSIS,
AND ANALYSIS METHODS
**Questions**

1. What are the language ideologies circulating and practiced in the nation and school contexts, as demonstrated in the curriculum and pedagogy of two ESL classrooms?

2. How and to what extent do the language ideologies circulating and practiced in school contexts, as shown in the nation, curriculum, professional development, school and pedagogy of two ESL classrooms, support and influence the creation of a culturally relevant pedagogy in the classroom?

3. How and to what extent do ELL teachers negotiate/contest/reify these language ideologies in their beliefs and pedagogical practices, particularly in the area of language and literacy instruction, and how and to what extent do those beliefs and practices facilitate/inhibit the creation of a culturally relevant pedagogy in the classroom?

4. How and to what extent do ELLs participate in the pedagogical space of knowledge production in the classroom?

**Data Sources**

- National and local newspapers & Articles
- State standards, standardized tests, and curricular materials
- Written products submitted by teachers in university teacher education programs and syllabi in university teacher education program
- Observations (school & classroom)
- Interviews
- Journals (researcher & teacher)
- Student work

**Categories of Analysis**

- National/local/school language ideology
- Discourses about second language and literacy education in language arts curriculum and professional development
- Classroom language ideology
- Teacher language ideology
- The spaces of culturally relevant pedagogy in and out of classrooms

**Analysis Methods**

- Constant comparison
- Cultural-Historical-Activity Theory (CHAT)
- Critical discourse analysis (CDA)
APPENDIX C

TEACHER RESPONSE FORMS
1. What were the main goals?
2. What were the learners’ goals?
3. What were the teaching processes?
4. What went well?
5. What problems did you encounter?
6. What was the most effective in your lesson?
7. What was the least effective in your lesson?
8. What would you do differently next time?
APPENDIX D

THE FIRST INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
Personal History

1. Family Life: Could you tell me about your family? (father’s job, mother, siblings). How was your home environment? (monolingual or bilingual)

2. Institutional Life: Tell me about your school life (at elementary, middle, high schools, and university lives). Do you go to all your schools in Park City?

3. Friend Life: Do you have many friend from diverse backgrounds?

4. Societal Life: Have you seen racism, linguicism, sexism, or language ideological issues in your elementary, middle, high, and university school life? In what ways did you seen that? (examples)

5. Role Model: Who are those that make the most influence in allowing you to be a teacher? Could you give me some example stories? (anecdotal stories)

Factors to Influence Becoming a Good Teacher

6. Perceptions about how to be a good teacher: What factors do you think are the most important one to impact the improvement of your teaching practices? (personal life, teacher education programs, professional development programs, reflection journal writing, personal investment, school environment)

7. Working Conditions: If there is an offer for you to work in schools in East Side or Park City, would you like to move to those schools for work?

Teacher Education Programs

8. Literacy & SLA: How do you define literacy? What are the differences between literacy and language acquisition?

9. University Program: What school did you go to for your undergraduate and graduate degrees? Can I have your syllabus or writing you submitted to the class?

10. Perceptions: How much do you think that you learned from your teacher education programs in educating ELLs?

11. Have you ever been to University of Utah? Are there differences about teacher education programs, in particular, ELL teacher education programs between U of U and Westminster? If there is difference between them, what are the similarities and differences?
Professional Development Programs

12. How many PD programs did you participate? What are the characteristics of the programs?

13. How many PD programs are you currently participating? Which one do you like most? Why? Which one do you think helps your teaching for ELLs? Why?

General Impression About ELLs

14. What is your general impression about English language learners?

15. What do you think of the similarities and differences between ELLs and native English speaking students?

Best Instruction and SLA Versus Literacy and Reading/Writing

16. What do you think of what is the best way to improve ELLs’ writing?

17. What do you think of the best way to improve ELLs’ reading?

18. How do you think English language learners acquire English?

19. Do you think there is a right way or a wrong way to learn English?

20. What do you think is the best strategy for excellent writing English language learners' language acquisition?

21. How do you define literacy?

22. Do you think literacy is different from language acquisition or not?

Perceptions About ELLs’ Talking in Spanish

23. How do you feel kind of when your ELLs talk in Spanish in class?

Teaching Improvement and Instruction

24. How has your teaching improved over time? Do you feel like your teaching has improved?

25. What are some examples of lessons you have learned over the years that have resulted in the changes in your teaching practices?

26. What are your motivational strategies with ELL students?
27. What are your thoughts about the role of interaction among students in class?

About School

28. Would teachers like to come to this school?

29. What is your opinion about desegregation by bussing?

30. How about your principle? Is she helpful? In what ways does the school change since last year?

31. How do teachers in your school perceive and conceive ELLs?
APPENDIX E

THE SECOND INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
Teaching Approach (Beliefs/Values, Philosophy, History)

Beliefs
1. What do you think is the goal or value of education? (Why is education important?)
2. What do you think is your role as a teacher for English language learners?

