

**GENERATION 1.5 IN HAWAI'I:
GAINING CRITICAL TOOLS FOR READING THE WORLD**

RENAE SKARIN

Stanford University

A curriculum is a design for a future social subject, and via that envisioned subject, a design for a future society. (Kress, 1996, p. 16)

INTRODUCTION

There are more college-bound high school students than ever before. With changes in the U.S. labor market resulting in the disappearance of industrial or manufacturing jobs to overseas locations, there has been a push for students from working class and minority backgrounds to attain a higher education in order to achieve upward mobility. Mexican-Americans are now the fastest growing population of college-bound students and college participation rates among other minorities have risen substantially (U.S. Census Bureau, 1999). Despite the interest of many educators in promoting academic achievement for those labeled 'minority', what Bourdieu and Passeron noted in 1970 in *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* is still true today: that those children whose parents occupy privileged positions within our social hierarchy tend to also advance to privileged positions in society, while the children of those who occupy relatively subordinate positions tend to remain subordinate. We know that differences in academic achievement among racial/ethnic groups begin early in students' academic careers and continue throughout the remainder of their educational years. For example, scores recorded for students in the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) are markedly lower for African American, Latino, and Native Americans than Whites, and the former groups are grossly underrepresented among so-called 'high-achievers'. In fact, the gap between these differences in score attainment has been widening since the eighties (Borman, et al., 2000).

Among the college-age minorities, one group of students has been gaining increasing attention among educators, administrators, and policy makers. This group is often referred to as Generation 1.5, or simply as G1.5.¹ These students can be characterized as being located in a cultural in-between space. They have diverse educational experiences, but most immigrated to the U.S. sometime between elementary school and high school (Harklau, 2003) and all have received some schooling within the U.S. system. Thus, G1.5 students have varying degrees of bilingualism, biculturalism, and academic literacy (Danico, 2004; Skarin, 2001; Harklau, Losey & Siegal, 1999). Although they share characteristics from two or more cultures, many feel that they belong wholly to none. For example, in Hawai‘i, students may experience Local² and other cultures, depending on the neighborhood they live in, and the sociocultural choices they make. Similarly, in *Growing up bilingual*, (1997), Ana Celia Zentella documents the use of multiple language varieties by young Puerto-Rican Americans in New York, the uses of which are influenced by multiple sociocultural factors such as race, class, gender, time, place, and political relationship with the U.S., among others. Evidence (Davis, 1995; Zentella, 1997) indicates that G1.5ers experience what Bhaba (1994), Giroux (1994), Hall (1990; 1996) and others have referred to as ‘hybrid identities’ or, to use Anzaldúa’s term (1999), they are ‘border-crossers’, who inhabit a space which defies fixed and stable categories such as Chinese, White, American, or Local. For these students, there are tensions among the borders of their multiple identities and between inclusion and exclusion, belonging and otherness, localness and foreignness. The few texts that exist about Generation 1.5ers involve discussion of social and cultural issues such as accommodating the two (or more) cultures, resolving conflicting cultural values, and formulating border-crossing identities (Burnett & Syed, 1999; Chiang & Schmida, 1999; Rumbaut & Ima, 1988).

¹ *Generation 1.5* is a term coined by Rumbaut and Ima to describe the population of Southeast Asian refugee youth they studied in San Diego (1988) because although they are technically first generation in that they were born elsewhere, they share cultural characteristics of both the culture from which they originated and the culture in which they have made their homes.

² The term *local* is used to describe a native or long-term resident of Hawai‘i, who has acculturated or adopted the behavioral norms of the majority of locals. As in any culture, there are no hard and fast rules for how to be local, but there are many outward, social, and linguistic markers that other locals implicitly recognize.

For G1.5 students, the once traditional immigrant route of achieving upward mobility through skilled jobs in the manufacturing industry (requiring less ‘formalized’ forms of literacy) is now lost. They are like their American-born minority cohorts entering institutions of higher education by the droves, in order to achieve the now necessary qualifications for entry into a field with decent-wage employment. According to Harklau (1998), “Upon initial examination, in comparison with native-born peers, the demographic profile of immigrant participation in postsecondary schooling appears quite robust. Immigrants are more likely than American-born peer cohorts to attend college and, once there, to persist and receive a degree” (p. 636). Roberge (2001) reported that “virtually every public college and university in the U.S. must now contend with this new student population” (pp. 4-5).

For the past few years, TESOL and AAAL national and local conferences have included many colloquia, discussion sessions, presentations, and forums centered on the issues related to the college education for Generation 1.5 students. Academic books and articles (Ferris, 2002; Harklau, et al., 1995; Losey, 1997; McKay & Wong, 1996; Nero, 1997; Park, 1999; Ruiz, 2004; Rumbaut, 1994) increasingly consider the learning problems of this population and propose various ‘solutions’ to the difficulties that they face with academic literacy and discourse in higher education.

Most discussion of G1.5 academic challenges suggests that students are orally fluent or have acquired Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) (Cummins, 1984) and so focuses on the remediation of learners with academic literacy difficulties. Often methods of remediation, especially in L2 classrooms, involve the development of decontextualized skills including direct grammar instruction, sentence pattern and phonological instruction, model writing, peer editing, and sometimes social-process oriented strategies and various other approaches; all of which can be useful in particular contexts when used in conjunction with various others methods. But, a very few educators are tending to the question of the linguistic and racial injustices in schools in grades K-12, which marginalized these students in the first place.

According to Henry Giroux (1999), critical pedagogy asks, “whose future, story and interests does the school represent? Critical pedagogy argues that school

practices need to be informed by a public philosophy that addresses how to construct ideological and institutional conditions in which the lived experience of empowerment for the vast majority of students becomes the defining feature of schooling.” Accomplishing this empowerment for the vast majority, according to Valdes (2004), would involve mainstream K-12 classrooms being “opened to multiple texts and multiple voices”. In addition:

Students must be encouraged to see themselves as having something to say, as taking part in a dialogue with teachers, with students in their classroom, with students in their school, with members of their communities, and with other writers who have written about issues and questions that intrigue them. I maintain that students should not be encouraged to merely pretend to talk to distant audiences so that their teacher can correct their vocabulary and syntax. They should be made aware of other voices, of how they speak, of how they write, of the ways they say and do not say what they mean, of the resources they use to gain attention, to persuade, and to explain, and then, they should be encouraged to respond. (p. 123)

As it stands, most language minority students are academically segregated from their peers in K-12 mainstream classrooms and have little exposure to communication spheres where academic language is being acquired through classroom social practices (Valdes, 2004; Syed & Burnett, 1999). In addition, studies as early as 1981 (Scollon and Scollon, 1981; Heath, 1983) illustrate that students who enter school with different epistemological standpoints from those shared by the dominant culture of school will more often than not come into conflict with the ideological worldviews of those classmates and teachers in the mainstream and may have difficulty in acquiring the discourse practices that are considered important for academic literacy. Given the need for attending to cultural variation, as Gee notes, traditional classrooms do a poor job of facilitating mastery of academic discourses. He says:

These non-mainstream students often fail to fully master school-based dominant discourses, especially the ‘superficialities of form and correctness’ that serve as good gates given their imperviousness to late acquisition in classrooms without

community support. In fact, they often gain just enough mastery to ensure that they continually mark themselves as outsiders while using them, and are, at best, colonized by them. (Gee, 1996, p. 146)

In terms of the particular ideological and pedagogical concerns involved in educating G1.5 students, very few ESL and mainstream classroom practitioners who deal with ELLs in U.S. colleges are informed by students' past social and political circumstances when tending to the education of this population.

