Freirean Cultural Lenses for Promoting Future Teacher Literacy Knowledge:

Dominant Literacy Discourses and Majority Interns in a Minority High School

Mary Frances Agnello
Texas Tech University

> How is it possible for us to work in a community without feeling the spirit of the culture that has been there for many years, without trying to understand the soul of the culture?"
>
> —Paulo Freire cited in Gadotti, 1994

Introduction

Upon reflection about my teaching practice, I began my first phase of qualitative research in literacy policy research, moving from practice to theory. The result of this part of the project was a history of literacy discourses 1970-1998 (Agnello, 2001). In that history, I traced the development of what Bernstein called official pedagogical discourse, utilizing discourse analytical procedures to frame a critical study of prescriptions for literacy development in landmark educational policies (Bernstein, 1980). Citing official literacy statements as data, I constructed a history of four discourses of literacy including human capital, cultural, critical, and feminist literacies. The time range spans from the publication of Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970) to an effort to unite welfare and literacy in the *Workforce Investment Act* (1998). Most recently, I have added an analysis of *No Child Left Behind* in an effort to bring the dominant discourses of literacy study up to date. In sum, discourse analysis of landmark policy texts chronicled archaeological discursive relics that contributed to the development and regulation of a literate citizenry (Freire, 1970; Foucault, 1972; Agnello, 2001). Regulation results from discourses of human capital and cultural literacy and the power

exercised in many locations to perpetuate the knowledge arrangements such discourses afford the political economy (Freire, 1970). For those on the bottom of the social hierarchy, oppression often results from implemented literacy policies (Freire, 1970; McNeil, 2000; Valenzuela, 2005).

In the second stage, I moved from theory to practice. The history of literacy discourses became a backdrop against which I approached critical applications of teaching literacy in a language arts methods class. The objective of such teaching was to promote reflective and critical teaching practice. Cochran-Smith (1991, 2001), Darling-Hammond (1990), and Darling-Hammond and Wise (1991) have discussed the possibilities for such critical practice in the turbulent seas of educational restructuring resulting from policy reform. Followers of Freire promote reflection through teacher as researcher and teacher as public intellectual endeavors. In new multicultural times, with new literacy awareness, and upon new epistemological foundations of literacy research, I shared new teaching methods and postformal practices with language arts methods students in order to transform schooling and the world (Kincheloe, 1991, 1993; Giroux, 1988; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1993; Agnello, 2006).

Responding to Duke and Mallette, who express a paucity of lenses utilized to explore the many facets of national literacy research, I pursued archaeological, genealogical research, employing synthetic and interpretive discourse analysis of both student interns' influences on their literacy development and formal literacy policy articulations. This research is phenomenological and hermeneutical making interpretive connections among future teachers' experiences, national literacy policy, and the educational possibilities afforded a literate citizenry (Agnello, 2001). Such multi-epistemological and multi-methodological endeavors promote change in the way we view knowledge connoted by the "truths" of literacy and the practices implemented to achieve such literacy at large. Revolutions and struggles evidenced in research methodologies, in education, and in literacy studies stem from epistemological questioning of the "inscription of political and social doctrines of progress into science" (Popkewitz, 1997, p. 18; Lankshear, 2001). This revolutionary phenomenon has occurred particularly in the production of knowledge, social sciences, and education that "question[s] the presuppositions of progress and power underlying intellectual work" (Popkewitz, 1997, p. 18). In the realm of critically reflective literacy instruction and research, an analytical stance necessitates reconsideration of what counts as both literacy and literacy studies. James Gee's literacy insights (1991a, b, c, 2002), as well as those of others who have made strides in discourse analysis and literacy studies, support Duke and Mallette's argument for multi-epistemological and multi-methodological research in these

new times for representing the basis of what counts as official literacy knowledge.

Within the contemporary movement toward understanding teacher educational development, there is greater interest in the development of individuals as teachers (Snow, 2001; van den Berg & Ross, 1999). Research that probes self-development has come forward to be recognized as worthy of study (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001). The narrative has been utilized to understand the stories of peoples' lives and their place within their social and historical contexts (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). Capturing the stories and experiences of teachers through their descriptions has been utilized in the realm of qualitative inquiry. Van Manen (1990) said, "[T]he meaning of pedagogy needs to be found in the experience of pedagogy, because the lived experience of pedagogy is all that remains if presuppositions are suspended. And so we need to search everywhere in the lifeworld for lived-experience material that, upon reflective examination, might yield something of its fundamental nature" (p. 53). Looking to the realm of literacy development or literate identity formation in pre-service teachers, this study focused on teachers' responses to the open-ended query: "What have been the main influences on your literacy development?" Overall, the principal objective of the classroom study was to attempt to determine the "fit" of the influences of the interns' literacy development into the broader literacy policies found in the social and educational environment and to discern in the process how to promote the art of literacy instruction in highly diverse teaching environments.

It was through the scope of mandated official literacy policy that I questioned to what degree the regulating influences of literacy have affected pre-service language arts teachers, and to what degree they move around and beyond prescriptions. If their literacy were formed by forces outside of the policy prescriptions, I wanted to know what lay beyond what they learned at school. And finally, I was interested in discerning to what degree critical literacy is missing from the future language arts instructors' literacy repertoire. A more recent post study reflection reinforces the importance of providing a Freirean frame within which to understand the struggles of the local community, its history, and its local contexts to better match the literacy instruction to the learners.

