

“Sounding American”: The consequences of new reforms on English language learners

Kris D. Gutiérrez

Jolynn Asato

Mariana Pacheco

University of California, Los Angeles, USA

Luis C. Moll

University of Arizona, Tucson, USA

Kathryn Olson

Eileen Lai Horng

University of California, Los Angeles, USA

Richard Ruiz

University of Arizona, Tucson, USA

Eugene García

University of California, Berkeley, USA

Teresa L. McCarty

University of Arizona, Tucson, USA

We (the five authors at UCLA) eagerly took up the opportunity to write about the effects of new educational policies on English Language Learners (ELLs) and their teachers. It was an important opportunity to present empirical evidence of the consequences of new reforms on this important student population and to engage in a rich exchange with colleagues like Eugene García who

has also conducted studies of the schooling of ELLs in California, and Luis Moll, Richard Ruiz, and Teresa McCarty who are in the midst of assessing the effects of similar language policies and educational trends in Arizona.

We also believed it important to discuss issues that are continually ignored in recent U.S. reports on reading (e.g., National Reading Panel, 2001). While we would

agree in principle with many of the points raised in such reports (i.e., the importance of attention to skills required in early and efficient reading), we believe it is also important to understand and attend to other key issues of literacy learning and instruction. A glaring omission in such reports is a lack of attention to English Language Learners; to the heterogeneity among learners; to the social organization of learning and instruction; and to social class, poverty, and schooling. As Gee (1999) and Moll and Ruiz (in press) have pointed out, the issue is not poverty but rather how being a poor child becomes a debilitating condition in schools. So the issue is how schools treat poor children.

The research group at UCLA has concerned itself with these issues in an attempt to mediate the devastating effects of schooling on poor children. We have focused attention on the new poor in California, those who are also English Language Learners, and have been studying the effects of new language and literacy reforms on this important student population. Over the past decade, we have studied the literacy practices of urban schools and nonformal learning contexts. In particular, we have examined how effective literacy practices are established and sustained in classrooms with large numbers of English Language Learners, primarily immigrant Spanish-speaking Latino children (Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, & Tejada, 2000). In these long-term ethnographic studies, we have documented the social organization of learning of robust learning communities and the affordances of the primary language in learning activity (Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, & Álvarez, 2001; Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, Álvarez, & Chiu, 1999; Gutiérrez & Stone, 1997; Tejada & Espinoza, 2001). We have proposed new frameworks for teacher preparation (Gutiérrez, 2000) and teacher assistance or coaching (Gutiérrez, Crosland, & Berlin, 2001) and have challenged old paradigms for teaching the language arts in the 21st century (Gutiérrez, 2001; Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, & Turner, 1997).

But most recently, we have been immersed in studies about the effects of new language and literacy initiatives on ELLs. Proposition 227 (the voter initiative that essentially eliminated primary-language instruction in California) is one of the most important language policy decisions in recent U.S. educational history. Without doubt, the elimination of the students' home language from the learning process has had profound and negative consequences on the viability of democratic schooling in the 21st century. With a consortium of researchers across the University of California system, we have been documenting the ways school districts, the local schools, teachers, and parents make sense of this new policy to understand better its short- and long-term effects on the

education of ELLs (Gándara et al., 2000; Gutiérrez & Asato, 1999). Over the past 3 years, the UCLA team has studied how three different school districts, schools, and classroom teachers in southern California interpreted and implemented the new law. The first academic year after the implementation of Proposition 227, we also documented the evolution of classroom and language and literacy practices in three case study classrooms representing different language instructional models.

But studying education is never a quick and simple endeavor. We found that the consequences of English-only pedagogies were exacerbated by the simultaneous implementation of a constellation of educational reforms resulting in new educational practices we have termed backlash pedagogies (Gutiérrez, Asato, Santos, & Gotanda, in press). Central to this new pedagogy is a renewed focus on testing and the concurrent implementation of reductive or narrowly defined reading programs—programs most often taught by teachers with little formal preparation or experience in teaching, especially to ELLs.

Thus, contrary to reports in the public media about the success of English-only programs, our recent studies predict a very dismal future for large numbers of elementary school children who are English Language Learners. For example, we reported the effects of the New Literacy (i.e., English-only and reductive/highly scripted phonics-only reading programs) on students in one large school district for which the percentage of students reading at or above grade level dropped, on average, from 20 to 40 points from first to third grade on the statewide assessment (SAT 9). Although native Spanish speakers continue to be the largest group of ELLs, students from other language groups are also being affected by the new language policy. Of interest, Asian-language-speaking children were also among those who experienced the greatest drop in scores (Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, & Asato, 2001). Yet, the public perception is that these new reforms are working and that programs using the primary language are ineffective.

Within this educational climate, there are elementary schools that continue to surpass the targeted state-defined achievement goal (Academic Performance Index) and persist in their use of primary-language instruction. We believe it is important to document how these schools and teachers create effective learning communities in a high-stakes assessment context. Our preliminary analyses already show some very interesting results. Not surprisingly, we documented a range in what counts as bilingual/biliteracy programs among five schools, as well as significant variance in the role and use of the primary language. Several schools used very targeted approaches for preparing students for the state exam while others did

not address the exam in any explicit way. Of particular interest, two of the schools we studied, both dual-immersion schools, explicitly stated a valuing of the students' primary language as part of their educational missions. As a result, teacher practices were highly aligned with their ideologies about the value of students' primary language. But, of course, we continue to examine these empirical questions in our work. We have expanded this study to examine a new cohort of 29 schools identified for their achievement and primary-language use.

We believe that there is an urgency to conduct such studies as the trends we see in California are emerging in other states with growing numbers of ELLs. Most notably, the voters of Arizona recently passed a more stringent version of the English-only law, Proposition 203. It is for this reason that the UCLA research group flew to Arizona to interview several other prominent scholars who are in the midst of similar studies in Arizona. Moll and Ruiz have long studied the language and literacy issues in education, and Ruiz, in particular, has conducted extensive study of language planning and policy in the U.S. We were fortunate also to conduct a very brief but important interview with McCarty, a scholar of American Indian education in Arizona. The group also held a telephone interview with García and had e-mail exchanges subsequent to our conversation. We begin with García's discussion of the effects of the new reforms on English Language Learners in California.

Eugene García: The contemporary educational zeitgeist embraces excellence and equity for all students. National attention to non-English-speaking children, families, and students and is reflected, for example, in *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), the articulation of national goals, *Goals 2000* (United States Department of Education, 2000), and the more recent initiatives by President George W. Bush to "leave no child behind" (United States Department of Education, 2001). The major thrust of any such effort aimed at these populations has centered on identifying why such populations are not thriving, and how institutions serving these populations can be reformed or restructured to meet this educational challenge. Recent analyses following this theme are found in recommendations by the California State Department of Education's (1998) efforts to better train infant and toddler caregivers in state-supported programs, the U.S. Department of Education reforms for federally funded education programs (García & Gonzalez, 1995; United States Department of Education, 1997), the National Academy of Education's discussion of standards-based reform (McLaughlin & Shepard, 1995), the efforts of the Roundtable on Head Start Research of the National Research Council to provide an issue analysis of research

needed to produce a thriving future for Head Start for a highly diverse population of children and families (Phillips & Cabrera, 1996), the National Council of Teachers of English and the International Reading Association's (1996) treatment of language arts standards, and the National Association for the Education of Young Children's (1996) position statement regarding linguistic and cultural diversity. More directly to this issue are the contributions to this discourse by White House Initiatives on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans (2000), see <http://ed.gov/offices/oha/hispanics>. All these articulations have attended to the vulnerabilities of non-English-proficient children and students and have addressed issues of language and culture. Given this country's past treatment of this population, they also attend to present conceptual and empirical understandings of how institutions must become more responsive.