Ideological conditions that work toward promoting "empowerment for the vast majority of students" can provide equitable access to literacies of power, not only by attending to remediation of the structural errors and rhetorical problems in students' language, but also by unveiling the ideological constructs that underlie literacies of power. In addition, empowerment curriculum can attend to the issues of identity and worldview that might arise for the students as they are socialized in discourses of power³.

This paper introduces key aspects of a curriculum that I developed for Generation 1.5 in high-intermediate-advanced community college ESL classes in Hawai'i. It draws on applied critical linguistic approaches, which are informed by various theories including structuralism, poststructuralism, postmodernism, cultural studies, postcolonial studies, gender studies, and Marxist theory among others. It does not attempt to give a snapshot of my pedagogy-in-action, replete with all of its complexities, its need for constant reciprocity between theories utilized and actual classroom practices (praxis), and its need for continual negotiation between teacher and learners: I justify the approaches outlined here because they were successful on a number of levels for these students (Ford, 2003)⁴. Rather, I attempt in this paper to provide particular slices of the curriculum in which I explore in-depth what a critical approach to language development can look like.

This curriculum endeavors to begin the process of apprenticing students into academic discourse, while legitimizing and providing heuristics for the critical consumption of the 'texts' they are required to 'read' inside and outside of college in

³ See Gee, 1996, pp. 59-65 for a discussion of differing world views.

⁴ For a discussion of the participatory evaluation of this language curriculum, please refer to Shawn Ford's (2003) paper in which he describes his evaluation of this project

order to gain cultural capital. It uses complementary and sometimes overlapping methods and approaches such as critical discourse analysis, semiotic analyses, genre study, media literacy, student-as-ethnographer, and metalinguistic/metacognitive awareness. I also seek to apply Vygotskian approaches to teaching by scaffolding the particular cognitive tasks that I ask students to perform. Prior to this particular course, many of the students have never been introduced to cognitively demanding tasks in the classroom (Bennett, Kadooka, Menacker, Skarin, Talmy, & Winn, 2000)⁵. Harklau, et al. (1999) note that research has shown that high school students in low-track, sheltered, or remedial classes (into which many of my G1.5 students were mainstreamed) are socialized into literacy practices that differ from those used in higher tracks. What I attempt to do is to value and utilize the knowledge and experiences as well as the desires and hopes that students bring with them into the college classroom while apprenticing them to academic literacies. Their prior experiences and multiple identities are used as bases for building on their knowledge and provide scaffolding practices. The next section provides a brief overview of the assumptions and theories that underlie my practices in both marginalized and mainstream student classrooms.

CRITICAL THEORY

U.S. educators are facing the challenges of “new times” (Hall, 1996) wherein political, cultural, and physical climates are rapidly changing through technological development; social movements are arising out of the need to address the inequality of women, homosexuals, and blacks (among others); and profoundly altered demographics are resulting from large-scale immigration to the U.S. from Asia, the Middle East, and other areas of the world. In the postindustrial U.S., new hybrid identities are drawing attention to the multiple discourses of communities, workplaces, and schools. Giroux (1999) argues that,

⁵ This report presents the findings of a two-year ethnographic study that assessed the educational experiences and needs of G1.5 students at the particular community college in question and which culminated in the development of this curriculum for this particular population.

We need to develop social literacies that are functional, cultural, and critical. In this sense, we need literacies that both recognize the importance of cultural differences and the importance of individuals communicating across various social, cultural, and political borders.... Educators and others also need literacies that enable people to critically analyze the new electronic technologies that are shaping everyday life through the popular media, television, and film” (1999; online source).

But, what do those social literacies consist of, who are the students of those social literacies, and how do we go about developing them? In recent years, critical education and literacy theorists (Clark, Fairclough, Ivanic, & Martin-Jones, 1990; Fairclough, 1995; Gee, 1996; Burbules & Berk, 1999; Pennycook, 2001; Norton & Toohey, 2002; Morgan, 2002; Luke, 2002; Janks, 2002) have looked to the work of European critical theorists such as Bourdieu, Foucault, Giddens, and Derrida who recognize that language and discourse are central to identity formation and the construction and regulation of knowledge, social relations, and institutions. The underpinning orientation of these critical theorists has been summarized by Wendy Morgan (1997) as follows:

Critical theories of literacy ... share the view that society is in a constant state of conflict, for the possession of knowledge (hence power), status and material resources is always open to contest. Struggles to define the world and claim its goods are carried out by unequally matched contestants, for certain social groups have historically controlled the ideologies, institutions and practices of their society, thereby maintaining their dominant position. But since these are socially and historically constructed, they can be reconstructed. One of the chief means of such re/construction is language. Therefore critical literacy critics and teachers focus on the cultural and ideological assumptions that underwrite texts, they investigate the politics of representation, and they interrogate the inequitable, cultural positioning of speakers and readers within discourses. They ask who constructs the texts whose representations are dominant in a particular culture at a particular time; how readers come to be complicit with the persuasive ideologies of texts; whose interests are served

by such representations and such readings; and when such texts and readings are inequitable in their effects, how these could be constructed otherwise.

They seek to promote the conditions for a different textual practice and therefore different political relations than present social, economic and political inequalities as these are generated and preserved by literacy practices within and beyond formal education. (Morgan, 1997, pp. 1-2)

Critical theorists have helped us to understand the ways in which the individual agent reproduces (through routinization of social activities) social structure or culture “the basic existential parameters of self and social identity” (Giddens, 1984, p. 375). Further, whereas knowledge building has traditionally been looked at as the description and analysis of the social and biological world, critical theorists have pointed to the ways that knowledge is socially constructed largely through dominant social and historical discourses and how these discourses delimit disciplinary fields and what can be said and done within them (Foucault, 1984). For example, Bourdieu (1978, 1991), with his seminal concepts of *habitus*, *field*, and *cultural capital*, articulates the ways in which implicit and explicit socialization inculcates individuals into certain ways of behaving or acting in the world and privileges specific social practices over others. We now know that particular educational forms (including forms of literacy and ways of using language), though not inherently ‘better’ than others, are valued as possessing more economic, cultural, and symbolic capital than others. For example, those with the ability to read highly technical and practical documents associated with car repair (manuals, manufacturers documents, invoices, etc.) are not bestowed with the same capital as those who have literacy in more formal kinds of documents associated with higher educational institutions. And educational institutions have a vested interest in reproducing the notion that the most valuable knowledge is that kind produced within these factories of knowledge known as schools. Furthermore, some critical education theorists have looked at the ways schools and universities are comprised of and through dominant discourses, which then make up the bureaucracies (e.g., the symbolic texts and reified documents, policies, and curriculum), the social interactions, and the identities (e.g., teachers, adolescents, gifted, ADD, etc.), and categories (e.g., LEP, ELL), within them, and

which serve to reproduce them. In Foucauldian terms, instances of power relationships are located even in the seemingly nonpolitical discourse of educational institutions.

