

Critical Language Awareness and Learners in College Transitional English

► Deborah M. Sánchez and Eric J. Paulson
New Voice

This article reviews literature on Critical Language Awareness (CLA) studies in transitional English courses and with other related student populations in order to build an argument for and give implications for using CLA as a curricular approach in the classroom.

One of us (Deborah) recently received an e-mail from a colleague who expressed dismay at the increasing disappearance of transitional English at four-year universities. The e-mail said: “somewhere along the way basic writing became remedial, became punitive, became business as usual” (Susan N. Bernstein). The “business as usual” sentiment seems to be true at many institutions of higher education. For example, one Midwestern urban university recently published an academic plan for the twenty-first century which foregrounds academic preparedness for incoming students. The president’s report card to the board of trustees lists “elite entry” as one of the university’s achievements—citing an increase in enrolled National Merit Scholars. It also lists an increase in ACT scores of entering students as an achievement in academic excellence (UC 21: The President’s Report Card to the Board of Trustees).

The increased efforts of the university to “achieve academic excellence” and “elite entry” seem to have coupled with the passing of Ohio Senate Bill 311, which proposed phasing out all state-operated funding to developmental education at four-year universities. As a result, the combined effect has trickled down to the classroom level in the form of loss of access to the university for students who have traditionally been excluded (McNenny and Fitzgerald).

The “business as usual” sentiment, in which higher education acts in the interests of corporations and economic gains (Emery and Ohanion), and increases in the amount of standards work to exclude more students rather than provide access (Fox 7), have unfortunately become the norm at many previously open-access institutions, with ACT and SAT scores providing convenient measures for deciding who enters and who is rejected.

Despite, and also because of, these obstacles, research that continues to counter deficiency assumptions about students and demonstrates the value of open-admissions programs is indispensable. Owing to Mina Shaughnessy’s legacy, we find her

question still relevant: “What goes on and what *ought* to go on in the composition classroom?” [emphasis added] (CCC, 320). What *ought* to go on is still quite relevant amid the changing face of what it means to be academically and technologically literate in today’s world, in addition to the systemic inequalities of old that continue to affect students in transition in negative ways.

In this article, we use the term *transitional English*, rather than remedial or developmental English, in order to foreground the idea that literacy for all students develops over time. We also use *students in transition* (see Armstrong) where appropriate, rather than remedial or developmental students, because the latter terms often reflect negative assumptions about students’ cognitive abilities. Year after year, students in transition continue to arrive at two-year colleges and four-year universities and enter transitional English courses. According to a 2000 report from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), almost 30% of freshman entering American colleges and universities enrolled in a transitional course in English, reading, or mathematics (Remedial Education at Degree-Granting Postsecondary Institutions, Fall 2000, Table 4). Although institutions vary in how they approach curriculum in these courses— from grammar drills to experimental writing to critical analytical writing—basic skills remediation still exists (Shor “Our Apartheid”). In some cases, accountability testing in higher education is required of students in transitional English courses, as Bernstein (“Writing and White Privilege: Beyond Basic Skills”) recounted in her experience of teaching basic writing in Texas, where students had to pass an accountability test before their junior year. It is this skills-based approach—the point of view that academic literacy is a technical skill to be quickly acquired rather than a complex set of practices that take years to develop—that is most problematic.

Students who are in transitional English courses—often as a result of inferior schooling conditions (see Kozol), unequal funding (see Shor, “Errors and Economics” 31), and the miseducation (see Shor, “Errors and Economics” 33) that they receive because of a zealous reliance on one test score (Meier and Wood)—come from working-class backgrounds and racial and ethnic minority groups. Statistics from a report on Remedial Education at Higher Education Institutions in Fall 2000 revealed that minorities are overrepresented in remedial courses: “At institutions with high minority enrollment, 43 percent of first-time freshmen were enrolled in remedial reading, writing, or mathematics, compared with 26 percent at institutions with low minority enrollment” (20). As these discouraging statistics demonstrate, minority students’ underprepared status often serves to compound their marginalization and oppression. A more progressive and democratic pedagogical approach to teaching academic literacy would be one in which students learn not only how to read and write academic texts, but also how to examine critically the discourse that makes up their world(s). Paulo Freire asserted that teachers and students could use literacy to examine the themes that emerge from texts and look critically at the “limit situations”—the situations or myths that maintain the status quo and prevent them from fulfilling goals for their lives (99). One such limit situation might be the inequality of schooling conditions that results in

students being underprepared (see Kozol). More than thirty years ago, Shaughnessy wondered “what had gone wrong” (*Errors and Expectations* vii) as she read students’ writings; in the same way, students and teachers in transitional English courses need to examine what has gone wrong in regards to systemic issues mired in language practices and policies that result in inequality. This examination should not originate from a stance in which students are positioned as being in need of basic skills remediation or, even worse, as not belonging in higher education at all, but rather from one that examines the socially constructed dominant “Discourse,” to use James Gee’s big “D” notion (26), of the academy and how that impacts the perceived success of transitional students in college.

