Reframing literacy practices for culturally and linguistically diverse students in U.S. schools

By: Ye He, Amy Vetter, and Colleen Fairbanks

Made available courtesy of the National Council of Teachers of English:
https://library.ncte.org/journals/ee/issues/v46-4

Abstract:

The growing numbers of culturally and linguistically diverse students, including English learners, in US K–12 settings, pose unique challenges and opportunities for English educators. While there have been evolving efforts in policy, research, and classroom practices to support culturally and linguistically diverse learners' development, a broadened understanding of their cultural lives and more global and contextualized perspectives are needed. Building upon a cosmopolitan perspective, this article explores the current policies, research, and practices related to language and literacy education for these students. Promising practices in English education in terms of strategies to promote world Englishes, multiliteracy and critical literacy practices are examined. Finally, recommendations for the development of policy and research that address a broader sociocultural understanding of culturally and linguistically diverse students and English education are also provided.

Keywords: English education | English learners | multiculturalism | multiliteracies | critical literacy

Article:

***Note: Full text of article below**

Extending the Conversation

Reframing Literacy Practices for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students in U.S. Schools

Ye He, Amy Vetter, and Colleen Fairbanks

The increasing numbers of students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds attending U.S. schools have been a phenomenon that would seem difficult to ignore. In the past decade the number of school-aged students who spoke a language other than English at home nearly doubled (Aud et al., 2010). In many communities, culturally and linguistically diverse students already comprise a majority of the population. It is also hard to ignore the alarming statistics on the educational outcomes for students from linguistically diverse backgrounds, including those who are identified as English learners, in U.S. public schools. For example, students who speak a first language other than English achieve proficiency in literacy in far smaller numbers than their English-speaking peers (Garcia, Kleifgen, & Falchi, 2008). The dropout rates for English learners are also significantly higher than native English speakers (McNeil, Coppola, Radigan, & Heilig, 2008). The continuing achievement gap between these students and their English-speaking peers suggests that current policies and practices have yet to ensure equitable and accessible education.

The growing English learning population poses particular challenges and opportunities for English educators. In addition to the social and economic consequences that inequitable outcomes present to all educators, English educators teach language and literacy with all of the social and cultural nuances entailed. In this capacity they can and ought to play a significant role in supporting the academic development of culturally and linguistically diverse students. One way to examine how English education is positioned in relation to students from culturally and linguistically diverse

backgrounds is through examining the principles that inform the policy statements of its major organizations as well as comparing these principles to the diverse theoretical and empirical inquiries related to English learners. To these ends, this article begins with an exploration of the National Council of Teachers of English's (NCTE) current policies, research, and practices related to language and literacy education for students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds in the United States. Further, this article offers alternative perspectives and explores promising practices based on world Englishes, multiliteracy, and critical literacy principles.

Current Positions and Possible Directions

To identify the principles animating policy and instruction, we began with a review of the current policy documents published by NCTE (2005, 2006, 2007, 2008). To contextualize the policies, we reviewed them individually and in relation to educational and policy reports from the U.S. government, research centers, and professional literature. From this review, we noted that the NCTE documents treat English learning as primarily a classroom-based issue focused on cultural relevance and effective practices. For example, the 2005 Conference on English Education (CEE) position statement, "Supporting Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Learners in English Education," places specific emphasis on practices associated with culturally responsive pedagogy, including the infusion of cultural heritage and practices as part of the daily curriculum, critical use of popular culture and media, a variety of multicultural texts, writing personally meaningful texts, and so forth. This position statement reflects its historical time when few distinctions were made between racial/ethnic diversity and linguistic diversity.

By the time the 2008 Policy Brief appears, the approach to English language education changed significantly. This Policy Brief treats English learners as distinct from other culturally diverse students and makes a cogent argument for multilingualism and multiculturalism, acknowledging the heterogeneous nature of the English learner population. This report also clearly identifies heritage languages as resources both academically and linguistically. The brief reminds readers that English learners are simultaneously learning English and academic content and emphasizes the development of academic languages. Recommendations from the document include classroom practices consistent with the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) or Sheltered Instruction (SI) approach (e.g., Sheltered Instructional Observation Protocol [SIOP]). These practices also include setting high expectations, challenging curriculum, placing

students according to academic ability rather than language proficiency, and sound testing principles.

Generally speaking, NCTE policy and position statements illustrate the organization's evolving stance toward English learners and their instructional needs and broadly align with the prevailing recommendations about instruction for English learners. In this sense, they represent the needs of English learners within the boundaries of the classroom: instructional strategies to support language development; assessments for placement and accountability; collaboration with English as a second language (ESL) teachers; and cultural responsiveness with respect to social relations, materials, and teaching strategies.