Fairclough (1995, p. 221) asserts “I believe that the problematic of language and power is fundamentally a question of democracy. Those affected need to take it on board as a political issue...If problems of language and power are to be seriously tackled, they will be tackled by the people who are directly involved, especially the people who are subject to linguistic forms of domination and manipulation.” If school discourses are constructive phenomena, and if certain social discourses within schools dominate at the expense of other discourses, this would seem to suggest that the “people” to whom Fairclough refers might be our students, especially ELL and so-called minority students who speak a non-standard variety of English and “who are subject to linguistic forms of domination and manipulation.” If those forms of domination are discursively constructed, students need to become equipped with analytical tools, which will help them to deconstruct and reconstruct or resist those constructions in ways that will not be detrimental to their physical, material, and social well-being.

Many of those undertaking literacy, and language education and theory now view the nature of language in relation to other social practices; consider literacies as sets of social practices, normalized and stratified by the agents who reproduce them; and accept that the agent “knows a great deal about the conditions of reproduction of the society of which he or she is a member” (Giddens, 1979, p. 5). Yet, I would argue that there is not a great deal of literature available about how to undertake effective measures to upset the reproductive process and apply a critical lens to the texts in society which serve to reproduce their subordination. Educational applications of Critical Applied Linguistics (here used as an umbrella term for a number of different but overlapping approaches to language and literacy such as critical discourse analysis, critical language awareness, and critical literacy) can provide various analytical tools to such an end. Wodak (1989) defines the field of Critical Linguistics as “an interdisciplinary approach to language study with a critical point of view” for the purpose of studying “language behavior in natural speech situations of social

relevance” often with the purpose of attempting to uncover “inequality and injustice.”

Critical Applied Linguistics (CAL) heuristic frameworks have focused on the description of interactions between students and teachers (as well as caregivers) as moments in language socialization, and development of cultural and linguistic competence (see Cazden, 1988). CAL has described how social categories (such as gender, deficit, and disadvantage) have been constructed through classroom talk (Baker & Freebody, 1989); explored the hegemonic power of educational discourses in students’ identity constructions; and, in even more constructive moments, has been used in educational contexts to help students (primarily in the UK and Australia) learn about linguistic and cultural power relations through “critical language awareness” and “critical literacy” (Luke & Freebody, 1999; Janks, 2002; Comber, 2002). Yet, CAL has done very little with regards to the development of curriculum for ELLs, dialect speakers, and others labeled minorities in a U.S. context, which would not only help them develop fluency in English but also teach them how to critically analyze the texts of the culture within which they participate and recognize the importance of critical literacy tools under postmodern (or late modern) conditions.

But what practical techniques can we draw on to help develop such critical skills? And what specific issues do these critical skills address for these students? The following section describes key aspects of the curriculum I developed for Generation 1.5 students at Aloha Community College⁶, as well as gives examples of how I implement them in the classroom.

CURRICULUM DESIGN FOR *CRITICAL* PURPOSES

The curriculum described here, like any effective curriculum, is a curriculum-in-progress. By that I mean that it should be grounded in praxis defined by Pennycook as “a constant reciprocal relation between theory and practice” (2001, p. 3). Although the elements of this curriculum would be useful for all students, I provide

⁶ Aloha is a pseudonym that Shawn Ford invented for the purposes of his evaluation report.

descriptions of curriculum implementation at a community college in Hawai‘i to show how Generation 1.5 students, in particular, can benefit from a critical perspective.

The Project

This language curriculum project emerged from a larger ethnographic study conducted by the Center for Second Language Research team and directed by the Center’s director, Kathryn Davis. I was a member of this team that examined the educational experiences of Generation 1.5 students in Hawai‘i as well as the attitudes and language policy and planning issues that created the context for these experiences.

The context. This study was conducted at the behest of the ESL department coordinator, who reflected the community college’s growing concern with this underserved and underrepresented population. This two-year study revealed three things: (a) linguistic oppression brought about by the “development of a standard English ideology in DOE language policies and practices” (Davis, 2001), (b) linguistic power differentials within classrooms and schools, and (c) language education policies and practices that negatively impact immigrant students in Hawai‘i. The study also revealed increasing concern among the teachers, counselors, and administrators that these students appear to be “falling through the cracks” of the educational system in Hawai‘i’s community colleges. These educators report high drop-out rates, poor academic performance, and frequent displays of apathetic behaviour. Drawing on insights from the initial study findings, and at the behest of the community college, I was hired by the ACC ESL program director to develop an ESL course (or as Jim Cummins puts it, “a framework for intervention”) designed to meet the needs of this linguistically diverse student body and to try and reverse the pattern of G1.5 educational failure.

The students. Although the course was designed with the Generation 1.5 population in mind, because of the structure of the college, it was impossible to offer a course in ESL only to Generation 1.5. As a result, the students came into the program with a wide variety of linguistic, academic, socio-economic, and cultural backgrounds. The curriculum evaluator, Ford (2003, p. 28), divided the students into the following categories:

- Category 1- immigrant students who graduated high school in the US (G1.5 students);
- Category 2- recent immigrant students who graduated high school in their native countries;
- Category 3- long-term, older immigrants who are returning to college as non-traditional students;
- Category 4- foreign students from countries with western-style educational systems (e.g., Hong Kong, Micronesia, Polynesia); and
- Category 5- foreign students from countries with non-western-style education systems (e.g., China, Japan, Korea).

The site – Aloha Community College and the classroom. Aloha Community College (ACC) is one of seven community colleges in the state of Hawai‘i, offering two-year degrees, as well as a number of certificate programs in fields such as culinary arts, nursing assistance, and emergency medical services. Like the state itself, the ethnic, socio-economic, and cultural make up of ACC is quite diverse, and ACC takes great pride in that fact. The college draws a large number of international students, primarily from Asia and other Pacific Island nations, as well as a large percentage of long-term immigrant students who have recently graduated from high school or who are non-traditional returning students. A typical class can contain Locals, out-of-state students, and both long-term and recent immigrants with varying degrees of oral fluency and academic literacy. Many degree-seeking students enter the state’s four-year program after completing their two-year coursework at ACC.

As previously mentioned, the class was located within the ESL program at ACC. This program is part of the Arts and Sciences Department, and this class was an upper-intermediate ESL course, a prerequisite for ESL 100 (an advanced credit-bearing ESL course, which fulfills the English 100 requirement). This class normally utilizes a required textbook which integrates the four traditional skills of reading, writing, speaking, and listening. This section meets four days a week, two hours per class, with a 15-minute break in the middle, for a total of seven weekly hours of instruction. Because of the large number of contact hours, students were able to accomplish a great deal over the course of the semester.

Foundations

The first concepts that we begin to explore within the class are the concepts of culture, Discourse, following Gee’s notion of Discourse with a capital “D”⁷, and semiotic systems. These language learners are not divorced from the culture of the language they are learning (as you might be if you were studying a foreign language in your home country). For them, learning a language, involves learning a culture, and perhaps developing new or hybrid identities in order to become “insiders” in the culture that they have made their home. I am not arguing for unidirectional socialization wherein students become unthinking mimes of the culture around them; rather, I suggest that we begin to lay bare the culture in order to help students seize upon the tools they will need to critique it and acquire the aspects of the culture that they need in order to achieve whatever ends they choose. Previous ethnographic findings (Bennett, et al., 2000) have revealed that many of these Generation 1.5 students felt alienated from and out of step with both the culture of their parents and from local Hawai‘i culture. Many of them are diasporic individuals who have been frustrated and confused as they are marginalized in various ways within the culture that they have immigrated to. These students have reacted in various ways, including rejecting their home culture or Local culture and, in some cases, both of these cultures through active resistance. This resistance often manifests itself in the classroom as a lack of investment, withdrawal, and sometimes aggressive or disruptive behaviors (Bennett, et al., 2000)⁸. Our job then, as teachers of this population, is to become cultural workers, recognizing and drawing upon the diverse cultural resources that students bring with them to the classroom, with the aim of helping them begin to acquire analytic tools as well as linguistic and cultural capital. I say “begin to acquire” because learning academic Discourse is a long-term process and students need long-term exposure to the various literacies, continuous institutional support, and access to resources. I do not claim that this curriculum will

⁷ *Discourses* as defined by Gee (1996, p. viii) are “ways of behaving, interacting, valuing, thinking, believing, speaking, and often reading and writing that are accepted as instantiations of particular roles (or types of people), by specific groups of people...”