This discussion of the multi-methodological approach to literacy research involved the following steps. First, I define discourse and literacy discourses specifically. Doing archaeological research, I identify "truths" of literacy, framing what kinds of literacy are recommended in the rhetoric of serious landmark policy statements made 1983-2001 chronologically. (See Figure 1.) The extracted discourses of literacy are

Figure 1. Literacy Policies, 1983-2001

Policy	*Prescription*	*Discourses*
A Nation at Rick, 1983	New Basics: (a) comprehend, (b) write well-organized effective papers, (c) listen effectively and discuss ideas intelligently, (d) know our literary heritage and how it enhances imagination and ethical understanding, and how it relates to customs, ideas, and values of today's life and culture, technologica literacy, science, mathematics	Human capital literacy, especially for the Information Age, for international economic competition, cultural literacy, especially canonical knowledge
America 2000, 1991	Literacy emphasized in Goal 5; adult literacy and skills for citizenship; other goals included (1) readiness; (2) improved graduate rates to 90%; (3) competence testing in grades 4, 8, 12; (4) international predominance in science and math; (6) drug-free and violence-free schools	Responsible citizenship, human capital literacy for productive employment in our modern economy; human capital literacy for knowledge and skills in a global economy; adaptation to emerging new technologies, work, methods, and markets through public and private educational, vocational, technical, workplace, or other programs
A National Literacy Act,	Congress enacted this act proclaiming that the kinds of literacy deemed most important by business should be the kind of literacy developed in various literacy centers granted funding; assessments of literacy and basic as required by business	Human capital literacy, basic skills, training required by employers to establish a a trainable workforce that can take advantage of further job-specific training and advance the productivity of the labor force on an individual, industry, or national level
Reaching the Goals: Goal 5: Adult Literacy and Lifelong Learning, 1993	Five goals recommended involvement of every major American business between education and work, worker opportunity to acquire basic and highly technical skills, better programs to meet the needs of part-time and mid-career students, increased minority enrollment in college, encouraged critical thinking, effective communication, and problem solving	Human capital literacy, work skills, involved business in education, emphasized work training and re-training

Figure 1. Literacy Policies, 1983-2001 (continued)

Policy	*Prescription*	*Discourses*
Workforce Investment Act, 1998 (United Adult Education and Family Literacy)	Literacy and work police united federal employment reforms, adult education, and vocational rehabilitation programs in a "one-stop" system of workforce investment for adults and youth	Human capital literacy, literacy and work policy united federal employment reforms, adult education, and vocational rehabilitation programs
No Child Left Behind, ing, 2001	Reading and math proficiency, language proficiency for non-native English speakers, teacher preparation, and special education, conscription list of	Human capital literacy, more accountability test- cultural literacy to join the mainstream of dominant U.S. society

framed in terms of utilitarianism for worker productivity called human capital literacy and cultural literacy traditions as I have interpreted them from education policies and references made to reading, writing, and literacy made therein.

The second analysis is a synthesis of pre-service teachers' discourses to classify categories of the influences indicated by the language event, in this case, the interview. In Figure 2 are portrayed the influences on pre-service teachers' development. Through a constant comparative hermeneutical methodology, I interpreted genealogical features of the data, (how power is exercised to form literate subjects), in this case, (future language arts teachers). In Figure 3, relying on critical theory, I interpret how few references to social critique, social justice, or issues of equality are made by pre-service teachers and consider why their normal literacy development excludes such enterprise. Post study Freirean lenses led to the questions generated in this chart (Gadotti, 1994).

Theoretical Background

Archaeology and genealogy as recommended by Foucault provide vehicles for assessing the social construction of meaning assigned concepts around which discourses are conducted, and the power those discourses represent. Utilizing discourse analytical methods of naming and framing the discourses, the layering effect of truth formation of discourses is made visible. The work of Michel Foucault enabled the study of the power and knowledge relations of discourses across the social sciences to explain social, governmental, religious, and self-regulation through social policies and practices (1972, 1978, 1980). Paulo Freire thought in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970), carried forward by his subsequent

Figure 2

	Methodology Chart
Phase I	Performed archaeological and genealogical research through self and social discourse analysis, asking "What power constructs the truth of literacy discourses?" Reflected on teaching practice; Reflected on my literacy development; Did archaeological research on educational policy statements and prescriptions by naming, framing, and fixing the discourses of literacy; Did critical discourse analysis on landmark U.S. education policies to discern how power is exercised to form literate teacher identities; Isolated text references to reading, writing, and literacy; Did critical discourse analysis of how official pedagogical discourse constructs literate subjects and objects (teachers, students, citizens, workers) Formulated a hermeneutical interpretation of the data. (See *A Postmodern Literacy Policy Analysis*, 2001)
Phase II	Taught language arts methods students about reflection and critical literacy in addition to general methods of language instruction; Did an ethnographic interview of language arts methods class asking: "What have been the main influences on your literacy formation?" Linked classroom practice to social arena.
Phase III	Item analyzed texts of pre-service teachers' responses; Did qualitative methodology to discern salient influences on future teacher literate identity formation; Critical discourse analysis: "What did their responses include?" "What did their responses exclude" "Whose power influenced literacy development?" "What were the "truths" of their literacy formation?" Synthetic analysis performed: How did the literacy influences and experiences of the pre-service teachers differ from those of the students? Critical theoretical lens employed to view issues of race, class, and gender as they related to literacy development of the group in interpretive analysis; Constructed a narrative, noting variability between and among respondents; Propose the need for more ethical literacy teaching and learning for self, classroom, social, global transformation.

works and two generations of criticalists, arrived at an explanation of the manners in which literacy narrowly taught has profound connections to and can determine human experiences of the material world. Freire, intent on examining how power is exercised in light of literacy discursive formations, advised on-going examination of the learning and teaching setting where literacy instruction occurs. Literacy as knowledge and power relations, thus, is the assumption underlying this research wherein the analyst performs genealogy (explains how power is exercised) by determining how literate subjects are positioned by the