In this article, however, we argue effective policy and practice requires a broadened understanding of learners' cultural lives and more global and contextualized perspectives, aimed not only at students' cultural lives within the United States but also the increasing transcultural identities they maintain. Therefore, instead of focusing only on English learners, we target our discussions on a culturally and linguistically diverse student population, including English learners.

Several recent perspectives on language and literacy policy take standpoints beyond classroom pedagogy to advocate opportunities for immigrant youth that maintain their cultural and linguistic ties to home cultures and acquire proficiency in English language necessary for successful participation in U.S. society. Luke (2003) has been an outspoken advocate for this broadening of the theoretical and practical outlook. His perspective maintains that the increasing multiculturalism in postindustrial nations has changed the "cultural and daily practices of everyday life" (p. 137). He argues further that educational policies are also tied to the social, political, cultural, and linguistic marginalization of immigrant youth in society and fail to recognize the impact of demographic change on educational practice and students' needs. Luke stresses that globalization cannot be addressed only in the classroom but requires a more fundamental reframing of educational policy. Such reframing will not occur unless educators move beyond the "token inclusion of ethnic content in mainstream curriculum; teacher consciousness raising, or the adjustment of classroom methods" that has typified schooling and most reform efforts (p. 137).

One approach to reframing educational policy and practice has been *cosmopolitanism*, which not only aims at students' understandings of global connectedness but also supports students' opportunities to be connected to their own and others' cultures and to examine these connections critically (Appiah, 2006; Lam, 2006; Rizvi, 2009). Education, in this sense, is viewed

as "fostering in young people the cosmopolitan vision to see the world in more complex and interdependent ways" (Lam, 2006, p. 230) and by which they can construct new ways of being in it. Cosmopolitanism also suggests that teachers and teacher educators rethink literacy practices and consider students' changing cultural and linguistic identities in more compelling ways. To do so, teachers and teacher educators need to learn about their students' histories (both in the United States and other countries), socioeconomic realities, and the challenges they face in their schools and their communities. They also might support students' sense of belonging in school, if they began to recognize that geographical location does not necessarily determine national or cultural affiliation. In this way, cosmopolitanism extends notions of multiculturalism beyond the borders of any given nation to encompass the many geographic and cultural spaces people inhabit.

Perhaps most importantly, taking a cosmopolitan perspective asks educators to reframe the too frequent deficit orientations toward other cultures, languages, and practices. Such reframing requires complex reforms beyond the additive forms of multiculturalism that have characterized approaches to cultural and linguistic diversity. In addition, reframing begins with the capacity to embrace differences as an educational resource by building upon students' funds of knowledge (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992) and mobilizing culture and language in the service of students' English language and literacy education (Moll, 2010). Beyond this, educators should foster all students' global identities and sensitivities. For English education, the challenge is not to identify one single approach, but to "develop flexible repertories" that recognize the multiple contexts and meanings through which learning occurs and adapt them to the culturally and linguistically diverse students in their classrooms (Luke, 2004, p. 90). This perspective also requires much more broadly conceived purposes for English education.

Promising Practices

Cosmopolitanism in a classroom means that students engage in critical imaginings of themselves and others, respect differences across continents, understand new notions of citizenship, and engage in critical dialogues with people across the globe (Hull, Stornaiuolo, & Sahni, 2010). In an attempt to further unpack what that might look like in English education with students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, we reviewed recent articles from the past five years that documented empirical studies of teachers' innovative practices in English education, especially in their work involving learners from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. From

this review, the following major trends were observed: (1) the emphasis on critical appreciation of Englishes in language teaching; (2) the recognition and the innovative use of multiliteracy in English education; and (3) the integration of critical literacy practices for English classrooms.

Critical Appreciation of Englishes

From a cosmopolitan perspective, English educators recognize that students develop differences across continents and engage in conversations with people across the globe (Hull & Stornaiuolo, 2010). To do this, students and teachers need to develop a critical appreciation of Englishes in language teaching and learning practices that emphasize critical awareness, examination, and language use in both local and global settings. As an international language, English has taken on various forms in different countries. Some learners may have prior experiences with a variety of Englishes in their home country before coming to the United States. Other students may be categorized as English learners because their English "sounds" or "looks" nonnative even though a variety of English, Caribbean English, for example, is their native language (Nero, 2006). Encouraging critical and historical understanding of Englishes would not only help build upon learners' prior language experiences but also broaden the understanding of English language among native English speakers in the United States (Crystal, 2007; Hull & Stornaiuolo, 2010; Kirkland, 2010; Souto-Manning, 2010).

