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Abstract

This thesis provides a conceptual analysis of research literature on teachers’ ideology and literacy practices as well as a secondary analysis of three empirical studies and the ways in which the ideologies of the English as an Additional Language (EAL) (Street, 2005) teachers in these contexts impact the teaching of literacy in empowering/disabling ways. Several major theoretical components of Cummins (1996, 2000), Gee (1996, 2004) and Street (1995, 2001) are examined and integrated into a conceptual triad consisting of three main areas: power and ideology, validation of students’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and teaching that empowers. This triad provides the framework for the secondary analysis of three empirical studies on the ideologies of secondary EAL teachers. Implications of the findings from the conceptual and secondary analyses are examined in light of the research community and secondary school teachers of EAL.
Acknowledgements

Dolana Mogadime, my supervisor. Thank you for pointing me toward Cummins’ work. It has been an exciting adventure. As well, thank you for suggesting to me this thesis form. You foresaw how it would suit me in so many ways! From our first encounters in the Critical Thinking in the Curriculum course, you have encouraged me in my writing. You believed right from the beginning that I could do the thesis. Thank you so much for your confidence in me.

To Alice Schutz and Andrew Short, the other two members of my thesis committee. Alice, from my first semester in the MEd program you have supported me and encouraged me to ‘go for it’ in terms of the thesis and other opportunities (RA). Thank you for always having a moment to chat when I popped in your office impromptu. Andrew, you have brought so much to my thesis committee with your sociolinguistic background. Your constructively critical comments on my draft pushed me to think in new directions. Thank you both for your feedback and your encouragement.

Chris, my ever-loving and supportive husband. Thank you for continuously waving the proverbial ‘foam hand’ for your wife who, for the past 10 months, has lived entirely too much in her bathrobe. At every step of this awesome journey you have been there, running beside me. I could not have done this venture without you. If I am as supportive to you in your ThM as you have been to me (which I hope to be!), I know you will enjoy the process as much as I have.

To my parents, Larry and Sharon Hart. I love you both so much. Thank you for seeing my strengths during my kid and teen years when I could not. Any good I have ever done or will do, I owe in part to you, my first and most formative teachers.
# Table of Contents

Abstract .................................................................................................................. ii
Acknowledgements .................................................................................................. iii

**CHAPTER ONE: AN OVERVIEW OF THE INQUIRY** ................................................. 1
  Background of the Problem .................................................................................. 2
  Statement of the Problem Situation ..................................................................... 7
  Purpose of the Inquiry and Questions to be Answered ....................................... 8
  Rationale for the Inquiry Part I: Personal Context ............................................... 9
  Rationale Part II: The Educational & Social Contexts for the Inquiry ................. 10
  Importance of the Inquiry .................................................................................. 13
  Benefits of the Inquiry ..................................................................................... 14
  Analytical Methodology .................................................................................... 16
  Definition of Terms ........................................................................................... 22
  Outline of the Remainder of the Document And Directives for the Development of the Present Thesis .................................................. 28

**CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW** ................................................................. 30
  A Historical Overview ....................................................................................... 30
  The Nature of Empowering Practices .............................................................. 37
  Empowering Practices and Literacy as Autonomous/Ideological ....................... 38
  Pedagogy and Best Practice ............................................................................. 47
  Teachers’ Ideologies: Ideas and Consequences ................................................. 52
  Summary ........................................................................................................... 60

**CHAPTER THREE: THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK** ......................................... 62
  Ideology: A Conceptual Analysis ...................................................................... 79
  Literacy: A Conceptual Analysis ...................................................................... 83
  Application of Categories around Empowering Literacy Practices & Pedagogy (CAELPP) to the Secondary Analysis ........................................ 89
  Categories around Empowering Literacy Practices & Pedagogy (CAELPP) .... 89

**CHAPTER FOUR: THE SECONDARY ANALYSIS** .................................................... 91
  Summary ........................................................................................................... 114

**CHAPTER FIVE: IMPLICATIONS AND REFLECTIONS** ........................................ 126
  Personal Reflections .......................................................................................... 132
  Conclusions ...................................................................................................... 137

References ............................................................................................................. 139

Appendix A: Questions of Ideology and Pedagogy Related to Literacy: A conceptual tool ................................................................. 155
Appendix B: Instructional and Social Assumptions of Three Pedagogies and Their Implications ................................................................. 159
CHAPTER ONE: AN OVERVIEW OF THE INQUIRY

The purpose of this inquiry is to construct a conceptual analysis about ideology in relation to the teaching of literacy by teachers of EAL which can then be used as a lens through which to conduct a secondary analysis of three empirical studies and the ways in which the ideologies of the EAL teachers impact these contexts in empowering/disabling ways. Specifically, my aim is to examine the research literature on teachers’ ideologies and perceptions around empowering practices for secondary students from linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds who are learning EAL or, as it is more commonly known, English as a Second Language (ESL). The empowering practices that I propose to study are those linked with literacy practices. Although there exists a significant body of research on empowering teaching in general (Cummins, 1996, 2000) and a smaller body of research on empowering literacy teaching with English-speakers in particular, a paucity of research exists on teachers’ ideologies around empowering literacy teaching with learners of EAL in secondary school contexts. In addition, while research within the last decade (Readence, Kile, & Mallette, 1998) has shown that teachers’ beliefs and philosophies around teaching and learning significantly inform their teaching practice, much of this former research as well as some of the current research (Duff, 2001) highlights the voices of mainstream teachers. Less amplified in the research are the voices of teachers of English as an Additional Language. The lack of inquiry in this area has created a vacuum in educational research. Language educators are among the first teachers with whom EAL students interact within the school system. Thus, an inquiry consisting of a conceptual analysis of the ideology of EAL teachers and a secondary analysis on existing studies that suggests how this ideology informs the teachers’ practice
is of practical merit because the inquiry offers the field an emerging framework for exploring EAL teachers' thinking around literacy, literacy teaching, their students' literacy needs, and the teachers' role in addressing these needs.¹

Background of the Problem

In his intervention for collaborative empowerment, Cummins (1996) details why many immigrant and minority students continue, to a large extent, to experience failure in schooling. Rather than blaming the students, Cummins (1986) attributes their failure to the interactions between teachers and these students. He posits that it is within these interactions that students are either "empowered" or "disabled" (p. 21). He also suggests that the ways in which teachers perceive their roles with these students are related to four distinguishing features of empowering schools/practices:

1. The school includes the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of minority students in the daily life of the institution.

2. The school draws on the minority students' community as a vital part of the students' education.

3. The pedagogy used in the school encourages students to "use language actively in order generate their own knowledge" (p. 21).

4. School workers who are responsible for assessment are devoted to discovering the source of students' problems, rather than blaming the students for forces beyond their control such as cultural differences between the students' way of learning in their former country and the culturally dissimilar way of testing in the new

¹Within this thesis, the words "inquiry" and "research" are used in relation to the analytical work that I have conducted within the context of the existing research literature. The conceptual and secondary analyses that have emerged from this work offer frameworks that could extend empirical research if used as lenses or launching points within such contexts.
country. These experts look for alternative ways to assess immigrants or minority students instead of using culturally-biased tests.

Cummins claims that the ways in which minority students are disabled by schools are similar to how their communities are disempowered in and by society. As Auerbach (1995) explains, the classroom operates as “a kind of microcosm of the broader social order” (p. 9)\(^2\). Consequently, Cummins (1986) posits that “minority students will succeed educationally to the extent that the patterns of interaction in school reverse those that prevail in the society at large” (p. 24).

Cummins’ (1986) theoretical framework of empowering practice presents an appropriate starting point to this inquiry because of his focus on the issue of power at work in schools and society. I, therefore, use this framework as an entry point to exploring teachers’ ideologies around empowering practices and to exploring how empowering practices are linked to literacy teaching in classrooms where English is taught as an additional language.

Another reason why Cummins’ (1986) framework provides an entry point for this inquiry into teachers’ ideologies is because the notion of power that is present in Cummins framework for empowering practices relates explicitly to the importance of teachers having *ideological clarity* (Bartolomé & Trueba, 2000) around the issue of literacy in the EAL classroom. Ideological clarity refers to the process whereby individuals seek to pinpoint the “dominant society’s explanations for the existing socioeconomic and political hierarchy as well as their own explanations of the social order and any resulting inequalities” (Bartolomé & Balderrama, 2001, p. 48). Here, the

---

\(^2\) Harklau (2000); Pennycook (2000); Sleeter & Grant (1998) provide a similar discussion that is at work in the educational system.
The notion of power is apparent: teachers, along any point of the continuum toward achieving ideological clarity, are keenly aware of the hierarchy of power that exists in society and in schools.

But achieving ideological clarity entails more than a mere awareness that power exists and that it marginalizes certain people and groups in society. Bartolomé and Trueba (2000) note that teachers must weigh their own explanations against those of the dominant society "to better understand if, when, and how their belief systems uncritically reflect those of the dominant society and support unfair and inequitable conditions" (p. 279). Thus, it is not enough for teachers to simply acknowledge the inequities of power that exist in society; a key step along the path to achieving ideological clarity involves an element of interrogation of the personal, or reflecting on whether and to what degree one is collaborating with or resisting the destructive power that marginalizes immigrant and minority students and their families.

One of the underpinning notions that I bring with me to this inquiry, as it has been informed by the literature, is my personal conviction that teachers' belief systems around literacy/literacy teaching and learning inform their practice in specific ways that are empowering or disabling to immigrant students' learning. I, therefore, draw on this belief to explore secondary school teachers' ideology around empowering practices and to explore how empowering practices are linked to literacy teaching in classrooms where English is taught as an additional language.

Traditionally, "literacy" instruction to EAL learners has fallen under the broad field of second language acquisition (SLA) in which teaching literacy comprised teaching language learners' discrete skills. In recent years, SLA has been critiqued for its focus on
“generalisable rules and methods” (J. Miller, 2003, p. 28) including “best practice” (Edge & Richards, 1998; Freeman & Johnson, 1998; McKeon, 1998) at the cost of the “understanding of the contingency of local contexts” (J. Miller, 2003, p. 28). Other research (Gee, 1996; J. Miller, 2004) has challenged the prevalent notion in SLA that once EAL students learn literacy-as-disparate-skills, their success in schools and the larger society is assured (Exposito & Favela, 2003). With his concept of Discourses, Gee (1996) vigorously challenges the notion that literacy as discrete skills ensures immigrant and minority students academic and societal success. Gee refers to Discourses as “ways of behaving, interacting, valuing, thinking, believing, speaking, and often reading and writing that are accepted as instantiations of particular roles, or ‘types of people’, by specific groups of people” (p. viii) and notes that Discourses are always “ideological” (Gee, 1991, p. 4).

Relating Gee’s (1996) notion of discourse directly to the lives of EAL learners, researchers (Gee, 2004; J. Miller, 2004; Obidah, 1998) explain how certain discourses (i.e., “Standard English”) position immigrant and minority language learners as outsiders to those discourses that are favored by schools. Accordingly, J. Miller (2004) argues that teachers “cannot view the competence of the speaker in isolation from social practices, speaking in isolation from hearing, Discourses in isolation from relationships of power” (p. 122). Here, Miller draws attention to two vital elements of literacy teaching: literacy and learning occur in social contexts and having access or being denied access to certain discourses is a matter of power (Canagarajah, 1999a; Fairclough 1992; Street, 1993, 1995, 2001).

Fairclough (1992, 2001) draws attention to the increasingly subversive ways in
which language and power are related. Although he is writing from a British context, it is
certainly arguable that his view applies to Canadian and American educational contexts
as well. Fairclough (1992) claims that, in lieu of physical force, the dominant group in
society increasingly uses language as a means of exercising power over subordinated
groups in society: this ploy of power is carried out through discourse or language
practices. For example, Fairclough (2001) notes that “the tendency of the discourse of
social control towards simulated egalitarianism, and the removal of surface markers of
authority and power” positions people in certain ways (p. 30). In other words, the
pretense that everyone in society has the same opportunity to be equal, to “make it,” for
example, through hard work and perseverance, blurs the reality that the dominant class
has had “opportunities to land, schooling, good (better jobs) that [have been]
systematically denied to people of color” (Kivel, 2002, p. 27). Thus, Fairclough (2001)
connects the marginalization of certain people groups to the fact that certain discourses
are valued over others in society.

Relating this political struggle over language to schools, Fairclough (1992) argues
that “a language education focused upon training in language skills, without a critical
component, would seem to be failing in its responsibility to learners” (p. 6). This critical,
political, and ideological perspective toward literacy directly challenges the notion
around and practice of teaching literacy as discrete skills, a framework which Street
5). One of the destructive repercussions of the autonomous model of literacy is that when
teachers teach literacy as discrete skills, the larger society is ‘warranted’ in blaming the
individual or cultural group for its lack of success in school and society (Street, 1993)
instead of questioning in what ways schools (Dei, 2003) and institutional racism (Kivel, 2002) are to blame.

The above discussion elicits the notion that literacy can be a powerful tool in the hands of dominant groups in society for the marginalization of other groups, groups which typically have included immigrant and minority persons. Within an educational context, then, it is apparent that EAL teachers play a significant role in the ways in which immigrant and minority students are “schooled” into literacy practices. In these interactions between teachers and students, teachers’ ideologies of literacy and learners have the potential to position students in certain ways as insiders/outsiders, successes/failures. It is arguable that teachers who strive for “ideological clarity” (Bartolomé & Trueba, 2000; Exposito & Favela, 2003) would be more likely to take up the teaching of literacy in ways that reflect empowering practices. But how would this ideology play out in classroom practice? Are teachers’ conceptualizations of literacy empowering to their students? If teachers are the “linchpin” on which empowering practices with literacy hinge, these questions combine to form a rationale for an inquiry which would explore these very significant questions.

**Statement of the Problem Situation**

Teachers who teach English as an Additional Language play a key role in the lives of immigrant or minority students because they can either “empower” or “disable” these students (Cummins, 1986, p. 21) through their interactions, particularly around the teaching of literacy. Consequently, what does language teaching and learning look like in tandem with empowering practices? How is literacy taught when teachers approach it in ways that challenge the “autonomous model of literacy”? (Street, 1993, 1995, 2000).
While Cummins' (1986) theoretical framework provides a starting point for studying a teacher's ideology and practice into empowering literacy teaching, several gaps in his framework need to be addressed to be able to apply it, to any extent, to a secondary analysis involving research of EAL classrooms and teachers. The work of researchers in the field of New Literacy Studies (Gee, 1996; Street, 1993, 1995, 2000, 2001, 2005) may offer insights into a potential marriage between empowering practices and language learning/teaching. It is this potential marriage that this study seeks to explore in the literature review so as to inform the methodology used to construct the conceptual analysis of teachers' ideologies around literacy and empowering practices.

**Purpose of the Inquiry and Questions to be Answered**

As stated above, the purpose of this conceptual/secondary analysis inquiry is to explore the literacy-related ideologies of EAL teachers of immigrant or minority students and how these ideologies inform their pedagogy. For this, I draw on existing empirical studies of the classroom. Specifically, I examine in these studies teachers' perspectives on empowering literacy practices and how the teachers' ideologies inform their pedagogical movements within the language-learning classroom. Questions to be addressed within the inquiry include the following: What are empowering practices? How do empowering practices work within an ideological model of literacy? How are teachers' ideologies informed by one of the two or a combination of the two models of literacy outlined by Street (1993, 1995, 2001)? How do teachers perceive their role in meeting the literacy needs of the immigrant students in their EAL classes? How do these ideologies of literacy inform the teachers' pedagogical practices?
Rationale for the Inquiry Part I: Personal Context

A number of experiences have informed my interest in an inquiry into the teachers of immigrant and minority EAL students around literacy and empowering practices. Out of my life’s many border crossing experiences (Exposito & Favela, 2003), the influence of “travel abroad, of friendships with others whose culture is different from [my] own, or of personally experiencing the consequences of living outside the dominant ‘norm’” (p. 79), I was initially drawn to this topic of study. As a daughter of a man whose work motored the family on trips throughout Canada and the United States, I have met, befriended, and been keenly influenced by peoples of various countries and cultures. Visits to four of the six habitable continents have created many more border crossing experiences in my life. My interest in EAL stems from my undergraduate studies in English Education and from a few key opportunities for occasional teaching with a Multicultural Centre in the Region of Niagara. Teaching ESL in Seoul, South Korea for 14 months (2003-2004) only intensified my interest in the field of English language acquisition.

An incident from my own teaching practice provides a segway from my personal interest in this inquiry to my professional interest. In December, 2002, I was working as a short-term occasional teacher for a short stint at a secondary school in Southern Ontario. There, I soon became concerned with Lucia (a pseudonym), a Hispanic girl, in the eleventh grade English class, who was not completing any of her assignments. She did not volunteer answers; in fact, she hardly spoke in class at all. I voiced my concern to Lucia and in halting English she promised that she would hand in her overdue assignments the next day, but she never did. I felt hopeless: I wanted to help Lucia, but I
did not know where to start. Clearly, she needed one-on-one attention to develop her English proficiency as well as her grasp of the content, but what could I do in my short time there? Had I known then about the support networks that are sometimes available for students of EAL, I might have been able to share my concerns with an EAL teacher or assistant. Truthfully, I felt like I had failed the student. Worse, I felt like the school had failed Lucia as she seemed to be slipping through the cracks unnoticed.

I have thought of this experience many times. This incident birthed in me a professional interest in studying how teachers empower or disable their immigrant and minority students to negotiate the turbulent waters of secondary school academia. Since EAL teachers are often the leading workers with immigrant students, I am predominantly interested in studying the literature about these teachers, particularly empirical studies that focus on the EAL classroom context. In addition, through my course work in the Master of Education program at Brock this past year, I have increasingly gained a deeper understanding of teaching as an inherently political and moral act, not a value-free vacuum. These combined experiences and my reflections on them have led me to my current area of focus on teachers' ideologies.

**Rationale Part II: The Educational and Social Contexts for the Inquiry**

This proposed inquiry seeks to focus on the ideologies teachers of English as an Additional Language, in particular, those teachers at the secondary school level. Research that focuses on the beliefs of teachers of English as an additional language has a small presence within the literature (Mok, 1994), but there is a paucity of research that focuses on the ideologies of teachers *around literacy*, especially at the secondary school level. Within the studies that do address aspects of teachers’ ideologies, such as Olivo’s (2003)
research of a teacher’s “language ideology,” in many of these studies, the ideological beliefs are only studied implicitly by observing the teachers, asking them about their practices and then trying to discover the teachers’ ideologies. Few studies invite the teachers themselves to explicitly identify and explain their ideologies and, within this limited number of enquiries, even fewer studies concentrate specifically on the teachers’ ideologies around literacy, literacy teaching, their students’ literacy needs, and how the teachers perceive their role in addressing these needs. In fact, Readence et al. (1998) claim that “beliefs are seldom clearly defined or used explicitly as a conceptual tool” in research studies (p. 131). Moreover, as Bartolome and Trueba (2000) add, most teacher preparation programs and much of the literature on teacher education have largely overlooked or repudiated the significance that teacher ideology “may play in teachers’ thinking and behavior in education, especially in the education of low-status immigrant minority education” (p. 279). Therefore, in a field with limited empirical research on secondary school EAL teachers’ ideologies of literacy and the implications these ideologies have on immigrant students, this inquiry offers the field insight into this issue by providing a secondary analysis of the existing literature for insights into empowering literacy teaching.

Another significance of the proposed inquiry lays in its potential to help to alleviate the gap within the educational literature concerning the ideologies of teachers of EAL in secondary school contexts specifically. Many of the studies on the ideologies of teachers of EAL focus on elementary teachers (Torres, 2001; Exposito & Favela, 2003; Monzo & Rueda, 2003). If Faltis’ (1999) claim is valid that “bilingual and English as a second language (ESL) education at the secondary level is one of the most unexamined
and overlooked areas of education in the United States” (p. 1), likely related to the English-only movement propagated in states such as California and Arizona (Guerrero, 2004), this suggests that teachers of English to immigrant students also represent an underrepresented, understudied group in the field of education. Support for this proposition comes from researchers (Haycock, 2003; Walqui, 2000) who recognize a “culture” in the education system where educators’ “status flows not from their own effectiveness, but rather from the elite backgrounds of the students they teach” (Haycock, 2003, p. 13). If researchers erroneously perceive immigrant students as less desirable to research, it follows that teachers of these students may also receive less attention by researchers. This is lamentable, especially considering that the student population in Canada and the United States is becoming increasingly comprised of immigrant and minority students. Consider the number of students of EAL in Canada and the United States: approximately 53% of the secondary school student population in the Toronto District School Board (TDSB) of Ontario, one board among many, speaks a primary language other than English (TDSB, 2005). Similarly, in the United States, during the 2001-2002 school year, nearly 4 million students across the nation were considered English language learners (National Center for Education Statistics, 2003, as cited in Ren Dong, 2004a, p. 202). Research that fails to address these groups, particularly teachers of these groups, will also fail to keep abreast of the needs of immigrant and minority students as well as the teachers who teach them.

It is difficult in this study to disentangle the educational from the social context since I agree with Cummins (1986) and Auerbach (1995) that the former mirrors the latter. For example, Delpit (1995), who is often cited in the literature for her insight into
The development of a new technology in recent decades has
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the premises for teaching immigrant and minority students dominant discourses, argues that there is a "culture of power" (p. 24) at work in schools, a culture which mirrors that of White, middle-class homes (Heath, 1983, as cited in Davis, Bazzi & Cho, 2005). If the culturally-entrenched discourses which are valued in schools are those of White, middle-class homes, is it surprising that a disparity exists between the academic standing of white students and their immigrant and minority peers? (Dwyer, 1998)

Indeed, this very nature of education itself commonly marginalizes immigrant and minority students. Individuals who are not already participants in the culture of power will be able to engage with it more easily when they are told clearly and specifically the rules of this culture. Although many liberal educators think that education is for children to become independent, to self-actualize, Delpit (1995) notes that the parents of immigrant and minority students, those who are outside the culture of power, have very different expectations. These parents want the school to "provid[e] their children with discourse patterns, interactional styles, and spoken and written language codes that will allow them success in the larger society" (p. 24). It is not enough for teachers to construct the curriculum wholly around immigrant and minority students' home and community background; at some point, these students need to be formally introduced to and given guided opportunities to learn, the "culture of power" (p. 24). Otherwise, schools will fall short of meeting the needs of immigrant and minority students and their families.

Importance of the Inquiry

In their literature review of preservice teachers' beliefs of and practices around literacy, Readence et al. (1998) discovered that "beliefs are seldom clearly defined or used explicitly as a conceptual tool" in research studies (p. 131). Furthermore, as
Bartolomé and Balderrama (2001) claim, despite research that has been done on “teacher beliefs and attitudes, there have been few systematic attempts to examine the political and ideological dimensions of educators’ ‘beliefs,’ ‘assumptions,’ and ‘unconscious perceptions’” (p. 51). This study is, therefore, important, first, because it helps to address this gap within the research. In this proposed conceptual analysis, the construct of ideology is a central theoretical concept.

Second, I believe that the combined conceptual and secondary analyses are important because of their potential to provide researchers with theoretical notions which they can use as launching pads for additional research into the ideologies of teachers. In the same way that I am drawing from and extending the work of other researchers (e.g., Cummins, Street, etc.), including those who are well known and those who are new to the field, I hope that there will be those who will take up and extend my work on teachers’ ideologies, literacy, and empowering practices. By such means, the field of educational research evolves.

**Benefits of the Inquiry**

Below I outline the potential benefits that I believe this inquiry will offer to three groups of people: teachers, teacher educators, and graduate students interested in conducting conceptual/secondary analyses. To teachers, an analysis of teachers’ ideologies of literacy offers a means “for self-reflection upon their own beliefs and practices” (Muchmore, 2001, p. 105). In his life history study of the literacy beliefs and teaching practices of “Anna,” an urban English secondary school teacher, Muchmore (2001) claims that “by actively weighing Anna’s experiences against their own evolving life stories, readers may gain deeper insights into the underlying beliefs, assumptions, and
experiences that shape their own teaching and research practices” (p. 105). During my immersion in the research needed to conduct the analyses, my own ideology of literacy has been challenged and extended. When this inquiry is complete and I attempt to publish this inquiry, I hope that the teachers who read it will be able to use my conceptual analysis tool (see Appendix A) as a mirror in which to intensely reflect upon their own beliefs, assumptions, and experiences that inform their pedagogy so as to move their practice closer to empowering literacy teaching.

Second, this proposed inquiry presents a potential resource for teacher educators and other researchers interested in the development of pre-service and in-service teacher education programs. In their enlightening qualitative study on the motivations of African American women in becoming teachers, McCray, Sindelar, Kilgore & Neal (2002) conclude that “improved understanding about African American prospective teachers’ lived experiences that give rise to their perceptions of and purposes for teaching hold implications for teacher education and African American teacher recruitment and retention efforts” (p. 269). Similarly, I believe that conceptually analyzing teachers’ ideologies around literacy and literacy pedagogy may open up opportunities to learn how people develop a certain approach toward literacy and how this approach can be built upon and expanded to better address the literacy needs of secondary school immigrant students. As well, when teachers are given opportunities to reflect on their ideologies, and how these ideologies inform their practice (Fecho, 1998; Muchmore, 2001), they develop a greater measure of ideological clarity (Bartolomé & Trueba, 2000; Sugar Martinez, 2000). Thus, I have a high expectation that, when it is completed, my conceptual analysis will offer the field of research a tool to offer potential and practicing teachers with which
...
they can use to weigh the "underlying beliefs, assumptions, and experiences" (Muchmore, 2001, p. 105) that inform their teaching.

Third, I hope that this study will inspire other graduate students to attempt this kind of inquiry and, additionally, that my completed work could be a resource for them to procure ideas on how to conduct a conceptual analysis which they can then apply as a lens to a secondary analysis of existing research. In my own quest to find exemplars of an analytical methodological framework suitable for this kind of inquiry, I found Kumar’s (2004) The Conceptual Analysis of Margaret Walker’s system of ethics helpful. In like manner, I hope that my work will be of assistance to future students.

Analytical Methodology

Such a rich, deep topic as the ideologies of EAL teachers on empowering literacy practices calls for an approach that reflects this richness, this depth. A quantitative experiment or survey could never begin to touch the depths of people’s ideologies or include the richness of participants’ perspectives (Muchmore, 2001) as to how and why they came to think or believe in a certain way. For this reason, this secondary analysis draws from existing qualitative research studies. Unlike the product-focus of quantitative research, in qualitative methodology, the researcher is more interested in context and meaning (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). Indeed, the very nature of quantitative and qualitative research is different: the former seems to function under the assumption that reality can be understood in a rather straightforward, objective manner. Qualitative researchers, on the other hand, are wary of the claim of objectivity, and most would reject the notion that a person’s life or even an event or process could be understood from a detached and value-free perspective.
In qualitative research, researchers seek to "interpret" the understanding of a phenomenon. As Holliday (2002) beautifully describes, out of qualitative work a picture begins to emerge, but "the pictures are themselves only interpretations - approximations basic attempts to represent what is in fact a much more complex reality - paintings that represent our own impressions, rather than photographs of what is 'really' there" (p. 6). Holliday's use of the phrase "our own impressions" implies the elements of subjectivity within qualitative methodology. That is, researchers cannot be written out of their qualitative work because, although they may propose to acknowledge the notions that they bring with them to the project, a measure of subjectively remains.

In addition to the qualitative research that I draw from, this inquiry is also informed by four tenets of the critical approach proposed by Peirce (1995) in her feminist ethnography work. First, as outlined above, a critical approach denies the notion that research can be completely impartial or free of preconceptions.

Second, a critical approach holds to the notion that inequalities of gender, race, class, and ethnicity "produce and are produced by unequal power relations in society" (Peirce, 1995, p. 571). Many immigrant students and their families are among the most marginalized people of society. For many immigrant students within secondary schools, this marginalization happens on a daily basis: as Freeman and Freeman (2003) write, "immigrants enter schools that too often are characterized by hostile social attitudes toward them" (p. 198). This frequent oppression directed toward immigrant students often includes "rejection, put-downs, and efforts to freeze immigrant newcomers out of the social world of English. This is the context in which immigrants attempt to learn English" (p. 198). Students' intolerance of immigrant students' emerging English
proficiency is only one reason for the neglect and abuse of immigrant and minority students: another is plain, ugly racism. The inquiry proposed here touches on issues of racial, ethnic, and class oppression.