Figure 3

Freirean Cultural Guidelines (Gadotti, 1994)	*Local Culture and Classroom Culture Reflection Questions*
What was the relationship between the instrumental and educational action possible during the teaching/learning process?	Why were these students "at-risk," "failures," "learning challenged," "drop-outs"? Why was it difficult for the teachers and interns to understand the social, cultural, economic, and political problems and situations that had confined them in this Black community far from the downtown tourist attractions since just after the Civil War? Why was poverty still pervasive in parts of this community? What was life like for this community in its struggle for survival within a hostile menial work environment that continues to keep minorities in low-end tourism, service, local grounds/maintenance, and cleaning work? Why might the students have been resistant to literacy instruction as it was presented to them?
What is the relationship of the cultural content of the reading and writing being taught to the students with their social, political, and economic conditions?	What is the cultural origin of the reading and writing curricula? What is the cultural origin of those who are teaching the curricula? What is the culture of the students of the curriculum? What is the disconnection and/or connection between and among these three cultures? How is the taught curriculum real or unreal to the students? If the curriculum objective is to teach the students cultural literacy, which cultural literacy would be most appropriate to the students? How is such a community-based cultural literacy different from what is being taught? Is the curriculum being taught covertly or overtly racist? Is the manner that the curriculum was being taught judgmental?

discourses. In the case of the language arts students in their pre-service teacher educational methods course and internships, power is exercised over their literacy by the federal and state governments, high stakes testing in the public schools, the university system, the professor, university exit exams, local school districts, and the mentor teacher.

There is ample evidence that testing prescriptions for school success have become a respected indicator of school quality (Linn, 1993). In an era of testing, finding main ideas, grammatical errors, and context clues become the practice of literacy in preparation for standardized tests (Yeh, 2001). The testing craze, although illustrated amply to be detrimental to education and many learners has been normalized (McNeil, 2000; Valenzuela, 2005). Foucault called this process normalization, meaning that discourses surrounding ideas of behavioral expectations and the

"scientific" practices resulting from those expectations, render many otherwise pernicious practices normal (Foucault, 1972, 1978; Dreyfus, Rabinow, & Foucault, 1982). Some of these normal practices that produce few objections, or at least not well-publicized or vociferously articulated objections from those socialized into U.S. education include tracking, testing, textbook dependency, patriarchal curriculum, and precedence of economic productivity over citizenship in education and in daily life.

In many areas of policymaking, both social and economic, discourses of literacy are evidently important as work and education initiatives are fashioned to improve and test literacy through many programs including schooling. In the 1980s atmosphere of national paranoia the "*manufactured crisis*" began the movement to appropriate large sums of educational monies toward high stakes testing justified and advocated for economic productivity (Levin, 2001; Berliner & Biddle, 1997). In order to better understand how discourses of literacy become normalized, it is important to ponder what comprises discourse in general and how knowledge and power exercised through those discourses prevail or percolate beneath the surface of policymaking discussions. The connections between policy and practices are better comprehended when the normalization of regulation of the curriculum, and specifically, the essentials of education—reading and writing—are manifested through discussion or analysis. Such a task can be difficult. Bourdieu (1980) explains why:

> The cunning of pedagogic reason lies precisely in the fact that it manages to extort what is essential while seeming to demand the insignificant, such as respect for forms and forms of respect which are the most visible and most natural manifestation of respect for the established order, or the concessions of politeness, which always contain political concessions. (69)

Implicit in Bourdieu's assessment is the idea that discourses and the decorum surrounding them are regulatory. From Foucault's perspective, discourses can be identified as systems of thought which aim, tacitly or overtly, to produce and regulate knowledge (1972). In Freire's view, the dominant discourses serve to subjugate groups of people, dehumanizing them in the systematic thwarting of human and community development of potential and transformation.

Contextualizing Literacy Discourses

Discourse can be defined broadly as the following: the rhetorical representations that develop and mediate disciplinary technologies of the self (Foucault, 1972); the set of social and cultural practices associated with codes of meaning (Gee, 1991a,b,c). Discourses themselves are textual because they are constructed by producers, contain encoded messages,

and are interpreted by receivers (Butler, 1995). If we accept Foucault's notion that human subjects are formed by discourses, we understand the benefit of educators' questioning the knowledge and power relations that have formed us. Lankshear (2001) says that the kinds of questions we ask about literacy studies and the issue of how we frame literacy are not minor matters but, rather, amount to nothing less than taking up a stance for or against particular discursive practices.

James Gee's views of both discourse and literacy are also helpful tools for examining the phenomenon of knowledge that constitutes literacy. He informs us that discourses can also include ways of being, acting, presenting ourselves, as well as ways of speaking about something. Two of his important contributions to literacy study explain literacy first as a "socially contested term" and secondly as the creation and maintenance of social worlds based on arguments leading to social beliefs and theories by the social action they inspire (Gee, 1991a,b,c). Wood and Kroger (2000) rely on Kress's work to expound on the definition of discourses to include the systematically organized sets of statements which give expression to the meanings and values of an institution, as revealed in conversational analysis occurring in the institutional settings in which the talk occurs.

We see the effects of Gee's social action and Foucault's technologies in the literacy domain with many technologies contributing to the general population's literacy development in several social institutions whether they be governmental, religious, educational, workplace, or familial. Literacy development is connected to human capital development, mobilization, and economic productivity (Agnello, 2001; Lankshear, 2001). It is also related to access to print and other media, interest in various media, self-motivation, and desire for personal development. As we see in the case of the pre-service teachers, it is connected to social and parental influences and values, teachers, peers, and interest in learning that leads to more learning.

Framing Discourses of Literacy

The following definitions differentiate the kinds of literacy in discussion here. Human capital literacy refers specifically to producing basic skills and technological skills for an educated workforce. Cultural literacy entails the promotion of the primacy of Eurocentric male culture, a body of literature of western European and North American origins, the American English language, as well as cultural socialization into the way of life in the United States. Two other kinds of literacy that are dialectical to these discourses are critical and feminist literacy.

The working definitions of critical literacy I employ here is a con-

sciousness that recognizes oppression in power exerted within the institutions of knowledge, language, and social organization. Paraphrasing the Freirean (1970) denotation of the concept, critical literacy is reading the world in addition to the word as a means to take action for changing oppressive social relations. Related to critical literacy, feminist literacy is a facility with language that enables critical textual analysis leading one to read, write, and reform the world from a female perspective. A range of literacy studies has attempted to explain the teaching and learning of literacy, each from the assumptions that the researchers bring to the discussion of literacy. As Lankshear (2001) explains, literacy studies have evolved, along with the movement of the social sciences toward qualitative epistemological permutations.