Reform initiatives addressed in the above publications have served as the basis of new educational initiatives for Latino students throughout the United States. However, educational reform aimed at non-English-speaking students historically in California has diverged from many of these reform recommendations. The following discussion will deal with three substantive challenges in California regarding the schools' reform responses to new English-only policy initiatives at the state and school district level and their effect on English Language Learners. At the state level, a new reform has targeted language of instruction through the passage of Proposition 227 in 1998 (García & Curry Rodriguez, 2000). In 1999, the adoption of an English-only state school accountability program followed (García, 2001). We examined these two recent state policies—policies that were further enhanced by district-level policies dictating the move toward English-only reading programs (Stritikus, 2000). The primary findings of recent studies conducted at the University of California, Berkeley are that these policy initiatives work together to determine the form and outcomes of non-English-speaking student education in California today. Specifically, my colleagues and I (García and his colleagues) have reported on data from school districts that have responded to the implementation of these policies over the last 2 years. The conclusions very clearly indicate that these policies and related practices have spawned new and continued negative effects on Latino students. They are subtractive in nature and ignore the linguistic resources these students bring to the classroom, and they are out of alignment with responsive learning attributes of programs that work well for these students (García, 2001).

(We begin our conversation with a discussion of the effects of Propositions 227 and 203 with the larger group.)

The effects of Proposition 227 and 203

Kris Gutiérrez: In our new work we hope to examine the claim that primary-language instruction and academic excellence are mutually exclusive. This belief was certainly part of the subtext of 227—that the two could not coexist. We're finding that it's difficult for schools to retain primary-language instruction when accountability is measured solely by performance on the state assessment—a test that's given in English. In this high-stakes assessment context, even the schools most committed to offering primary-language instruction are defaulting to English language instruction and providing intense test preparation to their students.

Eileen Lai Hornig: Is Arizona's Proposition 203 different from Proposition 227 in any significant ways?

Luis Moll: There are basically no major distinguishing factors between the two propositions except that waivers may be a little bit more difficult to obtain in 203, and the threat of lawsuits is aimed at administrators—not at teachers like in California.

Jolynn Asato: In our documentation of instruction in the months immediately following the implementation of 227, teachers reported being completely confused because they didn't know if it was still legal to use the methods and materials they had always used. But it was worse for the children. We observed children's confusion about what language to use and why they could no longer use their primary language. Some older children worried that their teachers would be arrested for using Spanish in class, and other children reported feeling sad and afraid about being in school (Gutiérrez & Asato, 1999).

Luis: I think so far, from our observations and primarily from the teachers' own observations, we found that the process is very similar to that of California. There is a lot of confusion, and teachers report some children are scared. They also note an almost complete neglect of subject-matter teaching in structured immersion classrooms.

Mariana Pacheco: This was also a recurrent theme among teachers in southern California. The teaching of science and social studies is virtually absent from schools post 227, especially because of the implementation of the highly scripted reading programs that mandate large blocks of time and strict fidelity to the scripted program.

Luis: There is also no indication that anybody really has a handle on how to do things that will benefit the children. Comparable with what you found in California, there are significant differences in how the law is being implemented by schools and districts. As I mentioned, I think we want to pay attention to subject-matter learning and the exclusive emphasis on English language skills. Teachers report that there is an attitude that as long as the children are learning in English, there is little concern

if they learn anything else. Which is outrageous—within any school. So I don't think there is anything new to report from Arizona in terms of 227. It is a repeat of the same oppression over the past 2 years in California.

When you tell the advocates of this proposition that it is oppressive, they say, Why is it oppressive to want to help children learn English? Of course wanting to help children learn English is not oppressive. The specific actions taken against these students, their teachers, and their families are oppressive; it is oppressive to take away their rights—their right to decide, to make decisions about their children's education. That's oppressive. Because the English-only law is just being implemented here, we do not know yet what will happen under these negative conditions.

Kathryn Olson: So the same dilemma that teachers and students in California find themselves in is replicated in Arizona. It's just that we have more students being affected in California.

Luis: The local school district has bought completely into this idea of reform as simply testing the hell out of the kids. And on top of that you have 203. And on top of that you have this really limited reading curriculum—this drill-and-practice reading curriculum. So the prospects are not good for these children, especially the poor and the non-English speakers. So again in that sense the situation is very similar to California's.

Jolynn: I wonder if you are also seeing something else that we documented in California. Right after the proposition had passed, districts immediately dismantled their bilingual education departments, reassigned personnel, and renamed the departments with less politically loaded names such as the Multicultural Education Office. Even before the district had come up with an implementation plan, workers started to remove placards from the doors and to throw out primary-language instructional materials.

Luis: Yes, I think the same thing is happening here. If they dismantle the bilingual offices—I think it is a strategy to prevent critical analysis of the implementation of the new program. If you don't have people who are interested and keenly aware of the issues and who want to do a penetrating analysis of what's going on, then it won't get done. Without the key players there, it will hinder those documentation efforts.

Eileen: One potential difference is that because of our class size reduction policy in grades K–3 and our shortage of teachers, we have many more noncredentialed teachers teaching English Language Learners in California.

Luis: Right, that might be a difference. But here there is this move to decentralize teacher education; so you have these programs in school districts and junior

colleges and the practice of placing teachers in the classroom before they are credentialed. All these teachers would have only minimal pedagogical training. In Arizona, we also know that most of the teachers with the least professional training are the ones who are assigned to the poorest classrooms. So the children will face not only a highly structured and limited curriculum, but they will also have the least prepared teachers.

Kris: A recent report by a large district in California indicated that students did better with credentialed teachers. Specifically, second-grade students in structured English programs taught by teachers with a CLAD (Cross-cultural Language and Academic Development) or LDS (Language Development Specialist) certification had the greatest gains in reading, while students with BCLAD (Bilingual Cross-cultural Language Development) had the largest gains in the language assessment. On the whole, regardless of the model, teachers with credentials had students with greater adjusted gain scores than students enrolled in classrooms with emergency credentialed teachers (Hayes & Salazar, 2001).

Luis: Teresa, what are your impressions of the implications of 203 for Native Americans?

Teresa McCarty: I think regardless of the fact that Native Americans are supposedly protected from the effects of the proposition by virtue of the Native American Languages Act (1990/1992), Proposition 203 is having a chilling effect across Indian country. The status of Native languages is really very fragile right now. And it makes arguing for the kinds of programs that are really needed in Indigenous communities (i.e., heritage language immersion programs) even more difficult. An additional concern is that even though more Indigenous students come to school with English as a primary language, it tends not to be schooled English. The students are still labeled as LEP (limited English proficient), they're not experiencing success in school, and they need appropriate bilingual education services. I think we have to wait and see what the concrete impact of the new law will be in terms of programs and policies. However, between Proposition 203 and these standardizing educational mandates, right now things are not looking very good. It's very frightening because Indian students are just going to get an even more inferior education. At least there's hope for a quality education with some form of bilingual education, or immersion education. This trend will result in an even more inferior education for these students. It's a different context for American Indian students, but the effects are probably going to be just as devastating as for other language-minority students. It will make it harder for teachers to stand up for what they know the students really need.

Kris: Even though the use of their home language is legally protected?

Teresa: That's an interpretation that some have made for reservation schools. But that becomes problematic when you are dealing with public schools, whether they are on reservations or not. There are always jurisdictional issues with which to contend. So I don't think the jurisdictional issues have been resolved at all. Our state Attorney General made a preliminary finding that the law (203) would not apply to Native Americans—at least in reservation schools—and especially nonpublic reservation schools. But like all schools, American Indian schools are trying to come in line with the standardizing mandates because the funding in community-controlled and BIA (Bureau of Indian Affairs) schools is contingent upon meeting certain standards that are imposed by outside interests.

Kris: So the push toward English language instruction is part of that?

Teresa: Exactly; you can't separate this population from the impact of these new policies.

Kris: What Luis and I have both been documenting in our work is very consistent with what you've just stated. The effects of English-only are exacerbated by a high-stakes assessment context that results in the most reductive learning environment possible.