Third, Peirce (1995) claims that within a critical approach the researcher is dedicated to seek to understand how the participants in the study “make sense of their own experience” (p. 571). In those articles included in the secondary analysis that highlight teachers in secondary school classrooms, I seek to understand the teachers’ ideologies from their perspective, as much as the data itself permits. Also, as outlined by Peirce, within a critical approach, researchers consider the purpose of educational research to be “social and educational change” (p. 572). Therefore, set within these tenets of a critical approach (Peirce), I believe that this inquiry offers further insight into how the ideologies of EAL teachers inform their teaching practice with immigrant and minority students. The significance of this is outlined above under the sections “Importance of Study” and “Benefits of the Study.”

The Conceptual Framework Underpinnings

** The purpose of this inquiry is to construct a conceptual analysis about ideology in relation to the teaching of literacy by teachers of EAL which can then be used as a lens through which to conduct a secondary analysis of three empirical studies and the ways in which the ideologies of the EAL teachers impact these contexts in empowering/disabling ways. When I shared with my supervisor, Dr. Dolana Mogadime, my interest in researching the ideologies of teachers of EAL, Dolana, out of her own SSHRC research into the ideologies of elementary teachers, suggested that I read Cummins’ work (1986, 1996) on empowering/ disabling interactions between teachers and their immigrant/
minority students which has also informed her work. As I delved into Cummins’ work on empowering practices, I noticed his focus more on the ideologies of EAL teachers in general, less on EAL teachers of literacy specifically. From this I began to wonder, “What would empowering literacy practices look like?”

At the same time as I was thinking about this query, in my research assistantship with Dolana, I was reading Street’s (Ed.) (2005) Literacies Across Educational Contexts: Mediating Learning and Teaching. I did not understand Street’s autonomous and ideological models of literacy and I decided to go back to his earlier works (1993, 1995, 2000, 2001) to seek clarified understanding of these concepts. I subsequently dove head-first into the literature of the New Literacy Studies (Gee, 1996, 2004; Street, 1993, 1995, 2001, 2005) and became thoroughly engaged with Street’s ideas around literacy and literacy practices. I had already read Gee’s (1996, 2004) work and appreciated his notion of discourses or social practices (p. 54). I felt like his ideas really stretched me to conceptualize language teaching as more than language training. The vivid examples of discourses that he uses in his work (1996, 2004) helped to clarify in my mind the rather abstract concept of D/discourse.

I also found Gee’s (2004) description of authentic/false beginners to be incredibly enlightening as it connects intimately with the notion of cultural structures found in Street’s (2000) research on literacy practices. The combined work of these two theorists introduced me to the idea of family/community literacy practices vs. school/academic literacy practices and also to the idea that these practices are often incongruent. This has been an inspiring discovery as it has led me to question how schools (teachers) can better take up students’ “home-grown” literacy practices in the classroom and extend these
practices in such a way as to also familiarize these students with the academic discourses they need to be able to navigate the often unfriendly waters of schools, particularly in higher education, that do/will not value the literacy practices into which they have already been socialized.

Both my thinking and this inquiry have been influenced significantly by the work of Cummins (1996, 2000), Gee (1991, 1996, 2004) and Street (1993, 1995, 2001, 2005). For this reason, the major concepts within the works cited here form the conceptual backbone of this conceptual analysis inquiry. These major concepts include Cummins’ (1986, 1996) notion of empowering practices; Gee’s (1991, 1996, 2004) conceptualization of D/discourses and authentic/false beginners and Street’s (1993, 1995, 2001, 2005) theoretical models of literacy and notions of literacy practices and the pedagogization of literacy. This conceptual framework will guide my inquiry into the secondary analysis of teachers’ ideologies of literacy, literacy teaching, students’ literacy needs and the teachers’ role in addressing these needs. Guiding questions, such as the following, will assist me as I construct the secondary analysis: “How does this teacher conceptualize literacy, as autonomous or ideological (Street) or perhaps as a mixture of both? How does this conceptualization inform her pedagogy?” “How is this conceptualization empowering or disabiliing to the students?”

Methodological Orientation

As mentioned previously, I will be analyzing scholars’ research that is qualitative in nature including, but not limited to, case studies, life history and narrative research, and ethnographic research. I discuss in further depth below how these documents will be analyzed. Below I outline the procedural steps that I will take to conduct the research for
the conceptual and secondary analyses. For the sake of clear presentation, I portray these steps in a linear and chronological fashion; however, I believe that research, like life, is not entirely predictable or guest-ready tidy. In reality, these steps below are not analogous to rungs on a ladder, but like a person’s movements in a body of water. With every step toward shore (completion of the analysis), my movements send out burgeoning rings of water (the research is catalytic; one topic/notion often leads to another). That said, below are the movements (steps) that I will take to conduct the conceptual and secondary analyses.

First, I will briefly explore conceptually the notions of ‘ideology’ and ‘literacy.’ Second, I will examine the aforementioned theoretical notions of the three theorists Cummins’ (1996, 2000), Gee (1991, 1996, 2002a, 2002b, 2004, 2005) and Street (1995, 2000, 2001, 2003) around literacy and pedagogy, as outlined above (see p. 20). In Chapter Three, I will integrate the theorists’ main theoretical notions into a conceptual framework. I will summarize the categories for research that emerge from this conceptual framework into a tool entitled “Categories Around Empowering Literacy Practices & Pedagogy” (CAELPP) which will be located at the end of chapter three.

Next, I will immerse myself in the empirical studies on EAL teachers’ ideologies around literacy that I have selected so as to become familiar with this body of research. I will then use the CAELPP as a lens through which to conduct a secondary analysis of these empirical studies. This secondary analysis will comprise Chapter Four. In Chapter Five, I will outline the implications for further research, for theory and for the educational community that arise out of the conceptual and secondary analyses findings.
Definition of Terms

**Academic discourses:** The "practices and skills necessary for students to succeed in mainstream U.S. [Western] academic contexts" (Davis et al., 2005, p. 201).

**Authentic beginners:** Students "who have come to learning sites of any sort without the sorts of early preparation, pre-alignment in terms of cultural values, and sociocultural resources that more advantaged learners at those sites have" (Gee, 2004, p. 14). Although these students have "other sorts of (often equally complex) values and practices in regard to literacy and language" that they have learned at home, these are not accepted as valid by schools (p. 14).

**Autonomous model of literacy:** A framework for thinking about literacy (Street, 1993, 1995, 2001) in which literacy is considered discrete skills that once mastered, hold direct and unproblematic social and cognitive (1995, p. 5) consequences for the literate person. Sociocultural researchers would argue that the notion of literacy as a neutral set of skills is a flawed conceptualization because it "fail[s] to take account of social phenomena" (Barton, 2001, p. 93).

**Coercive relations of power:** Relationships characterized by the premise that only a limited amount of power exists: "the exercise of power by a dominant individual, group or country to the detriment of a subordinated individual, group or country" (Cummins, 2000, p. 44).

**Collaborative relations of power, or empowerment:** Relations whereby power "is generated through interactions with others" (Cummins, 2000, p. 44); people are "empowered' to achieve more" (p. 44) in these relationships than they would have if these relationships did not exist.
Colonialist/racialized Discourses: Discourses that emerged from and are reproduced in “unequal power relationships between European nations and regions of the globe formerly known as the Third World”; these “reflect a Euro- and Amerocentric attitude of superiority toward those parts of the world with which Western powers have held colonial, neocolonial, or quasi-colonial relationships” (McKay & Wong, 1996, p. 583).

Critical research: A paradigm for conducting research that includes the following tenets: research of humans cannot be extricated from the cultural lenses and subjectivity of those who conduct it, and therefore it is interpretative rather than objective (Holliday, 2002); inequalities of gender, race, class, and ethnicity “produce and are produced by unequal power relations in society” (Peirce, 1995, p. 571); a stance within which the researcher seeks to understand how the participants in the research study “make sense of their own experience” (p. 571); and, as also highlighted by Peirce, researchers within a critical approach consider the purpose of educational research to be “social and educational change” (p. 572).

Discourse: “Ways of behaving, interacting, valuing, thinking, believing, speaking and often writing that are accepted as instantiations of particular roles (or ‘types of people’) by specific groups of people” (Gee, 1996, p. viii; italics in original). “Instantiations” reflect ways of being instantly recognizable as a member of a particular group by other members of that group. (See also primary Discourse and secondary Discourse.)

discourse: “Language in use” (Gee, 2002b, p. 81) such as certain ways of interacting, speaking, writing that correspond with a particular Discourse. Each discourse, or social language, encompasses “specific ways of talking/listening and/or writing/reading” which produce different grammars” (Gee, 2004, p. 25) or “registers” (Gee, 2002b, p. 91).
EAL: An acronym that stands for *English as an Additional Language* (Street, 2005). I appreciate the additive (Lambert, 1975) nature of this term in that it highlights that students are already fluent in a language and are learning another one (English). I use “ESL” in contexts where people are more likely to be familiar with this term.

**Educators’ Role Definitions:** The ways in which teachers conceptualize their roles or identities as educators. These “determine the way educators view students’ possibilities and the messages they communicate to students in regard to the contributions they can make to their societies” (Cummins, 2000, p. 16). These definitions create three images that are reflected in teacher-student interactions (p. 48). (See related discussion in Chapter Three).

ESL: An acronym for *English as a Second Language*.

**Empowering practices:** Schools that empower immigrants and students have four common characteristics, outlined by Cummins (1986, 1996, 2000) (see p. 2).

**False beginners:** Students whose early socialization into their primary Discourses included integration of features/practices of secondary Discourses that are pre-aligned “in terms of cultural values, and sociocultural resources” (Gee, 2004, p. 14) with secondary Discourses. (See *filtering*).

**Filtering:** This term refers to the process of integrating features of a secondary Discourse into children’s primary Discourse during early socialization. Filtering is about “giv[ing] them certain values, attitudes, motivations, ways of interacting, and perspectives, all of which are more important than mere skills for successful later entry into specific secondary Discourses ‘for real’ (skills follow from such matters)” (Gee, 2002a, p. 161).

**Identity:** The ways in which “a person understands his or her relationship to the world,
how that relationship is constructed across time and space, and how the person understands possibilities for the future” (Norton, 2000, p. 5).

Ideology: In simple terms, a person’s worldview, how the social and the political are viewed and understood (Darder, Baltodano & Torres, 2003, p.13).

Ideological clarity: The extent to which teachers understand their “personal beliefs, where these beliefs originate from, and the effect they may have on the students they teach” (Exposito & Favela, 2003, p. 74). Furthermore, the process in which individuals strive to identify the “dominant society’s explanations for the existing socioeconomic and political hierarchy as well as their own explanations of the social order and any resulting inequalities” (Bartolomé & Balderrama, 2001, p. 48).

Ideological model of literacy: A sociocultural-based framework for thinking about literacy developed by Street (1993, 1995, 2001), of which the notions of everyday social practice and literacy shaped by relations of power (Baynham & Prinsloo, 2001, p. 83-84) are central. Literacy is perceived as learned contextually through social interaction and is politically contested. It includes meaning related to one’s cultural associations (Street, 1995), but it also entails an awareness of the relationship between power and literacy.

Immigrant: A person who has emigrated to Canada/United States from another country.

L1: One’s primary language which is often referred to as the “native” language, although this term has been heavily debated in the literature (Krachu & Nelson, 2001).

Literacy: The learning of discourses of a language and the taking up of identities that pertain to those literacy practices. A sociocultural framework acknowledges a literate individual as one who knows various discourses of a language but more than this, that these discourses signal that the individual belongs to a particular “community, expressive
of its identity, its conventions, and values” (Widdowson, 1994, p. 381)

**Literacy event:** An observable occasion in which reading or writing is a part (Street, 2001), for example, reading recipe books or completing forms at the doctor’s office. To Street, this term is limited because it is only “descriptive”; it “does not tell us how the meanings [of the event] are constructed [by the participants]” (p. 11).

**Literacy practice:** This term refers to “culturally constructed models of the literacy event in our minds … not only to the event itself but the conceptions of the reading and writing process that people hold when they are engaged in the event” (Street, 1995, p. 133). Later, borrowing Heath’s (1982) notions of *participants' interactions* and *interpretative processes*, as cited in Street (2001), Street highlighted the social aspect intrinsic to literacy practices and the meanings that the participants constructed within these practices.

**Low-status:** A term used in the Western world that refers to non-white, uneducated immigrants. Immigrants who are labeled high-status are often white, have received a formal education, and have the social and academic cultural capital valued and academically rewarded by schools which enables them to “assimilate into the dominant culture if they wish to do so” (Bartolomé & Trueba, 2000, p. 290).

**Mainstream:** A term that generally refers to those of White, middle-class culture.

**Minority student:** A student of color who may or may not speak a dialect of English other than “standard” English.

**Model minority Discourse:** This Discourse emerged from within a variety of social and historical events in the 1960s, events which influenced society’s perception of Asian Americans as success stories. Asian Americans as a cultural group were compared with
Latinos and African Americans who were intensely struggling, sometimes violently, at that time for civil rights. McKay and Wong (1996) explain that “The implication, overtly stated or otherwise, was the ‘trouble-making’ minorities should emulate the Asian Americans’ industry, self-help, and uncomplaining behavior” (p. 586).

**Pedagogization of literacy:** The process whereby the dominant singular conception of literac‘y’ (literacy that is particular to school contexts) permeates and is accepted by society as natural and value-neutral. The specific and accepted ways of conducting “writing practices and pedagogy in American schooling are not simply matters of technique and of neutral learning skills but [they] may be associated with deep levels of cultural meaning and belief: other literacies exist alongside the dominant, school-oriented versions” (Street, 1995, p. 111). Sociocultural researchers talk in terms of literacies. This pedagogization of literacy positions students to abandon ‘home-grown’ literacy practices for dominant discourses or school literacy.

**Political:** This term assumes that people of the “dominant” group of society, whether in classrooms or the societal/class order, seek either overtly or subconsciously to retain their dominant position and that, by default, by seeking to retain their position, the dominant group marginalizes other people groups, whether purposefully or unintentionally. Also implicit in the notion of the political is that people are free to resist attempts by others to marginalize or oppress them.

**Primary Discourse:** Discourses “to which people are apprenticed early in life during their primary socialization as members of particular families within their sociocultural settings” (Gee, 1996, p. 137). These Discourses include primary language(s), and cultural ways of being, interacting, valuing, thinking, etc.
Second Language Acquisition (SLA): A field of study within applied linguistics that has been largely influenced by the methods and philosophical orientations of the social sciences, primarily psychology (Davis, 1995, p. 427). The field of SLA holds to the tenet that "language acquisition resides mostly, if not solely, in the mind" (p. 428).

Secondary Discourse: People are apprenticed into these Discourses "as part of their socializations within various local, state, and national groups and institutions outside early home and peer-group socialization" (Gee, 1996, p. 137). These venues might include churches, gangs, schools, office (Gee, 1996, p. 137), community organizations, businesses or governments (Gee, 2002a, p. 161).

Sociocultural orientation: A way of looking at the nature, learning, teaching, and conceptualization of knowledge (Stone, 2004) that positions social and cultural contexts as central. Lemke (2003) explains that "language in use is always language-within-activity; socially and culturally meaningful" (p. 72, as cited in Stone, 2004, p. 11).

Standard English: Most commonly advocated by the dominant, ruling class of society (Fairclough, 2001; Freire, 1998), this notion is that a pure form of English exists which must be valued over all other dialects of English (other dialects are considered a threat to the pure language). Within this so-called safeguarding of standard English, the language becomes "not simply a means of communication but the symbolic possession of a particular community, expressive of its identity, its conventions, and values" (Widdowson, 1994, p. 381). (See p. 34 for more discussion on standard English.)

Outline of the Remainder of the Document:

And Directives for the Development of the Present Thesis

In Chapter One, I presented an introduction to the inquiry, the background of the
problem situation, the purpose of the inquiry and questions to be answered, a two-part rationale for the inquiry, the importance of the inquiry, benefits of the inquiry, the research methodology, and a section for the definition of terms that will be used throughout the thesis. Chapter Two is a review of the literature highlighting four interrelated themes that inform the proposed inquiry.

The third chapter comprises the conceptual framework. In this chapter I describe and analyze the major concepts of the three theorists which comprise the backbone of the conceptual analysis: Cummins’ (1986, 1996) notion of empowering practices, Gee’s (1991, 1996, 2004) construct of discourse and Street’s (1993, 1995, 2001, 2005) theoretical models of literacy, and notions of literacy practices and the pedagogization of literacy. The concepts of ideology and literacy will also be briefly analyzed since an understanding of these concepts is pivotal to the subsequent step.

From this conceptual framework, I will create a tool (CAELPP) which will outline the major categories of research that emerged from the work of the three theorists. Consequently, the CAELPP will guide my subsequent analysis of scholars’ research on EAL teachers’ ideologies and practices in secondary school classrooms. These findings will comprise the fourth chapter, the written secondary analysis.

In the final chapter of the thesis, Chapter Five, I will address the implications of the findings from the conceptual and secondary analyses for research, theory, and the educational community. I will conclude with a section of personal reflections on this adventure upon which I have embarked.
The purpose of this chapter is to outline, as argued in the literature, a rationale for teachers of EAL, more commonly known as English as a Second Language (ESL), to take up empowering literacy practices with their secondary school immigrant and minority EAL students. In educational contexts, students of English as an Additional Language are provided with opportunities to engage in empowering literacy practices only when their teachers hold certain beliefs around issues of teaching and learning, for example, an additive (Lambert, 1975) perspective toward students' primary language and culture. In preparation to addressing how teachers' ideologies inform the ways in which they take up the teaching of literacy in their EAL classrooms, I present four broad but related themes that have informed the conceptual framework which has led me to conduct an inquiry of conceptual and secondary analyses on the ideologies of EAL teachers around literacy and empowering practices. These themes include: the nature of empowering practices; empowering practices combined with literacy teaching within autonomous/ideological literacy models and implications of these models; pedagogy and "best practice"; and finally, the ideologies of EAL teachers and how these ideologies inform the teachers' pedagogical interactions with immigrant and minority students in empowering or disabling ways. Prior to the aforementioned themes, I present a brief historical overview of the teaching of English to immigrant students.

**A Historical Overview**

Dei (2003) claims that, in Toronto, more than 40% of the student population speaks a primary language other than English and that every year secondary schools within the Toronto District School board take in nearly 4,000 immigrant students. The
educational system in the United States is experiencing similar increases: within the last decade, the general population of elementary and secondary schools grew 24% while the English language learner population swelled by 105% (the National Clearinghouse of Bilingual Education, 2000, as cited in Freeman & Freeman, 2003, p. 5). These numbers clearly emphasize the need for special attention to be made to these students. In addition, this group requires consideration because of their unique needs. Immigrant students not only need help adjusting to a new country and, therefore, a new culture, but many also require assistance in learning the English language which may be unfamiliar to them. Especially in secondary school when the level of English proficiency needed to survive academically is high, immigrant students require intense support to negotiate the demanding challenge of juggling learning of academic content with language learning (Duff, 2001; Walqui, 2000).

Traditionally, the teaching of English to immigrants and refugees has occurred within the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA). Scholars, such as Chomsky (1957), Ellis (1985, 1997), Kramsch (2000), Cummins (1976), as cited in Baker, C., and Hornberger, N. (2001), and others, have brought key contributions to the teaching of English as an Additional Language including understandings of the contrasts between first and second language acquisition; interlanguage; macroskills; grammar; SLA pedagogy; the influence of age on arrival and length of residence; the importance of prior learning; communicative competence; and the types of language competence valued by schools (Cummins & Swain, 1986; Ellis, 1994; Lightbrown & Spada, 1999, as cited in J. Miller, 2003, p. 22).
In spite of these and other contributions that SLA has provided to ESL and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, researchers (J. Miller, 2003) have criticized the field of SLA for its concentration on “generalisable rules and methods” (p. 28) at the expense of careful pursuit of an “understanding of the contingency of local contexts” (p. 28). The sociocultural approach has begun to fill in this gap left by SLA in its neglect of the influence of social context on language learning. Instead of seeing English as a language to be taught (J. Miller, 2003; Pennycook, 1994), a sociocultural framework presents each language, English or other, as being made up of numerous assorted “discourses” or “social languages” (Gee, 1996, 2004). Hawkins (2004) defines these social languages as:

Different styles of language that communicate different socially-situated identities (who is acting) and socially-situated activities (what is being done). Each social language communicates in use, as it creates and reflects specific social contexts, socially-situated identities that are integrally connected to social group, culture, and historical formations. (p. 3)

Here, such phrases as “socially-situated activities” and “specific social contexts” indicate a much greater emphasis than in previous SLA frameworks on the context in which students are learning social languages. In fact, Lantolf (2001) claims that the social nature of the language learning context is the foremost notion of sociocultural theory. The correlation between the social element and language learning is that language is the mediator between the human mind and the world (others). Lantolf elucidates this point further when he explains that “as people participate in different culturally specific activities they enter into different social relations and come into contact with, and learn
how to employ and ultimately appropriate, different mediational means” (p. 13). Thus, to unite Lantolf’s (2001) argument with that of Gee (1996, 2004) and Hawkins (2004), people are socialized into assorted discourses as they participate together in any number of cultural activities where language is being used.

Within this social site where language is learned by using it, an unequivocal relationship exists between the classroom itself and the social order; in both contexts, an explicit relationship between language and power is at work (Auerbach, 1995; Fairclough, 2001; Pennycook, 1998). Auerbach (1995), in explaining this relationship between language and power, insists that the classroom serves as “a kind of microcosm of the broader social order” (p. 9) to the degree that “it is the knowledge, life experience, and language and discourse of the dominant class that are valued in educational institutions, it is their power that is perpetuated” (p. 11). Thus, according to this perspective, language learning classrooms are “sites of struggle about whose knowledge, experiences, ways of using language, literacy, and discourse practices count” (p. 12). If, as Auerbach claims, EAL classrooms are sites where certain discourses count, and, thus, by implication, others do not, the classroom is not value-neutral, as some teachers (H. Miller, 2002) and policymakers (Baynham & Prinsloo, 2001) may think. Rather, the classroom is a site of political struggle.

A prime example of the political within the Canadian and American educational systems is the notion of standard English. In many EAL contexts, standard, “native-like” English proficiency is the ultimate goal of language learning (Cook, 1999). But

---

3 Other researchers (Fairclough, 1992; Donato, 2001; Kramsch, 2000, 2003) join their voices with Lantolf’s (2001) to assert that this social element of language cannot be extricated from the process of language learning.
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researchers (J. Miller, 2004) have noted that while students do need to learn English so that they can be involved in “social and institutional practices, and in the wider society” (J. Miller, 2004, p. 12), the construct of “a standard English discourse, or school English, may be used as a ‘weapon’ (Gee, 1996) against those from language minorities who are outsiders to the Discourses” (J. Miller, 2004, p. 12).

Widdowson (1994), in his classic address, “The Ownership of English,” paints a vivid picture of how standard English can be used as a weapon: in asserting standard English as the norm, the keepers of standard English label and actually position those who do not speak standard English as “outsiders, nonmembers of the community” (p. 381). Thus, within this so-called safeguarding of standard English, the language becomes “not simply a means of communication but the symbolic possession of a particular community, expressive of its identity, its conventions, and values” (p. 381), in other words, who is ‘in’ or ‘out’ within mainstream society. According to Kachru and Nelson (2001), although original ‘standard English’ was “largely a matter of loose convention,” it served as “a shibboleth, a marker of the ‘right sort of person’” (p. 16).

It is disturbing that, within societies that proclaim themselves democratic, certain peoples, including immigrants and minority groups, could be considered by their neighbors as nonmembers of society. But is this situation merely theoretical in nature? What is actually happening in practice in secondary school classrooms in Canada and the United States? In her ethnographic study of grade 12 and first-year college students who had immigrated to the United States, Harklau (2000) observed ways in which schools positioned secondary school immigrants as outsiders: one of these ways was that, instead of considering students’ ability to speak two languages as a resource (Stein, 2004), many
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of the teachers saw the students’ bilingualism “as a disability, emphasizing what immigrant students could not do relative to monolingual, standard English speakers” (Harklau, 2000, p. 50). Research (Gunderson, 2000; Nieto, 2004) shows the damaging effects that this deficit (Lambert, 1975) attitude can have on students’ identity and academic achievement.

The notion of identity can best be understood when considered in light of the relationship between one’s language and one’s culture. According to Jin and Cortazzi (1998), “language reflects culture” and it “also constitutes culture” (p. 100). They argue that there are “few aspects of cultural life which are comprehensible without considering cultural ways of speaking (or literacy) as being an instrument of their constitution” (Bauman and Serzer, 1974; Saville-Troike, 1989, as cited in Jin & Cortazzi, 1998, p. 100).

Jin and Cortazzi’s (1998) argument on language and culture helps to elucidate what happens when immigrant and minority students are discouraged from using their primary language at school (Gunderson, 2000). When students are denied from using their L1, the school sends students and their families a message “about what kinds of identity are acceptable in the classroom and society” (Cummins, 1996, as cited in Baker & Hornberger, 2001, p. 318). Unfortunately, Cummins adds, “For subordinated pupils, the price of admission into the teaching-learning relationship and access to opportunity within the wider society, is frequently renunciation of self” (p. 318).

Lippi-Green (1997) points out accent as a specific element of language learning that entails identity loss for immigrant and minority students. People are not asked to “change the color of their skin, their religion, their gender,” Lippi-Green writes, “but we
null
regularly demand of people that they suppress or deny the most effective way they have of situating themselves socially in the world" (p. 63), that is, by use of their accented, primary language. As well as possibly experiencing identity loss during the process of learning a second or additional language, students are also likely to struggle with achievements in schools where their primary language is devalued (Nieto, 2004). In fact, Cummins (1996) argues that "reinforcement of students' identities is crucial for motivating students to engage with academic content" (p. 150).

What happens when students experience from their teachers a devaluation of their language, culture, and accordingly, their sense of worth? Many students who receive the message that "they should leave their language and culture at the schoolhouse door ... will accurately perceive the schooling process to be coercive and may resist it actively by not learning" (Cummins, 1996, p. 150). In fact, some students may resist to the extent that they drop out of school altogether (Ogbu, 1992, cited in Cummins, 1996; Atkinson, Brown, Canagarajah, Davis, Duff, Harklau, Jamieson, Markee, & Ross, 2003). That numerous immigrant and minority students are dropping out of secondary schools is an unfortunate reality (Dwyer, 1998).⁴

Gunderson’s (2000) two-large scale studies of 35,000 immigrant students in Vancouver, British Columbia, highlights the sense of identity loss and the ensuing effects of this identity loss on academic achievement in the lives of immigrant students. In this

⁴ For example, in Alberta, Canada, where the average drop-out rate is approximately 30-35% (Alberta Education, 1992, 1997; Calgary Board of Education, 1993; Human Resources and Labour Canada, 1993, as cited in Watt & Roessingh, 2001, p. 207), Watt and Roessingh observed that between 1989-1996, the dropout rate for EAL students in one large urban secondary school in Calgary remained exorbitantly high at 73-76% (p. 219).
inquiry into the feelings of immigrant students and their teachers toward their schooling experiences, Gunderson reports that one student-participant, a 19-year old Spanish refugee from Honduras, said the following: “I go to school, feel lost, real lost. There’s no one here who knows me, my trouble, the war, the killing I seen. The Canadians think I selling drugs. No friends” (p. 703). According to Gunderson, this student attended school intermittently for 3 months before dropping out. What hope does this young man’s future hold for him? What kind of future can immigrant and minority students expect when schools fail to reach them?