Literacy Studies Overview

Lankshear (2001) describes at least four tendencies in "literacy studies" since the 1950s. The first is a long-standing tradition of studies of reading and writing processes and characteristics of written language that did not identify themselves as "literacy" studies. Second, from the (late) 1980s, onward, in paradigms of psychology, literature, and literary theory, work in this same tradition re-identified itself as literacy research. However, it was not concerned with social aspects of literacy. Third, Lankshear's taxonomy isolates studies grounded in the larger study of social and cultural periods, milieu, processes, and changes. In this realm, studies explicitly embraced literacy, but where "literacy" was broadly and unproblematically defined as (alphabetic) writing, the ability to sign, or similar quantitative notions. The fourth phase in the development of literacy studies was grounded firmly in an understanding of literacy as sociocultural practice that has developed a large body of research. The last era has important implications for teacher education because implicit in the newest tradition is epistemological transition from teaching of reading and writing as skills to teaching of literacy as constructivist and at times political processes (Willinsky, 1990).

Moving Beyond Basic Skills in Language Arts Methods

In relationship to the study, the researcher's intention is to contextualize how pre-service teachers talk about their own literacy development within a political economy that prescribes worker and cultural literacy as official pedagogical discourse (Bernstein, 1990). Accordingly, my assertions are that literacy policy since 1983 was somewhat influential on literacy formation and that pre-service teachers' views on their literacy

development can illuminate kinds of literate identities that will be formed in the next generations of literacy learners who become teachers. In the language arts methods class, I tied literacy to language arts methods. Although this seems like a task that one might take for granted, it is not necessarily normal practice to do so, since language arts has been divided into several disciplines such as instruction in English, reading, writing, bilingual education, foreign language studies, each with a legitimate claim to its own body of literature, research, and taxonomic recognition in the public school and university curriculum. The study of language, literacy, and culture is a relatively new phenomenon and such study connotes different meaning than studies in the aforementioned disciplines (Oldfather & Thomas, 1998). A principal instructional objective was that the language arts methods class participated in a reconsideration of literacy beyond Lankshear's first three tendencies. Attempting to provide some experience in thinking about literacy from a critical perspective and as a sociocultural process, I assigned Joan Wink's book, *Critical Pedagogy: Notes from the Real World* (1997). In the book she describes the sociocultural processes that she experienced in some of her early teaching years, relying heavily on the work of Paulo Freire. She explained how sometimes her students' literacy was grounded in their social and lived worlds, how literacy learning could depend heavily on the interaction between students and the teacher, and that in some cases, students learned literacy of which she would have thought them incapable just to help her (the teacher), not because they wanted to or liked a certain kind of literacy skill particularly. Wink illustrated with self-references the process of on-going learning and the self-, social-, and political critique that one can utilize even many years after teaching work has occurred to make better sense of what has been taught and learned during the teaching phenomenon. In such reflective practice, aspects of phenomenology (capturing the phenomenon), hermeneutics (interpretive analysis), and archaeology genealogy (studying discourses and power) are useful research and reporting vehicles.

Studying Literacy Policies—Doing Archaeology

Naming and Framing the Discourses

In the macro-environment of literacy policymaking in the United States 1983-1998, policymakers, from positions of high power, articulated through official pedagogical discourses literacy prescriptions for society within landmark policy statements and laws. The specific policies and laws analyzed present a prescription for human capital literacy and cultural literacy development in the citizenry. They include *A Nation at*

Risk, America 2000, *National Literacy Act* of 1991, *Goal 5: Reaching the Goals: Adult Literacy, and Lifelong Learning*, and *Workforce Investment Act, and* most recently *No Child Left Behind of 2001*.

Literacy Policies 1983-2001

Discerning the Exercise of Power—Doing Genealogy

The truths of literacy are reinforced by politics and economics. The political economy is supported with social structures and institutions, one of which is the university that serves dual roles. On the one hand, the academy is a site of technological and business innovation; on the other hand, it is also one place where critique of social systems occur. In the present moment of research in the social sciences, individual experience has come to be respected, along with issues of justice and equity. Nonetheless, hard science views of research dominate policy informing topics of human development (Cochran-Smith, 2002). In this era, human experience and literacy research face the double roles of responding to the needs of individuals within institutions and the demands of an unyielding march toward quantifiable, verifiable, scientific research by a hierarchy of policymakers. Qualitative research responds to the onus of representing human experience within a positivistic policy arena (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994).

This study of the major influences on pre-service teachers' literacy development occurs within an era when more and more emphasis is being placed on standardized testing, skills mastery, and state-mandated curricula (Orfield & Kornhaber, 2001). A response by colleges of education for improved teacher education program has followed mandates from the federal state governments, in addition to local school districts (Cochran-Smith, 2001 a&b; Gore, 2001). Counter demands for more multicultural critical literacy and citizenship education are also placed on schools (Agnello, 2001; Banks, 2001). The truth of literacy and the knowledge that counts as literacy are mandated from high levels of policymaking, yet counter discourses are dialectically engaged to create a spectrum of discourses and literacy influences. In this milieu, the language arts interns were interviewed.

Doing Phenomenology—Capturing the Event

Participants

The demographics of the group as they classified themselves were 12 Anglo females, one African-American female, two Anglo males, one

Hispanic male, and six Hispanic females. The ages of the group ranged from 21 to 45. One Anglo female and one Anglo male were retired military personnel. Of the Hispanic females who participated in the study, four were Spanish majors. The Hispanic male was an English major.