History
3. What are the motivations and goals that led you to become a teacher? (Motivations and Goals)
4. Tell me about your experiences in teaching (teaching ELLs…)
5. What are the greatest difficulties and challenges you confront when teaching English language learners?
6. What do you think is your role as a teacher for English language learners?

Philosophy
7. How do you activate prior knowledge or cultural background knowledge of your students when teaching?
8. What do you consider to be some examples of best practices in teaching ELLs? Which do you consider the most important thing? Why?
9. To what degree do you think you are employing best practices in teaching English language learners in your classroom or in general when teaching students? What prevents you from using best practices for ELLs in your classroom? Could you give an example?
10. How do you think of culture? (Answer this question in metaphorical terms)
11. Tell me about some of the ways you think culture affects the way you teach students.
12. What is your philosophy on multilingual education?
13. How does teaching language as content differ from how you might teach another class through one language?

About Students
14. How many ELLs do you teach? Tell me about them. (Probing)
15. From what countries are they from? What countries did you come from?
16. How familiar are you with your students’ home background and language?
17. How do you or other teachers in your school obtain information about family background of your students? (Probing family background, cultural histories, etc.)
18. Have you ever thought of integrating students’ home culture and language in your classroom practices?
19. Have you ever invited students’ parents to your class? If so, for what purposes?
20. What kinds of information or support do you think you would need to gather if you wanted to integrate students’ home culture and language to your curriculum?

21. Where do you live? How far is it from your school campus? (Probe: miles/arrival time/neighborhood).

22. Tell me about the neighborhood around the school.

23. How does it compare to the neighborhood you live in? (Teacher’s knowledge of student background/funds of knowledge)

Teaching Materials

1. What kinds of materials/resources do you bring into the classroom to support teaching and learning? Describe how you use them. (Probe some examples.)

2. Do you think your classroom materials and teaching resources appropriate to your ELLs’ background knowledge and level?

3. What kinds of resources do you draw on in lesson and unit planning? (Probe: School resources, family resources, community resources)
APPENDIX F

THE THIRD INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
School Experiences

1. Your experiences in elementary school, middle school and high school.
   a. What were some of the most important life lessons you learned from your teachers in school?
   b. What were the pedagogical methods used by your teachers?
   c. How many friends from diverse background did you have in school?
   d. How did you come to know them and become friends with them?
   e. What do you think prevented you from having more friends from diverse backgrounds?
   f. Tell me about some episodes related to your friends from diverse backgrounds if any.

2. Your experiences in undergraduate and graduate school
   a. What motivated you to become a teacher?
   b. What were the ESL teaching related courses you took, and how did they prepare you for teaching ELLs?
   c. Could you relate some stories about your friends from diverse backgrounds?

The Education of English Language Learners (ELLs)

3. Why do you think ELLs have not had much success in K-12 public schools in the US?
4. Who do you think is responsible for the academic failure of ELLs in the US?
5. What do you think about No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act?
6. What do you think of the PD programs you participated in?
7. Did you have ELL teachers’ meetings in school? If so, how often did you meet, and what are the topics you dealt with?
8. In what ways do you think teachers should differentiate between ELLs and native English speaking students when they teach?
9. How do you usually differentiate between ELLs and native English speaking students when you teach?
10. What roles do you think teachers should perform in the schooling of ELLs?
11. What are some of the qualities and experiences that might make a teacher most suited for teaching ELLs?
12. Do you think there is racism in the US? If so, why do you think racism exists in the US?
13. Have you ever thought of teaching ELLs using the content concept, racism?
14. What would you think about the idea of integrating into your ELL classes the historical issues you explored in your thesis about Korean comfort women during World War II?
15. What kinds of teachers do you think best for educating ELLs?
Concluding Questions

16. Do you still get in touch with any of your friends from diverse background?
17. Would you like to continue teaching in secondary school in the future, or would you prefer to teach at the university level?
18. Is there anything else you think would be important for me to know about the influence of teachers in educating ELLs?
19. Is there anything else you would like to say about ELL education in K-12 public schools in the US?
APPENDIX G

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS
Adapted from Jefferson (2004)

- Kinesic signals are italicized inside round brackets
- ↑ shift into especially high pitch
- NOW especially loud sounds relative to the surrounding task
- :: prolongation of the immediately prior sound
- (.) a brief interval
- Pauses are marked with dots (...) with the number of dots indicating an estimated length of pause (Adapted from Locke, 2004, pp. 81-82)
- Kinesic, prosodic, and paralinguistic features are selectively identified
APPENDIX H