That the school bears a strong responsibility for keeping students in school is an argument that Freire (1998) states plainly. He writes that children do not quit school “for no reason at all, as if they just decide not to stay. What we do have are conditions in schools that either prevent them from coming to school or prevent them from staying in school” (p. 6). Although this situation appears dismal, scholars argue there are alternative possibilities. Cummins (1986, 1996, 2000) claims that the site for educational reform is in the interactions between teachers and their immigrant and minority students. In these interactions, students are either “disabled” or “empowered.”

The Nature of Empowering Practices

Empowerment involves “establishing the respect, trust, and affirmation required for students (and educators) to reflect critically on their own experience and identities” and it involves openly contesting “the devaluation of identity that many culturally diverse students and communities still experience in the society as a whole” (Cummins, 1996, p. iii). A crucial element in empowering interactions between teachers and students is the teacher’s role definitions, which I revisit in Chapter Three (see p. 62-63). Cummins
presents four elements that characterize schools that engage in empowering practices between teachers and immigrant/minority students (see p. 2).

This review and subsequent conceptual inquiry focuses on the first two empowering practices, on the incorporation/exclusion of students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds (Cummins, 1996, 2001) or their primary Discourses (Gee, 1991, 1996, 2002a, 2004) into the fabric of the school and on pedagogy that validates/denies students' access to generate knowledge (Cummins, 1996, 2001). These notions around empowering practices coincide with Street's (2001) work on literacy practices and the relationship of these practices to the broader societal and cultural context (p. 21). Next I address the relationship between empowering practices and literacy practices.

**Empowering Practices and Literacy as Autonomous/Ideological**

Foundational to recognizing the political nature of language teaching is an understanding that teachers' perceptions of literacy and how literacy should be taught have direct and profound implications on the lives of immigrant and minority students. Street's (1993, 1995, 2001) autonomous model of literacy and ideological model of literacy (see Definition of Terms, p. 21, 25) provide a framework for examining teachers' perceptions of literacy and how it should be taught. The autonomous conceptualization of literacy seems popular to cognitive scientists who think of literacy (usually reading and writing) as "relatively decontextualized skill systems" (Stone, 2004, p. 13) that once learned, can be applied to any context. The underlying assumption is that once EAL students master English, their academic and consequent societal success is assured.

As New Literacy Studies researchers (Street, 1993, 1995, 2001) argue, the autonomous model of literacy is largely deficient in that it fails to address the key
element of power at work in language learning (Baynham & Prinsloo, 2001; Fairclough, 1992, 2001). Furthermore, Street (1993) shows how the autonomous model of literacy endangers immigrant and minority students: by carefully dressing-up literacy practices as “value-neutral”, dominant groups effectively conceal that certain literacy practices hold implications for who holds power and authority in society. In this way, then, literacy “becomes a symbolic key to many of the society’s gravest problems ... issues of poverty and unemployment can be turned into questions about why individuals failed to learn literacy at school ... thus diverting blame from institutions to individuals” (p. 125).

Within this approach to literacy, blame is inverted onto immigrant students and their families/communities for their marginalized position in society with the underlying premise that these individuals plainly failed to “master” English. Nowhere in this model is there room for inquiry into the ugly countenance of systemic racism, purposeful or unintentional, at work within educational institutions (Kivel, 2002; Nieto, 2004).

Street’s (1993, 1995, 2001) ideological model of literacy does not discredit students’ need to learn skills in reading and writing; however, this model unfolds taut to its breaking point the notion that literacy is value-free. This second model of literacy maintains that literacy practices are “inextricably linked to cultural and power structures in society” (Street, 1993, p. 7). In his ethnographic research in Iran in the 1970s, Street (2000) discovered the cultural structures at work in literacy practices, that rather than simply encompassing discrete skills, literacy comprises “a set of social practices deeply associated with identity and social position” (p. 23; emphasis added).

The central difference, then, between the two models of literacy is the acknowledgement in the ideological model of the social and cultural context of the reader
or writer and the realization that this context is tied up with power. This difference is significant in that, once teachers realize this, they can begin to teach literacy in ways that acknowledge the ideological in literacy teaching and learning. Thus, the next question becomes, what does literacy teaching look like when it is ideological, not autonomous?

Using Cummins’ (1986; 1996) intervention for collaborative empowerment for the empowerment of immigrant and minority students, the first issue to be addressed, as proposed by Cummins, is whether or not schools integrate the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of minority students into the daily life of the institution. Below I address the linguistic aspect first and subsequently students’ cultural background. The separation of these two elements, the linguistic and the cultural, is used for clarification purposes only, as I believe, along with other researchers (Kramsch, 2003), that the two are indivisible.

Arguably, the highest level of appreciation and preservation of students’ linguistic background is a bilingual program that encourages further development of the students’ primary language and opportunities for increased acquisition of an additional language. However, despite researchers’ (Cummins, 2000; Nieto, 2004) arguments for bilingual programs, widespread practice of instruction in EAL students’ first language has not happened within North American educational systems. An avid supporter of bilingual programs for many years, Cummins (1986) argues that “the most successful bilingual programs appear to be those that emphasize and use the students’ L1” for primary instruction (p. 23). This claim has been met with resistance (Cummins, 2000) as some researchers and policymakers argue that instruction in the native language impedes acquisition of the additional language. However, other research (Cummins & Swain, 1986; Cummins, 2000; Schecter & Cummins, 2003) shows that this claim of imposition
is not accurate, that generally, “develop[ment] of conceptual and literacy skills in a minority language will tend to transfer to the majority language given sufficient exposure to the language and motivation to learn it” (Schecter & Cummins, 2003, p. 6).

Notwithstanding researchers’ claims over whether instruction in the students’ primary language or in English is better for students, are most EAL students, particularly those with emerging English proficiency, receiving instruction in their primary language? Not according to Kinder (2000) who discovered that during the 1999-2000 school year, less than 20% percent of EAL students in the United States were being taught in their primary language (as cited in Nieto, 2004). This statistic is distressing considering the strong case that researchers (above) have made for instruction in students’ L1.

In some cases, policy restricts the access that students have to learning in their primary language. Through Proposition 227 in California and Proposition 203 in Arizona, bilingual programs have been dismantled and a law passed that requires education for EAL students to be exclusively in English; to instruct in a language other than English is illegal in these states (Guerrero, 2004). Research (OSSTF, 2002; Ren Dong, 2004b) shows that it takes 5 to 7 years to acquire “Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency”; therefore, without primary language support to be able to negotiate both content and language learning, immigrant students face an incredible and, at times, insurmountable challenge.

However, lest researchers and educators consider the use of students’ L1 in the classroom an “either-or” issue, either instruction wholly in English or instruction entirely in the students’ L1, Lucas and Katz (1994) indicate that the use of the primary language in the education of English language learners can operate on a continuum. They claim
that “monolingual English speakers or teachers who do not speak the languages of all
their students can incorporate students’ native languages into instruction in many ways to
serve a variety of educationally desirable functions” (p. 558). From their research, Lucas
and Katz found that monolingual teachers can use students’ native language as a resource
by grouping students with peers who share the same L1 and by treating students of EAL
as “linguistic resources for the class” (p. 558). Additionally, Curran (2003) reminds
educators that “first language use can serve as a vehicle for the students to negotiate an
assignment and [to] actually help them to stay on task” (p. 336). This research shows that,
even when teachers do not share students’ primary language, there are ways in which
teachers can communicate to students that their L1 is a valued resource.

In addition to drawing on students’ linguistic resources in the life of the school,
Cummins (1986, 1996, 2000) also advocates that, to empower immigrant students,
schools need to engage students’ cultural background in the daily life of the institution.
But as research (Gay, 2000) indicates, many teachers do not consider ethnicity, culture,
and gender as factors that significantly influence schooling. One premise for this
reasoning is the notion that good teaching is universal. Some researchers (H. Miller,
2002) go so far as to claim that teachers should not look for a “formulaic methodology
that can be employed to effectively teach particular groups of students on the basis of
their cultural status” (p. 346) and that teachers should not teach nonmainstream students
that good teaching is universal, says Gay, are unaware that “their standards of ‘goodness’
in teaching and learning are culturally determined and are not the same for all ethnic
groups” (p. 22). These individuals do not recognize the cultural elements implicated in
their own personal philosophy of teaching and learning. Also, these teachers fail to recognize that their students may learn in markedly different pedagogical ways than those the teachers are accustomed to using (Cortazzi & Jin, 2002). Thus, an imperative first step in drawing on students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds in the classroom is realizing the potential discrepancy between the teachers' way of teaching and the students' way of learning (Cortazzi & Jin).

Second, to begin to resource students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds, educators need to recognize that many of the taken-for-granted ways of the school, such as routines, implicit rules for teacher-student interactions, and pedagogical styles, are those of the White, middle class (Delpit, 1995) and, consequently, may be difficult for immigrant and minority students to access. In this light, Gee’s (2004) description of authentic beginners and false beginners (see Definition of Terms) helps to explain, in part, the difficulties in schooling experienced by many immigrant, minority EAL and students from “lower-socioeconomic homes” (Gee, 1996, p. 14). Authentic beginners begin school lacking “the sorts of early preparation, pre-alignment in terms of cultural values, and sociocultural resources that more advantaged learners at those sites have” (p.14). This early preparation may include the language, “how students are accustomed to engaging in intellectual processing, self-presentation, and task performance” (Gay, 2000, p. 12). Alternatively, false beginners seem to be brilliant, avid learners when the reality is that the cultural capital (Lin, 1999; Valdes, 1998) that they bring with them is welcomed while that which is brought to school by immigrant and minority students may not.

Gee (2004) explains that schools establish as the standard of achievement that which is accomplished by the best false beginners and then the schools act as if “these
background of the students to help these students to be academically successful. Hopefully, in this process, schools will recognize that students begin school with previous literacy practices that are tied up with their primary language, and thus, their identity, practices learned within the contexts of their family and community. Unfortunately, it is clear from the research (Hartle-Schutte, 1993) that many times schools do not recognize these literacy practices as resources to draw from and fail to seek to understand the complexities involved in the potential mismatch between the literacy-related thinking of the immigrant student/family and that of the school (Li, 2003). Such failure on the part of the school can hold tangible and devastating implications on students' lives (Li, 2003). Encouragingly, the work of Davis et al. (2005) in a public secondary school in Hawaii highlights teachers who are resourcing the literacy practices that students have learned from their families and communities in ways that develop and extend students' academic literacy. I address this study (2005) in the secondary analysis (Chapter Four).

I have previously discussed Delpit's (1995) notion of the “culture of power” (p. 24) (see p. 12); here, I would like to address the tension that exists within the literature concerning how to teach these dominant discourses. Delpit argues that, if people are not already participants in the culture of power, they can engage within it more easily when they are told clearly and specifically the rules of this culture. Delpit posits that, although many liberal educators think that education is for children to become independent, to self-actualize, the parents of immigrant and minority students, many who are outside the culture of power, have very different expectations. These parents want the school to “provid[e] their children with discourse patterns, interactional styles, and spoken and
written language codes that will allow them success in the larger society” (p. 24).

The tension on how to teach these discourses can be seen in research (Walqui, 2000) that has taken up in somewhat complex ways Delpit’s (1995) idea around teaching explicitly the culture of power to immigrant and minority students. First, Walqui (2000) recommends that teachers invite their students to discuss features that are particular to their culture. Although this may be a beginning step toward accessing students’ cultural backgrounds, it resembles “the contributions approach,” the lowest integrative level of multicultural education (Banks & Banks, 2004). While a benefit of this approach is that it incorporates immediately a measure of ethnically and culturally diversified content into the curriculum, its limitations likely overshadow its benefits: it “focuses on the lifestyle of ethnic groups rather than on the institutional structures that really affect the life changes that keep them marginalized” (p. 243).

Walqui (2000) also proposes that teachers explicitly teach their minority students the rules of “cultural power” by teaching students the “rule” that only one person speaks at a time, because newly arrived students “who do not know this rule will violate it, and they will not understand why people resent their behavior” (p. 19). Clearly from Walqui’s voice in her writing, her intentions seem genuine. She seems to be trying to shield minority students from drawing negative attention to themselves from other students. However, some researchers and teachers may interpret her statement here as focusing more on students’ behavior than on their progression in their English language acquisition (Garcia, 1999). Also, this “rule” that she suggests is not a communication style used by all cultural groups but one used predominantly in White middle-class male contexts. Contrary to the “active–participatory” communication style of mainstream
education where teachers actively talk while students passively listen, many groups, such as Native Hawaiians, European American females, and people of color, engage in a communal communication style where "speakers expect listeners to engage with them as they speak by providing prompts, feedback, and commentary. The roles of speaker and listener are fluid and interchangeable" (Gay, 2002, p. 111). Walqui's (2000) suggestion does not seem to take into account students' diverse cultural communication styles, and it may actually reinforce the literacy practices most valued by the school and marginalize those of immigrant and minority students.

If then, as can be seen by Walqui's (2000) example, researchers, though well intentioned, suggest complex ways of drawing on students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds and ways of teaching students dominant discourses, how then shall teachers teach? What kinds of empowering pedagogy used in the school will, as outlined by Cummins (1986), encourage students' identity by drawing on their linguistic and cultural backgrounds and also teach them how to "use language actively in order to generate their own knowledge" (p. 21)? What kinds of pedagogical practices promote empowering literacy practices? Are some better than others? What are the best? Best practices and the debate around this issue are discussed in the next section.

**Pedagogy and Best Practice**

In addition to the tension within the literature regarding how to teach dominant discourses, another issue of related contention is whether or not there is a set of pedagogical best practices and, if so, what these pedagogical practices look like. A number of researchers (Edge & Richards, 1998; Mazzoni & Gambrell, 2003; McKeon, 1998; Pennycook, 1999) have taken sides on this debate.
McKeon (1998) defines best practices as “solid, reputable, state-of-the-art work in a field” (p. 493) and counsels teachers to collaboratively take up the research and implementation of best practices. However, McKeon notes that, when distribution of best practices occurs within educational settings, teachers are likely to adjust the practice to fit their particular learners and classroom context. Unfortunately, she seems to consider this adaptation as a hindrance: she contends that “this has typically been a problem in getting users to adopt a best practice or innovation” (p. 498). Here, she seems to be claiming that best practices are not more widely taken up because of teachers’ hesitancies, but what McKeon fails to take into account is that many teachers want to be treated as professionals not technicians (Giroux, 1985/2004), a point to which I return below.

Like McKeon (1998), Mazzoni and Gambrell (2003), venerate best practices and argue that, despite the debate surrounding them, in reality there is a large measure of agreement in the research as to what constitutes best practices. They outline 10 of these best practices for teaching literacy. However, unlike McKeon (1998), Mazzoni and Gambrell (2003) understand the need for teachers to take best practices that are presented in the research and to adapt them to fit their particular classrooms and learner needs. In this vein, Mazzoni and Gambrell argue that “best practices can be described but not prescribed” (p. 13).

On the other side of the argument, researchers who oppose the notion of best practices argue that the veneration of individual teachers and their pedagogical practices as best “undermines their status of particular understanding by holding out the prospect of general application” (Edge & Richards, 1998). In this line of thinking, teachers are not commended for their deep and intimate understandings of their personal classrooms.
Rather than professionals who can create or "critically appropriate[e] curricula to fit specific pedagogical concerns" (Giroux, 1985/2004, p. 206), they are considered specialized technicians. Giroux argues that students in teacher preparation programs, instead of

learning to raise questions about the principles underlying different classroom methods, research techniques and theories of education, are often preoccupied with learning the 'how to,' with 'what works,' or with mastering the best way to teach a given body of knowledge. (p. 208)

Other researchers (Freeman & Johnson, 1998) take up this argument and vehemently claim that learning teacher "tricks" does not automatically turn one into an effective teacher of immigrant and minority students. They explain that teaching is "much more than a set of discrete behaviors or routines that make classrooms run more smoothly" (p. 402). As well, when best practices are presented as purely generalizable, teachers who do not meet with success when they endeavor to implement a best practice in their classroom may be led to believe that the "failure to achieve it arises not as a result of flaws in its own constitution but because the correct procedures are not being followed or the teacher has the wrong attitude" (Edge & Richards, 1998, p. 571).

Luke (2003) raises another issue implicated in the debate over best practices: power. Arguing against best practices, he claims that in our unhesitating ingestion of the notion that "the pedagogic delivery of basic skill with automaticity is the bare and baseline solution, we leave educational research, school systems, and teaching professionals vulnerable to the most sophisticated forms of victim blaming in social policies" (p. 139). The idea that teachers can simply learn and then implement a set of
best practices contributes to the "deskilling of teachers," Luke (2000) argues (p. 571). An absolute belief in the notion of best practices-as-transferable-techniques seems to fly in the face of empowering practices: somehow it seems incompatible for a school that encourages its students to "use language actively in order to generate their own knowledge" (Cummins, 1986, p. 21) to simultaneously consider and treat its teachers as technicians rather than artists and professionals. This treatment disempowers teachers, although they can resist this disempowering.

Initially, as I read these arguments, I felt persuaded toward this sense of reproving best practices and yet, I also felt uneasy about doing so. In terms of the best practice argument I am pulled in two directions. On the one hand, as a Master of Education researcher marinating in the literature, I can see how teachers and students are disabled when researchers or teachers discover a "best practice" that has proven successful in a handful of classroom laboratories and then try to apply this practice in a completely different classroom context without adapting the practice. This practice is very similar to the autonomous model of literacy (Street 1993, 1995, 2001) in which knowledge (literacy) is treated as discrete and unproblematically transferable to any context.

And yet, beginning teachers must be taught some kind of approach to teaching: how else could teachers even begin to negotiate such a challenging career? They would be overwhelmed beyond imagination. As I have struggled with this issue, I have turned to the research for support. Perhaps, rather than taking the best practices debate to either extreme, there is a middle ground. If so, Moje, Young, Readance, and Moore (2000) with their ecological approach to pedagogy and best practice, seem to have found it. According to Moje et al., the ecological approach "emphasizes relationships" between
various elements (p. 7), like "an ecologist who takes up a plant thinks about how it relates
with the surrounding soil, climate, wildlife, and so on" (p. 7). These researchers urge
others to take up this ecological stance in addressing adolescent literacy and best practice.
As they lucidly explain, "To our way of thinking, any unqualified claim that an
educational practice is effective is quite a bit like claiming that watering plants is
effective: It depends" (p. 7; emphasis added). Their use of the terms "unqualified" and "it
depends" suggest their disagreement with the notion of best practices-as-transferable-
techniques; rather, like Mazzoni and Gambrell (2003), Moje et al. (2000) seem to argue
for practices that are contextually applicable according to teacher and student needs.

Additionally, Moje et al. (2000) propose two ways in which to address best
practices. The first is "to link specific promising practices with generally accepted
principles of teaching and learning" (p. 101). They site the example of the International
Reading Association which recently formulated the tenet that "Adolescents deserve
access to a wide variety of material that they can and want to read" (Moore et al., 1999, p.
101, as cited in Moje et al., 2000, p. 7). As they explain, "This principle offers a base for
deriving reader-friendly practices without sanctioning specific ones" (p. 7). Their
suggestion is reminiscent of Giroux's (1985/2004) above statement that pre-service
teachers should be "learning to raise questions about the principles underlying different
classroom methods, research techniques and theories of education" (p. 208). When
teachers are familiar with the principles that underlie certain pedagogical practices, they
can adapt these as needed.

Second, Moje et al. (2000) suggest that teachers and researchers become critical
consumers who "situate recommendations, determining where they are coming from and
where they would like us to go. Critical consumers continually question claims, analyzing, comparing, and evaluating what is said” (p. 7). They suggest a number of questions that researchers and teachers can use in their quest to be critical consumers of pedagogical practices, such as “Who says a practice is best; what is the philosophical orientation of the author?” (p. 7) I appreciate that Moje and her colleagues do not pit researchers and teachers against each other as if they are dichotomous, researchers theoretically contesting best practices and teachers in authentic teaching contexts blindly following pedagogical techniques that have been cited by others as ‘best.’ As well, I think that by reiterating the idea of teachers as critical consumers of pedagogical practices, Moje et al. treat teachers as intellectual professionals as opposed to mechanical technicians of knowledge (Giroux, 1985/2004).

Beyond the best practice debate, what will it take to bring educational reform within schools that serve immigrant and minority students? If Cummins’ (1986) theory is accurate, educational reform takes place within empowering interactions between teachers and students. But what do these empowering interactions look like? How do teachers’ ideologies inform their practice of whether or not empowering practices are at work in their classroom? What does the research say about EAL teachers and their ideologies? These questions are taken up in the next section.

Teachers and Ideologies: Ideas and Consequences

Researchers (Benesch, 1993) argue that teaching is ideological in nature, whether teachers realize it or not. After reviewing some older studies, Benesch concludes that ‘teachers’ decisions about subject matter, teaching methods, and assessment reflect a range of political positions, from wholehearted endorsement of the status quo in school
and society, to tacit approval, to critical dissent” (p. 707). She warns that “being unaware of the political implications of one’s choices, or claiming that those choices are neutral, does not mean that one’s pedagogy is free of ideology” (p. 707). Clearly Benesch sees a political component within ideology, but she seems to focus more on the effects of ideology and less on the nature of the construct itself. Out of their critical pedagogy framework, Darder et al. (2003) add that teachers can draw on the notion of ideology to critically “examine how their own views about knowledge, human nature, values, and society are mediated through the commonsense assumptions they use to structure classroom experiences” (p. 13). The next question, then, is, what are the ideologies of teachers of EAL students? Are these teachers aware of their beliefs about knowledge, human nature, values, and society? How do these views inform their practice? Are these ideologies ultimately empowering to students?

Research that focuses on the ideologies of teachers of English as an additional language (Blake, 2004; Davis et al., 2005; McKay & Wong, 1996) has a small presence within the literature, but there is a paucity of research that focuses on the ideologies of teachers around literacy, especially at the secondary school level. Within the studies that do address teachers’ ideologies (Olivo, 2003), these are only studied implicitly by observing the teachers, asking them about their practices, and then trying to discover the teachers’ ideologies. Few studies invite the teachers themselves to explicitly identify and explain their ideologies and within this limited number of enquiries, even fewer studies concentrate specifically on the teachers’ ideologies around literacy, literacy teaching, their students’ literacy needs, and how the teachers perceive their role in addressing these needs.
Cutri (2000) explains why it is so important that educators understand their own beliefs about teaching and learning and how this stance informs their teaching practice: “The deliberateness with which teachers make classroom decisions corresponds to their ability to identify and articulate the knowledge base and beliefs that inform their decisions” (p. 171). Although Cutri does not use the word ideological, it is apparent that she is aware that ideas have consequences (Zacharias, 1997). The beliefs that teachers have around the nature and purpose of education, about their particular discipline or disciplines, and perhaps of greatest significance, about their students, inform their practice in empowering or disabling ways. A number of researchers (Harklau, 2000; Sharkey & Layzer, 2000; Torres, 2001; Valdes, 1998; Vollmer, 2000) in their studies of students of EAL, refer to the influence of teachers’ expectations of their immigrant and minority students on the students’ scholastic achievement and affective self. For example, Harklau (2000) observed that teachers’ negative perceptions of their EAL students “are more likely to be reflected and reproduced in broader discourses” (p. 40) than the students’ representations of themselves because English language learning and teaching happen within uneven “relations of power between teachers and students in the classroom and between majority and minority in the broader society” (p. 40).

The inequitable school experiences that are produced by teachers’ negative representations of their immigrant and minority EAL students can be seen in Vollmer’s (2000) ethnographic study in an urban secondary school. Through interviews with teachers and critical discourse analysis, Vollmer observed that the teachers held certain groups of students (e.g., Russian) in higher esteem than other groups (e.g., Chinese and Latino students). While teachers frequently applauded the efforts of the Russian students,
they described their Latino students in negative terms. If Cummins' (1996) claim is accurate that students "are more likely to apply themselves to academic effort and participate actively in instruction" when teachers support the student's emerging "sense of self" (p. 2), the explicit favoring of the Russian students (Vollmer, 2000) over those from other cultures suggests that the teachers' failure to negotiate healthy identities with students from all cultural groups may hold negative implications for the academic and affective future of the Latino students who were negatively perceived of and represented by their teachers.

When teachers perceive particular groups of immigrants and students to be incapable of navigating higher level academic classes, these students are often channeled into lower-tracked courses where they tend to be "isolated or overlooked" and where "access to discipline knowledge" and opportunities to engage in English interactions are severely limited (Sharkey & Layzer, 2000). In low-tracked classes which are often marked by perfunctory, decontextualized (Garcia, 1999; Muchmore, 2001) work, students often have little opportunity to engage socially with peers and to engage critically with texts. In such classes, EAL students are denied opportunities that they desperately need to practice their burgeoning English (Olivo, 2003; Valdes, 1998) and they are denied access to higher levels of knowledge without which they are barred from higher education (Harklau, 1999). Thus, the harmful effects of teachers' negative perceptions of immigrant and minority students can produce a disastrous cycle. Additional studies have pointed to similar findings (see Torres, 2001; Valdes, 1998).

These studies are helpful in that they provide a small window into teachers' ideologies, but they are also limited in that the studies privilege the researchers' points-
of-view without specifically soliciting what the teachers themselves would say about their ideologies if they had been asked. In spite of a noticeable gap with the literature of EAL teachers' thoughts on their own ideologies, several studies (Exposito & Favela, 2003; Monzo & Rueda, 2003; Sugar Martinez, 2000) offer insight into the ideologies of EAL teachers from the teachers' own perspectives.

For example, Sugar Martinez (2000) initiated a study on the ideologies of the pre-service teachers in the Spanish language arts methodology class in which she was a teaching assistant. She was moved by the students' journal entries in which they were to investigate their "ideological baggage," a term borrowed from Farber (1995) which means that "teachers are products of their own schooling process and carry deep within them experiences that affect their classroom behavior (as cited in Sugar Martinez, 2000, p. 94). Two years later, Sugar Martinez invited six of these Latino bilingual student teachers who had by then started their teaching practice to participate in a study on teacher ideology in which she explored how "these interviewee's own schooling process affected their behavior in the classroom now that they themselves were teachers" (p. 94).

Sugar Martinez (2000) discovered that the teachers' ideologies had been influenced by their home life and by their experiences in school as bilingual students, experiences which had been predominantly negative. Incidents of their former teacher's misunderstanding, insensitivity or cruelty toward them, coupled with the opportunity in their teacher education program to work through this ideological baggage, informed the ways in which these Latino/a teachers sought to maintain high expectations of their students; to encourage their students' cultural identity; to refrain from discouraging students from using their primary language in class and to make their classroom a place
that was a warm and emotionally secure environment where the students would feel accepted.

In studying the ideologies of bilingual/bicultural teachers, Sugar Martinez’s (2000) study is somewhat different than others (Exposito & Favela, 2003) in this section in that the Latino/a teacher participants in Sugar Martinez’s (2000) study share the primary Discourse of their EAL students. Sugar Martinez explains that although “as children they were mauled by the ideological baggage of misdirected teachers, their own ideological baggage now brims with cultural pride and a firm resolve to effect change in the school system” (p. 104). Relatedly, Mogadime’s (2003) research delves into the empowering spaces that are created in the classroom when Sita Ramana and the South Asian students whom she teaches shared primary discourses which became a rich context for language experiences in the classroom. I discuss the implications of EAL teachers sharing their students’ primary Discourse in Chapter Four. This research (Mogadime, 2003; Sugar Martinez, 2000) highlights the need for teachers to reflect on their own ideologies and how these inform their teaching practice in ways that are empowering or disabling for their immigrant and minority students.

Exposito and Favela’s (2003) use of ideology as a theoretical research framework seems similar to Benesch’s (1993). First, Exposito and Favela summarize the five themes from the literature on culturally diverse students that guided their research focus. These themes revolve around teachers’ ideologies: ideological clarity (see p. 3), ideology based on middle-class values, ideological baggage, asset-based education and the life changing effect on an immigrant child that one caring teacher can have (p. 73). In terms of ideology based on middle-class values, the researchers learned that teachers’ ethical codes may be
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different from that of their students and their families and that teachers should not interpret students or their families’ behaviour or responses through the teachers’ own lens. Exposito and Favela borrow Sugar Martinez’s (2000) notion of ideological baggage. The basic idea in asset-based education is that if teachers can learn about their immigrant students and families’ “funds of knowledge” (Moll, 1994, as cited in Exposito & Favela, 2003, p. 76), teachers can “avoid the deficit trap of assuming that these families are somehow devoid of abilities or skills” (p. 76).