⁸ See Bennett, et al. (2000) for the findings of the Hawai‘i Generation 1.5 study.

‘fix’ anything or anyone. Students should not be made to feel that something is wrong with them that needs to be fixed because they have failed to master academic Discourse. As Luke and Freebody (1999) note, “It remains our position that literacy was never a matter of deficit but principally an issue of economic and social access to the cultural institutions charged with literacy education and practice.” Rather, what I attempt to do is to help to “produce mushfaking, resisting students, full of meta-knowledge” (Gee, 1996, p. 149), i.e., students who have been explicitly taught both the practical as well as the ideological aspects of academic Discourses and who have been given strategies to help them “make do” in academia and resist their own subordination.

The curriculum is designed not only to address the discursive or ideological features that are implicit in the texts and discourses that students can choose to learn and use, but also to scaffold the development of critical language awareness which provides them with meta-knowledge of more than the textual and rhetorical features of academic texts. I drew from Critical Language Awareness, Genre Theory, New Literacy Studies, and the New London Group (different models which according to Janks (2000) foreground different critical concepts such as domination, access, diversity, and design); used a social process approach; and employed ideas and tools from such areas as systemic functional linguistics, McComiskey’s (2000) critical text awareness heuristics, Luke and Freebody’s (1999) four resources model, and cultural and media studies heuristic frameworks, among others. The Critical Discourse Analysis and other Critical Language Awareness tools utilized in the curriculum were intended to provide interdisciplinary techniques to serve critical ends, especially with regards to the ways that ideology becomes entrenched in discourse and begins to appear commonsense to those who must function within a particular discourse.

Systemic functional linguistics (Halliday, 1994; Eggins, 1994) was utilized in order to help Generation 1.5 students recognize the ideological functions that linguistic forms or structures serve. For example, the use of the active/passive voice in a history textbook may have the effect of backgrounding or foregrounding different agencies or peoples within history. Analysis of paragraph structures (Nash & Stacy, 1997), narrative and prose structures (Labov, 1972; Toolan, 1988; Carter &

Nash, 1990), news report structures (van Dijk, 1998) and text structures and designs (Bernhardt, 1985) could give students access to and opportunities to question structural and linguistic conventions while exploring their ideological underpinnings. Introducing speech-act theory (Searle, 1979) would allow students to see the ways in which uttered sentences and written texts are discourse acts which affect audiences. Exploration of the way that texts position readers (or listeners) would help students resist naive subjection to positioning (Pope, 1995). Use of semiotics (the theory of signs and their meanings) would allow students to decode the ways words within texts are composed and understood by different people within particular contexts. Although these and other analytical tools that have been employed in courses in cultural studies, composition studies, the study of literature, linguistic courses, they have rarely been employed (at least in a U.S. context) in a curriculum aimed at helping generation 1.5 or other ELL or minority students to themselves become critical discourse analysts and gain critical literacy skills.

The curriculum was also designed to help students concurrently develop qualitative and (if relevant) quantitative research skills and become novice ethnographers of their college communities of practice. Research training was intended to culminate in an ethnographic research report of academic culture which included textual, rhetorical, and discursive analyses. This research report could be written in Standard American English or in Hawai‘i Creole English (the native language of most Hawai‘i locals and the second language of many Generation 1.5 in Hawai‘i).

The following section provides examples of some of the activities we did in class that reflect a Critical Language Awareness agenda. Although, for the purposes of clarity, activities are presented as discrete units or isolated activities, they involved continuous and evolving attention to textual, rhetorical, and discursive analyses. In addition, the curriculum attempted to serve students’ real needs and purposes through the use of authentic texts, exploring real events, and scaffolded activities which built upon one another.

CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION

I have divided the curriculum examples into three sections which represent the following themes: cultural awareness, text awareness, and discourse community awareness. Each section includes an introduction to the theme, is subdivided into activity clusters, and finally, provides a summary listing the pedagogical goals for each theme.

Cultural Awareness

The course began with exploring the meaning of culture and investigating how we express culture and how we become enculturated or socialized. I introduced to the students the notions of cultural change, ethnocentrism, and cultural relativity. We talked about Gee's concept of Discourses (1992; 1996) and his notion that every individual has multiple Discourses, multiple literacies, and therefore, multiple identities. There were a great number of different activities that we did to explore these ideas, so I will outline only some of them below.

Defining culture. First I gave explicit instruction in note-taking techniques. I also introduced some of the terminology used when talking about culture, which included the following: enculturation/socialization, ethnocentrism, nationalism, patriotism, cultural relativity, ideals, values, beliefs, ideology, crossing cultures, straddling cultures, universals, and cultural stereotypes. As a group, students explored the visible and invisible aspects of culture. I then asked students to envision culture as a ball (some people have used an iceberg to symbolize the visible and invisible features of culture). The outside of the ball is visible, but the inside is not visible. On the board, I drew a circle within a larger circle. Class members brainstormed visible aspects of culture (food, clothing, outward representations of religion, customs, art, and architecture) and wrote them down outside the circle. Members then brainstormed invisible aspects of culture (values, beliefs, ideologies, experiences, and behaviors) and gave specific examples of each which they wrote inside the circle. Members formed small groups and brainstormed inward/outward aspects of Local culture and of another culture that they knew well (such as the

culture of their parents). I then posed some key questions including: How are the visible aspects of Local culture similar to/different from this other culture? What are some of the things that these two cultures might not see the same way? How are the beliefs and values of each culture similar/different? Why doesn't everyone see things the same way? How do beliefs and values influence behavior? Is there a set of common Local/other beliefs and values? If so, what are they? What are some of the ways that people believe and act differently within each culture? Why might it be possible for people from two different cultures to misunderstand each other? How can one learn to see things from another culture's point of view? In what ways, if any, do you feel that you are straddling two cultures? Which aspects of your parent's culture have you kept, and which aspects of Local culture have you taken on? Why? This was extended by asking students to write about some of the questions and by providing a reading about someone grappling with cross-cultural identity issues.

Microculture. Class members constructed an identity map which illustrated the different microcultures of which they were a part. Members discussed the different identities that they display within their different social groups. The class then talked about the ideal cultural values within each microculture—ideal in the sense that they were looking at what others within the microculture would want them to believe and ways that they would want them to behave. I illustrated microculture by drawing from my personal life, such as my identity as a surfer and all of the values that are implicit within that culture, because many of my students are surfers or have friends who are and because it is a large part of Local culture. For example, I would suggest that in the surfing microculture the ideal surfer always waits in the line-up before taking off on a wave; the ideal surfer doesn't hog all the waves; and the ideal surfer cares about the ocean and doesn't pollute it. Class members then talked about the responsibilities of being a part of each microculture that they had identified and about the differences (both visible and invisible) among them.