Teresa: I've been working with the Rough Rock community in northeastern Arizona for about 20 years. It was the first American Indian community-controlled school, and it is famous for being the first Native school and bilingual program teaching the Native language. They have a Title VII, pre-K to 12th-grade bilingual program that is supposed to be immersion from pre-K to second grade and then 50-50 from there on. However, the last few times I've been there have caused me to worry about the viability of such a program. For example, I was in the preschool and heard a lot more English than Navajo. These are 3-year-olds who are supposed to be in a Navajo immersion program; yet Navajo is primarily being used only for directions, instructions, and disciplinary purposes. When I went to one center to observe the teacher and the students, the teacher just looked up at me in despair and said, "I just don't know what to do here—should I be teaching Navajo or should I be teaching to the standards?" Three-year-olds are taking this [Stanford 9] test. It's obscene. The tests are having a chilling effect in a community-controlled school that is supposed to be liberated from some of the restrictions on public schools and other Indian schools. But in order for them to get their funding, they have to meet these standardize mandates (see McCarty, 1998, 2001, 2002; McCarty & Watahomigie, 1998; McCarty, Watahomigie & Yamamoto, 1999).

Kris: It reminds me of a school in Los Angeles that is so well known for its effective primary-language instructional program. The school administrators and teachers have worked hard to retain primary-language instruction, and most of their students have up until recently waived out of the state testing program, which they can do by law. But the school may be forced to abandon its alternative language program because it needs the state money that comes with testing and monies to reform low performing schools. Here's a school that has for years been so committed to carrying out a model bilingual program but may now have to turn to English language instruction so that its students can take the state-mandated test. This high-stakes testing environment and 227 are forcing teachers to default to English language instruction. High test scores are the sole criterion used to measure accountability. Instructional decisions are influenced by testing issues rather than learning issues.

Convergence of reforms

Kris: It's difficult to separate the effects of Proposition 227 from the multiple reforms implemented in California recently. As you know, we have had a convergence of numerous reform efforts with 227 (e.g., class size reduction, a new state standardized assessment program, new mandated reading programs and accountability initiatives, state content standards, a high school exit exam, and a number of remedial programs in response to the ban on social promotion). Of course, teachers are overwhelmed, and it becomes easier to understand the cynicism that comes with what teachers say is the latest new and improved reform. I have written about this in what I call the archaeology of reform—that is, the layering of one reform on another without consideration of their compatibility, either theoretically or pedagogically, and their efficacy.

When I began studying the effects of writing reform efforts over a decade ago, I noted the coexistence of classroom practices that grew out of very different and even competing theoretical orientations to literacy and learning. Nevertheless, they were all part of the teachers' repertoire—their toolkit—and they were often used unintentionally at cross purposes. But the more we understood the educational histories of the state and district, the schools, and their social practices, the better we understood that teachers were expected to implement each new reform without the time and support to make sense of the reform in their own local context, or to understand the new reform in relation to previous reforms and practices—much less in relation to theories of literacy. What results is a layering of reforms—with old reforms being mingled unproductively with new reforms in class-

room practice. In this way, teachers' practices and understandings are unmediated by the reflective and examined practice that is required to transform contexts for learning.

Luis: Yes, I think that for reasons that we have discussed today, especially this confluence of factors, testing, the standards, and the reading prescriptive programs, the prospects of finding schools that emphasize biliteracy and the acquisition of two languages are not very good. I'll use the words that Teresa used in describing the effects on American Indians, "a chilling effect," she said. And in a sense, if we could extend that metaphor, Propositions 227/203 freeze any action and do not allow the continued development of classrooms and other settings that would promote literacy in two languages. So I think that the prospects for developing biliteracy in public schools with working-class children are not good at all right now.

High-stakes assessment

Eugene: California teachers' projections of the impact of high-stakes testing on their language-minority students find strong parallels in the research findings of McNeil and Valenzuela (in press). Drawing on emerging research on high-stakes testing and their individual investigations (McNeil, 1988, 2000; Valenzuela, 1997, 1999), the authors identify a set of alarming educational trends regarding the impact of the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) testing in Texas. Some of the critical issues identified by McNeil and Valenzuela mirror the set of concerns raised by teachers and principals in our studies. TAAS-based teaching and test preparation are usurping a substantive curriculum. TAAS is divorced from children's experience and culture and is widening the educational gap between rich and poor, between mainstream and language-minority students (McNeil & Valenzuela, in press). What are the effects of high-stakes testing in Arizona?

Luis: That is yet another similarity to California and Texas. Arizona wastes millions of dollars on the AIMS (Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards) test, which is just a typical high-stakes test administered solely in English, with a lot of pressure on teachers to shape everything they do in response to this test. The lowest performing schools identified by the district are the schools where the majority of the students are Hispanic or Native American. Of course, those schools are under the most pressure to improve the test scores.

Kris: One of my concerns is that educators and policymakers will overinterpret the early results of the state test scores, especially those of the first and second grades where there is such high alignment between the scripted reading programs and the test; and then they're surprised by the huge drop in scores when it comes to measuring

comprehension in the upper elementary grades. The other is that the districts are also not factoring in the huge systematic accommodations they have made in implementing the programmatic changes district wide. For example, they have designated large blocks of time to increase time on task for reading instruction; they have implemented lots of professional development and on-site assistance that would certainly bolster, in the short run, the test scores. The test scores have such legitimacy with the district and the public that they're being used to make all sorts of decisions about schools—at least the lowest performing schools where all the poor children are.

Luis: Now an interesting aspect here is that the private schools are exempted from the test. I don't know if it's the same in California.

Kris: Yes.

Luis: So the rigor of the test is required only of public school students. The private schools with the wealthiest children are protected from having to endure these tests and also protected from the changes in curriculum that concentrate on solely teaching to the test, as opposed to a more expansive curriculum for the children.

Kris: This is not new for poor children. Now it's just legislated.

Luis: That's right. There's nothing in these reforms or in 203 that helps create conditions to help children from poor families succeed in school. So why should we expect that it would have an effect? If we know that the percentage of poor children in schools is high, there should be attention to the working conditions of teachers so that they can access every resource necessary to help the students do their academic work. But there are virtually no resources being poured into improving the working conditions of teachers. On the contrary, they are deteriorating the working conditions of teachers.

So morale is also the issue. Teachers are considering leaving the profession because the curriculum has been forced upon them, and they are being forced to adjust the curriculum to the test. So you see, it's a Catch-22 for the schools and teachers. And it goes like this: If the students do well, and if the teachers do their work as well as they can, then the success will reinforce these oppressive measures. Yet the teachers won't get any credit. If they do poorly, then it will get even more oppressive and then it will reinforce those who want to privatize education. So schools are caught in a Catch-22 situation.

Scripted reading programs

Mariana: What exacerbates the effects of 227 is this attention to testing and the simultaneous implementation of reductive literacy programs in English, as well as other reforms.

Luis: Although scripted programs are not mandated in Arizona, several schools have adopted them. So we'll be able to also document, at least partially, the interaction between these prescriptive reading programs and the implementation of 203. The scripted programs are similar in the ways they control students through language, some through oral language and others through decoding the written language. They are both ways of using language, in this case English, to pacify and control the children.

Kathryn: This seems to be a trend in states with growing numbers of ELLs.

Eugene: Yes, the educational trends in California and Texas are similar. Both states use one test to determine academic outcomes for students. Both have placed a tremendous emphasis on school ranking and are seeing a drastic increase in the implementation of mandated scripted reading programs at the expense of known effective instructional practices for second-language learners. California's educational system is growing more and more prescriptive, just as Texas has, discrediting the cultural and linguistic assets students bring to the classroom.