Setting

The setting of the methods class and the internships was in a predominantly African-American high school in a primarily Anglo and Hispanic bicultural city. Because of low test score performances for several years in a row, the emphasis on teaching in the language arts class was on passing and/or raising scores on the Texas Academic and Knowledge Skills exam. In addition to least two formal instruction deliveries, the pre-service teachers were asked to work with their classroom mentors in a variety of capacities. Some of them taught more than others; some did clerical work; some tutored students with learning difficulties.

Some of the assignments that the language arts students were asked to perform included: (1) a professional paper in which they would describe their views of the expectations of their teaching roles as language arts teachers; (2) a literacy ethnography in which they described a short account of having learned or taught someone some aspect of reading and/or writing; (3) a two-week unit of study around a subject area that they taught in the field with their mentor teacher; and (4) short assignments that covered basic teaching skills expectations from the Kellough and Kellough book.

During the first days of the class, ontology and epistemology were the focus as the students were asked to consider in a brainstorming session what knowledge is and what, specifically knowledge in the language arts included. What the students derived was a blackboard of information that covered the gamut from basic skills to life skills, to language communication, to critical thinking. The same activity was utilized to elicit from the students what knowledge they thought they should teach students. In a teacher-centered curriculum, as the students soon saw, it is difficult to prescribe that students develop critical literacy. It also became very apparent to the methods students that little innovation, and certainly little or no critical literacy was going on in the classrooms where they were being asked to work. Of course, as many university/school collaboratives have shown, the goals of university professors in innovative education or pedagogy programs are not necessarily the goals of local public schools who are under fire for a myriad of public accountability issues (Gordon, 1995).

Researching the Event through Discourse Analysis

Wood and Kroger (2000) set forth precepts and concerns of doing discourse analysis. They describe three attributes of discourse on which the analyst focuses: (1) discourse speech and text are considered actions; (2) the talk or text is the event of interest; and (3) there is an emphasis on variability within and between persons (pp. 10-14). In the critical spirit of discourse analysis, two principal functions remain operational. One is to reveal the ways in which certain practices serve to obscure and therefore perpetuate what is taken for granted. The other is to identify unproblematic practices that members of a culture think should be problematic (pp. 13-14). By doing so, the critic is not finding faults with the person, but rather is focused on the behavior. In the case of this study, it is important to ponder how the actions that have formed future teachers' literacies might affect, along with federal literacy policies, as well as other factors, the literacies of future public school students.

The origin of a macroanalytic procedure described by Wood and Kroger derives from linguistics methodology and usually critically examines social and cultural practices. In keeping with these goals, discourse analysts study social discourse in relation to social problems, with particular attention to race, class, gender, and power relations. The French tradition of textual analysis was developed by Foucault, as well as Barthes and Derrida, who looked at an array of social features, based on texts as representational (p. 21).

The construction of subjects and objects through discourse has been disclosed through insights on identity construction, notions of self-development, membership categories, and positioning. Moving beyond explanation of the grammatical features of language, discourse analysis is concerned with how people who are active users of language are affected by and through discourse, agency, and social constraint. Tools for pursuing discourse analysis have been developed by drawing from several disciplines including sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, discourse psychology, text linguistics, ethnomethodology, sociology, and related areas. The contributions of these disciplines include suppositions about language and its users, various techniques, devices, and strategies, rejecting the possibility of one true interpretation. In the actual analysis, the units studied vary, as does the mission of identifying the function of talk in spoken language and text (in the case of written language).

By engaging in interpretive work, the discourse analyst performs tasks of social construction and identifies the ways in which participants actively create and utilize categories in their communications. Actual analysis utilizes steps of coding, category numeration, and can include

statistical analyses. It is requisite that the analyst identifies words, phrases, sentences, and language bits or units specific to the material being examined (Wood & Kroger, 2000, pp. 29-31). Moving toward a more informed and sophisticated interpretation of the language data is an inductive process. The discourse analyst is less interested in concrete aspects of language, (such as grammar), looking instead for what is meaningful about the language in its social environment, as well as what features are present and absent (Agnello, 2001; Foucault, 1972; Wood & Kroger, 2000).

Gee (2002) set forth a simple query as guidelines for understanding the "criticalness" of discourse analysis as concerned with three issues: (1) the context in which the discourse occurs; (2) the meaning made by the discoursers and the analyst; and (3) the distribution of goods. (Who gets the goods? How is the receiver of the goods constructed?) (Gee & Moser, 2001) Important criteria included in trustworthy discourse analyses are information about the setting in which the discourse occurred, circumstances under which they occur, social roles of those performing the speech act, demographic variables, power relations of those involved in the institutional setting. In interpreting the data, an important qualitative feature focuses on how the context is captured in the responses; quantitative analysis, on the other hand, is concerned with counting various features and detecting patterns. To verify the findings, the analyst accounts for an identifiable set of claims and represents with coherence the exceptions, alternatives, and similarities. In a plausibility check, the analyst juxtaposes what we know about and can observe in social life versus what kinds of claims are made in the literature, selecting excerpts that manifest diversity (Wood & Kroger, 2000).

In narrative analysis, the analyst's purpose is to explicate the use of language in making sense of the experience and constructing the self of the study's participants. An interpretive case is built upon the emphasis of explaining the relations between the production of the discourse and social action. Agency as indicated by the personality, outlook, world view, or speech product is an important variable in the overall consideration of discourse producers and products. Performing an –etic and –emic task, (looking at the phenomenon from both insider and outsider views), the researcher interprets what the participants find meaningful.

The analyst in pursuing synthesis reads, distills the data, finds categories, and makes meaningful connections. Interpretive analysis is utilized to bring social, institutional, and political insights to the discussion. Critique is achieved by iterative consideration of what connections and disconnections are present in the interaction of the participants, the setting, the institution, and the larger social setting. Similar to Freirean

frameworks for looking at oppressive social conditions extant in many literacy programs, critique of the literacy instruction environment is rich in possibilities to examine knowledge and power relations such as those exercised by the teacher and student, the respect afforded or denied language learners, the acknowledgment of local versus book knowledge, etc.