This multilingual perspective in English education is built upon two key assumptions. First, Englishes are perceived as pluralistic, changing, and sociopolitical by nature (Kirkland, 2010). The varieties of Englishes includes both regional or social dialects of English used by the Inner Circle, speakers from traditionally English-speaking countries, and the varieties used by the Outer Circle, regions that adopted and adapted the English language through colonization, and the Expanding Circle, regions where varieties of English are used as a medium of international communication (Kachru, 1992). The development of online local and international social networks further contributes to this complexity by broadening both the form and content of Englishes that students will use and encounter in the future (Crystal, 2007; Hull & Stornaiuolo, 2010). The emergence of "new literacies" has played an integral role in highlighting the varieties of Englishes and their implications for English education (Lankshear & Knobel, 2006).

Second, with this expanded understanding of the varieties of Englishes and the media through which language is learned and taught, it is critically important that educators understand and appreciate language teaching and

learning processes. The promotion of linguistic pluralism is the apprecia-
tion of "the hybrid and textured nature in which English is practiced and
performed by inner-city youth as elemental to English education" (Kirkland,
2010, p. 293). Privileging one variety of English over another marginalizes
students by restricting their right to their own language. Such appreciation
entails both the critical awareness and analysis of Englishes and "respect for
legitimate difference" (Appiah, 2006, p. xv), which, from a cosmopolitanism
perspective, recognizes the sociopolitical tensions that students encounter
when they use a variety of Englishes. For example, Fecho (2003) found that
even though students understood how and when to use "mainstream" En-
glish, they still had to negotiate the benefits and constraints of it within their
social and cultural worlds. Making critical appreciation an integral element
of English education allows English learning to become a more inclusive
process in which all learners, including English learners, are engaged, re-
spected, and empowered in learning and actively expanding one another's
understanding of Englishes.

Various promising teaching practices have emerged in operationalizing
critical appreciation of the varieties of Englishes, which have significant
implications, especially for English education involving learners from di-
verse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Critical analysis of the traditional
English curriculum and material is among such practices. As a high school
English teacher, Rojas (2010) examined the English curriculum, and specifi-
cally the instructional materials used to introduce Latino/Latina literatures.
Based on her analysis, she examined the traditional readings that tend to
maintain the status quo (Rojas, 2010, p. 270) and challenged teachers to
disrupt dominant discourses to "provoke, challenge, expose, and reexamine
the discourses that surround and make up what is referred to as the Latino
culture and identity" (p. 275).

Students' responses to and interactions with the traditional curriculum
could also help provide further insights that challenge prevailing cultural
discourses. Dutro (2009), for example, analyzed students' responses to the
writing prompt: "What are some signs of hard times?" after reading a story
depicting how a family overcame economic struggles during the Great
Depression. She found that instead of viewing "hard times" as temporary,
historical events, children revealed personal experiences that reflected the
economic struggles they currently faced. Her conclusions demonstrated the
set of background knowledge sometimes neglected in the traditional cur-
riculum. Furthermore, these findings defy "the curriculum's assumptions
that poverty and its impact on families is something children will access
only through the text and that their responses will, therefore, be surface-

level and text-dependent" (Dutro, 2009, p. 90). This type of critical inquiry of the traditional curriculum allows K–12 teachers and teacher educators to better understand and appreciate the diverse linguistic and cultural assets all students bring into their literacy development. Medina (2010) proposed a "reading across communities" approach in literacy instruction through critical analysis of instructional materials questioning static views of students' background knowledge. The proposal urges educators to involve students in the process of sharing their personal experiences and situating such experiences in larger global issues through literature discussions.

In addition to instructional materials, critical analysis of classroom discourse could provide further insights for English teachers and help "blur the roles of student and teacher" (Souto-Manning, 2010, p.257). Kirkland (2008), for example, studied the literacy practice of six young black men through critical discourse analysis and identified the ways in which these youth deconstruct and pluralize traditional language use through the "remixing" of varieties of Englishes (p. 299). Based on his research, Kirkland (2008) called for English teachers and teacher educators to consider "voices of today's youth" and acknowledge "the power of codes other than LWC [Language of Wider Communication]" in curriculum, teaching, research, and policymaking (p. 302). Similarly, Souto-Manning (2010) positioned a teacher as learner of his students' cultural and linguistic practices through a collaborative action research project in a Head Start program. Building upon the critical analysis of classroom discourse, the teacher was encouraged to "put himself in a vulnerable position as he analyzed his culturally specific expectations" (p. 259). Through these kinds of interactions, teachers can learn about students' varieties of Englishes, their uses, and their meanings. As a result, students are likely to benefit from classrooms that promote literacy practices in students' variety of Englishes and Standard English to show "Englishes in *juxtaposition* rather than *opposition*" (Nero, 2006, p. 509).