Luis: The tendency is to remediate what students can't do well, as opposed to building and developing what they can do well, to use reading as a way of bolstering other needs that may need further development. It seems odd to me that you would spend many semesters working on the children's pronunciation of symbols without having any concern for the child's ability to understand text and to do interesting intellectual things with text, especially in the early years. It's a strange notion to me. Why would anybody want to read if it's not to understand? Except for religious purposes, where you might recite text without really understanding it. I remember being at a conference and meeting a man from an early childhood reading center. I asked the group whether comprehension of text was a primary goal of the center. He said, "Why would you want to worry about comprehension?" This is an early childhood center and that means the children have not finished decoding yet. So his idea was that you didn't have to worry at all about understanding text.

Kris: So there's no meaning making going on in early childhood? (laughs)

Luis: Yes, that's right, you only have to worry about decoding the text. So that means drilling the students on these issues or language sounds for long amounts of time. It's really an absurdity to think that you could deal with comprehension issues of reading much later, maybe fourth grade.

Jolynn: Several of the most widely used new reading programs give little attention to comprehension, to deep learning of content and language. But teachers who want to do more than just teach isolated skills are over-

whelmingly concerned with how to teach English language reading to English Language Learners.

Richard Ruiz: That's because they're being evaluated according to certain standardized measures of reading skills. The view of reading currently in the ascendancy reduces a very complex process to a set of discrete skills, in part to create a reading program that can be packaged and sold to schools and given to teachers off the shelf. Reading is more than discrete skills, and literacy is bigger than reading. The whole idea of environmental print and meaning making, what Freire (1971) called "reading the world" is something that people don't want to hear about in these times. In their way of conceptualizing reading, his ideas are not useful. The goal of the school has become to teach students to read this text so that they can score high on this test. Even the whole issue of critical literacy, that is being able even to understand what you have read so that you can reflect on it, criticize it, think about it and even beyond, is not thought of as useful here. Teachers have to know specific things about reading for sure, but they also have to know what literacy is. They need to know what dimensions of social life enter into meaning making and comprehension and the role of first-language development in second-language reading. The relationship between first-language development and second-language reading is something that's obviously very important. See, for example, the work of Diane August and her team of researchers that shows that Spanish literacy skills are a great resource to the development of English reading proficiency (August, Carlo, & Calderon, 2000). But the view of reading that predominates in Washington these days ignores the importance of first-language development. I would even say that they do not consider anything literacy if it is not in English.

Kris: One district administrator recently told me that what his teachers needed were prepackaged lessons. What he's really saying is "give me an ironclad, teacher-proof, systematic way of teaching so that I can make accountability easier. I can measure teacher variables; I can measure kid variables if you just give me an ironclad curriculum."

Mariana: We're talking now about highly scripted programs that come out of a particular view of learning. How would you compare this view to a cultural-historical-psychological view of learning and development, especially if we're thinking about early literacy development of English Language Learners?

Luis: Oh, that's a tough question. It really depends. Some of the people who have worked with a cultural-historical line disagree or have different approaches to the teaching of reading. There is no one particular way that the theory will dictate how reading has to be organized. However, there are certain aspects one can take into ac-

count in organizing reading instruction. One is that reading instruction must be semantically driven. The making of meaning or what Vygotsky referred to as semiotic mediation, not only the mediation of thinking through symbol systems but also the mediation of thinking through meaning, always involves meaning. This would suggest that acquiring the symbol system always involves facilitating the making of meaning by children. That's what I mean by the system first and foremost being semantically based. The other aspects of learning how to read include understanding symbol-sound correspondence and how the alphabetic system works. Those aspects would be addressed but in the context of the making of meaning. I see that the more holistic approaches to the teaching of reading are much closer to the cultural-historical perspective that involves acquiring a system, an alphabetic system that becomes first and foremost a tool for the mediation of meaning. So I see compatibility between a cultural-historical-psychological view and the more holistic approaches that include meaning as a principle of development from the beginning.

Vygotsky wrote that one principle of development is that whatever outcome you want to develop has to be present in some form from the beginning of the activity (Moll, 2000). So in the same way, the teaching of reading from the very beginning has to include the semantic aspects of literacy development if you want that child to develop into that system and retain those aspects of literacy. But that said, like all theories, there are many different actions that may be taken on the basis of this theoretical perspective. There's no one particular direction that the theory necessarily takes. So it depends on what principles are utilized to create a particular pedagogy. For example, Raphael and Goatley (1994) studied book clubs as systems of instruction organized around children acquiring discourse to talk about texts in learning activity. They claimed that many of these kinds of literacy activities are built on Vygotskian ideas—especially the appropriation of the discourse means. Claude Goldenberg's work on instructional conversations (1992/1993) represents a very different approach, a much more scripted approach in terms of teaching reading comprehension. He also claimed that this approach builds on Vygotskian ideas, in this case, the zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978). The Goodmans (Y. Goodman & K. Goodman, 1990) stated that Vygotskian and Piagetian ideas were central to their whole language approach to literacy. Those are at least three very different ways of approaching the topic of the teaching of reading that have been influenced in one way or another by Vygotsky's ideas. But there's no prescription that you can borrow from the field of teaching. There's a whole lot of intellectual work that one must do

to develop a pedagogy that's inspired by the theory, but I don't think the theory provides you with prescriptions for practice.

Kris: But in line with what you said before, while there are no prescriptions, there are some general principles that are inspired by cultural-historical perspectives of learning and development. For example, let us consider the distinction that Cole and Griffin (1983) made in their discussion of remedial reading. One major distinction between an approach that *remediates* reading and one that *re-mediates* reading issues is the way in which learning is organized, how the intellectual work required in learning to read is defined and organized. I've also made some of those same distinctions in my own work. Keeping Cole and Griffin's distinctions in mind, remedial reading instruction, for example, most often emphasizes the learning of basic skills, while re-mediating reading difficulties requires immersing students in a basic reading activity in which they learn both basic skills, as well as the sociocultural knowledge about what it means to be literate and participate in literacy activity. I don't want to oversimplify this distinction. It is a fundamental difference that is ignored in current research on reading development. I think there are other distinctions that are worth mentioning as well.

Another is that remediation, as well as the new national paradigm of reading, privileges one way of organizing learning, namely explicit instruction. I think a sociocultural view of literacy learning would argue for multiple mediational means that would include explicit assistance as but one form. And explicit instruction would be used strategically and purposefully. In line with that, this view would value engaging students in rigorous tasks where accountable talk (Michaels, 2001) and joint activity are part of the normative classroom script.

Luis: Yes, that's right, that's a differentiation that Cole and Griffin (1983) also made—the importance of the broader activity and how those activities help organize the details of the teaching and learning. That's another way of thinking about it. As a matter of fact, research like Annemarie Palincsar's reciprocal teaching (Palincsar, 1986; Palincsar & Brown, 1984) was inspired in part by Vygotskian (1978) ideas of mediation, the zone of proximal development, and the guidance of significant others. So again, I don't think a theory, especially a theory like cultural-historical psychology, provides prescriptions for practice. Those have to be generated. Gordon Wells (1996, 1999) also provided ideas on the teaching of reading and writing that built perhaps more directly on Vygotskian ideas than other researchers. The tools of reading and writing are used deliberately to develop students' own thinking. I borrow the idea of literate thinking from him. Wells was interested in social interactions and

how certain types of discourse patterns were appropriated by the students in interaction; he was interested in organizing activities that students eventually take over because they have developed expertise with specialized forms of discourse.

Jolynn: And, of course, your own body of work, Luis, is inspired by Vygotsky (Moll, 2000, 2001).

Language planning and policy

Luis: Richard, do you consider the phonics-based reading programs where the children are drilled in isolated word sounds a language planning issue?

Richard: Sure. In programmatic terms, if you can make ELLs sound more like normative English speakers with the short-term gains that you get from phonics programs, you can exit them out of primary-language programs more quickly.

Kris: I think your emphasis on short-term gains is a critical point. One of the things, it's too soon to tell in Arizona, but one of the main effects that we saw immediately in 227 was the absolute reduction of the use of the primary language even in places where it was required. The whole campaign around 227 made public and sanctioned this new ideology about language and the primacy of English. And so, very quickly, there was a move away from primary-language instruction and the tendency to equate oral language proficiency with academic English language proficiency.