School as microculture. I first asked class members to envision the school as a microculture and explore what cultural values are inherent in high school and in college. Students read through parts of their college handbook, identifying implicit and explicit values of the school within it. Members then brainstormed ways that

those values are reinforced (grades, detention, rewards, etc.). The group then considered the hierarchical relationships in schools; the distribution of power; the social relationships between all of the social actors; the instructional methods encouraged; the geographical lay-out of their various classrooms and how these positions positively or negatively affect various social relationships; and the assignments students are required to complete and the negotiability of those assignments. Next, the group discussed ways that students resist, negotiate, and accommodate the requirements and/or the cultural values perpetuated in the classroom/school. Subsequently I asked them to invent an ideal school, wherein they were allowed to construct all of the ideal values, rules, and behaviors of all of the citizens of this school. Handbooks or online websites from various alternative colleges were used to show some of the ways that institutions have resisted the usual cultural values of schools, e.g., colleges of alternative medicine, online colleges, colleges that use alternative learning methods such as ‘Learning Communities’, and colleges that rely heavily on experiential learning. First, they brainstormed the values and identities that they most wanted to promote within this college, giving reasons for their choices. As a follow-up, I asked questions such as: What do members of this college community do? How do they act? How do they write? How do they talk? How is this microculture different from the college that you attend now? Do you agree with the values promoted within this college? Why or why not? What are different ways that you can negotiate or resist these values?⁹

Discourses. I discussed with students James Gee’s concept of “Discourse”, which includes ways of believing, valuing, doing, etc. I then modeled a number of humorous role-plays wherein I took up the ‘wrong’ Discourse within various social contexts or environment, whether because I used the ‘wrong’ language, or the ‘right’ language but the wrong action or body language. While Gee (1996, p. viii) uses the example of someone enacting the wrong Discourse in a biker bar, I tried to use situations that might occur within the students’ own lives. For example, while trying to learn to surf, you might try to get to know other surfers in the water, but might be

⁹ Parts of the subsections on *Microculture* and *School as microculture* are adapted from *Teaching composition as a social process* by Bruce McComiskey

shunned because you are not tan enough, don't know how to talk about getting barreled, sick waves, wipe-outs, and ankle slop, and have not mastered a duck dive or how to line up for the waves. A discussion ensued as to what a social context consists of, such as people and their social relationships, the geographic place, the purposes of the actors, unspoken or implicit rules about how to talk in a particular social context, and the register being used. Members discussed how people can disrupt a social environment by using an inappropriate or unfamiliar Discourse in that environment (an extreme example would be cursing in a confessional box). We considered how people can suffer many different kinds of consequences for disruption, from being ostracized by a particular social community to being beaten up in a biker bar. Members then formed teams and wrote their own humorous role-plays, which they acted out for the class. I then asked members to discuss the following questions: Why was the Discourse inappropriate in that particular situation? Where would it be appropriate? How is language related to situation in each role-play? What were the particular social relationships in each role-play? Who seemed to have more power in each situation? Why? Who made the implicit rules about the particular Discourse for that social context and for those social actors? Are there practical reasons for those rules? What could be some of the other reasons for those implicit rules? What are the possible consequences for not enacting the appropriate Discourse for each situation, e.g., job loss, ostracism, violence, being snubbed, causing confusion, having others think badly of you?

Summary. Through activities intended to raise awareness of the complex and political nature of culture, opportunities were created for class members to:

- Begin to explore their multiple identities.
- Reposition themselves as questioners of the everyday world.
- Begin to notice and interrogate discursive practices.
- Begin to engage, examine, and play with language in order to explore the social, cultural, political, and economic dimensions of Discourses.
- Recognize that each of them has a repertoire of Discourses from which to draw, and that Discourse to use depends on the social context, the interlocutors and their relationships, and the mode of communication.

- Value and make use of their knowledge of their own cultures or social environments, and use that knowledge as a base from which to build more knowledge.
- Value their developing literacy skills and recognize them as powerful tools of change.
- Be introduced to a meta-language (Discourse, social context, cultural values) and meta-analysis techniques (heuristics) from which to critique cultural values and to ultimately gain agency to change the world around them.
- Experience a social process approach to writing, which I believe helps motivate Generation 1.5 students who may not have experienced themselves as having a ‘writer’ identity and may have a fear of writing.
- Invest in an academic identity by the scaffolding of a critical voice with which to interrogate cultural values, ideologies.

Textual Awareness

Developing textual awareness involves class members in the negotiation of texts (whether literary or non-literary, written, spoken, or conveyed through images) or ways of reading and writing those texts (and by extension ‘reading and writing the world’). In this sense, texts are records of communicative events which convey meaning through semiotic systems (which are inextricably tied up with culture). Part of the work of reading texts, especially in an academic environment, involves critiquing them or ‘being critical readers’. Critical reading has traditionally been presented in classrooms as an objective process wherein the teacher who holds the knowledge capital bestows that capital on the students in small doses and, if the students are successful learners, they are subsequently able to use that knowledge capital to judge the value of texts. Yet being a critical reader is more than judging the relative value of texts; it involves exploring texts and how they are ideologically constructed and communicated, including how texts and/or Discourses position us as readers. Acquiring literacy then, is not just about being able to ‘read or write the words’, but also about bringing analytic and critical resources to bear on the social

and ideological forces that underlie or determine the meaning of texts, as an integral part of the reading and writing process.

Developing textual awareness and other parts of the curriculum are influenced by Luke and Freebody’s (1997) four resources model of literacy which purports that reading and writing necessarily involve a repertoire of practices that will allow readers and writers to:

- break the code of written texts by recognizing and using fundamental features and architecture, including alphabet, sounds in words, spelling, and structural conventions and patterns;
 - participate in understanding and composing meaningful written, visual, and spoken texts, taking into account each text’s interior meaning systems in relation to their available knowledge and their experiences of other cultural discourses, texts, and meaning systems;
 - use texts functionally by traversing and negotiating the labor and social relations around them—that is, by knowing about and acting on the different cultural and social functions that various texts perform inside and outside school, and understanding that these functions shape the way texts are structured, their tone, their degree of formality, and their sequence of components;
 - critically analyze and transform texts by acting on knowledge that texts are not ideologically natural or neutral—that they represent particular points of views while silencing others and influence people’s ideas—and that their designs and discourses can be critiqued and redesigned in novel and hybrid ways.
- Luke & Freebody (1999; online text)

In fact, Freebody (1992, p. 58) contends that, “[A]ny program of instruction in literacy, whether it be in kindergarten, in adult ESL classes, in university courses, or any points in between, needs to confront these roles systematically, explicitly, and at all developmental points.”

The next slices of classroom pedagogy attempt to illustrate some ways in which I have taken up the Luke and Freebody theoretical model and have translated it into classroom ‘practice/s’ with Generation 1.5 students in Hawai‘i.

Features and architecture and the subject. Groups were given some texts (online texts could work here) written in languages that members did not know. Students worked in groups to hypothesize what the text meant and what the text was trying to do (the purposes for the text). While they were brainstorming, groups noted the textual features that were ‘visually informative’ (Bernhardt, 1985) such as graphic features, global layout features, or highlighting of features that aided their hypothesis. They also compared them to texts they had seen before, and noted the context in which they had seen them. Groups organized and engaged in a discussion about the activity. Some of the questions I posed were: What kind of text do you think this is? What clues about the text inform your hypothesis? Where else might you find this type of text? Why do authors produce texts that have such similar features? What identity/identities do you think that writer is asking you to take up if you could read the text? How is learning a language similar to reading a text in an unknown language? What strategies did you use to ‘decipher’ the genre, and how could these same strategies be used in your academic studies to read and write other texts? Can you think of ways to improve on the textual features that would make the text more visually interesting? If you changed the text, would it still be acceptable to others within the Discourse community in which it was produced? Why or why not? Are there genres that you like/don’t like to read because of their textual features? Which genres have you written in and where did you use them?