Findings

Synthetic Analysis

A general discussion elaborates on the researcher's chart data. The self as a literacy agent was expressed by most of the respondents. Others wrote of the sensory connection that they had to literacy. Reading and writing were also described as a habit, consistent with Bourdieu's *habitus* that describes a learned ritual of performance engaging the brain, speech apparatus, as well as writing ability, as part of the mission of the state's formation and distribution of linguistic capital (Luke, 1992). Several of the partipants' responses revealed that they had built their literacy by their own initiative.

Yet a category of Family influences showed the power of the family on literacy development. The most cited family member was the mother, but "parents" and a "sister" were important influencers. The school environment was quite important for literacy taught by teachers, professors, and books. The library and authors also exerted a good deal of influence on literacy. Shakespeare was the particular author that was meaningful to one of the respondents. The range of literacy learned in the school environment ran the gamut from grade school literacy, to the liberal arts and beyond, to multidimensional genres, and multicultural literacy. The social and economic environment also exerted control over some of the respondents' literacy. The workplace and the military provided job experiences that contributed to literacy along with friends, arts, and exposure to worldly knowledge. This worldly knowledge also came from "no television."

Interpretative Analysis

Two respondents made interesting social and poetic commentary in their interview. Upon analyzing the two individuals, contradictions arose in their identity formations versus what an overgeneralized view of their experiences reveal about them as individuals in a society founded upon the dominance of Anglo male culture and the subordinance of the African-American female (Collins, 1991). The African-American female intern was empowered by her literacy; the Anglo-male was empowered

because of the family, social, and military expectations of him to become literate. As one might expect, his literacy was somewhat regulated while he served in the military.

The interns contextualized literacy instruction going on in the school setting within their own frameworks. They were not interested in dialog or learning Black vernacular (which I always find intriguing, interesting, generative, and creative).

With regard to instruction, all the language arts interns read Joan Wink's (1997) *Critical Pedagogy: Notes from the Real World*. I had done a short lecture on Paulo Freire and his influences on my thinking about literacy. They had heard of critical literacy, as they had heard about the regulatory effects of literacy policies that seek to make good workers rather than good citizens. They did not seem to connect the importance of critical literacy development to their own backgrounds, or to their present experiences, or possibly their future teaching. They did not state the importance of literacy for citizenship, governmental participation, school or world transformation.

These future language arts students did not see their relationship to the dominant culture as relevant to the non-dominant culture of their students. Critical literacy as self-, social-, and political-engagement did not surface as a possibility for future instruction in their classrooms. What the interns saw was much practice for competency exams that public school students would be expected to master in order to bring up last year's overall school performance in reading, writing, and mathematics. Some saw African American literature being taught. The interns often commented that there was little time to do much literature teaching. (They did not express concern about not having time to teach critical or non-traditional literacy.)

Encouraging teacher as researcher practices, I proposed that the future teachers take charge of their students' literacy learning and do research to see what worked and did not work in the implementation of their teaching. I told the students about the mistakes that I made in my early teaching years that were racist (Lalik & Hinchman, 2001), classist, and sexist. All in all, the future teachers knew that the expectations of them would be very high and that there were many social variables to overcome in the classroom. Although taught about classroom and social transformation *a la* Freire and *a la* Wink, they did not embrace transformation, but rather looked forward to survival in their first years of teaching. They did not envision the complexity of the policy environment that would make it very difficult to learn or practice critical literacy or any literacy.

Contextualizing the Data in a Macro-Policy Environment

Within the macro literacy policy environment, the interns were on track with their mastery of cultural literacy, and in their training for the teaching profession they showed themselves to be potentially good future workers. The policies from *A Nation at Risk* to the *Workforce Investment Act* promote literacy for good worker skills, technological literacy (that is also classified as human capital literacy in *The Postmodern Literacy Policy Analysis*), and cultural literacy. They saw themselves as solutions to the problems of their future students, rather than contributors to social reproduction that perpetuates class inequalities. As future teacher agents of the state, the interns knew what was expected of them and knew the importance of compliance within the educational system that would provide them some economic stability in return. In the *No Child Left Behind* policy, it is evident that similar discourses are pervasive with even more emphasis on testing and accountability.

Freirean Frameworks and Final Thoughts

> We are now dealing with the present in order to create the future. We are now creating the future by the formation of the present. We are creating the future present for the new generation, from which they will make history. For these reasons, I think it is absolutely indispensable that educators be secure, capable, and have a capacity for loving and for curiosity. (Freire in Horton & Freire, 1990, p. 191)

Blindness and indifference to change impede the possibilities toward transforming the manners in which we think about literacy and human beings. Popkewitz (2002) explains how the newest formulas for school success disregard the revolutions of research that question the basis of modern science. Such disregard frames much educational research inquiry accordingly, interprets the evidences as such frames would suggest, and subsequently excludes individuals and important movements from the timely considerations of what knowledge is and perhaps more importantly why we follow canonical practices. In multidimensional visions of education, the multi-epistemological and multi-methodological approaches to literacy research that informs teacher education help to inform us about the gross omissions (Lalik & Hinchman 2001). Multiculturalists and a range of critics of capitalistic principles that drive the educational policies in the United States see the possibilities of social transformation of literacy as a sociocultural process. The motive for the transformation is concern with democratic principles, justice, and attention to issues of race, class, gender, sexual orientation, and other politically charged topics that remain largely unaddressed in the new

millennium. However, before such transformation occurs, teachers who know themselves understand how their literacy has been formed to exclude ethical principles connected to the treatment of people in various cultures (Gadotti, 1994) and then begin to make policy changes through informed classroom practices (Horton & Freire, 1990; Agnello, 2001, 2006).