As this review has shown above, this transforming of a teachers’ framework from a deficit (Lambert, 1975) view of immigrant students to a perspective that values students’ literacy practices is a crucial element involved in the empowering of immigrants and minority students toward academic success and emotional stability. That the students’ home-grown literacy practices may be used as bridges to help them learn and critique dominant discourses has been documented in the research (Davis et al., 2005). However, a major complexity exists in this endeavor: how can students engage in critiquing dominant discourses when they have not yet attained enough English language proficiency to engage in such language-heavy activities? I address this complex issue in further detail in the conceptual framework (see p. 72-73).

Next, Exposito and Favela (2003) summarize the findings from ethnographic studies conducted by four prospective EAL teachers within their teacher education program. In these ethnographies, the teacher interns included their personal story and what made them choose teaching as their profession; their impressions of how this influenced their present perspective of students and their classroom management; their “schooling and formative life experiences”; and their “interests, academic knowledge and
special skills" (p. 81). These student-teachers then chose five immigrant students to interview and observe for a year and they analysed their own ideologies in relation to the interactions they had with their immigrant students. Exposito and Favela conclude that

Teacher education programs need to create opportunities for novice teachers to engage in a reflective process that explores, names, and questions their ideology. If novice teachers do not reflect on their beliefs, they can judge students based on erroneous personal views of language and culture. (p. 79)

Not only is it inequitable for teachers to use their own social and cultural lenses to “judge” students, but it is also likely to create disempowering micro-interactions between teachers and immigrant or minority EAL students. For this reason, it is crucial, either in teacher education programs before they begin teaching, or in-service seminars during the initial years of their teaching career, that teacher candidates are given opportunities to seriously contemplate their ideologies of teaching and learning in the EAL classroom.

Secondary school contexts often contain many complex variables not present within elementary contexts, such as tracking, separate ESL and “regular” classes, (Harklau, 1999) and language that is more abstract (Cummins, 1979, as cited in Baker & Hornberger, 2001) than at the elementary level. As well, secondary school students have “less time than elementary age students to learn English and master the academic content required to graduate from high school” (Walqui, 2000, p. 14). Furthermore, many of these secondary schools “still do not provide native-language support for these classes, English-language instruction tied to content, or content classes taught with adaptations of English appropriate for these students’ level of English proficiency” (p. 14). Within these weighty constraints, how do teachers’ ideologies inform their teaching practice so that
students are empowered? It is imperative to the schooling and lives of immigrant and minority EAL students that studies addressing this question be conducted on the ideologies of secondary school teachers of EAL. Studies of this nature would begin to fill in the gap that exists in this area of research.

The work of Bartolomé and Trueba (2000) begins to address this gap. These researchers make a case for teacher preparation programs to foster ideological clarity so that teachers will be better prepared to teach an increasingly immigrant student population. According to Bartolomé and Trueba, teachers develop ideological clarity by comparing their own understandings of the political and class inequalities in society with the explanations presented by the dominant groups in society. In this way, teachers begin “to better understand if, when, and how their belief systems uncritically reflect those of the dominant society and support unfair and inequitable conditions” (p. 279). Moreover, from their research on secondary school EAL teachers’ ideologies, Bartolomé and Balderrama (2001) document three beliefs common to these “exemplary” teachers: “rejection of meritocratic explanations of the existing social order; assimilationist orientation and deficit views of Mexicano/Latino students, and romanticized and White supremacist vies of White middle-class culture” (p. 54). As well, each of the four teacher participants had engaged in border crossing experiences (see p. 9) “where they personally experienced or witnessed someone else’s subordination” (p. 54). Refusing to adopt these notions which they believed were harmful to their students, these teachers questioned and challenged such views.

Summary

Benesch (1993) claims that “educators who do not acknowledge or discuss their
ideology are not politically neutral; they simply do not acknowledge or discuss their ideology" (p. 706). It is essential that educators who seek to engage in empowering literacy practices with their immigrant and minority students critically examine their ideologies around the teaching and learning of English language learners. After all, how can teachers engage in the empowering practice of drawing on students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds to resource the literacy practices students glean from their families and communities if the teachers are unaware of their own ideological backgrounds and assumptions and/or if they do not recognize the power element that exists when schools and society venerate certain discourses over others?

Teachers must realize that while students do need to learn specific ways of accessing literacy, teachers cannot stop there. Whether or not they are familiar with the theoretical notions of "autonomous" and "ideological" models of literacy (Street, 1995), if teachers do not see the harm of teaching students functional literacy skills without also teaching them how to "develop[p] a critical awareness of the world and the ability to act on it to improve matters" (Crookes & Lehner, 1998, p. 320), teachers will simply reproduce the status quo and schools will continue to push immigrant and minority students to the periphery.

As this review has shown, reform begins within the pedagogical interactions between individual teachers and students. Inquiries, then, into the ideologies of teachers of EAL and how these ideologies inform these pedagogical interactions between teachers and their students present a significant addition to the field.
CHAPTER THREE: THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK


*power; validation and inclusion of students’ linguistic & cultural backgrounds; ideology;* and *teaching that empowers.* In most of the themes discussed below, Cummins offers the broad framework and Gee and Street provide significant details.

*An Integrated Framework on Power*

Based on his intervention for collaborative empowerment, Cummins (1996, 2000) provides the following concepts for this section:

- Macro-interactions/micro-interactions based on *coercive or collaborative relations of power:* in micro-interactions characterized by collaborative relations of power, teachers and students actively challenge disempowering macro-interactions generally based on coercive relations of power that occur in the larger society among dominant and subordinated groups in society.

- Disempowering macro-interactions are challenged when immigrant students are encouraged to draw on their language, culture and prior experiences/knowledge (which simultaneously validates and develops students’ identity) and when opportunities are created for students to develop further these parts of themselves to build bridges to new knowledge.

- In tandem with educational structures (i.e., tracking, culturally bias standardized testing, and curriculum that mirrors the dominant class (Cummins, 2000), teachers’ role definitions play a crucial part in the extent to which teachers “either reinforce
coercive relations of power or promote collaborative relations of power” (Cummins, 2000, p. 44). Therefore, educational reform hinges on educator role definitions that are based on collaborative relations of power or empowerment.

- Three images that are informed by educators’ role definitions are reflected in micro-interactions.

- Teachers’ role definitions inform their interactions with students, which in turn are reflected in four distinguishing features within schools. Of particular interest to this thesis are the degree to which teachers incorporate the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of minority students into the institution and the extent to which the pedagogy used encourages students to “use language actively in order to generate their own knowledge” (Cummins, 1986, p. 21).

- Teachers operate along a continuum between collaborative relations of power or empowering relations (an intercultural orientation) or coercive relations of power (an assimilationist orientation) (Cummins, 1996, 2000). Cummins’ (1996) presentation of this model seems to imply that teachers operate somewhere along this continuum.

Cummins’ (1996, 2000) intervention for collaborative empowerment provides the backbone or skeleton for my inquiry into teachers’ ideologies around empowering literacy practices because of his sensitive discernment into the ways in which coercive or collaborative relations of power deeply inform immigrant students’ failure or success in formal school settings. Second, his work calls attention to the significance of educators’ role definitions in the micro-interactions between teachers and students and the influence of these role definitions on the inclusion of students’ linguistic and cultural backgrounds.
into classroom life and on opportunities that are created or denied students in which they use language activity to generate and critique knowledge. Therefore, Cummins’ intervention framework for collaborative empowerment provides a tool with which to broadly analyze interactions between immigrant and minority students and their teachers and how educators’ role definitions inform these interactions in empowering or disabling ways. On its own, however, Cummins’ (1996, 2000) intervention framework is too broad to be used as an analytical tool for studying the ideologies of secondary school EAL teachers around literacy specifically. This is where the smaller brush strokes of Gee and Street emerge to fill in the details.

Understanding Gee’s (1991, 1996, 2002a, 2004) contribution to the integrated framework on power requires a brief delineation of these subsequent notions:

- Discourse/discourse: Primary and secondary
- Authentic/false beginners

Gee’s (1991, 1996, 2002a, 2004) notions of Discourse/discourse and authentic/false beginners narrow the focus of the conceptual triad by highlighting how power is often subtly at work in the relationship between power, literacy, and Discourses to position immigrant and minority students as outsiders to the school system.5 Gee locates power within the broader society, and like Cummins (1996, 2000), shows how this is mirrored in educational structures. But Gee channels the discussion of power nearer to literacy in that he ties the two strands of power and language together: to borrow and extend Cummins’ (2000) notion of ‘coercive relations of power’ (p. 44), Gee (1996, 2004) pinpoints that the coercive power of macro-interactions in society are reflected in the

5 Due to space constraints, I will not conceptually analyze these terms here (see Definition of Terms, Chapter One).
Discourse interactions between teachers and students because and when certain Discourses in society are valued over others. Gee (1996) argues, citing Heath (1983), that Western schools are comprised of “the values and practices of certain types of (usually middle class) homes” (as cited in Gee, 1996, p. 14). In other words, the primary Discourses of students from these homes are closely aligned with the Secondary Discourses, also of a largely middle class nature, that are produced and favored in the schools.

Educational structures endorse these power relations when the students who come to school with primary Discourses that already contain elements of secondary Discourses are rewarded (i.e., with high levels of teacher expectations, advanced level classes, and superior grades) and those whose primary Discourse do not contain elements of the dominant secondary Discourses or whose primary Discourses are different altogether from the secondary Discourse of the school are penalized, i.e., teachers are more likely to have low expectations of the students’ abilities (Harklau, 2000; Nieto, 2004; Vollmer, 2000) and these students are overly represented in special education and lower streams of the tracking system (Harklau, 2000). Even worse, this valuing of certain Discourses generally operates covertly in that these false beginners are considered “masterminds” (Gee, 2004) by school personnel when the reality is that these students are simply continuing to practice and develop that which they have already been to some extent socialized into at home.

In highlighting how schools are structured in ways that reward false beginners and penalize authentic beginners (Gee, 2002a), Gee’s notions of Discourse/discourse and authentic/false beginners shows that while schools are presented as democratic
institutions, as the “great equalizer of the conditions of [humankind]” (Mann, 1868, in Nieto, 2005, p. 43), in reality they actually disempower some immigrant and minority ESL students and their communities. Gee’s work is helpful here in that it locates the focus of this inquiry closer to language, but it is still fairly broad in that his notion of Discourses includes ways of being, interacting, etc., in addition to the use and meanings of social languages.

Street’s (1995, 2000, 2001, 2003) theoretical notions, listed below, complete the conceptual triad with his explicit position on ways of thinking about literacy that tie into the relationship between power and Discourses in school systems:

- Theoretical models of literacy: autonomous and ideological
- Literacy events/literacy practices
- The Pedagogization of literacy

Street focuses the lens of power more narrowly than the other two theorists onto the assumptions in society around the nature of literacy and the reciprocal effect of these assumptions on the brand of literacy that is pedaled within schools and, then again, in society. In this way, Street shows that the nature of the relationship between power, schools, and literacy is much more problematic than can be understood at first glance. In his (1995) book, Street reports the results from research that he and J. Street conducted on school-related literacy practices in middle-class homes (i.e., helping out with homework, test preparation). Street explains that they initially interpreted the school to be the head of operations in the pedagogization of literacy, that the parents in these homes were just falling in line with the school’s expectations. Later in their study, however, they revised their thinking on this issue when they recognized that
the extent of the internalization of the pedagogic voice for literacy acquisition and dissemination suggests it is part of wider social and cultural currents. It is produced and reinforced through newspaper discussions on literacy, labelling on educational toys, political debates, and parental discourses. (p. 117)

They concluded that the pedagogization of literacy occurs simultaneously at different levels within society. In another rich passage, Street and Street problematize to a greater extent than Cummins and Gee how families from the dominant group in society, as well as schools, are just two elements of the social machine that surrounds schools with autonomous, pedagogized messages about literacy:

It is not simply a matter of how school imposes its version of literacy on the outside world as we originally imagined and as a rich educational literature has presumed. Rather, the question to be explored is how and why this version of literacy is constructed, assimilated, and internalized in many different contexts, including the school itself. (p. 124)

This statement reiterates that the relationship between school and society around assumptions of literacy tends to be cyclical and reciprocally-effecting.

An Integrated Framework on Validation of Students' Linguistic/Cultural Backgrounds

Despite their use of distinct terms, each of the three theorists connects power with the schools' incorporation of students' linguistic and cultural background. As a long-time advocate for bilingualism (Baker & Hornberger, 2001), Cummins argues that, ideally, immigrant students should be taught in their primary language and given opportunities to develop this language further (i.e., in primary language classes held by school personnel or volunteers from the community). He claims that immigrant students are written out of
the life of the school when their linguistic and cultural backgrounds are ignored in the classroom because this denies them opportunities to engage with teachers and peers in generating knowledge. Conversely, according to Cummins (1996), when linguistically and culturally diverse students are provided opportunities to bring these backgrounds into the foreground of school activities, instead of sitting back as passive recipients of knowledge they are able to use language actively to generate knowledge. However, Cummins (1996) is not content to leave the issue there. He also alleges that these students need to be able “to reflect critically on social issues of direct relevance to their lives” (p. 155). Cummins calls for transformative or empowering pedagogy which would engage students in critical literacy.

Gee (1996, 2004) adopts a similar stance, but again, narrows it closer to language teaching and learning. He explains that students’ linguistic and cultural make-up which are tied up with their primary Discourses are often ignored because they are unrecognized by the schools as legitimate ways of being. Gee (1996) depicts the school that empowers immigrant students as teacher and as learner. He insists that schools teach students school secondary Discourses of “school” (dominant discourses), but that schools also must learn, adapt to, and incorporate the Discourses of linguistically and culturally diverse students into the fabric of school life.

To get at Street’s (2001) stance on validating students’ linguistic and cultural backgrounds in schools necessitates consideration of his position on teaching dominant literacy. Street’s notion of literacy practices is similar to Gee’s (1996, 2004) theoretical construct of Discourses in that literacy practices have to do with cultural ways of writing and reading. Like Gee, Street (2001) addresses “dominant” literacies, although he uses
the term dominant vs. local literacies (p. 7), rather than subordinate literacies. Street expresses a distinct uneasiness with the issue of teaching access to dominant literacies and points out several problems with this argument. First, he claims that this “argument disguises the questions about how such genres become dominant and remain so, which will eventually determine how many others can in reality access them” (p. 13). Street makes a valid point here that exclusive attention to teaching dominant literacies leaves uncontested how these literacies came to be accepted and assimilated into school culture in the first place. It also serves to repeat the cycle of which literacies (dominant) are validated in schools (not students’ “home-grown” literacies).

Street (2001) also emphasizes that the argument surrounding dominant literacies implies that “the present condition – the current genres and forms of literacy – are fixed, universal, and given, where in fact they have been historically and culturally constructed” (p. 12). Drawing on Gee (1990), Street (2001) argues that it is relatively easy for dominant groups to change the “the current genres and forms of literacy” (p. 12) when it seems as if too many people are able to access dominant literacies. Here, Street vividly reveals that, although the message (mis)communicated within society is that anyone can achieve dominant literacies, in reality, dominant groups are likely to change the standards whenever they sense their powerful perch in danger of attack.

Two of Street’s (1995) arguments against the teaching of dominant literacies contain a number of perceptive insights, but they also hold a few points which I find problematic. According to Street, more research needs to be done on the connections of “specific genres and the holding of power, financial and political. To lead students to believe that there is a one-way relationship between particular genres taught in school
and those positions is to set them up for disappointment and disillusion” (p. 140). To a certain degree, I agree. That is, as Rogers (1990) so convincingly argues,

Even when children have acquired the powerful genres, there is no guarantee that they will become empowered; the goal-posts may shift, as many women and those from ethnic minorities and working-class backgrounds have discovered in the USA and UK, where statistics show that women and people of color who have university degrees cannot obtain the kinds of jobs achieved by men with comparable qualifications. (as cited in Street, 1995, p. 139)

I agree that just as there is more to getting a Discourse ‘right’ than merely using the right words (Gee, 2004), there is more to mastering literacy than just knowing how to perform the literacy event. As Street (2001) vigorously argues, dominant literacies are maintained expressly because there are other things tied up with knowing these literacies, such as institutional racism and jobs around remnant patriarchal systems of power which exclude women and minorities. In this light, then, I do agree with Street that it is likely unfair to portray to students a direct and unproblematic linkage between literacy and power.

And yet, my dilemma with Street (1995) herein is this: how would he reconcile the claim of his fellow New Literacy Studies researcher, Gee (1991) that “control over certain Discourses can lead to the acquisition of social goods (money, power, status) in a society” (p. 5)? If some sort of connection between certain dominant literacies (i.e., expertise in writing essays; authoritative, congressional-type speeches) and social mobility (i.e., entry to university) did not exist, then how would dominant literacies ever have come into being? Clearly, certain literacies are called ‘dominant’ because people in power have learned them and continue to ‘safeguard’ them. For these reasons, I cannot
agree with Street unreservedly that there is not some sort of tangible connection between dominant literacies and a measure of social power. However, I do take from Street's argument that there are also other elements of power (i.e., institutional racism; the constant shifting of the "goal-posts" by dominant groups) wrapped up with dominant literacies above and beyond the reading and writing events themselves that complicate the relationship between literacy and social power.

A second problematic issue that I find in Street's (1995) stance on the teaching of dominant literacies is within his resistance to the "wait for critique" (p. 139) approach. This approach, adopted by some researchers in Australia, posits that "children cannot learn to question the power structures of the society they inhabit until after they have learned these genres" (p. 139). Therefore, students are apprenticed into traditional ways of reading and writing, including "the dominant literacy forms, the genres of expository prose and essay-text writing" (p. 139). Conversely, Street argues that because of the intimate connection between the learning of Discourses and "cultural models of identity and personhood" (p. 140), it is problematic for students to learn dominant literacies and genres first and how to critique them afterward.

Gee (1996) explains a kind of identity crisis or struggle that can happen when the secondary Discourses that students are learning are at odds with their primary Discourses. From the learner's vantage point, this identity crisis or "conflict is between who I am summoned to be in this new Discourse and who I am in other Discourses that overtly conflict with- and sometimes have historically contested with - this Discourse" (p. 135). On one hand, I agree with Street (1995) that the "wait for critique" approach is problematic because by the time dominant literacies have been mastered, students may
have internalized elements of these Discourses without having had opportunities to contest those “certain values, attitudes, motivations, ways of interacting, and perspectives” (Gee, 2002a, p. 161) of the secondary Discourses which might be in conflict with those of the student’s family and community.

However, I find problematic Street’s (1995) claim that students be taught how to critique dominant literacies as they are learning them. It is not the logic of Street’s argument that strikes a dissonant chord with me, but rather its fragility on a practical level. Although it seems advantageous that students learn how to analyze and critique their school learning as they are learning it, I believe that EAL students’ must possess a certain degree of fluency in dominant literacies, a certain ease of moving in and out from their own primary Discourses and into dominant literacies, in order for them to be able to engage criticality with these secondary Discourses. For example, how can a first level EAL student possibly engage in critical analysis of, to take Street’s example, the Discourse around the Stock Exchange, without first having acquired a fairly high level of communicative competence? To a practitioner, this is common sense!

Of course, the above scenario is altered considerably if EAL teachers share their students’ primary Discourses and can draw on “the insider knowledge they have gained from having lived in the community” or, the “cultural knowledge or linguistic background that they share with their students” (Mogadime, 2003, p. 135). By sharing students’ primary Discourse and possessing “insider knowledge”, these kinds of EAL teachers are able to mediate between their shared primary Discourse(s), the target language, and criticality. This argument advanced by Mogadime highlights the need for EAL teachers who are able to move with ease between the students’ primary Discourse
and the secondary Discourse of the school.

On a practical level, I think the issue is more complicated than Street’s (1995) portrayal of it. I agree that students should be taught criticality as soon as possible, but the issues of at what level and how if their language competency is still at an early emerging level call for further research that can be adapted and applied to practical contexts. In conclusion, I am not arguing whether students should be taught how to critically analyze dominant literacies: with this, I entirely agree. However, my question is, how? Regrettably, Street seems to be more talkative on the should than the how.

**An Integrated Framework on Ideology**


> Cummins charges that the lack of success of reforms, specifically in relation to culturally diverse community schools, is attributable to teachers’ resistance to critiquing how they are personally implicated in the politics of schooling. (p. 62; emphasis added)

This process of personal critique I refer to as interrogation of the personal. That is, ideology encompasses the extent to which I, as a teacher, understand my “personal beliefs” (Exposito & Favela, 2003, p. 74), including my view of the social and the
political, "where these beliefs originate from, and the effect they may have on the students [I] teach" (Exposito & Favela, 2003, p. 74). Furthermore, the closer I am to achieving ideological clarity (Bartolomé & Trueba, 2000), the more I am aware of if and how my own "belief systems uncritically reflect those of the dominant society and support unfair and inequitable conditions" (p. 279). I have already addressed as one of these conditions the validation and incorporation of students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds into school life. Within this theme of ideology, Cummins' (1996, 2000) educator role definitions play a relevant part.

Cummins (1996, 2000) sketches three images that are reflected in teacher-student interactions: an image of our own identities as educators; an image of the identity options teachers highlight for our students; and an image of the society teachers hope our students will help form (2000, p. 48). For the purposes of this inquiry, I want to briefly theorize how a person's ideology might affect the three images. I am aware that my perspectives into these images stem from my own subjectivity; other researchers might offer very different ideas. The first image is that of the teacher's own subjective identity as an educator. To me, this implies how I see myself as a teacher, including 'why I do what I do'. The second image entails the kinds of identity options teachers highlight for our students. I would argue that this is directly tied up with how teachers' view the students they teach. Research (Harklau, 2000; Nieto, 2004; Sharkey & Lazer, 2000; Torres, 2001; Valdes, 1998; Vollmer, 2000) provides a convincing case that the ways in which teachers think about their immigrant students has weighty implications on the students academically and emotionally. The third image has to do with the kind of society we hope our students will help to create. To me, this includes teachers' thoughts on the kinds
of knowledge that we think students need to learn to transform society.

Street's (1993, 1995, 2001) research on the models of literacy moves this discussion closer to my inquiry into the ideologies of EAL teachers around literacy. To the embryonic concept of ideology as the ways in which the social and the political are viewed and understood, Street's theoretical models of literacy narrow this definition to the ways in which literacy is viewed through a social and political lens. This conceptualization of literacy might include, but is likely not limited to, the nature of literacy (i.e., autonomous/ideological; literacy/literacies, ideas around how one comes to be "literate," beliefs around the ways in which literacy should be taught, and the purpose of literacy, that is, what literacy "does" for one, etc.). I elaborate on these elements of the conceptualization of literacy in the section below entitled "Literacy."

The combination of Cummins' (1996, 2000) and Street's (1995, 2000, 2001, 2003) work provides a useful framework for my inquiry into teachers' ideologies around literacy practice, but what is the impetus for teachers to evaluate their own ideologies around literacy? I think that in Gee's (1996) work on ideology and theory this motivation can be found. Gee (1996) entitles this principal, "The moral imperative of explicating our tacitly held theories or ideology" (p. 20). Although in our postmodern era, a call to the moral may be fairly unpopular, Gee makes a strong case for this imperative.

Gee (1996) distinguishes between an "overt" theory which is "based on a set of generalizations about which the [person] has been reasonably explicit, so actual argument and debate can take place" and a "tacit" theory which is "based on generalizations that have not been overtly considered nor explicitly spelled out, to themselves or to others" (p. 13). Similar to Cummins' (1996, 2000) notion that empowering pedagogy exists along a
continuum (i.e., transmission → progressive → transformative, 1996, p. 154), Gee (1996) notes that tacit and overt theories operate on a continuum, that is, "a theory can be more or less tacit" (p. 16). He then insists that

If I have good reason to believe, that a theory I hold gives people like me (however this is defined) an advantage over other people or other groups of people, then my continuing to hold this theory in a tacit and removed/deferred way is unethical. I have an ethical obligation to explicate my theory, make it overt, and engage in the sort of thought, discussion, and research that would render it a primary theory for me. (p. 20; parenthetical comments in original)

Here, I draw on Gee's words to challenge teachers, including myself, to commit to what I have called an interrogation of the personal: to adopt a disposition that is amenable to self-examination.

An Integrated Framework on Teaching that Empowers

Each of the three theorists adds a valuable strand to the conceptual framework around teaching that empowers. To avoid repetition, I refer only briefly to Cummins' (1996, 2000) and Gee's (1991, 1996, 2002b, 2004) positions on teaching that empowers, as I have already addressed these to a large extent in the other themes. According to Cummins (1996, 2000), empowerment occurs through collaborative relations of power where each person in the relationship (i.e., the teacher and the immigrant student), is empowered or enabled to achieve more because of their relationship. Although he does not use the term "empowerment," Gee (2004) insinuates that authentic beginners are

---

6 Cummins' (1996) notion of the collaborative relationship is similar to Vygotsky's (1978) concept of zone of proximal development, the distance between what one is able to achieve on one's own and what one can achieve with the supportive assistance of an adult or more capable peer (as cited in Wells, 1999, p. 313).
empowered when they are apprenticed by their teachers into secondary Discourses and also when schools acknowledge, value, and learn about the Discourses that students embody from their varied culturally and linguistic backgrounds.

Street (1995, 2001) posits that foundational to teaching that empowers is an understanding on the teachers’ part that students bring with them to the learning desk, table, or mat embodied primary Discourses or literacy practices into which they have been socialized at home. As well, Street (2001) suggests that a key element of empowering teaching is openness on the teachers’ part to listen to the students: these teachers “listen, not just deliver” (p. 14). This small phrase “to listen” holds insight in view of Cummins’ (1996, 2000) discussion on the three pedagogical orientations. Within transmission pedagogy, students are considered “empty vessels” to be filled with knowledge by their teachers. It does not follow, thus, that listening would likely comprise an element of this pedagogical stance: after all, only those with an openness to learn, who can see their own fallibility of knowledge (not see themselves as ‘experts’), are open to listening, a stance, then, that may be more suggestive of transformative pedagogy.

Additionally, Street (2001) suggests that teachers need to “respond to local articulations of ‘need’ as well as to make their own ‘outsider’ judgments of it” (p. 14). Teaching that empowers necessitates a response to students’ ideas about their literacy needs: Street insinuates that this is not a passive listening to on the part of the teachers, but an active response. In other words, he calls teachers to teach to the students’ perceived literacy needs. And yet, he also calls teachers to find a balance between teaching to and analyzing the students’ perceptions of these literacy needs. But what are students’ perceptions of their own local literacy needs? How would this apply differently
to students in various schools or learning contexts? These fascinating questions call for further research.

Street (1995) argues that teachers must guide their students toward awareness "of the ways in which literacy practices are sites of ideological contest" (p. 137) and "make explicit from the outset both the assumptions and the power relations on which these models of literacy are based" (p. 141). This involves teaching students "critical interpretation" which "teachers have a social obligation to do" (p. 141). However, this approach is not feasible unless "skilled teachers can facilitate critical perspectives in appropriate language and communicative forms as readily as traditionalists can impart genres, levels, contents and skills within a conservative view of literacy" (p. 141).

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have analyzed the major theoretical constructs of the three theorists, Cummins' (1996, 2000), Gee (1991, 1996, 2002a, 2002b, 2004, 2005) and Street (1995, 2000, 2001, 2003) that relate most to my inquiry into EAL teachers' thinking around literacy, literacy teaching, their students' literacy needs, and the teachers' role in addressing these needs. As well, I have integrated the ways in which the three theorists address the themes of power; validation and inclusion of students' linguistic & cultural backgrounds; ideology; and teaching that empowers into a united framework. From this third chapter, a list of categories which I have entitled "Categories Around Empowering Literacy Practices & Pedagogy" (CAELPP) has emerged. This organizational tool, located at the end of Chapter Three, will guide the secondary analysis (Chapter Four) of the research around EAL teachers' ideology and practice around literacy.
Ideology: A Conceptual Analysis

Until this point I have been working with the rather simple definition of ideology delineated in the Definition of Terms section. However, for the purpose of the conceptual analysis, Darder et al.'s (2003) definition may be overly simplistic. Therefore, I want to briefly outline here my use of the concept of ideology.