Dividing reality. Groups formed and made a list of vocabulary or terms that they associated with or have heard associated with the following words or phrases: people who live in Hawai‘i, people who recently immigrated to Hawai‘i, people who speak more than one language, surfers, Caucasian people, Filipino people, Japanese people, Chinese people, the mainland U.S., man/woman, old man/woman, brother, sister¹⁰. Students then listed their various terms as positive, negative, or neutral. A class discussion followed in which the following questions were posed: Why is X term negative/positive? Who decided that this term would be positive/negative? If the term

¹⁰ I chose words that have local meaning and relevance to the student’s lives. For example, one of the terms often disparagingly used for recent immigrants is ‘FOB’, or ‘Fresh off the Boat’. Many Generation 1.5 students in Hawai‘i have worked quite hard to try to escape this categorization and desire to acquire a ‘local’ identity.

is negative, does that mean that the people that they describe are naturally ‘bad’ people or have negative characteristics? If not, do words then, *not* reflect the way the world ‘is’? Who uses these words for/against whom? Do you think that the term could be used in a positive way?¹¹ How do the words you came up with reflect the various Discourses of Hawai‘i? How do words affect our perceptions of people or events? Are these terms common stereotypes in Hawai‘i? This assignment could then be extended by asking students to look at local newspapers, tabloids, books, and magazines to find instances where writers use various terms to describe people in Hawai‘i. They should note the context of such usages and whether the usages are practical or ideological (of course this is highly debatable).

Shape-shifting. Class members were given explicit instruction in genre and common ways that texts are organized. These concepts included analysis of some of the following: the distribution of information in sentences; patterns of organization in sequences of sentences and paragraphs and how these foreground some people/events while backgrounding others; basic paragraph structures; visual information in texts; and generic structure. As these concepts were introduced, a number of mini-activities were used to illustrate the concepts. For example, students were given two newspaper articles which covered the same story, but reflected differing ideologies through the use of syntactical features, vocabulary, and the way that they positioned the readers. The particular articles that I used reported, one sympathetically and one judgmentally, the arrest of a mother who had killed her five children. Class members noted which information was foregrounded, which information was suppressed, emotive language, the use of active/passive, and other syntactic and lexical features which revealed the hidden ideologies present in the two stories¹².

Students were then asked to practice genre writing by using all of the elements of the narrative genre in telling or inventing a humorous story about something that

¹¹ Here the example of the appropriation of the word ‘Nigga’ by African Americans from the racist Caucasian term could be used if appropriate.

¹² Newspaper articles from two different countries’ newspapers covering the same event would work well in reflecting differing ideologies.

happened to them.¹³ Course members then cross-compared the narrative genre with that of newspaper stories and indicated how their grammatical, structural, and visual elements differed. In the college computer lab, students worked in groups to transform their narratives into newspaper stories with all the relevant textual features such as use of graphics, columns, headlines, and rhetorical elements such as details about the people in the story and commentary from authority figures (which may have to be invented). Questions I then posed included: How did you change the structure of the narrative, both at the sentence and paragraph levels, and in the visual information? How did you highlight people or particular actions/events as important in your news story? Which characters are most important to the news story? Are the same characters as important in the narrative? Who “speaks” or is called upon to speak in the news story? Who “speaks” in the narrative? Were any of the news stories misleading, or did you distort the events of the narrative to fit your purpose?

Summary. Through activities designed to help students raise their awareness of textual features and architecture, recognize the social and cultural functions of textual features, and realize their ability to manipulate and transform texts, class members began to:

- Decode and describe texts and textual genres.
- Compare texts to one another, so as to highlight the organizational conventions of specific genres as well as to provide meta-knowledge of how to look for those conventions in other genres. This skill can be used to help students develop confidence to create their own texts (required for their academic work, current/future employment, or for social purposes) that will be recognizable and acceptable to others within a particular Discourse.
- Recognize and produce the structural features of texts within particular genres (whether at the lexical, clause, sentence, paragraph, or multi-paragraph level).
- Notice how structural features can be brought to produce subjective, if not distorted, information. In other words, to recognize the ideological nature of

¹³ Alternatively, students could tell a fairytale or moralistic tale that they learned in childhood.

text structures and the ways that “language becomes meaningful, only through Discourses.” (Gee, 1996, p. 150).

- Notice the ways that common classifications of people/things/events are socially produced, reflect ideological values, and do not arise from the inherent nature of the thing being categorized.
- Notice the way that texts call audiences to play specific roles. In other words, through ideology, a text positions a reader.
- Take an active role with writers in constructing meanings of texts. In other words, to resist the ways that texts position them.
- Recognize the ways that our prior experiences and identities will cause us to make sense of texts differently.
- Recognize the ways that some texts/Discourses are considered to have more power in society than others and that if one has the ability to use those texts, one can be considered to have more cultural capital than those who cannot and can use that capital for academic and economic gain, e.g., good grades and elite jobs.
- Construct texts collaboratively, helping them to view each other as colleagues and as members of a community of practice.

Discourse Community Awareness

As text analysis tools are being explicitly taught, course members can go out into their school communities as ethnographers of communication. They can interrogate the implicit ideologies that are continually reproduced within academic communities while at once reflecting on their own transnational identities, cultural ideologies, and the relationships among them. Students can also begin to see their classrooms as a microcosm of the larger social and political world which they reflect, reproduce, and also change (whether consciously or unconsciously).

As part of apprenticing to the Discourse of the community and developing life-long language and literacy learning, course participants develop student-as-ethnographer skills, which include interviewing, observation, and artifact collecting skills. These skills can be utilized in multiple ways within literacy or language

courses in order to meet multiple objectives. First, they can be used to self-identify language strengths and needs by examining language learning experiences and academic and possibly career goals. Second, through rich description and interpretation of a particular classroom as micro-culture, they can explore literacy in social context. This examination also implies exploring their own and other's positionalities within various Discourse communities so that they can begin to see the processes that their identities are subjected to and of which their identities are constituted by the structures of ideological practices. They can apprentice to Discourses and/or learn to use their agency to negotiate or take up alternative/hybrid identities of their own within Discourses. In this way, these Communities of Practice (Wenger, 1998) can invite "identities of participation" in which students can "explore new ways of being that lie beyond (their) current state." Third, through meta-analysis of successful student papers, and other ideological documents (such as syllabi), students can begin to notice the rhetorical, structural, and discursive conventions used within various genres in different fields of study. Applications can then be made to their future student practices. Qualitative research classification schemes and analysis techniques should be taught and utilized to include in the final ethnographic report. These analyses can increase meta-linguistic awareness of the ways that writers organize and present data, which could then be extended to improve writing skills. Again, I outline below just a few of the activities used to support the student-as-ethnographer portion of the curriculum.

Researching discourses. Extending from text analysis activities, I explained to the students that each academic microculture has its own discourse conventions, ways of writing, and expectations for ways of disseminating information, i.e., their own Discourses. Students were introduced to the concept of field or ethnographic research and told that they would be given a chance to become ethnographers of their own college majors/potential majors. Models of student ethnographies were analyzed for their textual, rhetorical, and discursive features.