Richard: Historically, language planning has been divided into two areas: status planning and corpus planning. Recently, Robert Cooper (1989) has suggested a third dimension, which he calls acquisition planning. Acquisition planning involves the decisions that are made about language learning—how you structure the learning environment, how you prepare teachers and create materials. And how you develop the sound theoretical bases to ensure students learn what you intended them to learn. To my way of thinking, along with that of others such as Nancy Hornberger (1989, 1994, 1997), Rebecca Freeman (1998), Maria Brisk (1998), and a host of others, the most crucial issue in acquisition planning is how to create additive contexts out of situations that have historically been subtractive ones. For the most part, language-minority children around the world enter a subtractive environment when they go to school. Their language is not valued in schools. So if you're going to have a bilingual program that actually works and that sustains long-term bilingualism, you need to create an additive rather than a subtractive language and literacy program.

Eugene: Our data indicate that the same is true in California; most of the learning contexts for minority students were already subtractive. And now the combined effects of recent reform attempts will exact a greater price

on the education of California's poorest minority students. These policies and related practices are not aligned with either federal efforts to build additive bilingual/bicultural programs as opposed to subtractive English-only programs (García, 2001); nor are they aligned with empirical information related to optimal and effective schooling for language-minority students (August & Hakuta, 1997).

Kris: You have done so much work on language planning. I want to ask you if you think the tragedy of September 11, 2001, is going to change our national stance toward languages other than English or toward language planning and policy?

Richard: Well, the most intense language planning activities in the world are generally military based. This is certainly true in the USA, where the most effective language developers are the military. They have a captive audience that they can keep for 2 or 3 years at a time, immersing them in a new language. And the military has a mission, a goal. This has not always been true, by the way. Certainly in the last 50 years, our sense has been that language, the knowledge of different kinds of languages, is beneficial militarily, to know the language of the enemy (Ruiz, 1984). So I suspect that since September 11th the military has been really intensifying its recruitment of people who know Arabic, who are interested in learning Arabic, or who have a background in it. So, yes, there will be a huge impact on language with respect to schools. At the same time, the history of linguistically or racially diverse students in schools has not been good when we have a conflict because what often happens is that, and you see it now, there are clear symbols of political and national allegiance that you have to display. Language behavior is one of those: The extent that you insist on maintaining and using your heritage language, even if you are proficient in English, becomes an indicator of allegiance to those around you. And there are consequences to pay if you don't engage in such public displays of patriotism. These conflicts intensify a kind of inwardness, an almost jingoistic and xenophobic idea. So in times of war or perceived threats to our national stability, our schools tend not to respond positively to things like language, diversity, and pluralism. It makes it much harder to impress on people the value of language diversity and language pluralism.

Jolynn: So what you're describing is a paradox. On one hand, language pluralism is valued when it's used to safeguard our national borders and interests. On the other hand, our national identity is premised upon the condition of linguistic homogeneity.

Richard: Yes. At the same time, there is this tendency now to have more and more people talking about the value of language as a resource to the nation, and to the society, and to the school, and to the students, and so

on. But let's be clear. The languages that people perceive in these ways are those that have been attached to high prestige or social (usually economic, but sometimes military) usefulness; these are the so-called world standard languages. But it's not clear that the knowledge and language proficiencies of local communities are seen as resources that children can utilize in schools. What's more, in the language planning literature it is clear that globalization itself, which Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson (1994) and others refer to as "McDonaldization," is probably detrimental to small language communities. It homogenizes small communities and makes them more susceptible to the problems of globalization. For example, if they speak or use a local language, they are pressured to abandon their local language, their regional language, and their community language in favor of the world standard. By the way, foreign-language educators have never been great supporters of bilingual education, because they see the local language as essentially a different kind of language from those they study and promote—if they see the language of the community as language at all.

Mariana: Again, the language of the local community is not valued in the larger community or in schools.

Richard: Few pay attention to the fact that in Tucson there are old and vital communities where languages other than English live. If we would see these communities and their languages as resources, we would make use of them in schools. We would figure out some way to conserve, manage, and develop the local languages in interesting and important ways in schools. But for the most part we don't do that because we really don't see them as useful in any substantive way.

Luis: But bilingual education didn't just serve the function of educating the children. Bilingual education was a powerful medium to bring a lot of people from the local communities into the profession—people who otherwise wouldn't be in the profession. So in that sense, it forever transformed the social demographics of schools. And so there's a powerful legacy. If you asked many of us in academia and many of the teachers, "What was your motivation?" we and they would answer, "Well, my motivation was bilingual education." In that sense, there's a contribution we have to honor.

Effective learning communities

Kathryn: Our study of effective schools that use primary-language instruction documents the specific practices that schools and teachers use that both build biliteracy skills and increase achievement. We found that across schools there is a range in how schools organize literacy learning, how they use the primary language, as well as a range in how they value the children's

languages and cultures. What does your research say about effective learning contexts for English Language Learners?

Luis: We are studying one school that has been particularly successful by any criteria. Our observations and documentation of the progress of the students in biliteracy programs have shown that they are above the national average in all respects. In reading, the students are scoring around the 65th percentile. It's almost as if they have a guarantee of academic success at that school. They tell the parents: Bring your children here. Regardless of whether they're Spanish speakers or English speakers, they will leave the school literate in two languages and competent in subject matter. That's a hell of a guarantee. Thus, part of the idea behind this study is to understand how the school does its social work to achieve this success. And, ideologically, how they function to protect the children from propositions oppressing their language. Now we're documenting how they're mediating the impact of Proposition 203.

Mariana: So how do these schools do the social work and get these higher test scores with a primary-language focus?

Luis: Part of what we are trying to understand in our studies, like you are in California, is to document what people are doing to create the space to do work they think is valuable for the children, teachers, and families. That's not only an educational achievement; it's a political achievement. How do they do it? It takes a combination of factors, including having a supportive ideology and having a language ideology in which having children develop two languages is a very good thing. Part of this ideology is the belief that it is a particularly important thing for them to develop their primary language not only as a basic right, but also as a valuable intellectual resource. Schools should be about creating a set of intellectual resources for students. Schools do many other things, but one of the primary responsibilities is to create an intellectual environment for students. So that's one aspect of the ideology.

Another requires relationships of trust between the teachers and the administration, the school and the broader community—the school's ability to open its doors to potential resources from the community and the school's ability to provide resources to the community—and the school's ability to create a larger educational ecology that's not solely in the classrooms. It should provide a lot of after-school activities and the support to sustain those activities. These are all consistent with a philosophy of providing an additive schooling experience for the children, particularly one in which the two languages are privileged and are marked in those activities. The challenge is to create unmarked contexts for the use

of Spanish for sustained periods of time. Our study of biliteracy has also turned into a study of ideologies and a study of the social organization of schooling.

In a recent article Richard and I wrote, we called it achieving educational sovereignty (Moll & Ruiz, in press). What we mean by sovereignty is not in the sense of isolating and creating borders to isolate the community you have created, like strengthening the borders of the U.S. to protect its sovereignty from immigrants. That's not the way we're using the term here. We are using the term *sovereignty* in almost the opposite way, to describe the process of creating the social networks, social interactions, and social relationships necessary to bolster the school's opportunity to develop and sustain additive environments for the children—even in the face of rather oppressive social factors. We're trying to understand a little better how they achieve that sovereignty.

Mariana: Do you think we can count on schools to accomplish this if the educational trends continue?

Luis: Not necessarily, but I do think that we have to worry more about how to create other learning arrangements like the 5th Dimension after-school programs or versions that expand the ecology of education beyond the school and create other social networks that provide an expanded view of how education can take place. And within those broader views, Spanish I think can play an important role.