Unfortunately, the research (Blommaert, 2005; Cormack, 1992; Eagleton, 1991; Lye, 1997; Pratte, 1977) displays considerable opposition and inconsistency regarding the definition and use of the term. Although some researchers (Cormack, 1992) unite the various definitions by linking their commonalities, I am uneasy with this approach because it ignores their vast metaphysical, epistemological, and axiological differences. Rather than analyzing here each definition of ideology that I have encountered, I take up Eagleton’s (1991) advice and seek to locate the valuable elements and to reject those elements that are invaluable or conceptually flawed for my inquiry into the ideologies of teachers of EAL around empowering literacy practices.

Frequently, in research, the term “ideology” seems to be equated with the general concepts of “philosophy” or “belief.” But Pratte (1977) suggests that ideology “is a form of thought with a special, intimate relationship to social, political, or economic action” (p. 16). Pratte connects thought with action. In fact, this is what distinguishes ideology from beliefs: “belief systems alone do not account for ideology, for beliefs systems must be transformed into significance and made a social force to be reckoned with” (p. 37; emphasis added). Belief systems become ideologies when they lead to action.

Blommaert (2005) outlines the two main ways in which authors approach ideology: as a particular concept and as a total concept (p. 158). Within the former,
ideology refers to “a specific set of symbolic representations – discourses, terms, arguments, images, stereotypes – serving a specific purpose, and operated by specific groups or actors, recognisable precisely by their usage of such ideologies” (p. 158). Examples include the easily recognized “isms” (p. 158), from socialism to Marxism to “particular positions within a political system” such as “conservative”, “racism” (p. 159).

The total concept of ideology, Blommaert (2005) notes, is “a general phenomenon characterising the totality of a particular social or political system, and operated by every member or actor in that system” (p. 158). Herein, ideology “penetrates the whole fabric of societies or communities and results in normalised, naturalised patterns of thought and behaviour” (p. 159). This concept of ideology is extremely interesting in light of Street’s (1995) notions around the pedagogization of literacy in society which he and J. Street claim is not limited to schools but filters throughout society and becomes the normal, natural, and uncontested way of thinking about literacy.

Of the six definitions of ideology that Eagleton (1991) analyzes, the entirety of which I do not examine here, Eagleton’s fifth definition seems closest to Cummins’ (1996, 2000) notion that the dominant group seeks to retain by whatever means necessary “the maximum control with the minimum of conflict” (Lye, 1997, ¶ 1). Herein, “ideology signifies ideas and beliefs which help to legitimate the interests of a ruling group or class specifically by distortion and dissimulation” (Eagleton, 1991, p. 30). In that this definition restricts ideology to the dominant class, it calls into question the staying power of teachers’ ideologies, depending on whether teachers are considered part of the dominant class in society. If I adopt Althusser’s (1971) idea of ideology that schools and other institutions are “ideological state apparatuses” through which “ideological
dominance is maintained" (as cited in Cormack, 1992, p. 11), then, on the one hand, teachers can be considered to have an ideology but only that of the dominant class, ideology "as an unconscious stabilizer and justifier of the status quo" (p. 16). I find this proposition critically unstable for two reasons. First, as other researchers (Cormack, 1992; Eagleton, 1991) have pointed out, to Althusser (1971), ideology is limited strictly to a "dominant formation" (as cited in Eagleton, 1991, p. 18). As I argued above, it is a restrictive view to think that ideology is held only by those with a particular position of power in the political system.

Secondly, I agree with those criticisms that have been launched by various researchers throughout history at Althusser's (1971) view of ideology "as a massively determining force against which individuals have little power to react" (Cormack, 1992, p. 12). I cannot align myself with a view of schools as overly deterministic forces, especially considering that the very basis of my inquiry rests on my belief that teachers' action-oriented beliefs around teaching practices in general and literacy teaching in particular operate along a continuum of empowerment/of disabling to immigrant students and that these beliefs that work to challenge or sustain the status quo of marginalizing immigrants and other subordinated groups.

That said, the element of "distortion and dissimulation" in Eagleton's (1991) fifth definition is conducive to my inquiry because it provides a beginning framework for looking at the clandestine ways in which the ideology of the dominant class operates within schools to promote the interests of certain students, such as those from dominant, White middle-class families, while it simultaneously marginalizes the interests of others, such as immigrant and minority students. I am not in a position to argue with certainty
that every argument and decision made by those in power in society is inculcated with falsification and underlying, faulty ulterior motives; however, neither would I argue that this is uncommon or infrequent. Therefore, while teachers, because of their important position as educators of future generations, could be considered to be at least materially although not necessarily ideologically a part of the dominant class in society, there is also a sense of tension between teachers' resistance to a dominant status quo ideology and also a sense that the very uncontested, and presented as seemingly "natural" practices of marginalization that occur in public secondary schools suggest a dominant class ideology that is maintained through pretense, if not veiled falsification.

With the immense drone of confusion that exists around the concept of "ideology" in the literature (Blommaert, 2005; Cormack, 1992; Eagleton, 1991; Lye, 1997; Pratte, 1977), I cannot claim to draw this section to a completely resolvable conclusion. However, I wish to succinctly reiterate those points which I have extracted from the various notions around ideology which are conducive to a workable conceptualization of ideology which I can then use to apply to the secondary analysis. For brevity's sake, I will list these points.

- **Ideology** refers to a body of thoughts that relate intimately with social, political, or economic action.

- **Ideology** is a belief system *in flight*, that is, in action.

- The dominant group in society seeks to retain their power and often uses distortion and dissimulation to do so; however, this does not imply that everything handed down from the dominant group is necessarily "ideological." Although teachers may be considered members of the dominant group because of their material position (a
contestable argument, I realize), this material membership does not necessarily imply ideological conformity with the dominant class. In this I thoroughly reject Althusser’s (1971) view of ideology of schools as overly deterministic forces (as cited in Cormack, 1992, p. 11-12).

- From the *total* concept, there is a pervasive element about ideology: it “penetrates the whole fabric of societies or communities and results in normalized, naturalized patterns of thought and behavior” (Blommaert, 2005, p. 159).

- Ideologies can be linked in part to the material structure of society as a whole, but this does not account for the whole picture. That is, whether or not people are born into particular material structures (i.e., classes), people are able to resist dominant ideologies.

I acknowledge that the initial conceptual analysis of ideology that I have presented here is a mere dewdrop in a potential ocean of arguments that could be presented on the topic of ideology. However, I have endeavored to make explicit my use of the term. I turn next to a brief conceptual analysis of the concept of literacy.

**Literacy: A Conceptual Analysis**

Understanding the concept of literacy is complicated by the fact that the two main approaches to literacy, *cognitive science* and *sociocultural*, are often “couched in a binary or exclusionary rhetoric” (Stone, 2004, p. 3). Underlying these two perspectives is a set of assumptions that address these questions: “What is language and how is it learned?” (p. 10), “What is literacy and how is it mastered?” (p. 13) and “How do we conceptualize variation in language and literacy skills?” (p. 14) I address the first two questions below.

The cognitive approach, seemingly aligned with Street’s (1995, 2001)
autonomous model of literacy, typically refers to reading and writing which are seen as “relatively decontextualized skill systems” (Stone, 2004, p. 13). Since they are not context dependent, these skills, learned “in a fixed, arguably universal sequence” (Ehri, 1994, in Stone, 2004, p. 13), are transferable to other settings once they are mastered.

Conversely, the sociocultural perspective emphasizes the use of language in authentic, real-life situations (Stone, 2004). Literacy within the sociocultural perspective is context-dependent since “specific literacy practice is grounded in sociocultural experiences and is bound to such experiences (Scriber & Cole, 1994, as cited in Stone, 2004, p. 13).

The two approaches also differ in their stances on the relationship between oral and written discourse (Stone, 2004). The idea in the cognitive science perspective is that once a child has “cracked the code” of oral language, this knowledge can be applied to the creation of writing systems (p. 13). But in the sociocultural perspective oral language and literacy represent distinct sets of cultural practices or patterns of use. Thus, it is only in specific cultural contexts that foster a close convergence of practices (e.g., Western formal schooling) that there would be a close wedding of the two domains. (p. 13; emphasis added)

The first half of Stone’s definition, that literacy represents sets of cultural practices or patterns of use, is similar to Street’s (1995) definition of literacy practices. And yet, Stone (2004) uses the terms oral language and literacy as if the latter does not encompass the former. In so doing, he seems to suggest that literacy encompasses reading and writing but not speaking practices. I agree with Garton and Pratt (1998) who do not exclude oral language from “literacy.” Although oral language and written language have different “grammars” (Gee, 2004, p. 25) or “registers” (Gee, 2002b, p. 91), I argue that
speaking cannot be cut out of the definition of literacy since speaking is undeniably part of cultural practices and patterns of use. However, this opens up another issue: what are the boundaries of literacy? I undertake this argument in more detail below.

In addition to their stance on the relationship between oral and written language, the two approaches also differ in terms of how they view literacy as singular or plural. Literacy in the cognitive science approach is considered a single entity - a repertoire of skills, but in the sociocultural perspective, "the existence of multiple cultural practices within a given society implies the existence of multiple literacies (i.e., Gee, 1992; Heath, 1983; Scribner & Cole, 1994; as cited in Stone, 2004, p. 14). Theorists of a sociocultural approach to literacy, then, are much more likely to talk of literacies rather than literac"y".

Here I want to address the limits of literacy. Although the idea of literacy as all cultural patterns of encoding meaning holds a certain appeal, I am wary of this definition because it places no limits around literacy. Indeed, it seems that some researchers think of literacy as boundary-less. For instance, in his examples of 'text', Mahiri (2004) includes stories, poems, essays, speeches, films, cartoons (Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium of the Council of Chief State School Officers definition, as cited in Mahiri, 2004, p. 7) as well as "lived experiences like a day in the park" or "an observation about some social situation" (INTASC, as cited in Mahiri, 2004, p. 7). The ability to analyze literacy events lies in researchers' ability to be able to distinguish that a certain practice counts as literacy and that another does not. Without any limits to literacy, the word "literacy" loses its analytical value. Therefore, I cannot reconcile myself to Mahiri's (2004) suggestion that a day in the park or an observation (that remains in the mind, rather than becoming part of a discussion with a friend or the topic
of a written text) about a social situation counts as literacy.

Influenced by broadening notions of literacy in related fields, such as New Visual Literacy (Street, 2005), ongoing changes to New Literacy Studies (NLS) researchers’ original conceptualization of literacy as *multiple literacies* seem to have taken place. From the work of the New London Group (1996), the term *multi-literacies* has emerged which differs from the original NLS (Street, 2000) notion of *multiple literacies*. *Multi-literacies* refers to “multiple forms of literacy associated with channels or modes, such as computer literacy, [and] visual literacy” (Street, 1995, p. 19). Although Street’s (2005) stance on multi-literacies seems to have softened, he (2000) previously argued that, although the notion of multiple literacies is the means of challenging the autonomous model of literacy with its reified notion of literacy as singular, the construct is also “problematic” because “the further these usages get away from the social practices of reading and writing, the more evident it is that the term ‘literacy’ is being used in a narrow, moral, and functional sense to mean cultural competence or skills” (p. 135).

This further usage of literacy that Street (2000) describes is exactly what seems to have happened to this concept. Current terms not only include computer literacy and visual literacy but “‘information literacy’, ‘media literacy’, ‘science literacy’ and even ‘emotional literacy’” (Lankshear & Knobel, 2003, p. 15). In some fields, literacy is considered the ability “to find one’s way around some kind of system, and to ‘know its language’ well enough to be able to make sense of it” (p. 15). Clearly some immense changes have taken place around the conceptualization of literacy. As aforementioned, Street’s (2005) latest work suggests adjustments within his original notions of literacy. He asserts that many authors of the studies in his book share the notion that literacy
practice should not be perceived and treated as if it is distinct from other communicative practices, such as visual communication and performance (p. 12; emphasis added).

I recognize that "cultural and linguistic diversity and the burgeoning impact of new communications technologies are changing the demands on learners in terms of what we have identified here as the operational and cultural dimensions of literacies" (Lankshear & Knobel, 2003, p. 11). And yet, although my conceptualization of literacy has become more inclusive (i.e., considering visual, computer, and media literacy as literacy), I find it challenging to deal theoretically and practically with an ever-expanding notion of literacy that seems to have no limits.

Despite this challenge, I realize that, arguably, teaching in the EAL classroom can be more inclusive when the teacher's boundaries of literacy are more comprehensive. Teachers who are willing to challenge traditional definitions of literacy will likely be able to empower EAL students further than those whose conceptualization of literacy is limited to reading, writing, and speaking because the former teachers will be able to see and draw into the classroom literacies from students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds that push the boundaries of traditional literacy. For example, teachers who recognize the "para-phrasing" literacy (Orellana, Reynolds, Dorner, & Meza, 2003) of pre-adolescent students who assist family members in their homes and communities with the demands of a new language are more likely to try to draw on this literacy practice in their classroom, to engage the student motivationally, to validate students' out-of-school identities in school, and to develop further the students' literacies in other areas. Nonetheless, I think that teachers would be amiss if we did not recognize that in society, certain literacies are favored over others, that "once children enter school, there is a privileging of the written
over other modes” (Pahl & Roswell, 2005, p. 32).

Clearly, a complex, multifaceted tension exists here. In the first layer of complexity, by recognizing society’s privileging of the written mode over others, teachers can begin to move toward creating spaces for inclusion in the classroom literacies that may formerly have been unrecognized. And yet, within the second layer, EAL students can also be marginalized when their teachers focus *predominantly* on the literacies that students’ bring from home, when they “romanticiz[e] such local practice against that of the dominant culture” (Street, 2003, p. xii) where the written mode is expected of students in the larger society. Thus, there is also the need for teachers to engage students in this written mode. However, the third side of this complex issue is that since it is this written mode that stratifies and marginalizes, this apprenticeship into the written mode must not happen uncritically through indoctrination but critically through a spirit of inquiry. As the second study (Davis, et al., 2005) of the secondary analysis reveals, EAL students can engage in academic discourses, such as the written mode in discursive ways. Additionally, as Pennycook (1995) suggests, teachers can engage students in “counter-discourses in English [that] may offer remarkable potential for change” (p. 50).

The complexity of the above issue is heightened further by the fact that even this privileging of the written mode is ever evolving. As Pahl and Roswell (2005) write,

We cannot afford to ignore the communicational landscape out students find themselves in. If we harness it, and tie it to literacy learning, its potential is huge. However, we might not see how the visual adds to literacy, it is already embedded within literacy, within the landscape of communication our students engage in. It
is our challenge to capture its flows and ebbs, and to develop a dialogue with our students, across the flow of web pages, instant messaging, texting, emailing and the graphic novels and comic books of our students, we will develop a literacy curricula that matches and recognizes our changing world. (p. 47)

As teachers who are committed to empowering literacy practices struggle to negotiate the tensions between theoretical notions of literacy that challenge currently held conceptualizations of literacy and the ever changing boundaries of literacy, the words of Pahl and Roswell (2005) may provide both comfort and a challenge.

**Application of Categories around Empowering Literacy Practices & Pedagogy (CAELPP) to the Secondary Analysis**

From the concepts that emerged from the conceptual analysis of the literature, specifically those from the conceptual triad of the work of Cummins (1996, 2000), Gee (1991, 1996, 2002a, 2004) and Street (1995, 2000, 2001, 2003), I have developed an organizational tool (below) which I have entitled "Categories Around Empowering Literacy Practices & Pedagogy" (CAELPP). Using this tool as a lens, I conduct a secondary analysis of the reports from three existing qualitative studies that highlight teachers of English as an Additional Language and the impact of their ideologies in ways that empower/disable their EAL students. This secondary analysis is presented in the following chapter.

**Categories Around Empowering Literacy Practices & Pedagogy (CAELPP)**

*Power and Ideology:*

1. Coercive to collaborative relations of power continuum in the classroom.
   Images reflected
   - in the teacher’s *identity as a teacher* – Hall of Mirrors (distorted, authentic)
   - in the *identity options this teacher highlights for students* – a door (closed and bolted shut, opened wide)
in the kind of society the teacher hopes/believes the students will help to create – a hammer and a cloth

2. The teacher’s conceptualization of literacy (seen in words and practices around literacy): autonomous/ideological literacy (or as a mixture)? Literacy“y” or literacies?

3. Origin of teacher’s conceptualizations of literacy

4. Evidence of adoption/resistance to literacy models

5. Teacher open to critiquing his/her implication in “the politics of schooling” (Mogadime, 2003)

Validation of students’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds:

6. Teacher’s awareness/unawareness of students’ embodied Discourses/literacy practices

7. Does the teacher weave students’ linguistic and cultural background (primary Discourses) into the fabric of the classroom?

8. Reconciling identity/personhood issues that come from learning secondary Discourses which (are likely to) conflict with primary Discourses

9. Does the teacher offer any practicalities on how go about teaching criticality simultaneously with teaching beginning levels of an additional language?

Teaching that Empowers

10. Building on what students bring to class

11. Teacher listens and responds to students’ perceptions of their literacy needs. Are there any complexities involved in this issue?

12. Negotiating dominant literacies - how are they presented? As discrete items (spelling, grammar and phonology of) that if mastered, lead in a direct fashion to social power (money, mobility, etc.)? What are complexities around this issue?

13. Balance - teaching to local needs and central (dominant literacies) needs

14. Pedagogy that challenges the ‘autonomous’ model of literacy

15. Does the teacher guide students toward awareness “of the ways in which literacy practices are sites of ideological contest” (Street, 1995, p. 137)? Do the teachers guide students into “critical interpretation” (Street, 1995, p. 137)?

16. If there is not teaching of criticality happening, is there any evidence of the complexities/obstructions that hinder this kind of teaching that empowers?
CHAPTER FOUR: THE SECONDARY ANALYSIS

In order to correspond to my inquiry into the ideology in relation to the teaching of literacy by secondary school teachers of English as an Additional Language (EAL), I decided that studies for the secondary line of analysis needed to satisfy four conditions:

a) To have taken place within the secondary (middle and high school) level
b) To have taken place in a classroom where literacy is taught
c) To have taken place in a classroom where literacy is taught to students of English as an Additional Language.
d) To have taken place in a classroom where literacy is taught to students of English as an Additional Language and the EAL teacher is, if not the focal participant of the study, highlighted among the participants.

I conducted extended searches in ERIC, Language and Language Behavior Abstracts (LLBA), Sociological Abstracts, and Sociology: A SAGE Full-Text Collection under various terms including literacy, literacy education, literacies, multiple literacies, multiliteracies, computer literacy, media literacy, language minorities, second language learning, ESL, English as a second language, secondary education, secondary school, and high school. Although I found studies that correspond to one or even two of these conditions, studies that met all four of the above conditions were difficult to locate.

From the pool of empirical studies that address one or more of the criteria listed above, I found three studies (Blake, 2004; Davis et al., 2005; McKay & Wong, 1996) which satisfy the four conditions specified above. Following the same guideline in

---

7 For example, the following studies that I researched and examined, while noteworthy, satisfy only two or three of the aforementioned criteria: Cruickshank, 2004; Lam, 2004; Morrell & Duncan-Andrade, 2004; Rubinstein-Avila, 2004.
conceptually analyzing each study, I provide necessary background information of the study, such as demographics and research methods used; I analyze the study using the *Categories Around Empowering Literacy Practices & Pedagogy* (CAELPP); and I address limitations/benefits of the study. After analysis of the three studies, I summarize the major findings.

**The Secondary Analysis**

The first study, "Teacher Literacies: Colleen's Migrant Labor Camp Classroom" (Blake, 2004), highlights Colleen who teaches adolescent and adult immigrants in the kitchen of a migrant labor camp in New York State (p. 94). In addition to teaching, Colleen was also enrolled in Brett Blake’s graduate ESL methods course.

During one of the classes, Professor Blake suggested that the class members begin to have their students journal, a suggestion which became the catalyst for a major transformation in Colleen’s teaching. Initially, Colleen balked at Blake’s suggestion because she felt that the migrant worker students were interested only in learning oral English. In situating her students’ language learning needs and interests in the oral realm alone, Colleen’s resistance to Blake’s suggestion suggests a narrow interpretation on Colleen’s part of her students’ literacy needs.

Although skeptical of journaling, Colleen decided to try it with her students. Reading the students’ journal entries for the first time proves to be a revolutionary experience for Colleen. She writes, “Wow, I thought. Dreams. He’s got dreams. And I hadn’t ever asked about them. This teacher (me) needed to change her approaches in the classroom, and her ideas about her students” (p. 96). Colleen realized that some of her ideas surrounding her students’ literacy needs may be inapt, and she was open to change
her ideology and her pedagogical orientation to meet their needs. Up to that point, Colleen had generally been relying on workbooks that had been supplied to her by the adult education program for her curriculum, but after reading her students' initial journal entries, she realized that “reading, writing, listening, and speaking in our classroom needed to have meaning and value in their lives, instead of focusing on my conception of what they needed to learn” (p. 97; emphasis added). Below I examine the implications of Colleen’s changing ideology of literacy on the micro-interactions between her and her students.

Each pedagogical orientation consists of a set of instructional and social assumptions which promote different student outcomes (Cummins 1996, 2000; see Appendix B). That Colleen’s (Blake, 2004) pedagogy at the beginning of the study consisted mostly of workbook ‘work’ hints at an instructional assumption and belief of literacy and learning as discrete and decontextualized skills to be mastered. I use the word “hints at” because it is very easy for an outside researcher (like myself) to correlate Colleen’s reliance on workbooks to a traditional belief of literacy as discrete, without considering the complexities and limitations of Colleen’s teaching environment (i.e., her “abysmally low” (p. 102) salary which implies a correlated lack of financial resources for curricular materials; her kitchen classroom with its constricted quarters and use as a common room for preparing/cooking food as well as an EAL classroom, etc.).

That said, Colleen (Blake, 2004) seems open to critiquing her part in “the politics of schooling” (Mogadime, 2003), how her ideology around literacy and teaching and learning marginalizes her students. After reading the journals, Colleen began to re-think her social assumptions, “the ways in which relations of culture and power are addressed
in the curriculum" (Cummins, 1996, p. 153). In hindsight reflection, Colleen notes that, in having her students journal, the students were being asked to express their dreams and aspirations, perhaps for the first time. She seems to connect this ignoring of the immigrant students' voices to the larger society's failure to invite them: for example, she explains that the majority of her neighbors would not even know that "a migrant camp is hidden in the woods only two miles from our middle-class-Main Street- neat row of homes" and that she "wasn't much more aware" (p. 95). Colleen realizes that in not knowing her students, the micro-interactions of her classroom reflect the macro-interactions of her neighbors in the larger society not knowing or caring about the migrant workers in society. In response to this realization, Colleen seeks to get to know her students through their journaling.

A change in Colleen's ideology of literacy and literacy teaching and the effects of this change on her pedagogy are evident here: initially, her predominant reliance on workbooks, a literacy-as-decontextualized-skills, teacher-centered, approach, was suggestive of coercive relations of power where students are treated as passive recipients of knowledge and the "teaching/learning process is [treated as] neutral with respect to social realities and intergroup power relations" (Cummins, 2000, p. 254). As Colleen (Blake, 2004) strove to get to know her students better and to give space for her students' voices to be highlighted in the classroom interactions, she and her students began to engage in collaborative relations of power where the students used language in meaningful literacy practices (journaling) to generate knowledge and where they "participate[d] confidently in instruction as a result of the fact that their sense of identity [was] being affirmed and extended in their interactions with educators" (Cummins, 2000,
In these ways, Colleen's pedagogy began to reflect in greater measure empowering literacy teaching.

At seeing how her students "had begun to open up, to let down those walls" (Blake, 2004, p. 98) through journaling, Colleen sought to apply to the regular classroom in the fall what she has learned with the students at the migrant labor camp. This former breakthrough was immediately put to the test when Esther, an immigrant from Africa, joined the EAL class which was comprised mostly of Mexican students. Esther had already faced many hardships in her young life, including being in and out of refugee camps and struggling (and sometimes failing) to pass ESL classes in Philadelphia, her former home.

Despite Colleen's previous success in connecting with the migrant worker students, Colleen did not seem to know how to interact with her new student. In her anger, Esther often made sharp, cutting statements about her hatred of the class, the other students, and the school. Hurt by these comments, Colleen realized that she "had allowed to happen [to Esther] the same thing that happened to migrant kids all the time. Feeling like an outsider: the other. Out of place. Apart" (Blake, 2004, p. 99). Again, Colleen considered how she was implicated in the politics of schooling (Mogadime, 2003), how she was perpetuating coercive relations of power in her classroom. Engaging in a reflective interrogation of the personal, Colleen acknowledged her responsibility in the relationship with this student: Colleen recognized that her angry, distanced responses to Esther had pushed the girl to the periphery of the classroom. Again, as Colleen's ideology began to change, this shift affected the micro-interactions of the EAL classroom.

Colleen began to look for inroads into the girl's life and found one in Esther's
journal entries: observing comments in the entries that reflected a faith discourse, Colleen asked Esther if she could attend a Sunday morning church service with the student and her family. Esther agreed. This experience, says Colleen, “was a turning point in our student-teacher relationship” (Blake, 2004, p. 99). When Colleen began to see who Esther really was behind her anger and hurt,

Esther let her own guard down. She shared herself in her writing, and through her love of music and poetry. She cheered on the most timid and reluctant students to participate and share, and became a well-loved member of the class. I believe that this happened because I finally stopped to listen to her voice—what was important to her. (p. 100)

As Colleen began to get to know Esther better through the student’s journal, the teacher realized that “pedagogy was not enough” (Stein & Mamabolo, 2005, p. 34). Similar to early literacy educator Mamabolo in South Africa who became a “literacy activist” (p. 37) who “felt she had to ‘look deeper into the social situations of the children, their home contexts and living conditions’” (p. 34), by inviting herself into Esther’s world beyond the pedagogical realm, the teacher (Blake, 2004) opened herself up to see Esther anew.

Before addressing the benefits of this study, I want to briefly touch on three of its limitations: The principal weakness is that readers are provided with a mere glimpse of Colleen’s pedagogy: only journaling is discussed. In what other literacy practices did her students engage? Were these practices as reflective of empowering literacy practices as the journaling? Second, conducting something even remotely close to a comprehensive analysis of Colleen’s ideology of literacy is impossible because of the limited scope of the study, although the study does provide a glimpse of this ideology. Third, although
Blake (2004) reveals that Colleen validated her student’s local literacies (p. 102) by drawing on their backgrounds through journaling activities, the article does not mention whether and how Colleen took up dominant literacies with her students and “the ways in which literacy practices are sites of ideological contest” (Street, 1995, p. 137). I suggest this with caution as it may not be reflective of her teaching but of the data chosen by Blake.

This venerable core of this study is Colleen’s (Blake, 2004) willingness to interrogate the personal not only in terms of recognizing the inequities of power in society against immigrant students (“These students’ very physical existence is hidden away from the ‘mainstream’” p. 101), but also a willingness to begin to consider to what degree she was involved in assisting in or resisting against this marginalization of immigrant students and their families. I emphasize the phrase “to begin to” as I suggest in the summary below that Colleen could have taken this reflection further (see p. 115).

Through Colleen’s introspective reflection, she realized that she needed to know her students; thus, as she got to know them through their journals, she drew into the classroom elements from students’ primary Discourse. Increasingly, the micro-interactions in the kitchen classroom of the migrant worker camp and in her classroom in the ‘regular’ school, reflected collaborative relations of power between Colleen and her EAL students. As Blake (2004) explains, “By tapping into their local literacies, Colleen worked to help break the students’ culture of refusal that for so long had engulfed their beliefs and even the perceptions of themselves” (p. 102). Colleen learned that her students’ voices, “when finally heard by a willing listener can allow students to envision themselves as persons of value and worth” (p. 101). In these ways, Colleen’s teaching
reflected elements of empowering literacy teaching.