This process is not only critical in classrooms where English is used as the instructional language but also in bilingual or two-way immersion classrooms. Although teachers in bilingual or biliteracy programs are typically perceived as highly supportive of bilingualism, Lopez and Franquiz (2009) found that in a school where sequential biliteracy instruction was adopted (i.e., students receive instruction in one language first followed with instruction in another language), teachers revealed their parallel monolingual ideology (Heller, 2001). However, using critical discourse analysis to challenge teachers' deficit thinking offers possibilities to "problematize their cultural assumptions, reposition themselves, and engage in learning" (Souto-Manning, 2010, p. 258). This approach creates the groundwork for

333

adopting a strengths-based approach and provides a means by which English educators can adapt instruction to support students' multilingualism and their English learning.

Recognition and Innovative Use of Multiliteracies

Cosmopolitanism recommends rethinking traditional concepts of literacy practices and considering students' changing cultural and linguistic identities in English education. To better understand how that recommendation might work in classrooms, we draw on a multiliteracies perspective developed by the New London Group (1996). Such a perspective redefined what it meant to be literate within a global economy and highlighted the importance of cultural and linguistic diversity and nonlinguistic, multimodal forms of representation and communication. According to the New London Group, being literate, then, is the ability to "construct and understand the different possibilities of meanings made available by differing textual forms associated with diverse domains" (as cited in Ajayi, 2009, p. 586). Because the multiliteracies perspective includes a wide range of literacy practices, teachers have more opportunities to draw from the cultural and linguistic experiences, interests, and resources of students as suggested by a cosmopolitanism perspective, and foster opportunities for them to be actively engaged in social change and development (Ajayi, 2009).

Building on the multiple literacy practices that youth already engage in during their own time is one way that teachers have capitalized on students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds. For example, Black (2009a, 2009b) found that the use of fan fiction outside school provided a space for Nanako, an English learner, to develop confidence and motivation for writing in English, to display expertise in her cultural and linguistic background, and to position herself as a successful user of multiple social languages. Specifically, the fan-fiction website was a space for Nanako to receive validation for her writing (e.g., "I love this chapter!"); specific feedback on grammar, form, and style of writing; and to be treated as a legitimate participant of a writing community that integrated multiple cultures and languages within their composition.

Similarly, Lam (2000, 2004) illustrated how two Chinese students gained status as experts in Japanese animation and website development, which afforded them opportunities to develop multiple social languages as well as global linguistic and cultural identities. For example, by developing a website on Japanese popular (J-pop) music, one student became more confident and skilled in learning a second language because he was writing

about something that interested him. He also benefitted from interacting with other English speakers via email and instant messaging. Thus, his background in J-pop and his preference for learning English in a social and written environment helped him develop as an English language learner.

Another way that English learners use their prior experiences to engage in literacy learning is through social networks focused on writing. For example, Yi (2008) found that participatory online literacy practices (i.e., online relay writing of a novel) are successful because they foster language learning that is dialogic and multi-authored, and encourage "students co-constructing knowledge and understanding in a community setting" (p. 671). Such writing communities draw from the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of the participants because they were able to write in a familiar format (e.g., fan fiction, Korean novel, J-pop), engage in writing to other writers and readers, and receive supportive comments from other similar authors. These promising practices provide examples that are not limited to national borders and illustrate a means by which cosmopolitanism might be integrated in English education. In fact, the global aspect of these practices enabled students to learn English as a second language in ways that were not available to them in the classroom.

With that said, educators must be careful of co-opting students' "owned" literacies in classrooms by making them "schoolish" and no longer their own. To prevent that from occurring, Guzetti (2009) suggested that teachers foster the collaborative and interactive nature that new literacies present rather than turning these out-of-school literacies practices into school assignments. For instance, educators could open opportunities for students to discuss out-of-school projects as a way of educating teachers and other students about the multiple literacies available to them and raising awareness about unrecognized literacy practices.

It is important to note that most of this research focused on students from a middle to high socioeconomic background who have access to a variety of literacies. The term *digital divide* is used to describe the inequalities between groups in terms of access to information and communication technologies, both locally and globally. In addition, even if everyone had access, the Internet favors English speakers (less than 32 percent of Web pages are in languages other than English; Gorski, 2005). Specifically, recent immigrants to the United States who have little exposure to computers struggle to use these technologies even in their classes because of their inexperience.

Home access to computers and how students use technology in schools play a crucial role in this digital divide. For example, Warschauer, Knobel, and Stone (2004) found that students at a high-SES school were asked to

335

engage in more complicated and creative tasks online in comparison to a low-SES school. In a low-SES school with many English language learners students were asked to do research by searching the Web and cutting and pasting information into a Word document. Students were not engaged in

Teachers need to involve students in critical reflection and conversation about cultural and linguistic issues across continents.

higher-level literacy skills, such as determining the best search engine or synthesizing information (Lankshear & Knobel, 2006). These findings pose challenges for English educators and suggest the need for more research that explores how learners from a variety of cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic backgrounds might gain access and learn to use technologies as a tool for their language and literacy development.