Real Cultural Literacy

In a post study reframing and interrogation of this study, it has occurred to me that I stopped short of the goal of facilitating my interns' understanding of the inner city students' "illiterate behavior." Two questions help to redirect thinking toward a more fruitful consideration of what was going on and perhaps has been going on in this black high school on the east side of the city (Gadotti, 1994). First, what was the relationship between the instrumental and educational action possible during the teaching/learning process? The possibilities were few in light of the high stakes testing environment. The goal of the teachers and the school was to raise test scores. Such a pedagogical disposition was not favorable for the students who have been constructed as "at-risk," "failures," "learning challenged," "drop-outs," etc. The teachers and interns were positioned not to understand the social, cultural, economic, and political problems and situations that had confined students in this black community far from the downtown tourist attractions since just after the Civil War. Rather they were working to change the local culture. Yet the existing culture is inextricably linked to the economic poverty present in parts of this community pervasive to this day, part of a long struggle for survival in a menial work and jobs environment that had been and continues to be hostile to the African-American minority and has kept them in low-end tourism, service, local grounds/maintenance, and cleaning work. Perhaps, many of the students who slept during class did so because they were not interested in the action taken or materials utilized to teach them literacy and/or because they were tired from working or from living a life not conducive to reading and writing in the manner taken for granted by many middle class people.

Second, the relationship of the cultural content of the reading and writing being taught to the students was not user-friendly with regard to the social, political, and economic conditions of the "illiterate" secondary students. The guidelines in Figure 3 help provide a checklist for interns pursuing their field assignments to ask themselves as they attempt to make sense of their learning. What is the cultural origin of the reading and writing curricula? What is the cultural origin of those who are teaching the curriculum? What is the cultural origin of the students of

the curriculum? What are the disconnection and/or connection between and among these three cultures? How is the taught curriculum real or unreal to the students? If the curriculum objective is to teach the students cultural literacy, which cultural literacy would be most appropriate to the students? How is such a community-based cultural literacy different from what is being taught? Is the curriculum being taught covertly or overtly racist? Is the manner that the curriculum was being taught judgmental? If the curriculum attempted to broach the topic of racism, how was the topic handled?

Were the students who were the object of community/city racism able to articulate what kinds of feelings they had in response to what they interpret as racist treatments, policies, and practices? Who had the power in the classroom? Who did not have the power? How could the students have been asked to challenge the knowledge and power relations that existed in the classroom, school, or community? How could a more receptive classroom culture that might have altered heretofore unchallenged educational policies and practices have been built? What can the teacher do to make the curriculum more authentic to the experiences of the student population? How could the pre-service teachers have questioned their privilege or the privilege of the non-minority teacher in the classroom, school, and community with regard to the literacy being taught? What were the dynamics and social conditions, politics, and economic conditions of the community (Gadotti, 1994)?

Finally, as a facilitator of literacy instruction and an instructor of future teachers, I can help my students understand the layering effects of the implementation of the literacy policies to produce and reproduce worker competence in the international Information Age economy, even as many impoverished people know technological skills evident by their checking their email and surfing the web at public libraries. Teacher educators can help lead future teachers to a realization that the American way of life through ideological formation is achieved as we are all compliant in following literacy policies and practices. As the leader of discussions about "literate identity formations," a curious educator can promote discussion about the manner in which the ideological assumptions of capitalism, competition, and scarcity inform future teachers' work. As literate subjects, we can all dialog about how when we adhere to the prescribed official literacy pedagogical discourse, that we may not be teaching the kind of literacy that is wanted and needed in such a classroom (Gutierrez, Rymes, & Larson, 1995). We can inspire dialog about how sleeping in class might be resistance to the literacy curriculum on the parts of the students. How might the literate identities of the African American students have been more appropriately co-constructed

through collaboration and dialog amongst and between the students and the teacher?

Literate identity formation of pre-service teachers is a relatively unexplored dimension of literacy research. As we reconsider what is important in the global community, global conversations will open new venues to re-determine what is important to future literate identity formations in all teachers (Agnello, White, & Fryer, 2006). As our voices are commingled, it will become more necessary for teacher educators, as well as in-service and pre-service teachers, to question how their "truths" of literacy have been formed, and how the macro-policy environment has constructed national "truths" of literacy. Through narrower or wider windows created by more and less regulated policies, we will construct and reconstruct the discourses from which we can view ourselves in our sociopolitical environments. To study literate identity formation, through multiple methods is a highly important component of reflective teaching practice and can be a big step toward democratizing literacy practices. Such study can initiate the journey upon which each educator who is serious about teaching multiple literacies in a dynamic shrinking world embarks as he or she *makes the road by walking* (Freire & Horton, 1990).

References

Agnello, M. F. (2001). *A postmodern literacy policy analysis*. New York: Peter Lang.

Agnello, M. F. (2006). Personal and critical literacy disconnect: Pre-service teachers in an urban minority school. *The Charter Schools Resource Journal*, *2*, 10-17.

Agnello, M. F., White, D., & Fryer, W. (2006). Toward twenty-first century global citizenship: A teacher education curriculum. *Social Studies Research and Practice, 1*(3), 312-326.

Banks, J. (2001). Citizenship education and diversity. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *52*(1), 5-16.

Bernstein, B. (1990). *The structuring of pedagogic discourse*. New York: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1980). *The logic of practice*. (Trans. R. Nice). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bullough, R.V., & Pinnegar, S. (2001). Guidelines for quality in autobiographical forms of self-study research. *Educational Researcher*, *30*(3), 13-21.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. In J. Thompson (Ed.), Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Butler, R. (1995). *Women in audiovisual education, 1920-1957: A discourse analysis*. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 56*(1), 73A. (University Microforms No. AAI95-08907)

Cochran-Smith, M. 1991. Learning to teach against the grain. *Harvard Educa-*

tion Review, *61*(3), 279-309.

Cochran-Smith, M. 2001a. Learning to teach against the new grain. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *52*(1), 3-4.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2001b). Higher standards for prospective teachers: What's missing from the discourse? *Journal of Teacher Education*, *52*(3), 179-181.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2002). What a difference a definition makes: Highly qualified teachers, scientific research, and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *53*(3), 187-189.