In their study entitled "'Where I'm from': Transforming Education for Language Minorities in a Public High School in Hawaii," Davis et al. (2005) offer many insights into ideologies that affect the teaching of literacy to EAL students in empowering ways. With over 100 languages (U.S. Census, 2000, as cited in Davis et al., 2005, p. 192), Hawaii is home to a linguistically and culturally diverse population. The student body of the site of this research project, the largest secondary school in the state, mirrors the diverse composite of the larger society: in 2000-2001, the student body was comprised of 58.4% Filipinos and 13.3% Samoans (p. 194) and many students who were "economically disadvantaged" (p. 194). Here, Davis et al. report on their critical academic literacy project, part of a larger program called SHALL (Studies of Heritage and Academic Language and Literacies) "designed to promote school success" (p. 191).

One note here is necessary: due to the small number of studies that fit the criteria needed for my inquiry (see p. 89), I have included this study in my secondary analysis even though it does not explicitly highlight the ideologies of the high school teachers who teach the SHALL classes. I have done so primarily due to the outstanding nature of the study. As well, considering that the SHALL courses were integrated into the already existing program of the school, I argue that it is highly unlikely that teachers with ideologies noticeably at odds with those of the researchers would have chosen to teach these courses. A significant degree of overlap might have existed between the ideologies of the researchers and the teachers. To avoid presumption, however, I refer mostly to the ideologies of the researchers unless the data clearly points to the teachers.

The three goals of the SHALL project were as follows: to provide heritage
language courses for Filipinos and Samoans that “allow student exploration of multiple language and cultural identities while promoting linguistic proficiency” (Davis, Bazzi, & Cho, 2005, p. 196); second, to offer academic English courses “to help students develop an improved understanding of the social and educational expectations of teachers within classrooms and across disciplines” (p. 196); and third, in both the heritage and English language courses, to provide students with ‘third spaces’ in which to negotiate or resist the hidden meanings of dominant discursive practices and knowledge frameworks (p. 196).

At the outset of the chapter, the researchers depict their alignment with an ideological model of literacy (Street, 1995, 2001). They challenge the literacy model underlying the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 with its “idealized direct instruction approach” which the researchers argue decontextualizes literacy learning. Like Street (2005) in whose edited book this study is published, Davis et al. (2005) subscribe to the notion of literacy as social practice, a tenet foundational to the ideological model of literacy. However, Davis et al. do not claim that implementation of pedagogical interventions that are aligned with an ideological model of literacy happens unproblematically; often, they claim, teachers are constrained from being able to freely engage students in literacy-as-practice by structural forces (i.e., the historical exclusion of students’ primary Discourses in schools; standardized testing which has not gone well so far in Hawaii\(^8\); and low expectations held by teachers and administrators of students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, which often result in “busy work in the form of

\(^8\) In 46 schools, “the state is considering federally recommended ‘major changes’ that could include replacement of all or most of the staff, conversion to a charter school, and assigning school operations to a state or private organization” (Hiller and Dayton, 2003, p. 192 in Davis et al.).
worksheets”) (Kadooka, 2002, as cited in Davis et al, 2005, p. 193).

Yet, in the face of these structural forces, Davis et al. (2005) contest the cultural-neutral tenet of the autonomous model of literacy by connecting literacy and learning with the learner’s identity. Students were given opportunities to explore the intersecting points between language, literacy and their own “cultural identities” (p. 197). Such opportunities included discussions and assignments around investigations of the origins of Pidgin; syntactic and lexical explorations of Pidgin, and “literature analyses” in which the students considered Pidgin’s “social purpose (e.g., political statement, entertainment)” (p. 199). Subsequently, students began to take on new identities. A SHALL teacher explains:

Up until today I would have characterized Bruce as a reluctant reader. But now, Bruce thumbs through the Pidgin short story book Da Word by Lee Tonouchi, the proclaimed ‘Pidgin Guerilla.’ I am so pleased I try to ignore him sneakily reading it under the table after reading time. At the end of the class, eyes wide open, he proclaims, ‘Miss, I can read this. It’s in my language!’ (p. 199-200)

I argued in the conceptual framework that, of the three images that are reflected in teacher-student interactions (Cummins, 1996, 2000), the second image is aligned with teachers’ perceptions of their students. I see a door as a fitting metaphor for this image. Students’ identities are reaffirmed and doors to additional and new identities are opened when teachers act in ways that reveal the potential they see and the trust that they have in students’ abilities. When Bruce, in the above example, read a book in his own dialect, this fascinating experience (evidenced by him sneaking it under the table), led him to take up a new identity. Perhaps for the first time, this student identified himself as a reader, an
[The content of the page is not legible due to the image quality.]

identity which, like an open door, can hold hope and promise.

In addition to celebrating the new identities that the EAL students are negotiating, these researchers (2005), in keeping with the ideological model of literacy, are aware of the issue of power in schools, that some Discourses are favored over others (Gee, 2002b, 2004). Many of students’ “multiple discourses” (p. 198) have been “silenced” from the classroom by the dominant discourse of the school and society. This silencing “may exclude students weak in the dominant discourse or [may exclude students] who feel participation in that discourse is threatening to their identity” (Willett, Solsken & Wilson-Keenan, 1999; Burke & Hermerschmidt, 2005, as cited in Davis et al., 2005, p. 198).

Two key insights emerge from an analysis of the previous statement around silence.

First, silence is enforced by teachers when the voices of immigrant, minority, and economically disadvantaged students are excluded from the classroom by virtue of the class’ workings in the dominant language. Again, I am reminded of the silence of “Lucia” (see p. 9). As a tenth grade student from Olsen’s (1995) study fittingly explains, “If I talk Dari ever, they make fun of me. But they make fun even when I talk English. I learn to shut up” (Olsen, 1995, as cited in Olsen, 2000, p. 198). How harshly ironic that when students who are supposed to be apprenticed into the secondary discourse of English come in as authentic beginners (Gee, 2004) who are weak in this discourse, they are further marginalized from acquiring it when they are excluded from class and academic participation by virtue of the dominant discourse through which the school operates.

Davis et al. (2005) also write that “silencing can create a language mismatch, which may … [exclude students] who feel participation in that discourse is threatening to their identity” (p. 198). In other words, silence can be a powerful tool used by students
as a means of resistance to the dominant discourse that threatens their identity. Although this resistance may serve as a legitimate means of emotional defense against the identity crisis that students sometimes face when learning secondary Discourse(s) (Gee, 1996), this resistance can also lead to a rejection of dominant discourses which presents the potential for “marginalization from the mainstream” (Fecho, 1998, p. 94). This presents a thorny and complex issue. I do not wish to make an unproblematic cause-and-effect association between “master[ing] dominant forms of cultural practice” and “access to and mobility across mainstream and political and economic institutions” (Luke, 2003, p. 133).

And yet, I cannot believe the fact that literacy practices hold political, social, cultural, and personal implications into people’s lives. I return to the issue of silence below.

The SHALL teachers engaged in the first part of Gee’s (1996) twofold suggestion for empowering immigrant and minority students when they took up and valued in the classroom Discourses beyond those of the dominant mainstream. They “engage[ed] with the full array of Discourses in which the school and all its members swim in terms which their members can first recognize as theirs and then reflect on and ‘make strange’ (Gee 1993c) for themselves” (Gee, 1996, p. 166).

And yet, the students were also guided beyond their primary Discourses to academic discourses. Herein, stemming from their ideological beliefs of the relationship of literacy and power, the teachers took up the second part of Gee’s (1996, 2004) suggestion, that students be apprenticed by their teachers into secondary Discourses, into “the Discourse of power” (Delpit, 1998, as cited in Davis et al., 2005, p. 201). Students became “students-as-ethnographers” (p. 202) so that they could use the “metacognitive awareness [they had] developed through community exploration of language use to gain
explicit knowledge of how school tasks are performed” (p. 202). Through “careful analyses of reading material and writing assignments, students began to ‘notice,’ and thus have the capacity to reproduce, teacher expectations for classroom behavior and written work” (p. 202). Through this spirit of inquiry, rather than indoctrination through skills-focused drills, students learned how to engage in academic discourses.

But the SHALL students did not just learn how to mechanically and unthinkingly reproduce their teachers’ expectations around academic (dominant) discourse. The teachers also demonstrated commitment to guiding students toward awareness “of the ways in which literacy practices are sites of ideological contest” (Street, 1995, p. 137). To teach students criticality, the teachers drew on McComiskey’s (2000) three levels of analysis: textual, rhetoric and discursive (as cited in Davis et al., 2005, p. 202). I limit my discussion to the discursive level which reflects the third goal of the SHALL program; “students are provided with ‘third spaces’ in which to negotiate or resist the hidden meanings of dominant discursive practices and knowledge frameworks” (p. 196).

According to McComiskey (2000), as cited in Davis, Bazzi, & Cho (2005), discursive analysis is the least addressed in schools. In this analytical realm, SHALL students learned and practiced how to “critiqu[e] institutional, economic, and cultural factors that shape texts to understand the position of the writer and reader in their micro- and macro-environments” (Davis et al., 2005, p. 205). This pedagogical stance clearly challenges a transmission-orientation: students “were encouraged to not see themselves as passive receptacles of information; instead, they interacted with texts, talking back to them as they developed their own stances and opinions” (p. 205). The act of teaching criticality challenges the autonomous model of literacy because it contests the idea that
literacy is neutral (Street, 2003, p. xiii) and devoid of “particular cultural values that underpi[n] this surface neutrality” (p. xiii).

To Davis et al. (2005), part of teaching criticality meant not only acknowledging the silencing of students’ multiple discourses from the classroom which I have discussed above, but taking concrete action to cultivate a third space (Bhabha 1994), where students’ primary and hybrid language practices were viewed as ‘an inherent feature of negotiation across differences,’ within the academic discourses of the classroom (Low, 2005). This third space provided opportunities for ‘disrupting’ the dominant classroom discourse and creating room for new and more inclusive discourses. (Willet, Solsken, & Wilson-Keenan, 1999, p. 168, Burke and Hermerschmidt, 2005, as cited in Davis et al., 2005, p. 198)

Third spaces were created to elicit in students additive perspectives toward their bilingualism. Students were introduced to pamphlets written in Ilokano and Samoan on the topic of bilingualism: here, some students were able to see for the first time their language in print. Within this and other activities (Davis et al., 2005), the teachers highlighted for the EAL students an image (Cummins, 1996, 2000) of another open door. As they participated in third space activities, “students began to value bilingualism as a resource rather than consider it as a problem for them and their parents to overcome” (Davis et al., 2005, p. 199). Metaphorically speaking, the teachers opened the door for students’ self-validation related to their bilingual ability.

Visible in a plethora of ways, Davis et al. (2005) have conduced and written a report of what seems to have been a tremendous study. And yet, my greatest contention is
that the teachers who were involved in the study are almost completely relegated to the shadows in this publication: the researchers have taken complete "voice." This is particularly disconcerting in light of the researchers' claim to be critical researchers. Without question, the goals of the SHALL program markedly reflect the stance of critical research. But the treatment of teachers here in the publication of the study seems uncharacteristic of critical research which claims a dedication on the researchers' part to seek to understand how the participants in the study "make sense of their own experience" (Peirce, 1995, p. 571). Rendering voiceless the teachers in the study does not seem to correspond with the critical approach to which Davis et al. (2005) ascribe.

Despite this limitation, analysis into the study of Davis et al. (2005) does reveal incredible insights into the ways in which their ideology of literacy and pedagogy informed the pedagogical practice of the SHALL program in ways that reflect empowering literacy practices. Recurring inquiry into this study has revealed many insights related to the questions from the CAELPP. Further publications from this study by Davis et al., especially those that highlight the teachers' ideologies and practice and the ways in which they appropriated the threefold SHALL goals in their individual classrooms, are likely to add beneficial knowledge to the research field.

I draw on McKay and Wong’s (1996) "Multiple Discourses, Multiple Identities: Investment and Agency in Second-Language Learning among Chinese Adolescent Immigrant Students," the third study of my secondary analysis, as a "contrary case" (Wilson, 1963) because it serves as a foil to the teachers' ideologies in the other studies (Blake, 2004; Davis et al., 2005) which reflect varying degrees of empowering literacy teaching. I have chosen to limit my discussion to "Mr. Thomas," one of the four teachers
in the study (McKay and Wong, 1996), who reflects significantly more than the others a definably disempowering ideology of literacy and literacy teaching/learning.

Part of a larger ethnographic research project on the writing development of EAL middle school students (grades 7 and 8) from Spanish and Chinese-speaking backgrounds at Waltonville Junior High, this article (McKay & Wong, 1996) focuses on the students from a Chinese/Taiwanese background and is not limited to an isolated focus on writing. It highlights four case study students whom the researchers “tracked” throughout a two-year period using such research methods as evaluations of students’ reading and writing abilities; observations and interviews.

McKay and Wong’s (1996) theoretical framework reflects their belief that SLA theory has limitedly perceived “the learner’s subjectivity and agency” in terms of the motivation of the learner. Alternatively, McKay and Wong set out to examine and to extend the notion of investment (Peirce, 1995) in the lives of second language learners which posits foremost that “an investment in the target language is also an investment in a learner’s own social identity” (1995, as cited in McKay & Wong, 1996, p. 17-18).

That language learning involves a negotiation of identity by both teacher and student (Cummins, 1996, 2000) is an issue that I addressed in the conceptual framework. Similarly, McKay and Wong take up Peirce’s (1995) suggestion for SLA theory to “develop a concept of the language learner as having a complex social identity that must be understood with reference to large and frequently inequitable social structures which are reproduced in day-to-day social interactions” (1995, p. 13, as cited in McKay & Wong, 1996, p. 579; emphasis added). An obvious correlation appears here between investment, “social structures” (Peirce, 1995) and Cummins’ (1996, 2000) notions of
macro/micro-interactions, that the negotiation of identity in teacher-student micro-interactions is empowering only to the extent that it challenges the macro-interactions in society in which immigrants are treated as subordinates by dominant group(s).

With Peirce's (1995) notion of investment, McKay and Wong (1996) merge five specific Discourses9 which “helped shape the investment each student made toward learning English” (p. 583). Because of the focus of my inquiry on teachers' ideologies around empowering literacy practices, I address colonialist/racialized Discourses and model minority Discourse (see Definition of Terms) since these relate expressly to Mr. Thomas' ideology of literacy, teaching, and learning. The researchers suggest four beliefs that are indicative of the colonialist/racialized Discourse, although further study would undoubtedly reveal additional examples.

- Immigrant students who are not White are more “difficult” than those who “could readily 'pass' into the mainstream” (p. 584).

- Asian students are “better than” Latino students.

- The “master myth” (Gee, 1996, p. 86) held by dominant groups in society that “cognitive maturity, sophistication, degree of Americanization, and general personal worthiness” (McKay & Wong, 1996, p. 584) are highly correlated with English speaking proficiency. In brief, the higher the English speaking proficiency the greater maturity, sophistication, and so on are ascribed to the student.

9 The other three Discourses are school Discourses (social and academic); Chinese cultural nationalist Discourses and gender Discourses. Although McKay and Wong (1996) seem to use the words “discourse” and “Discourse” interchangeably, their descriptions of the Discourses in the teachers and the students' lives seem to resemble Gee's (1996) notion of Discourse with a capital “D” (See Definition of Terms, p. 23).
Conversely, the student with minimal English proficiency is considered cognitively underdeveloped, infantile, etc.

Lastly, "immigrant status and limited English proficiency are considered states of deficiency and backwardness from which students need to be 'saved' as quickly as possible" (p. 584).

Stemming from my focus on the ideologies of literacy held by EAL teachers, next I address the ideological beliefs of one of the four teachers highlighted in this study, Mr. Thomas, a model example of a teacher whose disempowering ideology of literacy informs his teaching practice in ways that are disempowering to his EAL students.

As "an expert practitioner of the audiolingual method with behavioristic assumptions about the language learning-process" (p. 590), Mr. Thomas' pedagogy is exclusively transmission-oriented (Cummins, 1996). Mr. Thomas adhered to "a rigid listen-speak-read-write sequence on his curricular materials and his students" (p. 590); this curriculum was comprised mostly of stimulus-response choral repetition, decontextualized vocabulary development, drill exercises like copying, fill-in-the-blanks, and "controlled compositions based on close modeling" (p. 590).

Mr. Thomas' ideology of literacy seems completely aligned with the autonomous model which is clearly illustrated in his discrete and mechanical approach to teaching literacy. For example, McKay and Wong (1996) found that before Mr. Thomas taught students how to write a paragraph, he would teach them to write in five sentence-lists (p. 596), which suggests his belief of literacy as disparate, decontextualized skills that are acquired "in a fixed, arguably universal sequence" (Ehri, 1994, as cited in Stone, 2004, p. 13). As well, Mr. Thomas' predominant reliance on teacher-centered methods (p. 591)
seems to point to an implicit theory that learning happens primarily in the cognitive domain. Absent from this autonomous idea of literacy is the notion that literacy is learned through *social* interaction and that the meaning implicated to the person(s) engaged in the event (Street, 2001) is actually central to literacy.

Mr. Thomas’ ideology of literacy is clearly harmful to his immigrant students in two key ways. First, within Mr. Thomas’ transmission pedagogical orientation, the teacher is positioned as the knowledge keeper and the students as passive recipients of this knowledge (Cummins, 2000). Because of the idea here that students are inert learners to whom school provides the knowledge they are lacking and *deficient* without, this approach reinforces low expectations of students through the defective notion that students have nothing to contribute to the generation of knowledge. This idea that the students bring nothing with them to the learning process echoes again and again throughout Mr. Thomas’ ideology of literacy and in his literacy teaching practice. For example, Mr. Thomas’ preoccupation with mechanics (McKay & Wong, 1996, p. 591) reinforces my proposal of his low expectations of his students. It does make (twisted) sense, logically, although certainly not ethically, that the attention of a teacher who believed his students had nothing of importance or value to write would be so fixated on the surface features of the students’ written texts that he would fail to regard and validate the meaning therein.

Second, Mr. Thomas’ ideology of literacy which informs his teaching is clearly harmful to his immigrant students’ language needs. As Cummins (1996) argues, this kind of (transmission) pedagogy goes against “central principles of language and literacy acquisition in that it is impossible to learn or develop literacy in the absence of ample
opportunities for meaningful communicative interaction in both oral and written modes” (p. 155). By denying his students’ opportunities to engage in meaningful communicative interaction orally or in writing, Mr. Thomas allowed his class to be dominated by coercive relations of power (Cummins, 2000) where, by maintaining complete control over the discrete, asocial knowledge learned in the classroom and by denying students opportunities to use literacy meaningfully, Mr. Thomas reinforced in the micro-interactions between him and his students’ the disempowering macro-interactions of immigrant communities.

By analyzing Mr. Thomas’ ideological orientation of literacy and literacy teaching and learning in light of Cummins’ (1996, 2000) three images reflected in the micro-interactions of teachers and students, the disempowering nature of Mr. Thomas’ pedagogy becomes glaringly clear. Cummins (2000) claims that “empowerment derives from the process of negotiating identities in the classroom” (p. 48). Considering this statement in light of the identity options that Mr. Thomas’ highlighted for his students, this metaphorical door that is closed and bolted shut reflects the image to students that, in Mr. Thomas’ classrooms, there is no negotiation of identity and, therefore, no empowerment for either the students or the teacher.

As well, Mr. Thomas acted in ways that suggest an implicit belief that identity is not dynamic or multi-faceted but fixed. This non-negotiation of identity, in fact this subordination of the students’ identities (Cummins, 2000, p. 44), is evident in the colonialist/racialized discourses and model minority discourse that he takes up when he outwardly prefers some students over others. Mr. Thomas showed preferential treatment by having an amiable relationship with a White, immigrant student from Eastern Europe
that he did not have with others students. On different occasions, he called this student before Wong with comments, such as “she is our star pupil” (p. 584). Here, Mr. Thomas’ preferential actions may suggest that only certain persons are permitted to pass through the door of acceptance and validation in the larger society, perhaps those with a certain (high) degree of English proficiency and who can thus ‘pass’ as a native speaker, or perhaps even those who can ‘pass’ racially or ethnically as an ‘American.’ In this way, Mr. Thomas communicated to his students a flawed view of identity, one based on English speaking proficiency and perhaps even racial or ethnic superiority.

Similarly, Mr. Thomas demonstrated model minority discourse in his overt preference for certain cultural groups of students (Chinese) over others (Latino/a). He claimed that his Spanish-speaking students were lazy and lacked ambition and spoke of his Asian students as superior to Latino students because of “the latter’s problematic culture, where parental expectations and bonding with adults were felt to be minimal” (p. 585). According to Cummins (1986), “minority students will succeed educationally to the extent that the patterns of interaction in school reverse those that prevail in the society at large” (p. 24). By conceptualizing his students’ cultural backgrounds as deficit, Mr. Thomas contributed to a disempowering school experience for his students by reproducing in the micro-interactions of his classroom “public sentiments about the deficiency of immigrants” (McKay & Wong, 1996, p. 590).

A comment that Mr. Thomas made to Wong reveals the image of the kind of society that Mr. Thomas believes the students will help to create (Cummins, 1996, 2000). For this image, I envision a hammer and cloth. The hammer symbolizes concrete action. Awareness and critical thinking are not enough to affect transformation: transformation
happens when critical thinking and awareness inform action. After all, it is in the kiln of action where beliefs become ideologies that can grow into “a social force to be reckoned with” (Pratte, 1977, p. 37). In addition to action, compassion and mercy, represented by a cloth, are also needed to transform society. History repeatedly demonstrates that, with action only, coercive relations of power can be changed, but usually only to other hands. The transformation of inequitable, undemocratic or oppressive institutions and social relations must be accompanied by compassion and mercy. Sadly, as I argue below, neither a hammer nor a cloth is visible in the image of the kind of society that Mr. Thomas believes his students will help to create.

Mr. Thomas remarks to Wong that “his seven-year experience as a special education teacher was ‘excellent preparation’ for teaching ESL (presumably because handicaps characterize both types of students)” (McKay & Wong, 1996, p. 585; parentheses in original). Mr. Thomas reflects to students the image that not knowing English is akin to having a handicap and that until they learn English they are of no use, no value in society. Because to Mr. Thomas, the students’ contribution to society is tied up with their being able to ‘pass,’ to speak English, he communicates that the symbolic hammer and a cloth are of no use to his students because they cannot nor will not make any contribution to society until they can speak the language. Again, Mr. Thomas reiterates a sense of immigrant students as deficit, based on his erroneous, stereotypical, and ultimately disempowering representations of immigrant and minority persons.

To me, the image of the teacher’s identity as an educator (Cummins, 1996, 2000) pertains to how teachers see themselves as educators. I argue that this image is tied up intimately with one’s ideology of literacy, teaching, and learning. When I envision this
image, I visualize a Hall of Mirrors, like that of a carnival funhouse. Anyone who has visited a carnival funhouse knows the feeling of looking in a mirror and seeing one’s physical shape twisted into a Gumby-type figure or seeing a reflection of oneself with a scrawny body holding up a gargantuan head. In these two mirrors, one’s identity, at least in the physical sense, is distorted. It is only in the last mirror in the Hall of Mirrors, the everyday one most similar to that which hangs above one’s bureau, where a realistic depiction of one’s (physical) image is reflected. Drawing on this metaphor, the image that Mr. Thomas reflects as an educator (Cummins, 1996, 2000) is a cracked and distorted mirror of a teacher who is neither interested in nor cares about negotiating identities with his students.

The mixed messages that Mr. Thomas sent his students about their value and personhood accounts for the cracked and distorted nature of this mirrored reflection. On the one hand, “he was an extremely dedicated teacher who often sacrificed his recesses and lunch hour to tutor and enthusiastically coach students” (p. 585), but on the other hand, he communicated an acute belief of immigrant students as deficient (McKay & Wong). For example, Mr. Thomas failed “to take the students’ pre-immigration literacy experiences into account” (p. 585). He did not try to explore his Chinese students’ writing abilities in their primary language; rather, he assumed that they had none and perceived “the immigrant student as a candidate for cognitive overhaul” (p. 590). In so doing, Mr. Thomas was completely unaware of the resources — the primary Discourses, “home grown” literacy practices, and prior experiences - that his students embodied and brought to class which he could have been helping to explore, to validate, and to develop further.

The following statement seems to summarize the ways in which Mr. Thomas’
autonomous conceptualization of literacy and his transmission-oriented pedagogy informed his practice in ways that were disempowering to his EAL students: "when the power asymmetry between teacher and student was magnified, and when curtailment of the student’s agency was overwhelmingly supported by public sentiments about the deficiency of immigrants, the student was placed in a position of helplessness" (McKay & Wong, 1996, p. 590).

**Summary**

As outlined in Chapter One, I set out in my inquiry to address these main questions:

1. What are empowering practices? How do empowering practices work within an ideological model of literacy to become empowering literacy practices?
2. How are teachers’ ideologies informed by one of the two or a combination of the two models of literacy outlined by Street (1993, 1995, 2001)?
3. How do teachers perceive their role in meeting the literacy needs of the immigrant students in their EAL classes?
4. How do these ideologies of literacy inform the teachers’ pedagogical practices?

Within my immersion in the literature within the past 9 months, I have learned much about the nature of empowering literacy teaching. I have learned that empowering literacy teaching comprises many facets: an ideology of literacy framed within an ideological model of literacy (Street, 1995, 2001); an awareness on the teacher’s part of the power struggle over Discourses within schools (Gee, 1996, 2004; Street, 1995, 2001, 2005) and society (Cummins, 1996, 2000); and micro-interactions that are constituted by collaborative relations of power where students and teachers negotiate identities
Empowering literacy teaching also involves a tender balancing between and constant negotiation of validating students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds, guiding students toward dominant Discourses through inquiry rather than indoctrination and teaching students how to resist the oft-oppressive elements of secondary Discourses through a critical lens. These goals are also tempered by the teacher's commitment to helping students navigate the waters of identity struggle and new identity adoption that may accompany this balancing act. I do not present the elements above as a prescriptive list for teachers to follow, but rather to suggest that these issues are among those that teachers are likely to wrestle with as their ideology and practice become more empowering.

In an attempt to address these main inquiry questions by drawing connections across the three studies (Blake, 2004; Davis et al., 2005; McKay & Wong, 1996; Muchmore, 2001), I look again to the CAELPP (see the end of Chapter 3) and to the conceptual framework from which the CAELPP questions emerged. The studies that I have analyzed in this chapter have largely addressed the three areas in the CAELPP: power and ideology, validation of students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and teaching that empowers. Although I feel that to claim infallible "results" after conceptually analyzing three empirical studies is premature and inconsistent with rigorous research, I do make suggestions and generalizations below from my cross examination of the three studies. In a future publication, which I hope to write, I plan to invite other researchers to take up these emergent findings in order to further analyze and research these key areas.
The second of my original questions was how teachers' ideologies are informed by one of the two or a combination of the two models of literacy outlined by Street (1995, 2001). When I began this inquiry, I did not expect to find in the research that all teachers would demonstrate a complete and unwavering adherence to the ideological model of literacy in every area of their ideology and practice. That is, I theorized that some teachers' ideologies and practices would likely contain elements of both the autonomous and the ideological models of literacy. In my study of this question, two generalizations have emerged from the secondary analysis of the three empirical studies. I present them together here and then discuss each in turn:

Teachers take a step toward empowering literacy teaching when they move beyond a skills-dominated focus to engage students in drawing on their personal experience in class.

To fully engage students in empowering literacy practices, teachers must move beyond the personal.