Integration of Critical Literacy Practices

A cosmopolitan perspective suggests that students are prepared to participate in critical imaginings of themselves and others and understand new notions of citizenship that expand globally (Hull, Stornaiuolo, & Sahni, 2010). To begin this kind of work, teachers need to involve students in critical reflection and conversation about cultural and linguistic issues across continents. These critical literacy practices invite multiple perspectives; question commonplace assumptions; examine social, cultural, and political issues; and make changes in the community (Giroux, 1993; Lewison, Flint, & Van Sluys, 2002). They specifically challenge learners to examine their position in the world and how they might affect their community in the future. For example, Hull, Stornaiuolo, and Sahni (2010) created and used space4cre8 as both a social networking site and a research tool. Youth from United States, Norway, South Africa, and India engaged in conversations about social issues (e.g., drug and alcohol use) through student-created media products and personal digital storytelling (Hull et al., 2010). These social dialogues across countries promoted respect for multiple perspectives and opened opportunities for students to recognize "the other in oneself" (p. 334). Such spaces challenge students to negotiate norms and provide moments of intercultural cohesion. Overall, students in the study were able to develop cosmopolitan habits of minds and attitudes by engaging in critical dialogue about marriage or poverty across nations. These opportunities encouraged students to think of themselves as citizens of the world rather than of one particular nation.

Another aspect of critical literacy is teaching students to read their world critically through visual representations. Ajayi (2009) conducted a study with 18 students who composed visual representations of their under-

standings of an advertisement. He found that multimodal texts (i.e., visual representations) afforded students opportunities for diverse interpretations and representations of visual images that oftentimes led to critical literacy practices. For example, one student drew an exaggerated picture of a "super fun guy" as a representation for how he questioned advertiser's overuse of models to sell products that do not always live up to their potential.

Janks and Comber (2006) worked with students in two primary schools across continents to study other critical readings of visual representations. This project challenged students to create an alphabet book based on their cultural and linguistic experiences. Throughout the process, students examined what their words and images represented socially and culturally. When creating this book in Johannesburg for the Australian classroom, students had to think about what was significant to their lives to represent their communities to an audience across the continent. Representations from both books examined everyday life in their worlds and discussed issues such as youth violence, community gardens, and HIV.

Drama has also been used a medium for critical literacy. For example, Goldstein (2003) found that in a multilingual high school with racial tensions about the prevalent use of Chinese, the play *Hong Kong, Canada* was used as a resource to represent everyday tensions and conflict resolutions. With teacher guidance, students wrote and performed their own ethnographies, which opened opportunities for marginalized students to voice their experiences at school. It is through these kinds of critical literacy practices (i.e., critically examining visual representations, performing marginalized stories) that students and teachers engage in the tenets of cosmopolitanism that promote new notions of citizenship and critical identity work across continents.

Discussion

The NCTE policy and position statements for English language instruction have evolved by increasingly acknowledging students' cultural and language backgrounds within the classroom boundaries. However, English education policy and practices are far from maximizing all learners' potentials and supporting them in developing more cosmopolitan sensibilities. With the goal of enhancing learners' academic English language proficiency, too often teachers neglect the multilingual assets, home literacy traditions, and multicultural identity development through education and settle on "just good teaching" practices (de Jong & Harper, 2005). Unmasking the assumptions of monolingual and static understandings of literacy, recent English

education research has provided promising insights. By promoting Englishes, multiliteracies, and critical literacy practices, teachers and students might actively engage in problematizing the current curriculum and policy and pushing the boundaries of the English classroom. These practices all aim toward not only understandings of a global world but also opportunities to learn the political, cultural, and linguistic functions of language in conjunction with the English content and skills all learners need.

The foundation for such practices is a cosmopolitan vision that celebrates and promotes the complex and dynamic English literacy practices beyond classroom walls and that take up current global realities and richer understandings of the students we teach. Through such practices, learners from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds are not positioned as having only "gaps" in English language to fill. Instead, they are class members with rich cultural and linguistic resources they can share with their native English-speaking peers and their teachers. Building upon what we learned from current practices in English education and envisioning the development of English education from a more cosmopolitanism perspective, we believe teachers and researchers in English education should consider more systematic efforts to highlight and promote such experiences. We propose the following four recommendations.