DATA COLLECTION TIMETABLE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Ms. Lewis</th>
<th>Ms. Clark</th>
<th>Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Notes</td>
<td>January, 2008 - April, 2009</td>
<td>September, 2008 - April, 2009</td>
<td>ESL classroom and school observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video/audio taped classroom</td>
<td>2x-5x per month (8 months)</td>
<td>2x-5x/month (6 months)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instructions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Notes</td>
<td>January, 2007 - April, 2009</td>
<td>June, 2008 - April, 2009</td>
<td>PD course observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video/audio taped PD Days</td>
<td>1x or 2x per month (12 months)</td>
<td>1x or 2x/month (8 months)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal interviews</td>
<td>April, 2008 - July 2010 (5 times)</td>
<td>October, 2008 - August, 2009 (3 times)</td>
<td>Views about ELLs and ELL pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-taped Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal interviews and casual</td>
<td>2008 - 2010 almost every time</td>
<td>2008 – 2009 almost every time</td>
<td>PD course instructors two ESL teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conversations</td>
<td>after classroom and PD course</td>
<td>after classroom and PD course</td>
<td>school district personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student work</td>
<td>2008 - 2009</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>writing samples DVDs created by ELLs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Articles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Curriculum Texts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

GLOSSARY OF CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS TERMINOLOGY
I. Micro Level Analysis: Text

Word/Phrase Level
- Classification: choice of individual words to name and label things
- Modality: degrees of the writer’s or speaker’s commitment to text
  - Deontic modality: necessity and obligation (should, may, must)
  - Epistemic modality: probability (will, can, may, would)
  - Markers of modalization: modal adverbials (certainly, probably, possibly)
    participial adjectives (allowed, supposed, required)
  - Pronouns: representation of social actors (we vs. they): How do texts construct, categorize, and represent groups and communities?

Sentence/Utterance Level
- Insinuations (double meanings): manipulative purposes
- Topicalization: front positioning of some elements of text for its emphasis
- Registers: a form of language depending on purposes or social situations
  (i.e., informality, formality, technicality)
- Textual silences: certain things out of the texts for ideological or benign purposes

Text Level
- Genre: text type
- Agency: roles of the speaker in the text
- Multimodal discourse: pictures, signs, symbols
- Framing: angles, perspectives of the writer or speaker
- Presupposition: taken-for-granted assumptions in text
- Ideologies: social, cultural, and political ideologies underlying texts
- Foregrounding/Backgrounding: degrees of emphasis on certain concepts

II. Meso Level Analysis: Discursive Practice
adapted from Fairclough (2003)

This level of analysis mediates the linguistic analysis of text and the social analysis of social events and practices.

Production: Who are the author(s) of the text?
Whose voices are represented?

Consumption: Who are the possible audiences?
How do author(s) of texts draw on existing discourses?
How do author(s) resist the texts?
Distribution: What do the conditions and processes texts go through?

Intertextuality: How do texts draw upon, incorporate, recontextualize, and dialogue with other texts?
- Dialogicality (Bakhtin): To what extent are there dialogical relations between the voice of the author and other voices? To what extent are these voices represented and responded to, or conversely excluded or suppressed?
- Reported speech: direct report, indirect report

Interdiscursivity: combination of different discourses, genres, and styles
How different genres, discourses, and styles are articulated together in the text?

Orders of discourse (a network of social practices in its language aspect)
- Genre (ways of acting and interacting)
- Discourse (ways of representing)
- Style (ways of being and identifying)

III. Macro Level Analysis: Social Practice

What effects does the discursive practice have for the broader social practices?

Discursive Elements: genre, discourse, and style
Nondiscursive Elements: Cultural Historical Activity Theory (CHAT) System
- Subject (actors and participants)
- Object (purposes and objectives)
- Mediating Artifacts (material and symbolic artifacts)
- Rules (explicit and implicit norms and conventions)
- Community (those who share the goal-oriented conventions)
- Division of Labor (power structures among the members of community)
APPENDIX J

LANGUAGE PROCESSING DATA
## Language Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Interaction</th>
<th>Whole Class Time</th>
<th>Teacher in English</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To the whole class</td>
<td>To the individual student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording Time (minutes)</td>
<td>46:07</td>
<td>15:02</td>
<td>25:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage (%)</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>33 %</td>
<td>55 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Teacher’s Language

### Instructional Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Language</th>
<th>“So”</th>
<th>“Shhh...”</th>
<th>“Vocab”</th>
<th>“Copy”</th>
<th>Words related to students’ own culture or language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Feedback Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Language</th>
<th>“Ok”</th>
<th>“Good”</th>
<th>“Yes”</th>
<th>“Thank you”</th>
<th>Words related to students’ own culture or language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wh-Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wh-Qs</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Where</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>Why</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Content Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Language</th>
<th>brainpower</th>
<th>prediction</th>
<th>improve</th>
<th>definition</th>
<th>figure out</th>
<th>intelligence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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