The steps/elements of the project were then laid out as follows: (a) contact a teacher from your major to work with, (b) gain permission to observe three or four classes, (c) interview the teacher/s at least twice to gain a teacher's perspective on the Discourse of

that major, (d) gather artifacts (for this activity, multiple examples were given, such as syllabi, student papers, assignments), books/texts from the field, tools used in the major, and internet information, (e) interview ‘successful’ students or other cultural informants in this field, (f) develop short observation write-ups, (g) share data and collaborate in data analysis with others in the same major, (h) analyze differences among the various student papers so as to locate differences/similarities, and (i) follow a multi-step process to write up data into a 10-15 page ethnographic report on the college major.

Observation techniques. Members engaged in a discussion about ethnographic observation skills and I posed questions and asked students to brainstorm together about what kinds of things to look for and what kinds of questions to ask themselves as they engaged in observation. I then sent students out in groups of three to four to observe a public space on the Aloha campus (the bookstore, library, cafeteria, study hall, computer lab). Students were given the following general instructions, which had been adapted to fit the language level of the class. During a sustained 30-minute period, students should:

1. Separately note everything that they hear, see, touch, taste, for a multi-sensory and thick description. They should try to think of themselves as aliens in the culture and try to imagine every person, object, and activity as new and strange. Note-taking should be done in an unobtrusive way. All identities must remain protected.
2. Describe the setting and provide a schematic drawing of the site. What kind of setting/event is this? Where are you positioned in the setting?
3. Describe the individuals and groups you see. Describe what they are wearing, what languages they are speaking, who appears in charge, who has specialist roles in this setting, what rituals you see being performed in this place, and how the individuals use the space?
4. Describe the activities and interactions taking place. Write down (unobtrusively and without revealing identities) any conversations you overhear.

Students then came back together with their groups and compared their observations and their different perceptions of the setting/activities/events/participants. Following that, students individually wrote a two plus page observation and interpretation report.

Interviewing techniques. Explicit instruction was given in ethnographic interview skills. Concepts taught included: formally structured and informal interviews, open-ended vs. closed questions, grand-tour questions, specific questions, informed consent, and interview protocols. Next, I performed two unscripted model interviews with a colleague about his/her teaching methods. My first model was an unsuccessful interview and the second was a successful interview. Students took notes on successful and unsuccessful techniques they observed in the interview. They then discussed the questions asked in the interview and why they were good or bad questions. Students also explored discourse style. Was it appropriate or not? Why or why not?

Course members formed groups and brainstormed a list of interview questions that were relevant to the interviews that they were preparing to do for their own research projects. I roamed from group to group, giving help with types of questions and helping individuals who were struggling with grammatical structures.

In the field. After techniques were taught, and practice activities completed, students began their fieldwork. Class time was given for students to do their observations and to conduct interviews (I find this worked best with my Generation 1.5 students, because many had very little time outside of class because of family and/or work obligations). As students gathered data, it was put into a portfolio (along with all artifacts and anything having to do with the project). Methods of coding were taught so that students could make sense of the data gathered. The goal was to encourage students to explore the ideal students in this microculture, desirable social values and practices, reified objects (Wenger, 1998), pedagogical practices, positioning of the students (both geographically and ideologically), attitudes of the participants, social characteristics of participants, and the generic structures of texts common within it. I asked them to explore their interpretations and perspectives of the microculture by attending to questions (given with examples and appropriate rephrasing for understanding) such as: What are/is the social norms/Discourse of this microculture and why is this so? How do/es the social norms/Discourse reflect/reinforce power structures? How is language used to display power? What identities do various students have, and what identities do you think the teachers/administrators would like them to have? Would you like to have or do you have

any of these identities? In what ways would you change those ideal identities? In what ways would you change the texts used within the microculture? The teaching practices?

Students analyzed and compared texts, using the textual analysis techniques introduced earlier. Taped interviews were partially transcribed. Finally, all of their data and analysis came together as they began to write their ethnographic essays. Much class time toward the end of class was devoted to writing and writing workshops and students received one-on-one as well as group instruction with structural and grammatical features of their texts. In addition, students received additional assistance through their college-provided writing tutors. After multiple revisions, students submitted the final product along with the remainder of the portfolio. Students also gave three to five minute presentations to the class on their findings, interpretations, and perspectives.

Summary. Through activities designed to train students to conduct ethnographic research, class members were able to:

- Develop awareness of academic and literacy genres within their chosen fields.
- Become aware of language resources and how to better utilize attentional resources.
- Develop explicit awareness of classroom norms and teacher expectations and critique them.
- Become aware of how the school acts as a socializing force and how socializing forces within school exert power over them and other members.
- See themselves as participating in democratic political processes with their writing.
- Engage with others in a community of practice.
- Develop literacy skills through a social process approach to writing.
- Gain increased self-efficacy through recognition of the resources that they have and the academic product that they are able to produce.
- Broaden their field of possible identities.

CONCLUSION

In the last decade, public education has experienced increasing conservatism as exemplified in the No Child Left Behind Initiative, the continued commercialization and corporatization of public school spaces, a change of goals from producing democratically-minded citizens with an equal shot at cultural and economic capital to that of socializing students into their respective roles in a world of increasing global economic competitiveness, and continued attacks on bilingual education. One example of these trends (or agendas) in education took place within the judicial system. According to Ohanian (2003, online reference), Manhattan Supreme Court Justice Leland DeGrasse had ruled that the state education funding system was unequal and that it privileged children who lived in rich areas of the city and suburbs while denying poor inner-city children of their right to a basic education. He ordered reforms made, such as hiring certified teachers, reducing class sizes, buying up-to-date texts, and improving technology so that students living in the inner city would have the same educational opportunities as their more affluent counterparts. Governor Pataki and the state of New York appealed DeGrasse’s ruling and in June 2002 the New York Supreme Court overruled his decision. Justice Lerner, in the writing of the appellate decision, said, “Society needs workers in all levels of jobs, the majority of which may very well be low-level” (Perez-Pena, 2002). If these discriminatory trends continue, we will begin to see more and more disenfranchised Generation 1.5 students entering college, whose parents and communities are desperate for them to “get ahead”, but who have not acquired the Discourses and subsequently the cultural capital to compete for anything but subordinate positions in society.