Collins, P. H. (1991). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1990). Teacher evaluation in transition: Emerging roles and evolving methods. In J. Millman & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), *The new handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers* (pp. 17-32). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Wise, A. E. (1991). From bureaucratic control to building human capital: The importance of teacher learning in education reform. *Educational Researcher*, *25*(9), 9-11.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dreyfus, H. L., Rabinow, R., & Foucault, M. (1982). *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Duke, N. K., & Mallette, M. H. (2001). Preparation for new literacy researchers in multi-epistemological and multi-methodological times. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *33*(2), 345-360.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language* (A.M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality* (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power / knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings* (C. Gordon, Ed.; C. Gordon, L. Marshall, J. Mepham, & K. Soper, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.

Freire, P., & Horton, M. (1990). *We make the road by walking: Conversations on education and social change*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Gadotti, M. (1994). *Reading Paulo Freire*. (J. Milton, Trans.). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Gallego, M. (2001). Is experience the best teacher? The potential of coupling classroom and community-based field experiences. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *52*(4), 312-325.

Gee, J. P. (1991a). What is literacy? In C. Mitchell & K. Weiler (Eds.), *Rewriting literacy: Culture and the discourse of the other* (pp. 3-11). New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Gee, J. P. (1991b). The narrativization of experience in the oral style. In C. Mitchell & K. Weiler (Eds.), *Rewriting literacy: Culture and the discourse of the other* (pp. 77-101). New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Gee, J. P. (1991c). Discourse systems and aspirin bottles: On literacy. In C. Mitchell & K. Weiler (Eds.), *Rewriting literacy: Culture and the discourse of the other* (pp. 77-101). New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Gee, J. P. (2002), April. What makes discourse analysis critical? A paper presented at American Education Research Association convention, New Orleans, LA.

Gee, J., & Moser, B. (2001). An introduction to discourse analysis. *The Modern Language Journal*, *85*(1), 141-3.

Giroux, H. 1988. *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning*. Westport, CT.: Bergin & Garvey.

Gordon, E.W. (1995). The promise of accountability and standards in the achievement of equal educational opportunity. *Teachers College Record*, *96*(4), 751-756.

Gore, J. M. (2001). Beyond our differences a reassembling of what matters in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *52*(2), 124-135.

Gutierrez, K.D., Rymes, B., Larson, J. (1995). Script, counterscript, and underlife in the classroom: *James Brown versus Brown v. Board of Education*. *Harvard Educational Review*, *65*, 445-471.

Kellough, R.D., & Kellough, N.G. (1997). *Secondary school teaching: A guide to methods and resources: Planning for competence*. New York: Merrill.

Kincheloe, J. (1991). *Teachers as researchers: Qualitative inquiry as a path to empowerment*. New York: Falmer Press.

Kincheloe, J. (1993). *Toward a critical politics of teacher thinking: Mapping the postmodern*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Kincheloe, J., & Steinberg, S. (1993). A tentataive description of post-formal thinking: The critical condfrontation with cognitive theory. *Harvard Educational Review*, *63*, 296-320.

Lankshear, C. (1998). Meanings of literacy in contemporary educational reform proposals. *Educational Theory*, *48*(3), 351-372.

Lankshear, C. (2001). Literacy studies in education: disciplined developments in a post-disciplinary age. Book chapter in progress.

Lalik, R., & Hinchman, K.A. (2001). Critical issues: Examining constructions of race inliteracy research: Beyond silence and other oppressions of White liberalism. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *33*(3), 529-561.

Levin, H. (2001). High stakes testing and economic productivity. In G. Orfield & M. Kornhaber (Eds.), *Raising standards or raising barriers? Inequality and high-stakes testing in public education* (pp. 39-50). New York: A Century Foundation Book.

Linn, R.L. (1993). Educational assessment: Expanded expectations and challenges. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *15*(1), 1-16.

Luke, A. (1992). The body literate: Discourse and inscription in early literacy training. *Linguistics and Education*, *4*(1), 107-129.

McNeil, L.M. (2000). *Contradictions of school reform: Educational costs of standardized testing*. New York: Routledge.

Mitchell, & K. Weiler (Eds). (1991). *Rewriting literacy: Culture and the discourse of the other* (pp. 77-101). New York: Bergin & Garvey.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425.

Oldfather, P., & Thomas, S. (1998). What does it mean when high school teachers participate in collaborative research with students on literacy motivations? *Teachers College Record*, *99*(4), 647-691.

Orfield, G., & Kornhaber, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Raising standards or raising barriers? Inequality and high-stakes testing in public education*. New York: A Century Foundation Book.

Popkewitz, T. S. (1997). A changing terrain of knowledge and power: A social epistemology of educational research. *Educational Researcher*, *26*(9), 18-29.

Popkewitz, T. S. (2002). How the alchemy makes inquiry, evidence, and exclusion. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *53*(30), 262-267.

Snow, C. E. (2001). Knowing what we know: Children, teachers, researchers. *Educational Researcher*, *30*(7), 3-9.

U.S. Department of Education, National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Education. (1991). *America 2000: An education strategy*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Goal 5 Work Group. (1993a). *Reaching the goals: Goal 5: Adult literacy and lifelong learning*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Van den Berg, R., & Ross, A. (1999). The permanent importance of the subjective reality of teachers during educational innovation: A concerns-based approach. *American Educational Research Journal*, *36*(4), 879-906.

Valenzuela, A. (Ed). (2005). *Leaving children behind: How "Texas-style" accountability fails Latino youth*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. London, UK: Routledge.

Wink, J. (1997). *Critical pedagogy: Notes from the real world*. New York: Longman.

Wood, L. A., & Kroger, R. O. (2000). *Doing discourse analysis: Methods for studying action in talk and text*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yeh, S. S. (2001).Tests worth teaching to: Constructing state-mandated tests that emphasize critical thinking. *Educational Researcher*, *30*(9), 12-17.