First, supporting culturally and linguistically diverse students, including English learners, in the classroom must begin by valuing the knowledge, skills, and linguistic resources from outside the classroom. To do so, educators must learn about the students they teach. As Stevens (2011) points out, teachers (and we would include students as well) need to "become sociologists of their own back yards" (p. 139). This process entails more than supporting language maintenance or more critical and deliberate inclusion of multicultural curriculum. It involves knowledge of students' communities, family life and practices, and their social and historical circumstances. Educators can learn a great deal when they open their classrooms to students' voices and stories, but there is no substitution for firsthand knowledge. Attending community events such as ethnic fairs and celebrations, inviting parents and other community members to visit classrooms, and creating opportunities for students to engage in cross-cultural and international projects offer important ways to recognize and learn about students' cultural lives. In addition, Black's (2009a, 2009b) use of fan fiction, Lam's (2000, 2004) practice with J-pop music, and Yi's (2008) participatory online literacy practices provide clear examples of multiliteracies practices that extend the traditional boundaries of English education and demonstrate untold possibilities for students to engage in language and cultural learning through technologies.

338

School and community collaboration in particular is essential to backyard sociologists-educators. Such collaboration does not include simply hosting programs or meetings where families were "taught" the expectations of schools and mainstream literacy practices. Positioning teachers, students, and parents as equal partners in the learning process will allow families to be active collaborators in teaching and learning, and schools to recognize more diverse and more cosmopolitan views of literacy practice. Building upon a single teacher's or school's efforts to engage the community in English education, more systematic ways of eliciting the community's participation in teaching and learning processes need to be highlighted in educational policies and implemented at district, state, and federal levels.

Even though recent standards on English education have demonstrated significant improvement in promoting culturally responsive practices, typical curriculum and teaching materials still assume the "generic child" (Dutro, 2009; Luke, 1995, 1996). Critical curriculum review with a focus on language instruction and the use of technological resources offers opportunities to create English classrooms that value diversity to accomplish instructional goals and to embrace the changing demographics of our student populations. Creating low-anxiety environments and providing intentional differentiation to support learners' language skills and disciplinary content are clearly essential to their education. By the same token, learning to respect differences, negotiate cultural discontinuities or conflicts, and develop multilingual and multicultural identities are equally so. To accomplish both of these important goals, English educators need to reframe their thinking about language education in broader terms, not just the immediate need for students to acquire English. Learning English, especially academic English, should not take place at the expense of students' first languages or cultural identities (Hakuta, 2011). U.S. policies that restrict opportunities for language maintenance serve only to marginalize English learners and create social divisions between English speakers and English learners (Pyon, 2009).

Finally, English teacher educators need to broaden the scope of inservice and preservice teachers' experiences by moving beyond the classroom and engaging in the community, highlighting and integrating global perspectives in relation to texts and languages, and experience represented in community schools (Brown-Jeffy & Cooper, 2011; He & Cooper, 2009; Nieto, 1999). Further, teacher education curriculum should support preservice and inservice teachers in problematizing how they are taught and engage them in critical reflections on current English education practices. Although the millennial generation coming into the teaching field has had more cross-cultural experiences and is more familiar with technology and more sensitive

to global interactions (Castro, 2010), they will need support to leverage these experiences in their classrooms. Thoughtfully designed case studies, field experiences, and critical reflections can provide preservice teachers with opportunities to extend their understandings of multilingual, multiliteracies, and critical literacy instructional practices. Such revision of English education curriculum seems especially important in places where immigrant and refugee populations have surged in the past decade and where veteran teachers are themselves struggling to find better, more inclusive ways of teaching.

Conclusion

In reviewing the development of policy statements in English education, we were encouraged by the growing recognition of diversity among English learners, consideration of the learners' linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and the importance of developing not only their English language proficiency but also content mastery in education. The promising practices reviewed in this article further extend the mission of English education in a global context and represent new possibilities for English education within and beyond the classrooms. More than this, we urge researchers and educators to engage in collaborative dialogues with local immigrant and refugee communities to inform systematic changes in English curriculum and policy. Learning from community members is essential to understand the tremendous variety and vitality culturally and linguistically diverse students bring to the classroom. Moreover, it offers the possibility to involve all students in new ways of being in and understanding our increasingly global world. It is only through collaborative and systematic efforts that we will honor learners' diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds as assets and resources in teaching and learning. Such efforts may then lead to the acknowledgment and support of the development of cosmopolitan citizenship.

Authors' Note

References

Ajayi, L. (2009). English as a second language learners' exploration of multimodal texts in a junior high school. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 52*(7), 585–595.

Appiah, K. A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in world of strangers*. New York: Norton.

Aud, S., Hussar, W., Planty, M., Snyder, T., Bianco, K., Fox, M., Frohlich, L., Kemp, J., & Drake, L. (2010). *The condition of education 2010* (NCES 2010-028). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC.

Black, R. (2009a). Online fan fiction, global identities, and imagination. *Research in the Teaching of English, 43*(4), 397–425.