Kris: Unfortunately, we are having to rely more and more on outreach efforts to mediate the effects of, as you say, oppressive schooling practices on urban students. One of our more successful attempts is our after-school computer-mediated club in a port-of-entry elementary school in Los Angeles. You referred to the 5th Dimension. Our after-school club is a variation of the 5th Dimension after-school clubs originally conceptualized around cultural-historical activity theoretic views of learning and development by Cole and Griffin (Cole, 1996). This effort is part of a statewide consortium of University of California researchers, primarily the group at UCLA, Olga Vasquez and Michael Cole, and a number of others who have dedicated themselves to creating and sustaining robust contexts for learning in partnerships with local communities. These sites are characterized by their expansive learning opportunities (Engestrom, 1987) and hybrid language practices—that is, the strategic use of the children's complete linguistic toolkit to learn new content and to build literacy skills (Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, & Tejada, 2000).

Luis: I think that could be a place that takes advantage of resources in the children's broader environment and coordinates that with their schooling—especially after-school programs, both school based and community based, that currently play a very limited role. The idea of

a teacher closing the door to the classroom with the teacher in charge means that you're also closing the door to all sorts of resources and allies for the teacher working with the student. You close the door on that.

Richard: Earlier I was talking about additive and subtractive schooling. I first heard Lambert and Taylor (1972) speak about these concepts, but they were speaking mainly in terms of language acquisition and language development. Subsequently, other researchers, like Hamers and Blanc (2000) who wrote a book on bilingualism, also talked about the notions of additive and subtractive as sociocultural factors rather than only linguistic ones. They argued that it is impossible to have an additive context if the child's first language is not valued—if *both* or *all* of the languages are not highly valued or reflected in the curriculum. For example, from an additive perspective, a child's language is used for important functions—not just to give directions or just to converse with children, but actually to use the language as the medium of instruction. We often think of additive and subtractive as having more to do with whether the child's bilingualism is stable, rather than the sociocultural environment in which the child acquires language, right? Lambert (1977) has expanded the terms to include the quality of the sociocultural contexts of language acquisition.

Kris: Luis, this is similar to the way you and others talk about cultural amplification—that education should be about amplifying one's linguistic and sociocultural knowledge (Cole & Griffin, 1980).

Luis: There's another way of thinking about additive schooling. There is also a strong emotional aspect to consider. Additive schooling can be thought of in terms of creating nurturing and effective environments for the children's learning, while subtractive environments are both punitive and distressing emotionally, like the current environments resulting from Propositions 203 and 227.

Richard: Yes, I wanted to come back to this point. In these contexts that Lambert and others call subtractive, it is extremely difficult to convey any sense of value for the student's first language. In this political context students are transitioned into a mainstream program as quickly as possible, in no longer than 1 year. How can you do this and possibly convey a sense of value for their language to teachers, to students, to their parents, and to society in general? How can you value what they bring to the school when you're basically saying there's nothing of educational value in their language because we want to transition them out of it as soon as possible and never use it again. Right? And so what you're doing in passing initiatives such as 227 in California and 203 in Arizona is institutionalizing a subtractive environment. This practice has been there forever for these children;

we are going back to the same educational situation that we've always had.

Kris: But now it's legalized.

Richard: Yes. The folks who are pushing English-only are saying that this is a new thing. It's not a new thing. It's something that English Language Learners have always had to deal with in schools. But now it's legal and institutionalized and, in some cases, part of the constitution of the state. It is depressing from that point of view. Yet, whenever there are creative and well-intentioned and capable teachers around, they are going to find a way to make something good out of something terrible. That doesn't mean that it wouldn't be better if you didn't have terrible language policies to resist or deal with.

Eileen: But there are teachers doing good things even in this oppressive context.

Luis: Yes, there were a few teachers we observed who were exceptional. What I admire is that they have so much self-confidence about their work, what they're doing, and their pedagogy. Sometimes I would walk in and observe in the classrooms without even asking them beforehand. And they would say, "Come on in, what do you need to check out?" They are just very self-confident and are constantly trying to expand the learning environment where the students are participants. In these environments, they provide the students with the tools, practices, and the discourse practices to be able to engage in sophisticated activities using texts and computers in Spanish and in English. And they show tremendous respect for their students.

Kris: The effective teachers we have studied also insist on what Mike Rose (1995) called a respectful curriculum. A respectful curriculum is one that is built on high expectations of students' ability and potential, on the need to engage students in rigorous, demanding, and authentic literacy activities. And at the same time, a respectful curriculum provides the necessary scaffolding or mediation that students need in order to develop.

Luis: That's correct. And that's what I mean too. These teachers manifest this respect in their work, and they are self-critical and question, Did I do this right? How else can I organize this activity? What new things can I include in here to engage the students? And they include the children in the decision making. It's not that the children have total say in the classroom, but the teachers share the decision making with the students. They share the power of deciding not only what they are learning, but why they are learning it. These are really excellent teachers.

Kris: And how do these students perform on more traditional criteria measures or state tests?

Luis: They score well. I've never seen any of them teaching to the test or training children to do the test or

anything like that. I think they go so much beyond the test that the test items are within the children's reach because they are used to doing more complicated literacy activities.

Kris: How do you think these teachers got to be so good?

Luis: I think who their colleagues are makes a big difference. And I think they also have a certain ideology about the needs of the children and the families that sustains their practice. We could call it an additive ideology that sustains their effective practice. So regardless of how difficult the social conditions of working as a teacher can get, they find ways of sustaining these additive environments—sometimes with great difficulty. They are really heroes in that sense, completely unselfish in terms of their work and in their attempts at helping the children succeed.

Teacher preparation

Kris: What do teachers need to know to teach English Language Learners in this post-227/203 context?

Luis: There should be a list of essential criteria.

Richard: I think there are some interrelated categories: knowledge of language, and not just language with a small *l*, but language development—how children develop language, how they use the resources at their disposal to develop different concepts and ideas. So language development is a large category. But also teachers have to know about the students' language, about their students' backgrounds and experiences, and about the contexts of their language development. What do they need to know about their students' communities, the resources in the communities, and about the way in which the communities have developed? These questions are important because most of the teachers, especially teachers of English Language Learners or minority children in general, do not live in the communities in which they teach. So teachers need to know something about what's going on in the community (see Moll, Amanti, Niff, & Gonzalez, 1992). In other words, their teaching can't be a totally decontextualized experience within the classroom. People often talk about how you can close your classroom door and do your thing in there. Well, you know what? You can close your door, but you're always in this larger context from which your children come. The context is always there.

Luis: Teachers also need to be familiar with theories of reading and how particular theories treat the issues of language. But they also need to know that learning to read, and teaching reading, isn't simply a technical skill—that there are other broader social, cultural, and semantic factors involved.

Richard: What do we do now in terms of teacher preparation? Do we act as if there are no English Language Learners out there, or do we act as if every teacher in every circumstance is going to have English Language Learners and, therefore, we have to teach them? The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (2001, see <http://www.nbpts.org>) created a new certification program for what they called Teachers of English as a New Language (ENL). The standards are an attempt to address the importance of teachers needing to have knowledge of community, knowledge of their students, and knowledge of culture. They also need to have knowledge of language development, including development of the students' language. How teacher education institutions such as the University of Arizona will ultimately respond to this new situation is unknown; the recognition that we will have to change to prepare teachers for all students is just starting to hit us.

Kris: One of the tensions in teacher education programs in California is that some educators and policy-makers believe that there is no need to continue the special preparation of teachers who can provide instruction in the students' home language or teachers who will teach English Language Learners in general. Even some more progressive teacher education programs do not recognize the special challenge that bilingual teachers now face in light of English-only and highly scripted literacy programs. Others of us argue that teachers of English Language Learners need more professional development, more knowledge than ever before, and that they cannot receive the same preparation program as other novice teachers and still be adequately prepared. So even programs that are social justice oriented should ask themselves if one-size-fits-all ideologies inform their teacher preparation practices, if there is a need to prepare bilingual teachers and teachers of non-English-speaking students differently—especially when it comes to teaching reading.