Blake's (2004) study, seen through the lens of my conceptual framework, suggests that teachers move toward a pedagogy of literacy that is more empowering when they invite their students to draw on their personal experience in class. Colleen recognized within her ideology of literacy, literacy teaching, and learning, that the skills-focused curriculum that she was using was silencing students' voices. As I have argued profusely throughout this inquiry, within an autonomous model of literacy, literacy is conceptualized as skills that are distinct from any particular context or power structure, and thus, within this contextual vacuum, skills are seen as purely cognitive functions (Stone, 2004) largely devoid of a social and/or cultural base. When these social and cultural bases are written
out of the curriculum and the pedagogical micro-interactions between EAL teachers and students, immigrant and minority EAL students are disempowered.

Colleen (Blake, 2004) moved toward empowering literacy teaching by shifting her pedagogy past the experiential and the literal phrases (Cummins, 2000, adapted and extended from Ada, 1988a, 1988a; Au, 1979) and into the personal phase (Cummins, 2000) of literacy teaching/study. She did so by “tapping into [students’] local literacies” (Blake, 2004, p. 103) through journal writing that was meaningful to each student. In this way, Colleen’s pedagogy shifted to reflect in greater measure an ideological model of literacy which emphasizes the social nature of literacy. And yet, although Colleen recognized that she needed to engage her students in something more than the skills-based, asocial approach to literacy that she had formerly been adopting, she did not shift her practice into the critical phase (Cummins, 2000) where students engage in “critically analyzing the issues or problems that are raised in the text” (p. 276) or the more empowering creative phase (Cummins, 2000) where students work to “discove[r] what changes individuals can make to improve their lives or resolve the problem that has been presented” (p. 276). Moving her students into these phases would have moved Colleen’s (Blake, 2004) teaching practice into an even firmer stance within the ideological model of literacy with its emphasis on the relationship between literacy and power.

My inquiry in the conceptual framework combined with Davis et al.’s (2005) study has shown me that to fully engage students in empowering literacy practices, teachers must move even beyond the personal phase because this does not take students far enough into the ideological nature of literacy. While I do not include this as a reproach to teachers, I think that this finding is important not only because it suggests a
goal for which teachers can aim, but because it also suggests that empowering literacy teaching operates on a continuum. It may not be an either empowering/or disempowering situation. Even in the case of Mr. Thomas (McKay & Wong, 1996), whose ideology of literacy and literacy teaching/learning contained elements that were markedly disempowering, his pedagogical practice included aspects that could be categorized as “culturally sensitive” (p. 585). For example, he “allowed students to talk quietly in their native languages and to consult bilingual dictionaries” (p. 585). This suggests that a teacher’s ideology and practice can be more or less empowering and also that some areas of a teacher’s ideology/pedagogical orientation may be empowering while other areas may be more disempowering. I address the implications of this finding for the educational community in Chapter Five.

The third question I originally asked was how teachers perceive their role in meeting the literacy needs of the immigrant students in their EAL classes. Analysis of the three studies has not led me to an absolute, conclusive answer that applies to every teacher; instead, my inquiry suggests that the ways in which teachers perceive their role in meeting the literacy needs of the students in their EAL classes is dependent on several variables, including, but likely not limited to, the ways in which the micro-interactions between teachers and students are reflective of coercive/collaborative relations of power; the teacher’s ideology of literacy (including the nature of literacy, how it is learned, and how it should be taught); the teacher’s awareness of power struggles over language (dominant Discourse favoured in school and society; certain literacies promoted in schools, etc.) including their perceptions of and pedagogical responses to the ways in which “literacy practices are sites of ideological contest” (Street, 1995, p. 137).
As I write this list above, I am keenly aware of its noticeable similarity to the list of facets of empowering literacy teaching that I listed above (p. 114). This is not a surprising find to me now because I am more aware than when I began this inquiry that the questions “What are empowering literacy practices?” and “How do teachers perceive their role in meeting the literacy needs of the immigrant students in their EAL classes?” are intimately related questions, because teachers who are intent on teaching literacy in ways that are empowering to their students are likely to see their students’ literacy needs in light of at least four related elements: validation of students’ linguistic and cultural backgrounds; access to dominant Discourses; admission of students into criticality of dominant Discourses (awareness of discursive analysis and opportunities to engage in criticality in class); and opportunities for students to negotiate identities in third spaces.

Related to the original questions from my proposal, “What are empowering literacy practices?” and “How do teachers perceive their role in meeting the literacy needs of the immigrant students in their EAL classes?” are the third and fourth findings from my secondary analysis. The third finding is

For teachers to guide immigrant students into dominant Discourses in ways that are empowering, validation of immigrant students’ primary Discourse (including ‘home-grown’ literacies) is a non-negotiable.

Davis et al. (2005) were aware that essential to students’ engaging in dominant Discourses was a foundation in the classroom where students’ linguistic and cultural backgrounds were welcome and validated. It seems that the SHALL classrooms reflected the researchers’/teachers’ (Davis et al., 2005) awareness that coercive relations of power are attributable for the ways in which the many elements of students’ primary Discourses
have typically been excluded from schools. In fact, there seems to be an implicit notion in Davis et al. that without this validation, it is highly unlikely that students would be able to risk sharing in school those primary Discourse elements that had formerly been ignored and not welcomed into the school.

Davis et al. (2005) also highlight that without validation of students’ backgrounds and without guiding students into a criticality of dominant Discourses, students are merely indoctrinated into dominant, secondary Discourses, which is not reflective of empowering literacy teaching. Accordingly, Street (1997) in Street (2005) writes that

In order to build upon the richness and complexity of learners’ prior knowledge, we need to treat ‘home background’ not as a deficit but as affecting deep levels of identity and epistemology, and thereby the stance that learners take with respect to the ‘new’ literacy practices of the educational setting. (p. 4; emphasis added)

In other words, the ways in which students’ prior knowledge is taken up in the classroom affects the negotiation of identities that occurs therein and how students respond to literacy practices reflective of dominant Discourses. In this way, Davis et al. (2005) have modeled a way in which EAL students can be guided into dominant Discourses in ways that reflect empowering literacy teaching. Rather than being indoctrinated into school discourses, the students in Davis et al. were apprenticed as ethnographers of language. Instead of indoctrination, a spirit of inquiry pervaded their classrooms. Intimately studying their own primary language created and reinforced students’ pride around their primary Discourse and it enabled students to ‘notice’ (Davis et al., 2005) features of language in new ways, to “make strange” (Gee, 1993c, as cited in Gee, 1996, p. 166) their own literacies. Through this apprenticeship into a meta-awareness of language,
students were then able to apply this spirit of inquiry (and criticality which they also learned) to their learning of dominant Discourse.

As I discussed in the conceptual framework, the EAL teacher’s ability to navigate the three concurrent goals of validating and developing students’ primary Discourse(s), apprenticing the students into dominant discourses, and providing them with opportunities to develop and practice criticality (i.e., discursive analysis) is likely to be higher when she or he shares with students this primary Discourse, or cultural ways of being, interacting, speaking, etc. The fluidity with which these teachers are better able to move with ease between these three goals is likely to be envied by teachers who do not have this advantage and who are, therefore, more likely to need to make a concerted effort to understand their students’ primary Discourse and to identify their students’ family literacies which they may initially find difficult to recognize.

In her research of six Latino EAL teachers, Sugar Martinez (2000) writes that in addition to “the pedagogy they mastered in their teacher preparation program, these new teachers possess an authentic comprehension of their students’ cultural frame of reference, not because they, too, are Latinos but because of the adversity they encountered in school” (p. 98; emphasis added). These Latino/a teachers shared insider knowledge (Mogadime, 2003, p. 135) with their Latino/a students, including language and other features of their shared primary Discourse. As well, stemming from their “outsider status as the marginalized cultural other” (Mogadime, 2003, p. 135), and especially their past of being misunderstood, hit, taunted, or shamed by former teachers because of their cultural status as ‘outsiders,’ these Latino/a teachers were also able to empathize with students and assist them in identity struggles over literacy learning.
This raises interesting questions for further research: for example, what can teachers who do not share their students’ primary Discourses learn from those teachers who do? Similarly, how can White, middle-class EAL teachers learn from bilingual/bicultural EAL teachers’ “outsider status as the marginalized cultural other” (Mogadime, 2003, p. 135) in order to better understand EAL students’ struggle to manage the turbulent waters of secondary school within a potentially new language and culture?

From the secondary analysis inquiry emerged the fourth finding, that Teachers whose EAL practices are empowering or who are moving on this continuum toward empowering literacy practices recognize and respond (in various ways) to the emotions/reactions that students’ experience as they learn a secondary Discourse (i.e., identity crisis, silence). One of the ways in which teachers respond to these identity struggles is through an awareness and creation of third spaces in their classrooms.

Cummins (1996) claims that subordinated groups respond to the discrimination in society against them in various ways, from “internalization of a sense of ambivalence or insecurity about their identities to rejection of, and active resistance to, dominant group values” and he goes on to say that “at both extremes, alienation from schooling and mental withdrawal from academic effort have been a frequent consequence” (p. 137). As my fourth finding suggests, it is important to the academic and emotional success of immigrant students that teachers recognize the struggles that these students are often faced with as they are being apprenticed into a secondary Discourse which may be quite different, even in opposition, to their primary Discourse. As well, not only is this recognition necessary but, as highlighted in Davis et al. (2005), teachers also need to
respond in ways that assist students in reconciling or at least coping with these identity crisis issues in some way.

Students may respond to these identity crises with their silence, an issue which I have already addressed above. I have also argued how silence is forced on students when the learners are unable to participate in the dominant Discourse workings of the class. But students’ silence in the classroom may not only be attributable to one of the preceding two reasons, as pointed out to me by a fellow graduate student from mainland China: silence may also stem from students’ cultures of learning (Cortazzi & Jin, 2002), or “the distinctly cultural processes through which teachers and learners conduct classroom-related work” (p. 49) which include turn-taking or participation in question/answer sessions; “how to learn, how to use language for learning, what is good work in class” (p. 50). For example, some students may be silent because they are shy or out of a fear of making a mistake (Cortazzi & Jin, 2002) in front of the rest of the class. The implications of these issues related to silence are considered in Chapter Five.

The secondary analysis reveals that one way in which teachers can help students to negotiate various identities and identity crises is by creating classrooms characterized by third spaces. Teachers in the SHALL program (Davis et al., 2005) created third spaces by providing opportunities for EAL students to develop an additive (Lambert, 1975) perspective toward their bilingualism which had in the past been slated as deficit. These safe places afforded students opportunities to negotiate and/or resist the hidden meanings of dominant discursive practices. By assisting immigrant EAL students and minority students as they negotiated these identity/personhood issues, the SHALL teachers responded to students’ literacy needs out of an ideology that recognized the power
struggle over discourse in school and society.

I have found the fourth and final of my original questions, "How do these ideologies of literacy inform the teachers' pedagogical practices?" to be by far the most fascinating to study. This question has led me into a variety of new realms including a fresh conceptualization of literacy which I discuss in the final chapter; an introduction to and an emerging understanding of the field of New Literacy Studies; a deeper understanding of the political nature of literacy; and a greater understanding of how teachers and researchers who are committed to an ideological model of literacy put into practice this empowering ideology.

As I have delved into the relevant literature, repeatedly I have had the sense that the threefold tenable reply to my question on how these ideologies of literacy inform teachers' pedagogical practices – namely, validation of students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds, access to dominant discourse, and criticality of these discourses was 'old news' within the research. But to me, this inquiry has provided exposure to a new way of thinking about literacy and literacy teaching. From my secondary analysis of the three research studies (Blake, 2004; Davis et al., 2005; McKay & Wong, 1996) emerged the proposal that, regardless of the historicity of the New Literacies Studies (NLS) and related fields within the research, many teachers in the field, such as Colleen (Blake, 2004) and Mr. Thomas (McKay & Wong, 1996) may still be unaware of a view of literacy beyond that of reading and writing or at the most reading, writing, and speaking. A cognitive or autonomous approach to literacy may still dominate certain realms of the profession where teachers are unaware of the social, cultural and "the power dimension of literacy" (Street, 2001, p. 9).
The challenge, then, is to find ways to provide teachers of EAL opportunities to explore their own ideologies of literacy without approaching teachers as deficient and without treating change in beliefs as "unidimensional and interchangeable entities that can be influenced through direct or indirect interventions" (Muchmore, 2001, p. 106). I am not convinced that 'flash-in-the-pan' teacher development courses or workshops provide viable means for teachers to explicate their beliefs. For some teachers, changes within their pedagogical orientation are gradual (Muchmore).

From the findings of my secondary analysis which has been situated within the conceptual framework I generated from the work of Cummins (1996, 2000), Gee (1991, 1996, 2002a, 2004) and Street (1995, 2000, 2001, 2003), I present for the benefit of the research community and for those teachers interested in examining their own ideologies around literacy, a conceptual analysis tool (see Appendix A) with which teachers can reflect on the "underlying beliefs, assumptions, and experiences" (Muchmore, 2001, p. 105) of literacy that inform their teaching. I hope that other researchers will take up and extend this conceptual tool and in the process find their theoretical considerations of literacy and EAL literacy teaching stretched as I have.
CHAPTER FIVE: IMPLICATIONS AND REFLECTIONS

The purpose of this inquiry has been to explore the ideologies of secondary school teachers of English as an Additional Language (EAL) around empowering literacy teaching in order to better understand how these ideologies inform pedagogical interactions in ways that are empowering to immigrant and minority EAL students. By studying and integrating several theoretical notions of Cummins (1996, 2000), Gee (1991, 1996, 2002a, 2004) and Street (1995, 2000, 2001, 2003) into a framework, I have been able to apply this lens to a secondary analysis of three studies (Blake, 2004; Davis et al., 2005; McKay & Wong, 1996). In the summary of Chapter Four, I discussed the findings from the secondary analysis. Below I articulate the implications of these findings for further research, theory, and practice. Finally, I conclude with some personal reflections on my experience of engaging in this conceptual inquiry.

Implications for Further Research: Where do we go from here?

This conceptual inquiry points as an area for potential future research the journey that teachers make in moving beyond the personal in their pedagogy to fully engaging students in empowering literacy practices. When Colleen (Blake, 2004) took up the suggestion of her graduate ESL methods course professor to engage her students in journaling, Colleen’s pedagogy began to move out of the literal phase (Cummins, 2000) of literacy teaching into the personal phase. In this way, then, Blake’s suggestion became for Colleen a catalyst for ideological and pedagogical change. This raises further questions for research, including: What kinds of catalysts impel teachers to move their literacy pedagogy beyond the personal? What is the nature of these catalysts: a momentary flash from a ‘eureka’ moment, a period of gradual realizations or what? Is the
nature of these catalysts (i.e., prompts, discussions, research literature, etc.?) such that teacher education programs could provide potential teachers with these kinds of catalysts? When change in teachers' pedagogy has been sustained over time, what factors have mediated the initial catalyst(s) to create the sustainability?

The finding that validation by EAL teachers of immigrant students' primary Discourse, including their 'home-grown' literacies, is a non-negotiable for guiding immigrant students into dominant Discourses in ways that are empowering points also points to additional research. In Davis et al. (2005), the SHALL teachers negotiated this tension by providing opportunities for the students to become ethnographers (p. 202) in a spirit of inquiry about language. The students first explored the language in their community which provided the "metacognitive awareness" that they needed "to gain explicit knowledge of how school tasks are performed" (p. 202). Further questions that call for research include: How else do teachers validate students' primary Discourses and 'home-grown' literacies while apprenticing them into dominant Discourses?

Finding research that addresses this tension is difficult, as I highlighted in Chapter Four (see p. 89) because few studies simultaneously highlight teachers, address the literacies of immigrant and second-generation EAL students, and are situated within the secondary school level. A pattern I observed in the available research as I was searching for appropriate studies for my secondary analysis was a seemingly burgeoning interest in adolescent literacies in general, but a significantly less research interest in the literacies of EAL adolescents in particular. For example, not one of the 16 chapters in Alvermann, Hinchman, Moore, Phelps and Waff's (Eds.) (1998), fascinating and informative book, *Reconceptualizing the Literacies in Adolescents' Lives*, highlights the literacies of
immigrant and second-generation EAL students. As well, in the reprinted 43(5) edition of *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, dedicated entirely to topics related to adolescent literacy, there is a clear absence of any discussion related to the literacies of EAL students. The lack of studies in classroom contexts that are focused on the literacies of EAL students and the ways in which their EAL teachers negotiate the tension in their concurrent goals of validating students' primary Discourse and 'home-grown' literacies and of guiding them into dominant Discourses in ways that are empowering clearly points to the need for additional research in this area.

Another area for additional research in the EAL classroom emerges from a question that arose from the conceptual framework and the subsequent CAELPP that I developed: Does the teacher [in the study] offer any practicalities on how to go about teaching criticality simultaneously with teaching beginning levels of an additional language? Analysis of the data in the three studies (Blake, 2004; Davis et al., 2005; McKay & Wong, 1996) did not reveal any insights into this area; thus, it remains an area for further inquiry. As Mogadime (2003) points out, when EAL teachers share their students' primary Discourse, they are able to assist their students to engage critically with the dominant discourses that they are learning. But what about teachers who do not share their students' primary Discourses? How can they apprentice their students into criticality when the students' English proficiency lays at the beginning of the language learning continuum? If there are teachers within the secondary school educational community who do not share their students' primary Discourse and yet are engaging their EAL students in criticality, how are they doing this? What are the practicalities involved? What principles (Moje et al., 2000) can other teachers learn from these teachers? These questions call for
null
additional research.

Implications for Theory

I repeatedly saw each of the major theoretical notions of Cummins (1996, 2000), Gee (1991, 1996, 2002a, 2004) and Street (1995, 2000, 2001, 2003) that I discussed and analyzed in the conceptual framework confirmed by each of the studies (Blake, 2004; Davis et al., 2005, McKay & Wong, 1996) as practical realities in the educational system. And yet, although the findings from the secondary analysis confirmed the conceptual triad (Chapter Three) that I developed, they have also extended some of the theoretical notions found in the Cummins-Gee-Street triad. Perhaps the most significant extension concerns the issue of silence, which I discuss below.

My inquiry into the ways in which teachers' ideologies affect their literacy pedagogy in empowering ways has revealed that teachers recognize and respond (in various ways) to the emotions or identity crisis that students may experience as they learn a secondary Discourse. Cummins' (1996, 2000) and Gee's (1996, 2004) research on the relationship of language learning and identity crisis was confirmed in Davis et al.'s (2005) study on the issue of silence as one of students' responses to this struggle over identity. Analysis of Davis et al. revealed that

a) silence can be a coping mechanism for students struggling with identity issues and

b) silence can be used by students as a tool/weapon of resistance.

Further theorizing on the notion of silence may reveal additional knowledge into the ways in which students respond to and negotiate an identity crisis and how teachers can

\[10\] As highlighted in Chapter Four, silence may also reflect an element within students' cultures of learning (Jin & Cortazzi, 1998) which “include culturally based ideas about teaching and learning, about appropriate ways of participating in class, about whether and how to ask questions” (p. 100).
assist students through a process which is likely to influence academic/emotional development.

Further theorizing might include such questions as: How do teachers who recognize students’ silence as a weapon assist students to navigate this struggle in such a way as to stem the tide of oppositional resistance (Giroux, 1983, as cited in Canagarajah, 1999b, p. 98) that too often ends in students’ dropping out of school (Ogbu, 1992, as cited in Cummins, 1996; Atkinson et al., 2003)? How can teachers/students partner to transform silence as a weapon into more effective means of resistance? These exciting areas for further theorizing also hold implications for practice, which I address below.

**Implications for the Educational Community**

The findings from my secondary analysis inquiry present several implications for the educational community. For teachers who recognize within their ideology a conceptualization of literacy as autonomous, perhaps the quickest way to move toward empowering literacy teaching is to invite students’ voices (i.e., personal experiences, prior knowledge) into the class. Teachers who desire their pedagogy to become progressively transformative may begin at this first step.

Relatedly, the finding that the move toward empowering practices operates on a *continuum* is beneficial for the educational community because it encourages teachers that they need not become overwhelmed with discouragement over the shortcomings and inconsistencies (Muchmore, 2001) that they recognize between their beliefs and practice because empowering pedagogy is dynamic, always progressing. For example, even with the SHALL teachers (Davis et al., 2005) who guided their students toward an awareness “of the ways in which literacy practices are sites of ideological contest” (Street, 1995, p.
131), it is debatable whether they ever engaged students in the *creative phase* (Cummins, 2000) of literacy learning in which students use the critical knowledge they have generated in the preceding stage to challenge and/or transform in some way inequitable structures or forces within society. Thus, even in the empowering literacy teaching reflected in the SHALL courses, there was room for further progression toward empowerment.

Relatedly, if the infrequency of empirical studies that highlight both EAL teachers and the literacies of immigrant students is indicative of the amount of resources that are available to EAL teachers on notions of drawing into the classroom students’ ‘home-grown’ or out-of-school literacies, this then poses a serious problem for teachers and EAL students alike. Thankfully, studies in Hull and Schultz’s (Eds.) (2002) *School’s out!* *Bridging out-of-school literacies with classroom practice* and Street’s (Ed) (2005) *Literacies Across Educational Contexts: Mediating Learning and Teaching* do address the literacies and literacy practices of EAL students. And yet, the application of these theory-based studies to the everyday life of the classroom may prove overwhelming for some teachers.

This paucity of resources suggests to me that practical resources are needed for teachers concerning how they can identify their students’ ‘home-grown’ literacies, how to draw these into the classroom in empowering (as opposed to minimizing) ways, and how to draw on these literacies as bridges to the learning of additional discourses. It would be helpful if these resources were not just ‘how-to’ books, but rather based on ecological principles (Moje et al., 2000) that teachers could apply to their individual classrooms according to student needs.
Lastly, the finding from my secondary analysis on silence as a response of students to the identity crisis that often accompanies the learning of a secondary Discourse (Gee, 1996), holds significant implications for teachers of EAL students. For example, how do teachers identify what kind of silence the EAL student is displaying? Giroux (1983) claims that “the concept of resistance must not be allowed to become a category indiscriminately attached to every expression of ‘oppositional behavior’” (p. 109, as cited in Canagarajah, 1999b, p. 98). Consequently, as highlighted above in the implications for theory section, how can teachers apprentice students into resistance which reflects “ideological clarity and commitment to collective action for social transformation” (Giroux) as opposed to sheer opposition “which is unclear, ambivalent, and largely passive” (Giroux, as cited in Canagarajah, 1999b, p. 98)?

I suggest that, first, teachers need to be able to identify the underlying reasons for their students’ silence and to respond in empowering ways, (i.e., with sensitivity to immigrant students whose cultures of learning are different from those of the mainstream; with understanding when silence is a way of coping with an identity crisis). Second, teachers who understand issues around identity struggle and silence can guide students away from opposition which is passive (even passive aggression) to resistance imbued with “ideological clarity and commitment to collective action for social transformation” (Giroux, in Canagarajah, 1999b, p. 98). Action studies in secondary school EAL classrooms that address this issue would provide additional insights.

**Personal Reflections**

Every time a [person] stands up for an ideal, or acts to improve the lot of others, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope, and crossing each other from a million different centres of energy and daring, those ripples build a current that can sweep down the
mightiest walls of oppression and resistance

- Robert Kennedy (1966)\textsuperscript{11}

When young Lucy, in C.S. Lewis' (1950) classic, The Lion, The Witch and the Wardrobe, steps through the wardrobe and into the land of Narnia, little does she know what new adventures, new friends, and most of all, a new paradigm, this first step will lead her toward. In that first conversation with my supervisor, Dolana, where I explained to her my interest in ESL and immigrant students, I had no idea of the places where her suggestion for me to study Cummins' (1996) work on the micro-interactions of teachers and students would lead me. In undertaking this conceptual inquiry into the ideologies around literacy of secondary English as an Additional Language (EAL) teachers, my entire ideology of literacy - the ways in which I conceptualize literacy, literacy teaching and learning, and EAL students' literacy needs – has been challenged and expanded.

Looking back, I can see how, when I first began this inquiry, my conceptualization of literacy was quite limited. Although I knew that teachers should be aware and should seek to somehow address in the classroom the cultural aspects of students (i.e., traditions, values, etc.), I did not seem to transfer this notion of the cultural to literacy learning, that literacy is \textit{itself} culturally and socially learned and situated. I took it for granted that our primary language "gives us our initial and often enduring sense of self" (Gee, 2002a, p. 160). This has been a significant discovery. It has challenged my ideology of literacy in that, when I teach EAL students in the future, I must address issues of primary language or primary culture not as "add-ons" to the curriculum (Banks & Banks, 2004), but as features that are inherent within and

underlying every activity and every interaction in the EAL classroom.

My concept of literacy was also limited in that I thought of literacy as singular – literacy’ rather than literacies. For a long time I have been aware of the need for teachers to draw into the classroom those strengths that students have developed outside the classroom, but the reading for and the writing of the conceptual framework (Chapter Three) especially opened my eyes to the notion of literacies that are forged in and, thus, emerge from our linguistic and cultural backgrounds. This finding has been an enlightening one for me because it presents a tangible and practical way in which teachers can validate and draw into the classroom the linguistic and cultural selves of their EAL students, by looking to see what “home-grown” literacies their EAL students embody and by drawing on and helping students to develop these in the EAL classroom.

The research that I have conducted in the conceptual and secondary analyses has provided great insight into a situation that has confounded me for years. I was uncomfortable with the diagnosis that the teachers of a close relative of mine gave concerning the difficulty he experienced in school: I felt that there was something more to the situation than that he just was not ‘working to his potential.’ Learning about Howard Gardner’s (1993) work on intelligences in university gave me a new perspective: I realized that (my) verbal intelligence was one of the ones most valued and reproduced in school (which accounted for my good grades/identity as a good student), while my relative’s musical, visual/spatial and naturalistic intelligences were not considered as valuable within the formal school setting and were, therefore, not validated, nor were his potential identities as a musician, artist, or gifted naturalist taken up in school. Finally, here was a theory that showed that certain intelligences were not ‘superior’ to others.
And yet, it was not until I was immersed in Gee’s (1996) work on Discourse for the conceptual framework that I had made the association between some students’ difficulties in school and the power at work in academic settings where some students are rewarded and favored while others are penalized. Gee’s notion helped me to see, for example, that, in my case and the case of my relative, it was not only that certain intelligences were considered superior to others but also that certain ways of being in the particular schools (i.e., docile, bookish) we attended were valued over other ways of being (i.e., demonstrative, bodily active, passionately argumentative). When I think of my relative’s and my own schooling in this light, I am angered over the injustice of a school system that is (was) supposed to be the “great equalizer of the conditions of [humankind]” (Mann, 1868, in Nieto, 2005, p. 43), and that, instead, rewards (Gee, 2002a) some students and penalizes others. And yet, even in the injustice of a school system that validated certain literacy practices over others, I recognize that, as we both come from a White, middle-class family, both my primary Discourse and that of my relative contained many filtered elements of the secondary Discourse (Gee, 2004) expected of us by the school. In many ways, then, both of us were, to certain extents, false beginners (Gee, 2004).

The concept of literacies rather than literac’y’; the notion of Discourse and a more explicit understanding of the issues of power in schools over language and literacy: the combination of these realizations has led me to a greater awareness of my need and, I feel, my ethical responsibility as a future teacher of EAL, to recognize, teach to, and develop those literacies that stem from the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of my students.
Marinating for the past months in research has significantly challenged my ideology of literacy and, with it, my beliefs around teaching and learning literacy. I have been apprehensive, however, that the progressive ideas that I have engaged with during my research would prove to be temporary (Muchmore, 2001) when I return to the “real world” of teaching because of an inability to reconcile these emancipatory notions around literacy with the already-set-in-motion organizational patterns of schools with their “policies, programs, curriculum, and assessment” (Cummins, 2000, p. 44). I also was concerned that I would not be able to translate those theoretical concepts of the research into which I have been immersed into the practical context of classroom. Thus, I wanted to put into practice immediately some of these key notions around empowering literacy teaching. Fortunately, during the latter part of my studies as a full-time student in the Master of Education program, I have been involved in tutoring teenagers from lower socioeconomic backgrounds in the area of literacy. This venue has provided me with a context in which to reflect on and to begin to transpose into the practical, concrete level many of the theoretical notions that I have learned during this conceptual inquiry.