Black, R. (2009b). English-language learners, fan communities, and 21st century skills. *Journal of Adult and Adolescent Literacy, 52*(8), 688–697.

Brown-Jeffy, S., & Cooper, J. E. (2011). Toward a conceptual framework of culturally relevant pedagogy: An overview of the conceptual and theoretical literature. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 38*(1), 65–84.

Castro, A. J. (2010). Themes in the research on preservice teachers' views of cultural diversity: Implications for researching millennial preservice teachers. *Educational Researcher, 39*, 198–210.

Conference on English Education (2005). Position statement: Supporting linguistically and culturally diverse learners in English education. Retrieved from http://www.ncte.org/cee/positions/diverselearnersinee

Crystal, D. (2007). *English as a global language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

de Jong, E. & Harper, C. A. (2005). Preparing mainstream teachers for English-Language Learners: Is being a good teacher good enough? *Teacher Education Quarterly, 32*, 101–124.

Dutro, E. (2009). Children writing "hard times": Lived experiences of poverty and the class privileged assumptions of a mandated curriculum. *Language Arts, 87*(2), 89–98.

Fecho, B. (2003). *"Is this English?" Race, language, and culture in the classroom.* New York: Teachers College.

Garcia, O., Kleifgen, J., & Falchi, L. (2008). *From English language learners to emergent bilinguals. A research initiative of the Campaign for Educational Equity* (Equity Matters, Research Review No. 1). New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Giroux, H. (1993). Literacy and the politics of difference. In C. Lankshear & P. L. McLaren (Eds.), *Critical literacy: Politics, praxis, and the postmodern* (pp. 367–378). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Goldstein, T. (2003). *Teaching and learning in a multilingual school.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gorski, P. (2005). Education equity and the digital divide. *Association for the Advancement of Computers in Education Journal, 13*(1), 3–45.

Guzetti, B. (2009). Adolescents' explorations with do-it-yourself media: Authoring identity in out-of-school settings. In M. Hagood (Ed.), *New literacies practices: Designing literacy learning* (pp. 41–57). New York: Peter Lang.

Hakuta, K. (2011). Educating language minority students and affirming their equal rights: Research and practical perspectives. *Educational Researchers, 40*(4), 163–174.

He, Y., & Cooper, J. E. (2009). The ABCs for pre-service teacher cultural competency development. *Teaching Education, 20*, 305–322.

Heller, M. (2001). Undoing the macro/micro dichotomy: Ideology and categoriza-
tion in a linguistic minority school. In N. Coupland, S. Sarangi, & C. Candlin
(Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and social theory* (pp. 261–296). Harlow, UK: Pearson.

Hull, G. A., & Stornaiuolo, A. (2010). Literate arts in a global world: Reframing
social networking as cosmopolitan practice. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult
Literacy, 54*(2), 85–97.

Hull, G. A., Stornaiuolo, A., & Sahni, U. (2010). Cultural citizenship and cosmo-
politan practice: Global youth communicate online. *English Education, 42*(4),
331–367.

Janks, H., & Comber, B. (2006). Critical literacy across continents. In K. Pahl & J.
Rowsell (Eds.), *Travel notes from the New Literacy Studies: Instances of practice*
(pp. 95–117). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Kachru, B. (1992). World Englishes: approaches, issues and resources. *Language
Teaching, 25*, 1–14.

Kirkland, D. E. (2008). "The rose that grew from concrete": Postmodern blackness
and new English education. *English Journal, 97*(5), 69–75.

Kirkland, D. E. (2009). Standpoints: Researching and teaching English in the digital
dimension. *Research in the Teaching of English, 44*(1), 8–22.

Kirkland, D. E. (2010). English(es) in urban contexts: Politics, pluralism, and pos-
sibilities. *English Education, 42*(3), 293–306.

Lam, W. S. E. (2000). L2 literacy and the design of the self: A case study of a teen-
ager writing on the internet. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*(3), 457–482.

Lam, W. S. E. (2004). Second language socialization in a bilingual chat room:
Global and local considerations. *Language Learning and Technology 8*(3), 44–65.

Lam, W. S. E. (2006). Re-envisioning language, literacy, and the immigrant subject
in new mediascapes. *Pedagogies: An International Journal, 1*, 171–195.

Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2006). *New literacies: Everyday practices & classroom
learning* (2nd ed.). New York: Open University Press and McGraw Hill.

Lewison, M., Flint, A. S., & Van Sluys, K. (2002). Taking on critical literacy: The
journey of newcomers and novices. *Language Arts, 79*(5), 382–392.

Lopez, M. M., & Franquiz, M. E. (2009). "We teach reading this way because it is the
model we've adopted": Asymmetries in language and literacy policies in a two-
way immersion programme. *Research Papers in Education, 24*(2), 175–200.