In this paper I have outlined some of the aspects of a critical literacy curriculum that I developed for Generation 1.5 students in Hawai‘i. Space limits prohibit me from outlining all of the aspects of the curriculum and the ways in which the elements inform and support each other. In addition, as I stated earlier in the paper, I do not suggest that this curriculum is going to “fix” what ails students. What I do contend is that this curriculum is an attempt to interrogate ideological power

structures that lie covert in our seemingly natural school practices (and which often undermine the realities that young people experience outside of school). This paper is specifically intended to provide educators with a model for how to: attempt to help students develop critical thinking skills that allow them to participate in informed ways in social and political life; identify whose interests the knowledge taught within our institutions serves; challenge the “that’s just the way the world is” and the “I don’t have much to offer the world” notions and replace them with understanding of root causes for the situations in which students find themselves; and envision possible and better futures for our most disempowered students. It is true that public education cannot overcome the great inequities inherent in our political and economic system. Nor can one curriculum correct the vast discrepancies of language, literacy, and socioeconomic capital. What the curricular approach I have proposed here can do is play a small part in assisting students in their various struggles to achieve their goals. As bell hooks stated:

The Academy is not paradise. But learning is a place where paradise can be created. The classroom remains a location of possibility. In that field of possibility we have the opportunity to labor for freedom, to demand of ourselves and our comrades, an openness of mind and heart that allows us to face reality even as we collectively imagine ways to move beyond boundaries, to transgress. This is education as the practice of freedom. (1994, p. 207)

REFERENCES

- Anzaldúa, G. (1999). *Borderlands la frontera: The new mestiza*. San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.
- Baker, C. D., & Freebody, P. (1989). *Children's First Schoolbooks*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Bennett, L., Kadooka, J., Menacker, T., Skarin, R. Talmy, S., & Winn, M. (2000). Generation 1.5 at a community college: A preliminary report. Unpublished manuscript. University of Hawai‘i at Manoa.
- Bernhardt, S. (1985). Text Structure and graphic design: The visible design. In D. Benson & J. Greaves (Eds.) *Systemic perspectives on discourse, Volume 2*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Bhaba, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.
- Borman, G. D., Stringfield, S., & Rachuba, L. (2000). *Advancing minority high achievement: National trends and promising programs and practices*. A report prepared for the National Task Force on Minority High Achievement.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1970; English Edn. 1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. Trans.: R. Nice. London: Sage.
- Bourdieu, P. (1978). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Burbules, N. C., & Berk, R. (1999). Critical thinking and critical pedagogy: Relations, differences and limits. In T. S. Popkewitz & L. Fendler (Eds.), *Critical theories in education*. New York: Routledge.
- Burnett, A.C., & Syed, Z. (1999). Emerging identities and heritage language education. In K. A. Davis (Ed.), *Foreign language teaching and language minority children* (pp. 105-117). Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i, SLTCC.
- Carter, R., & Nash, W. (1990). *Seeing through language*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cazden, C. (1988). *Classroom discourse*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann

- Chiang, Y. S. D., & Schmida, M. (1999). Language identity and ownership: Linguistic conflicts of first-year university writing students. In L. Harklau, K. M. Losey, & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to U.S.-educated Learners of ESL*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates (pp. 81-96).
- Clark, R., Fairclough, N., Ivanic, R., & Martin-Jones, M. (1990). Critical language awareness, part i: A critical review of three current approaches to language awareness. *Language and Education*, 4, 249-260.
- Cummins, J. (1984). Wanted: A theoretical framework for relating language proficiency to academic achievement among bilingual students. In C. Rivera (Ed.), *Language proficiency and academic achievement*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Davis, K. S. (1995). Multicultural education and cultural communities. *Teachers and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies*, 11(5), 1-11.
- Eggs, S. (1994). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics*, London: Pinter.
- Fairclough N. (1995) *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman
- Ferris, D. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press/ESL.
- Ford, S. (2003). *Language curriculum development for generation 1.5 students: Aloha Community College Participatory Curriculum Evaluation Project*. M.A. Thesis, University of Hawai'i Manoa.
- Foucault, M. (1984). The order of discourse. In M. Shapiro (Ed.), *Language and politics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gee, J. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*. Philadelphia: Falmer Press, Taylor & Francis.
- Giddens, A. (1979). *Central problems in social theory: Action, structure and contradiction in social analysis*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society*. Berkeley: University of California.

- Giroux, H. (1994). Doing cultural studies: Youth and the challenge of pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 64(3), 278-308.
- Giroux, H. (1999). What is critical pedagogy? *Rage and hope*. Retrieved October 2004 from <http://www.perfectfit.org/CT/giroux2.html>.
- Hall, S. (1990). Cultural identity and diaspora. In J. Rutherford (Ed.) *Identity: Community, culture, difference* (pp. 235-236). London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Hall, S. (1996). The meaning of new times. In D. Morley & K. Chen (Eds.), *Stuart Hall: Critical dialogues in cultural studies*. London: Routledge.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed. revised). London: Edward Arnold.
- Harklau, L. (1998). Newcomers in U.S. higher education; questions of access and equity. *Educational Policy*, 12(6), 634-658.
- Harklau, L. (2000). From the 'good kids' to the 'worst': Representations of English language learners across educational settings. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(1), 35-67.
- Harklau, L. (2003). Generation 1.5 students and college writing. *Center for Applied Linguistics Digest*. Retrieved March 2005 from <http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/0305harklau.html>
- Harklau, L., Losey, K., & Siegel, M. (1999). Preface. In L. Harklau, K. Losey, & M. Siegel (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL* (pp. vii-ix.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- hooks, bell (1994). *Teaching to transgress*. New York: Routledge.
- Jamieson, A., Curry, A., & Martinez, G. (1999). School enrollment in the United States—social and economic characteristics of students. *Current Population Reports, October 1999*. US Census Bureau.
- Janks, H. (2002). Critical literacy: Beyond reason, *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 29(1), 7-26.
- Janks, H. (2000). Domination, access, diversity and design: A synthesis for critical literacy education, *Educational review*, 52(2), 175-186.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

- Leki, I. (1992). *Understanding ESL writers: A guide for teachers*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook
- Losey, K. (1997). *Listen to the silences: Mexican American interaction in the composition classroom and community*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex
- Luke, A. (2000). Critical literacy in Australia: A matter of context and standpoint. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 43(5), 448-461.
- Luke, A., & Freebody, P. (1999). Further notes on the four resources model. *Reading online*. Retrieved December 2005 from <http://www.readingonline.org/research/lukefreebody.html>
- McKay, S. L., & Wong, S. - L. C. (1996). Multiple discourses, multiple identities: Investment and agency in second-language learning among Chinese adolescent immigrant students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(3), 577-608.
- Morgan, W. (1997). *Critical literacy in the classroom: The art of the possible*. London: Routledge.
- Nash, W., & Stacey, D. (1997). *Creating texts: An introduction to the study of composition*. Harlow. UK: Longman.
- Nero, S. (1997). English is my native language...or so I believe. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 585-593.
- Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2002). Identity and language learning. In R. B. Kaplan (Ed.), *Oxford handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 115-123). Oxford: Oxford University.
- Park, K. (1999). "I really do feel I'm 1.5:" The construction of self and community by young Korean Americans. *Amerasia Journal*, 25(1), 139-163.
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*, New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Association.
- Pope, R. (1995). *Textual intervention*. London: Routledge.
- Roberge, M. (2001). *Institutional responses to immigrant college students: An ethnographic case study of a college composition, basic writing, and ESL program*. Dissertation. University of California, Berkeley.
- Rumbaut, R. G., & Ima, K. (1988). *The adaptation of Southeast Asian refugee youth: A comparative study*. Final report to the Office of Resettlement. (ERIC

- Document Reproduction Service No. ED 299372). San Diego: San Diego State University.
- Rumbaut, R. (1994). The crucible within: Ethnic identity, self-esteem, and segmented assimilation among children of immigrants. *International Migration Review*, 28(4), 748-795.
- Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Scribner, S., & Cole, M. (1981). *The psychology of literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Toolan, M. (1988). *Narrative: A critical linguistic introduction*, New York: Routledge.
- Valdes, G. (2004). Between support and marginalization: The development of academic language in linguistic minority children. *Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 7(2 & 3), 102-132.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *News as discourse*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Wodak, R. (1989). *Language, power and ideology: Studies in political discourse*. London: John Benjamins.
- Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual: Puerto Rican children in New York*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.