I have begun to try to change my pedagogical orientations between the (tutee) students and me by creating collaborative relations of power between us, for starters, in drawing from their prior knowledge, strengths, and interests in the literacy activities in which we engage. About a month ago, though, I realized that our interactions were not as empowering as I wanted them to be because I was at a standstill within the personal phase of literacy (Cummins, 2000). As I analyzed Colleen’s (Blake, 2004) pedagogy that seemed at a similar standstill, I felt compelled to move with my students beyond the personal phase into the critical phase (Cummins, 2000) of literacy response. I am
currently developing the skeleton of a unit which responds to a critical issue in their lives, to which I hope the students will add "flesh, character and life" (Fecho, 1998, p. 95).

I continue to struggle with the practicalities of this endeavor, especially the tensions of negotiating the various D/discourse communities to which I and the students belong and into which they need to be apprenticed (i.e., academic Discourses). My goal is to guide students into a spirit of critical inquiry. I know that the notions I have learned in my conceptual inquiry as well as the desire to consider my own part in "the politics of schooling" (Mogadime, 2003) have led me to this place closer toward empowering literacy teaching. And it is an exciting place to be!

Conclusions

Although my ideology of literacy, literacy teaching, and learning has moved progressively closer to empowering pedagogy, I feel that I have barely scratched the surface. Street (1995) claims that teachers, curriculum designers, and program developers need to understand educational theory, linguistic theory, literacy theory, and social theory (p. 136). Added to the introduction to educational theory that I had during my undergraduate studies in English Education, conducting this inquiry has provided me with a stronger foundation in educational theory, literacy theory, and a measure of social theory. And yet, the catalytic nature of this inquiry has made me realize how much more I need to learn!

While I would certainly not claim it impossible for teachers who are unable to take graduate courses and to immerse themselves in research to teach literacy in ways that are empowering to immigrant and minority students, I know that the theoretical notions of the micro-interactions of teachers and students, collaborative/coercive
relations of power (Cummins, 1996, 2000); primary and secondary Discourses, false/authentic beginners (Gee, 1991, 1996, 2002a, 2002b, 2004, 2005); the autonomous and ideological models of literacy (Street, 1995, 2000, 2001, 2003, 2005) are ones that I had not thought of before embarking on this adventure. These notions have really revolutionized my ideology of literacy in powerful ways. I have been further challenged by these and other theorists to advocate for immigrant and minority students by starting with me, starting with the way that I envision literacy, the social world and my students’ and my place in it. In this way, as the citation at the beginning of this section suggests, I desire to see my work send forth a tiny ripple of hope that will extend to other teachers so that we can redefine our identities as teachers and, from this redefinition, transform the ways in which we teach literacy so that it is empowering for all our students.
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Appendix A

Questions of Ideology and Pedagogy Related to Literacy

A conceptual tool which teachers can use to examine their beliefs around literacy and literacy teaching, and learning

Instructions: Please choose the answer that most fittingly describes you.

**Ideology**

1. Which most fittingly matches your description of “literacy”?
   A. reading, writing, speaking and listening
   B. reading and writing practices, visual literacy, computer literacy, and many more
   C. reading and writing

2. Which most aptly describes your view of literacy?
   A: Literacy has to do with learning reading and writing skills. These skills are transferable to other contexts. For example, if a student can read her textbook and write a story, she can also read a novel or write an essay.

   B: Literacy has to do with learning ways of reading and writing that are particular to our sociocultural group. These skills may not be easily transferable to other contexts.

   C: Literacy has to do with learning cultural practices around the use of text. For some cultures this may look like oral or written language, for others gestures, and for other cultures, pictures.

3. How do you think one learns literacy?
   A. Children learn skills in steps, one after the other. For example, learning how to speak is easier than learning how to write: once children learn how to speak, they then can use this knowledge to learn how to write.

   B. Children begin to learn how to speak and how to read when parents talk with their children and read to them at home. Then they are ready to learn more about literacy at school.

   C. Children begin to learn how to speak, read, listen, work on the computer in their homes and communities as they engage in these practices with other people (adults, older siblings, etc.) and as they learn what these practices mean within their family, their community.

4. Why do you think that some immigrant and minority students seem to have difficulty in learning literacy?
A: Literacy reflects cultural learning ways of reading and writing that are particular to a sociocultural group. The ways of reading, writing, speaking, and listening, etc. that schools teach and reproduce is that of the dominant class in Western society.

B. Some individuals are simply more intelligent than others. Or perhaps the students’ lack of English disables them from success in school. When students’ English proficiency improves, the students will be more successful in school.

C. The activities in most schools seem to focus on linguistic and logical/mathematic intelligence (Howard Gardner, 1993). Perhaps we are not reaching students who have other intelligences such as bodily kinesthetic intelligence, intrapersonal intelligence, musical intelligence, etc.

5. What do you think are the benefits of literacy for people?
A: The ability to read and write opens one up to a world of literature and knowledge that is otherwise inaccessible. This is significant because it opens and expands one’s imagination.

B. Being literate allows you to function in society. If you are unable to read and write, you are not likely to find work.

C. Any so-called benefits of literacy cannot be attributed to literacy alone, but also to issues of power: who has control over literacy related issues and how they try to main this control, etc.

Pedagogy
6. How would you describe the decision making over curriculum in your classroom?
A. Although I make most of the decisions, I discuss my expectations with the students and try to get their input. I share some of the decision-making with them, especially over issues such as letting the students choose their own working partners and their own writing topics.

B. I am opposed to a narrow, prescribed curriculum that does not relate to my life or my students’ lives. My students and I work together on the curriculum. I provide a loose curricular guideline and the students add flesh, character and life.

C. It is my job as the teacher to make all of the curricular decisions. I choose the texts we read; the assignments that the students do, the divisions for groups that the students work in, and the students’ writing topics.

7. How would you describe the interactions between you and students?
A. I have to have the students’ attention at all times. If we are having a class discussion and the students don’t agree with me I get upset (although I may not show this). At times, I try to persuade students to take up my point of view.
B. I encourage students to voice their perspectives, even if they are different than mine, but I do get uncomfortable when students disagree with me.

C. Even if I don’t agree with some perspectives, students are able to share their own perspective. Students must be prepared to explain their position, but my goal is critical thinking, not consensus.

8. What is your feeling about student’s primary (native) language(s)?
A. I have an “English-only” policy in my classroom. Speaking in their primary language hinders EAL students from learning English.

B. I encourage the students to use bilingual dictionaries in class and to ask for help in their primary language from their same-language peers when they need it.

C. I know that our primary language, which is part of our larger linguistic and cultural being, is tied up with how we see ourselves. Even though I may not share my students’ primary language, I often ask my students to teach me some words in their primary language.

9. What is your feeling about your students’ culture?
A. I wish I understood it better. I try to emphasize the ways in which we are similar, what we have in common.

B. I have to work hard at teaching in ways that match my students’ ways of learning. I ask the bilingual teacher at the school for ideas or read up on my students’ cultural backgrounds and try to understand this within the students’ individuality.

C. I don’t think that culture has much to do with learning English. After all, my culture does not really affect my teaching. If you are a good teacher/student, you’re a good teacher/student.

10. Which list of activities best describes the activities of your EAL classroom?
A. Reading school canon texts as well as supplemental texts that I find related to the students cultural backgrounds; group work where students talk about their personal response to the texts and generate ideas together for writing assignments. Students write in their journal what they thought of the text or they may discuss this with a partner or group of students. Sometimes I give them a prompt to think about and other times, I want to see them come up with their own ideas.

B. Studying language in different contexts: for example, a conversation between students’ parent and sibling, a speech made by a student representative and a TV new report. Discussions around why certain literacy practices (i.e., essay) are valued more than others (i.e., chat sessions, blogging) in society. Discussing the problems that characters/persons in texts face, how these problems relate to those in the students’ lives, and what the students can do to change these problems, i.e., writing a letter to their MP to ask for her/his support over a current issue in the news.
C: Stimulus-response choral repetition; vocabulary development; workbook exercises like copying and fill-in-the-blanks; dictations; reading texts from the canon; writing exercises or prompts that I provide. Answering comprehension questions on theme, plot, and other literary elements; writing a comparison/contrast essay on this text and a previous one that they read.

11. Have you noticed that some of your EAL students are often quiet in class, even though you’ve seen them talking enthusiastically in their first language with peers? If so, why do you think this is?
A. They haven’t mastered enough of the language (English).
B. I think it must be cognitively and socially overwhelming to try to learn a new language. Perhaps they are tired or frustrated with the many demands of the day.
C. The silence may be a response to a kind of identity crisis that the students are going through in learning a new language and engaging in literacy practices that are culturally unfamiliar to them.

12. Your class is doing group work. Picture yourself in your classroom, walking around the room and talking with various students. What would a visitor see?
A: You stop to talk and laugh with students from a certain cultural group; you avoid students from other cultural groups.
B. You treat students from all cultural groups the same; however, you seem to spend more time talking with the students who have a higher level of English proficiency.
C. You work with students of all cultures and levels of English proficiency. If a student were to accuse you of favoring another, you would seriously consider why the student said that.
## Instructional and Social Assumptions of Three Pedagogies and Their Implications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Progressive</th>
<th>Transformative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td>“Decomposed”: (p. 154) separated into distinct realms, i.e., phonics, vocabulary, grammatical rules</td>
<td>Same as Transformative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge/How Students Learn:</strong></td>
<td>Static/inert. Students learn knowledge or skills through steps or stages that move from “hierarchical internalization from simple to complex” (p. 154).</td>
<td>Same as Transformative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Assumption</strong></td>
<td>A “transmission of ‘cultural literacy’” (p. 154), the literacy of the dominant group. The curriculum is overtly devoid of any mention of issues of power.</td>
<td>“Celebrates differences but implicitly sanitized with respect to power relations” (p. 154).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coercive relations of power ↔ collaborative relations of power</strong></td>
<td>Coercive relations of power/Assimilationist orientation: power over interactions is controlled solely by the teacher ‘expert.’ Students are passive recipients of information.</td>
<td>Same as Transformative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes/Implications:</strong></td>
<td>Disempowered</td>
<td>Empowered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Students are likely to be compliant and/or uncritical. ♦ Students are denied occasions to “express and share their experiences with peers and teachers” (p. 155). ♦ Students have “few if any opportunities to reflect critically on social issues of direct relevance to their lives” (p. 155).</td>
<td>♦ Students learn criticality. ♦ Students engage in active use of language with peers and teachers. ♦ Students partner with teachers to critically consider “social issues of direct relevance to their lives” (p. 155).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Without opportunities to critically analyze their societal/cultural conditions, immigrant and minority students “becom[e] the trainable, low-level functionary of the dominant society, simply the grease that keeps the institutions which orchestrate his or her oppression running smoothly” (Delpit, 1995, p. 19).</td>
<td>Students may develop more liberal ideas but not be critical (p. 154).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix C

Issues of Ideology and Pedagogy Related to Literacy According to the Research

1. Which most fittingly matches your description of literacy?
Empowering: B. An inclusive view of literacy and therefore, the most empowering of the three. Teachers with this view would be more likely to identify students’ out-of-school literacies and to validate these by drawing them into the classroom.

Less Empowering: A. More empowering than “C” in that it extends beyond reading and writing, but disempowering in that it does not extend beyond reading, writing, speaking and listening.

Disempowering: C. This is a limited view of literacy because, stemming from this view, teachers would not likely identify students’ out-of-school literacies and would therefore fail to draw on these literacies in the English as an additional language (EAL) classroom.

2. Which most aptly describes your view of literacy?
Empowering: C. Teachers with this view challenge traditional definitions of literacy and thus will likely be able to identify and draw into the classroom literacies from students’ linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

Less Empowering: B. The idea that the nature of literacy is context-dependent is a notion aligned with the ideological model of literacy (Street, 1995). In this framework, literacy is considered to be social practice rather than context-neutral skills. This view suggests that you are moving toward empowering teaching because you acknowledge that literacy is tied up with the ways in which people learn reading and writing and the meanings they associate with these literacy practices (Street, 2001) within our specific sociocultural group(s). However, “C” represents the most empowering view outlined here because it concedes that “literacy” for all cultures does not necessarily center on reading and writing (as it generally does in Western culture), but might be based in gestures, pictures, etc.

Disempowering: A. This cognitive-based framework for thinking about literacy is aligned with the “autonomous model of literacy” (Street, 1993, p. 5): literacy is considered discrete skills that once mastered, hold direct and unproblematic social and cognitive (1995, p. 5) consequences for the literate person. This disempowering belief fails to recognize that there are “very few aspects of cultural life which are comprehensible without considering cultural ways of speaking as being an instrument of their constitution” (Jin & Cortazzi, 1998, p. 100). One negative repercussion of this view is that the larger society is ‘warranted’ in blaming the individual or cultural group for their lack of success in school and society (they didn’t master English skills) (Street, 1993) instead of questioning in what ways schools (Dei, 2003) and institutional racism (Kivel, 2002) should be held accountable for their part in the underachievement of EAL students.

3. How do you think one learns literacy?
Empowering: C. In this view, literacy is couched within its origins in the bosom of the family and community of one’s early socialization. This view gives homage to the notion, found in the ideological model of literacy (Street, 1995) that literacy is imbued with cultural assumptions, values, beliefs and motivations. Within this ideology of literacy then, teachers recognize that pedagogical interactions are not value-neutral but in fact, are permeated with cultural aspects.

Less Empowering: B. This view of literacy begins to acknowledge the cultural origins of literacy
in the family and community of one's early socialization. And yet, the belief in an unproblematic transfer between learning literacy at home and learning literacy at school is a disabling (autonomous model of literacy, see #2A) view of literacy because it fails to bear in mind that a discrepancy often exists between the ways in which literacy is learned in the home and the ways in which it is presented and reproduced in schools (Gee, 2004; Street, 1995).

Disempowering: A. Again, in that this cognitive science perspective (Stone, 2004), reminiscent of the autonomous model of literacy (Street, 1995), ignores the cultural nature of language, it is disempowering because it treats literacy practices as value-neutral which they are not (see #3C).

4. Why do some immigrant and minority students seem to have difficulty in learning literacy?

Empowering: A. See # 3C above. This view recognizes that many of the taken-for-granted ways of the school such as routines, implicit rules for teacher-student interactions, and pedagogical styles, are those of the White, middle class (Delpit, 1995) and thus, frequently do not reflect those of linguistically and culturally diverse students. As well, some students (Gee, 2004 calls them false beginners) have a 'jump start' in school: their early socialization into their primary Discourse included integration of features/practices of secondary Discourses “in terms of cultural values, and sociocultural resources” (Gee, 2004, p. 14). Authentic beginners (p. 14) are those who begin school lacking “the sorts of early preparation, pre-alignment in terms of cultural values, and sociocultural resources that more advantaged learners at those sites have” (p.14). Gee explains that schools establish as the standard of achievement that which is accomplished by the best false beginners and then the schools “pretend that (false beginners) learners are making quite ‘normal’ and adequate progress, [which] by any rational standards, are not ‘really learning’ ” (p. 15). Thus, immigrant students who are struggling to learn the content material and who are beginning to acquire the language are actually making great strides, but because of the way schools validate the progress of the false beginner, the true progress of the immigrant learner goes unnoticed.

1 Primary Discourses: Discourses “to which people are apprenticed early in life during their primary socialization as members of particular families within their sociocultural settings” (Gee, 1996, p. 137). This kind of “identity kit” (p. 127) includes “ways of behaving, interacting, valuing, thinking, believing, speaking [including one’s primary language] and often writing” (p. viii).

2 Secondary Discourses: “Ways of behaving, interacting, valuing,” etc. (Gee, 1996, p. viii) that people are apprenticed into “as part of their socializations within various local, state, and national groups and institutions outside early home and peer-group socialization” (p. 137). These venues might include churches, gangs, schools, office (p. 137), community organizations, businesses or governments (Gee, 2002a, p. 161).

Less Empowering: C. Howard Gardner’s (1993) theory of intelligences is empowering in it shows that certain intelligences are not ‘superior’ to others but rather validated and favored over others within schools. But it may not make explicit enough that it is not only certain intelligences that are favored over others but certain ways of being (Gee, 1996, 2004), (i.e., assertiveness, having a sense of humor, being passive or emotionally detached) (Vollmer, 2000, p. 56-57), ways which are tied up with social and cultural aspects of one’s early socialization.

Disempowering: B. This overly simplistic and determinist view attributes too much to ‘intelligence’ and ‘English language proficiency’ and not enough to social and cultural factors which also inform students’ academic and emotional development in learning an additional
5. What do you think are the benefits of literacy for people?

**Empowering:** C. Within an empowering view of literacy, any so-called benefits of literacy cannot be attributed to literacy alone, but also to issues of power (Street 1996, as cited in Street, 2001, p. 9). For example, research shows that in the US and the UK, many women and ethnic peoples with university qualifications are unable to obtain the kinds of jobs that men with similar qualifications do (Rogers, 1990, in Street, 1995, p. 139).

**Less Empowering:** A. It is an inaccurate notion that literature (essentially, narrative, poetry, etc.) and knowledge are inaccessible to those cultures whose literacy practices do not center around reading and writing. As Street with J. Street (1995) explains, often, “the associations commonly made with literacy are in fact cultural conventions rather than products of the medium itself. The uses of literacy by women; its association with informal, non-religious, and non-bureaucratic practices; its affective and expressive functions; and the incorporation of oral conventions into written usage – all are features of literacy practice that have tended to be marginalized or destroyed by modern, western literacy with its emphasis on formal, male, and schooled aspects of communication” (p. 110).

**Disempowering:** B. According to researchers of the New Literacy Studies (Gee, 1996; Street, 1995, 2001), this view is disempowering because it makes too easy and unproblematic a link between becoming ‘literate’ and benefits of literacy without considering how these dominant literacies came to be accepted and assimilated into society in the first place (Street, 2001). It also fails to recognize the association between literacy/power (see #5C).

6. How would you describe the decision-making over curriculum in your classroom?

**Empowering:** B. This kind of ‘power sharing’ over the interactions of the class is based on collaborative relations of power in which power "is generated through interactions with others" (Cummins, 2000, p. 44). Teachers and students are "empowered' to achieve more" (p. 44) in these relationships than they could if these relations did not exist. For example, in these interactions, students must critically consider the kinds of knowledge that they think they need to know and teachers are challenged to provide solid reasons for including/not including x in the curriculum. One teacher (Fecho, 1998) explained how he and his students worked together on the curriculum: he provided a loose curricular guideline and his students “added flesh, character and life” (p. 95). Teachers are likely to approach this control over curriculum, interactions, etc. differently.

**Less Empowering:** A. This position clearly indicates the teacher’s care for the students in soliciting the students’ outlook on their needs/interests. However, there is room here for greater movement toward more collaborative relations of power (see #6B) where power is more shared, less ‘owned’ by one party. Having students choose their own partners and writing topics may be a step toward empowering relations, but if the decisions that students make are only around classroom formats/routines and not about knowledge generation (Cummins, 2000, p. 254), then students are really not empowered to learn how (and provided with opportunities) to engage in criticality by using “language actively to generate their own knowledge” (Cummins, 1986, p. 21).

**Disempowering:** C. This position is characteristic of “coercive relations of power” (Cummins, 2000, p. 44), the underlying premise of which is that only a limited amount of power exists, so if I (the teacher) do not have complete jurisdiction over the classroom, then the class is out of control. It is dangerous for culturally and linguistically diverse students when teachers hold this belief
because the students are relegated to passive recipients of information when power over interactions in the classroom is controlled solely by the teacher who is the ‘expert.’ Research shows rather, that “good educational practice today requires facilitators … to respond to local articulations of ‘need’ as well as to make their own ‘outsider’ judgments of it” (Street, 2001, p. 14; emphasis added).

7. How would you describe the interactions between you and students?

**Empowering:** C. Again, reflective of collaborative relations of power, this ideological view indicates that you do not feel like you are necessarily the ‘expert’ because are the teacher. By engaging your students in critical inquiry you are communicating to them your high expectations of what they are capable of and the high hopes that you have of their contributions to transforming society.

**Less Empowering:** B. You are moving toward empowering practice, but there is room for growth. Your ideology may contain remnants of a traditional pedagogical orientation (Cummins, 1996) which claims that the teacher is the expert, and so you may feel uncomfortable when students disagree with you because this makes it look like you are not the ‘expert.’ (See #7A & #7C).

**Disempowering:** C. Again, reflective of coercive relations of power, this view is fixed within a traditional pedagogical orientation (Cummins, 2000) or ‘banking’ education’ (Freire, 1993, as cited in Cummins, 2000, p. 154) where ‘learning’ is comprised of the teacher depositing information into the empty minds of the students. This ideology/practice disables linguistically and culturally diverse students by failing to provide them with opportunities to engage in criticality.

8. What is your feeling about your students’ primary (native) language(s)?

**Empowering:** C. This view suggests that you are keenly aware of the intimate relationship between one’s primary language and one’s identity. You are empowering your students by encouraging and validating their emerging bicultural/bilingual identities.

**Less Empowering:** B. This is a “culturally sensitive” (McKray & Wong, 1996, p. 585) view. You recognize that students will feel more comfortable in a challenging environment when they can resource their primary language in community with peers who share this primary language.

**Disempowering:** A. As well as disempowering, this view is inaccurate, according to the research (Cummins & Swain, 1986; Cummins, 2000; Schecter & Cummins, 2003). Generally, “development of conceptual and literacy skills in a minority language will tend to transfer to the majority language given sufficient exposure to the language and motivation to learn it” (Schecter & Cummins, 2003, p. 6). Denying students opportunities to resource their primary language in class is intimately tied up with motivation, as Cummins (1996) explains: “when students' language, culture and experiences are ignored or excluded in classroom interactions, students are immediately starting from a disadvantage. Everything they have learned about life and the world up to this point is being dismissed as irrelevant to school learning, there are few points of common connection to curriculum materials or instruction and so students are expected to learn in an experiential vacuum” (p. 2-3).

9. What is your feeling about your students’ culture?

**Empowering:** B. This empowering view recognizes that teachers need to adapt their teaching to meet students’ ways of learning. Jin & Cortazzi (1998) explain that students’ cultures of learning include “culturally based ideas about teaching and learning, about appropriate ways of
participating in class, about whether and how to ask questions” (p. 100).

**Less Empowering: A.** The desire to understand students’ culture suggests that you care about your students and want to know them better. However, even though your practice of emphasizing those aspects that you have in common with your students may stem from a benevolent motive (i.e., not wanting to draw attention to cultural differences for fear of centering students out), you may be inadvertently communicating to them that their cultural differences are invisible to you. This is actually disempowering because of the ways in which culture is so intimately tied up with issues of self (Cummins, 1996) and identity (Gee, 19096).

**Disempowering: C.** Many teachers do not consider ethnicity, culture, and gender as factors that significantly influence schooling (Gay, 2000): one reasons for this is that they believe that good teaching is universal. Some researchers (H. Miller, 2002) go so far as to claim that teachers should not look for a “formulaic methodology that can be employed to effectively teach particular groups of students on the basis of their cultural status” (p. 346), but Gay (2000) shows that those who claim that good teaching is universal are unaware that “their standards of ‘goodness’ in teaching and learning are culturally determined and are not the same for all ethnic groups” (p. 22).

10. **Which list of activities best describes the activities of your EAL classroom?**

**Empowering: B.** These activities in which you engage your EAL students suggest a move beyond the personal phase and literacy phase and into the critical analysis phase (Cummins, 2000, adapted and extended from Ada, 1988a, 1988b; Au, 1979) of studying literacy. These kinds of activities are empowering because students are engaged in both “knowledge generation” and “in a process of self-definition; as they gain the power to think through issues that affect their lives, they simultaneously gain the power to resist external definitions of who they are and to deconstruct the sociopolitical purposes of such external definings” (Cummins, 200, p. 276). Challenge: You and your students can engage in even more empowering literacy practices as you move into the creative phase (Cummins, 1996) where students work to “disco[ver] what changes individuals can make to improve their lives or resolve the problem that has been presented” (p. 276).

**Less Empowering: A.** This pedagogical orientation is closer to empowering literacy teaching than a traditional one (see #7 B & C) because it has moved past the experiential and the literal phrases (Cummins, 2000) of literacy teaching into the personal phase (Cummins, 2000) where students are given opportunities to discuss texts in light of their own experiences. According to Cummins (1996), “sharing and critically reflecting on their own and other students’ experiences opens up identity options for culturally diverse students” (p. 159). However, there is room for greater movement toward empowering teaching (see #10B).

**Disempowering: C.** This traditional/transmission orientation to pedagogy is harmful to linguistically and culturally diverse students: first, it positions the students as passive information banks to be filled by the “expert” teacher (Cummins, 2000, p. 154). Because of the idea here that students are inert learners to whom school provides the knowledge they are lacking and deficient without, this approach reinforces low expectations of students through the defective notion that students have nothing to contribute to the generation of knowledge. Second, this notion is harmful to EAL students’ language needs. As Cummins (1996) argues, this kind of pedagogy goes against “central principles of language and literacy acquisition in that it is impossible to learn or develop literacy in absence of ample opportunities for meaningful communicative interaction in both oral and written modes” (p. 155).
11. Have you noticed that some of your EAL students are often quiet in class, even though you’ve seen them talking with peers in their first language? If so, why do you think this is?

**Empowering:** C. A kind of identity crisis or struggle can happen when the secondary Discourse (see #4A) of the school/classroom is at odds with the student’s primary Discourse. From the learner’s viewpoint, this identity “conflict is between who I am summoned to be in this new Discourse and who I am in other Discourses that overtly conflict with- and sometimes have historically contested with – this Discourse” (Gee, 1996, p. 135). Teachers who are aware of the nature of this identity crisis are more likely to be sensitive to their students’ academic and emotional struggles during this turbulent time/process.

**Less Empowering:** B. This belief definitely reflects a move toward empowering ideology/pedagogy. One EAL student explains the difficulty of learning English: “I’d get so tired ... All day I sit in classes and hear English, English, English, and try so hard to understand ... I was trying to hear a word I knew ... I’d think, today I will understand. But by lunch my head was hurting, and I felt despair” (Olsen, 1998, as cited in Olsen, 2000, p. 198). Students who are learning an additional language will definitely face various levels of social, cultural, affective, and cognitive exhaustion during the language learning process, especially if they are new to the country, city, school, etc. Teachers should also be aware that beyond these factors, there is also the possibility that EAL students are going through an identity crisis (see #11C).

**Disempowering:** A. To attribute students’ silence only to their ability to speak the language is to ignore compounding social, cultural and affective and cognitive issues that linguistically and culturally diverse students are likely facing in their schooling process. Research (Davis, Bazzi & Cho, 2005) shows that silence can be a coping mechanism for students struggling with identity issues; silence can be used by students as a tool/weapon of resistance; and/or silence may reflect an element within students’ cultures of learning (Jin & Cortazzi, 1998) (see #9B). It is a disempowering view that students’ silence is simplistically attributable to their lack of English proficiency because the underlying premise is that if you, as the teacher, are doing all that you can to improve their English abilities, then the onus to assist them in their emotional struggle over learning a new language, possibly from within a culture that is also new to them, is not on you at all.

12. Your class is doing group work. Picture yourself in your classroom, walking around the room and talking with various students. What would a visitor see?

**Empowering:** C. This is indicative of empowering relations.

**Less Empowering:** B. One myth held by dominant groups in society is that “cognitive maturity, sophistication, degree of Americanization, and general personal worthiness” (McKray & Wong, 1996, p. 584) are highly correlated with English speaking proficiency. In short, the higher the English speaking proficiency, the greater maturity, sophistication, and so on are ascribed to the student. Have you taken up this notion unconsciously?

**Disempowering:** A: If you can admit that you tend to struggle with this habit, you are one step closer to an ideology/pedagogy that is empowering to you and your linguistically and culturally diverse students. There are a variety of possible reasons why you may find it easier to interact with students from some cultural groups over others. Perhaps, like the teachers in Vollmer (2000), you tend to favor whom you perceive to be most similar to yourself over those whom you find different.