Luke, A. (1995). When basic skills and information processing just aren't enough:
Rethinking reading in the new times. *Teachers College Record, 97*(1), 95–115.

Luke, A. (1996). Genres of power? Literacy education and the production of capital.
In R. Hasan & G. Williams (Eds.), *Literacy in society.* New York: Longman.

Luke, A. (2003). Literacy and the other: A sociological approach to literacy research
and policy in multilingual societies. *Reading Research Quarterly, 38*(1), 132–141.

Luke, A. (2004). Two takes on the critical. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical
pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 21–29). Cambridge: Cambridge Univer-
sity Press.

McNeil, L. M., Coppola, E., Radigan, J., & Heilig, J. V. (2008). Avoidable losses: High-
stakes accountability and the dropout crisis. *Education Policy Analysis, 16*(8),
3–4.

Medina, C. (2010). "Reading across communities" in biliteracy practices: Examining translocal discourses and cultural flows in literature discussions. *Reading Research Quarterly, 45*(1), 40–60.

Moll, L. C. (2010). Mobilizing culture, language and educational practices: Fulfilling the promises of Mendez and Brown. *Educational Researcher, 39*, 451–460.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & González, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 31*(2), 132–141.

National Council of Teachers of English. (2005). *NCTE position statement: On multimodal literacies*. Retrieved from http://www.ncte.org/positions/statements/multimodalliteracies

National Council of Teachers of English. (2006). *NCTE position paper on the role of English teachers in educating English language learners (ELLs)*. Retrieved from http://www.ncte.org/positions/statements/teacherseducatingell

National Council of Teachers of English. (2007). *Globalization and English education*. Retrieved from http://www.ncte.org/cee/2007summit/globalization

National Council of Teachers of English. (2008). *English language learners: An NCTE policy research brief*. Retrieved from http://www.ncte.org/policy-research/briefs

Nero, S. (2006). Language, identity, and education of Caribbean English speakers. *World Englishes, 35*(3/4), 501–511.

New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*, 60–92.

Nieto, S. (1994). Affirmation, solidarity, and critique: Moving beyond tolerance in multicultural education. *Multicultural Education, 1*(4), 9–12, 35–38.

Nieto, S. (1999). *The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Rizvi, F. (2009). Toward cosmopolitan learning. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 30*(3), 253–268.

Rojas, M. A. (2010). Revisioning U.S. Latino literatures in high school English classrooms. *English Education, 42*(3), 263–277.

Pyon, H. T. (2009). The review of English education policy for language minority students in the U.S.: A critical race theory perspective. *Asian American Policy Review, 18*, 65–80.

Souto-Manning, M. (2010). Teaching English learners: Building on cultural and linguistic strengths. *English Education, 42*(3), 249–263.

Stevens, L. P. (2011). Literacy, capital, and education: A view from immigrant youth. *Theory into Practice, 50*(2), 133–140.

Warschauer, M., Knobel, M. & Stone, L. (2004). Technology and equity in schooling: Deconstructing the digital divide. *Educational Policy, 18*(4), 562–588.

Yi, Y. (2008). Relay writing in an adolescent online community. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 51*(8), 670–680.

Ye He is an associate professor in the School of Education at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. Her research focuses on strength-based and community-engaged teacher education practices that impact teacher beliefs and their journey of "becoming."

Amy Vetter is an associate professor of English education at the University of North Carolina Greensboro, where she teaches undergraduate courses in teaching practices and curriculum of English and graduate courses in youth literacies and teacher research. Her areas of research interest are literacy and identity, classroom interactions, and teacher research.

Colleen Fairbanks is professor and chair in the Department of Teacher Education and Higher Education. She is also co-founder and co-director of the Coalition for Diverse Language Communities at UNCG. Her pedagogical and research interests include adolescent literacy, identity, writing, and diverse language communities.

Call for Nominations for the 2014–2015 Writing Program Certificate of Excellence Awards

CCCC is pleased to announce the call for nominations for the 2014–2015 CCCC Writing Program Certificate of Excellence awards. This award program, established in 2004, honors up to 20 writing programs a year. As a term, "programs" is intended to be capacious in its application and includes a first-year writing program or a coherent configuration of first-year courses; a basic or developmental writing program; an ESL writing program; a configuration of writing instruction within an intensive-English program (this instruction might be integrated into courses rather than appear in separate writing courses); a vertical sequence of courses (e.g., a concentration, a certificate, a minor, a major); a WAC or WID program; a writing program within a writing center; or a writing program designed for a special group. **Applications are due by August 31, 2014**. For a full description of this award and the application requirements, please visit http://www.ncte.org/cccc/awards/writingprogramcert or contact the CCCC Administrative Liaison at cccc@ncte.org.