Richard: Your colleague Leo Estrada at UCLA would call that demographic denial. That is, the idea that one can prepare teachers for classrooms in which all students speak English is a fantasy, yet we continue developing programs as if the fantasy were true.

At least in Arizona, that's certainly true of our programs. We have these bifurcated teacher education programs, where the regular and the bilingual teacher-preparation candidates are in different tracks, called "blocks." The regular students are in what is usually a 4-year program. In our case, people don't enter until their junior year, so they have 2 years of general education before they enter the College of Education for their last 2 years of methods courses. This is the so-called regular track or block of students. They hear virtually nothing

about bilingual language methods, nothing like that. I think they have one course at the end of their program that throws everything into it: mainstreaming, bilingual education, and all that stuff. I think this still exists, because we don't know what we're going to do yet. On the other hand, you have the bilingual block of students who have to do everything the regular students do, but in addition they learn about teaching methods appropriate for English Language Learners. So the bilingual program is a 5-year program. You have to go an extra year. This is why the argument that bilingual teachers are conspiring to keep bilingual education programs, regardless of their effectiveness, in their own self-interest is ludicrous. The bilingual teachers are just as certified as teachers as the other students when they leave the college, but in addition they have the added background and experience needed to work with these other children. If anyone should be afraid for their jobs, whether we have bilingual education or not, it is those who have no experience or training in this area.

Next steps

Jolynn: It looks like New York and Colorado might be next in line to consider initiatives similar to Propositions 227 and 203. How should language and literacy researchers respond to this trend? Do we have a role to play?

Luis: Well, I think that informing colleagues or people interested in these issues in New York is an important contribution. Although, as you know, the function of data in these political debates is negligible. We even have data here from the Arizona Department of Education that students in bilingual programs were outperforming students in English monolingual programs. Using their own data and their own criteria, those findings played no role whatsoever in shaping people's thinking about how to vote on the propositions. Even if you had presented the voters of Arizona with the most compelling data, they would have ignored it because they were voting at an ideological and emotional level—that is much more persuasive than any data that we could provide. Propositions 227 and 203 weren't about bilingual education. They were about broader ideological and political concerns, especially in the context of the changing demographics. Nevertheless, it's our work to provide information and collaborate with our colleagues in New York and Colorado to provide the analysis and theory they need.

Mariana: So what lessons have you learned from your research?

Luis: The primary lesson I have learned from the teachers with whom I've been collaborating is that if you're going to be in education, you have to stay optimistic, regardless of 203, 227, oppressive reading curricu-

la, the lack of resources, and the testing. If you lose that optimism, then you will become intellectually and socially demoralized and you won't be able to do your work. I believe that teachers in the system who are struggling to create and maintain additive learning environments for the children—those are heroes, man. And there are a bunch of them. We learn from them.

Kris: That's why it is really important for us to work closely with teachers committed to helping children in the districts because, more than anything, they need some validation, some meaningful assistance—they're dying in their unsupportive contexts. And I think good rigorous research that presents multiple perspectives should be available to them as well. I'm concerned about the medical model surfacing as the metaphor for educational practice and research. I recently heard someone say, I don't remember where, that even within the medical model one never hears doctors being told to adhere to one single perspective, to try only one method or test to diagnose and address a patient's illness, to treat the patient's illness without consideration of the patient's specific symptoms—to hold on to a particular view despite compelling new evidence. But that's what good teachers are being asked to do, especially when it comes to teaching reading to poor children, to English Language Learners.

At UCLA, our group has engaged in serious discussions about what this all portends for conducting literacy research in urban communities, for doing good research that makes a difference for those communities, and for mentoring the next generation of scholars. We have discussed the particular challenges the recent and not-so-recent trends in education present to scholars of color who are committed to studying and addressing the oppressive and unproductive schooling practices that so many poor and working-class children experience.

Conclusion

As we consider the next steps for research concerned with improving the schooling experiences of the rapidly growing student population in the United States, we believe it is important to challenge recent claims from sectors of the research community that reduce rigorous qualitative research to pseudoscience. Recent publications suggest that the knowledge base that informs the teaching and learning of reading must emerge from studies following a particular methodological orientation (National Reading Panel, 2001). In these discussions, rigorous research is defined by the exclusive use of control/comparison groups, standardized measures, and random assignment or comparable group pretesting. From this perspective, systematic research that focuses on activity or social practice as units of analysis would be excluded.

Similarly, research that concerns itself with culture and its relationship to literacy learning, or that examines how the social organization of learning influences learning outcomes, for example, is considered unscientific and irrelevant to the national discussion of how children learn to read and become literate. Of course, such dangerous dichotomies fly in the face of how many of us think about our work and prepare our graduate students, as we try to move away from methodological orthodoxy to deeper understandings of education as a complex activity requiring complex and multiple perspectives and methods.

REFERENCES

- AUGUST, D., CARLO, M., & CALDERON, M. (2000). *Transfer of skills from Spanish to English: A study of young learners: Report for practitioners, parents and policy makers*. Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org/pubs/articles/skillstransfer.pdf>
- AUGUST, D., & HAKUTA, K. (1997). *Improving schooling for language minority children: Research agenda*. Washington, DC: National Research Council.
- BRISK, M. (1998). *Bilingual education: From compensatory to quality schooling*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. (1998). *Fostering development in a first and second language in early childhood*. [Resource Guide]. Sacramento, CA: Author.
- COLE, M. (1996). *Cultural psychology: A once and future discipline*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- COLE, M., & GRIFFIN, P. (1980). Cultural amplifiers reconsidered. In D. Olson (Ed.), *The social foundations of language and thought* (pp. 343–364). New York: Norton.
- COLE, M., & GRIFFIN, P. (1983). A socio-historical approach to re-mediation. *The Quarterly Newsletter of the Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition*, 5(4), 69–74.
- COOPER, R. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- ENGSTROM, Y. (1987). *Learning by expanding*. Helsinki, Finland: Orienta-Konsultit Oy.
- FREEMAN, R. (1998). *Bilingual education and social change*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- FREIRE, P. (1971). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.
- GÁNDARA, P., MAXWELL-JOLLY, J., GARCÍA, E., ASATO, J., GUTIÉRREZ, K., STRITIKUS, T., & CURRY, J. (2000). *The initial impact of Proposition 227 on the instruction of English learners*. Davis, CA: University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute.
- GARCÍA, E. (2001). *Hispanic education in the United States: Raíces y Alas*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- GARCÍA, E., & CURRY RODRIGUEZ, J. (2000). The education of limited English proficient students in California schools: An assessment of the influence of Proposition 227 in selected districts and schools. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 24(1–3), 15–35.
- GARCÍA, E., & GONZALEZ, R. (1995). Issues in systemic reform for culturally and linguistically diverse students. *College Record*, 96(3), 418–431.
- GEE, J.P. (1999). Reading and the new literacy studies: Reframing the national academy of sciences report on reading. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 31, 355–374.
- GOLDENBERG, C. (1992/1993). Instructional conversations: Promoting comprehension through discussion. *The Reading Teacher*, 46, 316–326.
- GOODMAN, Y., & GOODMAN, K. (1990). Vygotsky in a whole language perspective. In L.C. Moll (Ed.), *Vygotsky in education* (pp. 229–250). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- GUTIÉRREZ, K. (2000). Teaching and learning in the 21st century. *English Education*, 32, 290–298.
- GUTIÉRREZ, K. (2001). So what's new in the English language arts: Challenging policies and practices, ¿y que? *Language Arts*, 78, 564–569.
- GUTIÉRREZ, K., & ASATO, J. (1999, May). *The effects of Proposition 227 on the teaching and learning of literacy*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Linguistic Minority Research Institute, Santa Cruz, CA.
- GUTIÉRREZ, K., ASATO, J., SANTOS, M., & GOTANDA, N. (in press). Backlash pedagogy: Language and culture and the politics of reform. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*.
- GUTIÉRREZ, K., BAQUEDANO-LÓPEZ, P., & ÁLVAREZ, H. (2001). Literacy as hybridity: Moving beyond bilingualism in urban classrooms. In M. de la Luz Reyes & J. Halcón (Eds.), *The best for our children: Critical perspectives on literacy for Latino students* (pp. 122–141). New York: Teachers College Press.
- GUTIÉRREZ, K., BAQUEDANO-LÓPEZ, P., ÁLVAREZ, H., & CHIU, M. (1999). A cultural-historical approach to collaboration: Building a culture of collaboration through hybrid language practices. *Theory Into Practice*, 38(2), 87–93.
- GUTIÉRREZ, K., BAQUEDANO-LÓPEZ, P., & ASATO, J. (2001). English for the children: The new literacy of the old world order. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 24(1 & 2), 87–112.
- GUTIÉRREZ, K., BAQUEDANO-LÓPEZ, P., & TEJEDA, C. (2000). Rethinking diversity: Hybridity and hybrid language practices in the third space. *Mind, Culture, & Activity: An International Journal*, 6, 286–303.
- GUTIÉRREZ, K., BAQUEDANO-LÓPEZ, P., & TURNER, M.G. (1997). Putting language back into language arts: When the radical middle meets the third space. *Language Arts*, 74, 368–378.
- GUTIÉRREZ, K., CROSLAND, K., & BERLIN, D. (2001). Reconsidering coaching: Assisting teachers' literacy practices in the zone of proximal development. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Los Angeles.
- GUTIÉRREZ, K., & STONE, L. (1997). A cultural-historical view of learning and learning disabilities: Participating in a community of learners. *Learning Disabilities: Research and Practice*, 12(2), 123–131.
- HAMERS, J., & BLANC, M.A. (2000). *Bilinguality and bilingualism* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- HAYES, K., & SALAZAR, J.J. (2001). *Evaluation of the structured English immersion program* (Final Report: Year 1). Los Angeles: Los Angeles Unified School District.
- HORNBERGER, N.H. (1989). Introduction: Bilingual education and language planning in indigenous Latin America. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 77, 5–9.
- HORNBERGER, N.H. (1994). Literacy and language planning. *Language and Education*, 8, 75–86.
- HORNBERGER, N.H. (1997). Literacy, language maintenance, and linguistic human rights: Three telling cases. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 127, 87–103.
- LAMBERT, W. (1977). The effects of bilingualism and the individual: Cognition and sociocultural consequences. In P. Hornby (Ed.), *Bilingualism: Psychological, social and educational implications* (pp. 15–28). New York: Academic Press.
- LAMBERT, W., & TAYLOR, D. (1972). *Bilingual education of children: The St. Lambert experiment*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- MCCARTY, T.L. (1998). Schooling, resistance, and American Indian languages. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 132, 27–41.
- MCCARTY, T.L. (2001). Between possibility and constraint: Indigenous language education, planning and policy in the United States. In J.F. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language education policies: Critical issues* (pp. 285–307). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- MCCARTY, T.L. (2002). *A place to be Navajo? Rough Rock and the struggle for self-determination in indigenous schooling*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- MCCARTY, T.L., & WATAHOMIGIE, L.J. (1998). Language and literacy in American Indian and Alaska native communities. In B. Perez (Ed.), *Sociocultural contexts of language and literacy* (pp. 69–98). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- MCCARTY, T.L., WATAHOMIGIE, L.J., & YAMAMOTO A.Y. (Eds.). (1999). Reversing language shift in indigenous America: Collaborations and views from the field. *Practicing Anthropology*, 21(2), 2–11.
- MCCLAUGHLIN, M., & SHEPARD, L. (1995). *Improving education through standards-based reform* (National Academy of Education Panel on Standards-Based Education Reform). Stanford, CA: Stanford University.
- MCNEIL, L.M. (1988). *Contradictions of control: School structure and school knowledge*. New York: Routledge.
- MCNEIL, L.M. (2000). *Contradictions of reform: The educational costs of standardization*. New York: Routledge.
- MCNEIL, L.M., & VALENZUELA, A. (in press). The harmful impact of the TAAS system of testing in Texas: Beneath the accountability rhetoric. In M.

KORNHABER & G. ORFIELD (Eds.), [Untitled]. New York: The Century Foundation.

MICHAELS, S. (2001, October). *Accountable talk: Classroom conversation that works*. Institute for Learning National Seminar: Ways of Knowing, Ways of Learning, Pittsburgh, PA.

MOLL, L. (2000). Inspired by Vygotsky: Ethnographic experiments in education. In C. Lee & P. Smagorinsky (Eds.), *Vygotskian perspectives on literacy research: Constructing meaning through collaborative inquiry* (pp. 256–268). New York: Cambridge University Press.

MOLL, L. (2001). The diversity of schooling: A cultural-historical approach. In M. de la Luz Reyes & J. Halcón (Eds.), *The best for our children: Critical perspectives on literacy for Latino students* (pp. 13–28). New York: Teachers College Press.

MOLL, L., AMANTI, C., NIFF, D., & GONZALEZ, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teachers: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice*, 31(2), 132–141.

MOLL, L., & RUIZ, R. (in press). The schooling of Latino students. In M. Suárez-Orozco & M. Páez (Eds.), *Latinos: Remaking America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE EDUCATION OF YOUNG CHILDREN. (1996). NAEYC Position Paper: Responding to linguistic and cultural diversity—Recommendations for effective early childhood education. *Young Children*, 52(2), 4–12.

NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS. (2001). Available: <http://www.nbpts.org>.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION. (1983). *A nation at risk: A report to the nation and Secretary of Education, United States Department of Education*. Washington, DC: Author.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH/INTERNATIONAL READING ASSOCIATION. (1996). *Standards for the English language arts*. Urbana, IL, & Newark, DE: Authors.

NATIONAL READING PANEL. (2001). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGES ACT, Pub. L. No. 101-477, Stat. 2167 (1990/1992).

PALINCSAR, A.S. (1986). The role of dialogue in providing scaffolded instruction. *Educational Psychologist* 21(1&2), 73–98.

PALINCSAR, A.S., & BROWN, A.L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of

comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction*, 1, 117–175.

PHILLIPS, D., & CABRERA, N. (Eds.). (1996). *Beyond the blueprint: Directions for research on Head Start's families*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

RAPHAEL, T.E., & GOATLEY, V.M. (1994). The teacher as “more knowledgeable other”: Changing roles for teaching in alternative reading instruction programs. In C. Kinzer & D. Leu (Eds.), *Multidimensional aspects of literacy research, theory and practice* (pp. 527–536). Chicago: National Reading Conference.

ROSE, M. (1995). *Possible lives: The promise of public education in America*. New York: Penguin.

RUIZ, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *National Association of Bilingual Education Journal*, 8(2), 15–34.

SKUTNABB-KANGAS T., & PHILLIPSON, R. (Eds.). (1994). *Linguistic human rights*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.

STRITIKUS, T. (2000). *Proposition 227: A qualitative analysis at the classroom level*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

TEJEDA, C., & ESPINOZA, M. (2001). *The dialectics of classroom discourse*. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Los Angeles.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. (1997). *No more excuses: The final report of US Hispanic Dropout Project*. Washington, DC: Author.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. (2000). *Goals 2000: Educate America Act*. Washington, DC: Author.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. (2001). *No child left behind*. Washington, DC: Author.

VALENZUELA, A. (1997). Mexican American youth and the politics of caring. In E. LONG (Ed.), *From sociology to cultural studies* (Vol. 2, pp. 351–373). London: Blackwell.

VALENZUELA, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S.–Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

VYGOTSKY, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Trans. & Eds.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

WELLS, G. (1996). Using the tool-kit of discourse in the activity of learning and teaching. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 3(2), 74–101.

WELLS, G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: Toward a sociocultural practice and theory of education*. New York: Cambridge University Press.