Critical Language Awareness (CLA) is one literacy tool that students need in order to examine limit-situations or “what went wrong.” Norman Fairclough defines CLA as an awareness of the ways in which ideas become naturalized or taken for granted as “truths” about the natural and social world and how these “truths” are tied up with language in use (14–15). The purpose of CLA is to encourage students to uncover the ways that the language of texts is socially constructed and how language may position students in negative ways, both purposefully and inadvertently.

Therefore, reading and writing instruction should not be concerned only with basic skills, but rather it should focus on how students use reading and writing to analyze language—in various textual forms—in order to understand the ways in which texts, and the Discourse that makes up texts, may impose certain ideas about the world onto readers. Students would benefit from an awareness of how language functions to impose certain beliefs and values about society. The premise we are developing is that the teaching of CLA and critical analysis should begin in transitional English courses, in order to prepare students fully for college-level literacy, democratic citizenship, and the realities of work; it should not be deferred for later composition courses, as is frequently the case.

Historical Context of Remediation

Glynda Hull, Mike Rose, Cynthia Greenleaf, and Brian Reilly trace the historical perspective of the discourse surrounding the concept of remediation, providing the analysis that labels given to poor-performing students at the beginning of the nineteenth century—such as “dunce,” “loafer,” “wrongdoer,” and “incorrigible”—blamed their poor performance on an inherently flawed character (6). During the latter half of the nineteenth century, the labels changed and terms such as “born late,” “sleepy minded,” and “slow” revealed a change from placing the blame on a flawed character to placing the blame on a developmental or cognitive problem (6). The advent of intelligence quotient (IQ) testing at this time fueled the idea that students who performed poorly in school were cognitively inferior (7). Although the twentieth century brought new and more progressive theories of learning, which included social and cultural aspects, Glynda Hull, Mike Rose, Kay Losey Fraser, and Marisa Castellano demonstrate in their study, through an analysis of

classroom discourse, the ways that teachers inadvertently reify deficiency assumptions about students in transition (317). Their discourse analysis of teacher-student talk in a developmental English class illustrates the contradictions that teachers carry with them in regards to students who are in transition. While teachers desire a progressive and liberatory curriculum, the talk use by the teacher in the study revealed deeply ingrained deficiency assumptions about students labeled “under-prepared.”

The problem is that a reliance on grammar instruction and basic skills remediation, which comes from socially constructed deficiency assumptions about students’ work, can hold them back further from equality in schooling and from fulfilling their desires for their lives. The significance of Hull, Rose, Fraser, and Castellano’s research study is that, although teachers may espouse sociocultural theories of language learning, contradictions still exist in how teachers view and educate students in transition, and these negative assumptions are often played out in the discourse of the classroom (318). Socially constructed deficiency assumptions, as illustrated in Hull, Rose, Fraser, and Castellano’s research study, may translate into a pedagogy based on a deficiency model in transitional English classes and open-admissions programs in higher education.

On the other hand, Allan Luke, a literacy teacher and theorist, argued that, “Criticism [. . .] is not a genre, not a skill, not a later developmental moment, not a reading position. It is [. . .] a constitutive and available element of every sign, utterance, and text” (334). The tool of critique, as Luke argues, should not be postponed until students have learned the basics or until they have reached a perceived level of cognitive maturity.

Through CLA pedagogy, a curricular aim is that students access the discourse of academic literacy—the dominant discourse—but also learn to critique the issues related to power, access, and equality that are entrenched in language practices (see Clark and Ivanic). Students can learn to use the language of academic literacy while learning to ask critical questions about language, such as “Whose interests are being served by the language in a text?” Although CLA is part of the curriculum in various settings in the United Kingdom and in South Africa (Clark and Ivanic), according to H. Samy Alim, few recent research studies in the United States employ a CLA curricular approach.

CLA Studies

In the following section, the term CLA is not used in all of the research; nevertheless, these studies are significant because of their focus on instruction that encourages students in transitional English courses to critique dominant messages about societal issues, such as access to education and the world of work—issues that are endemic to the situations of many students in college transitional English courses. In addition, all of the studies in the following section provide evidence that students develop academic literacy skills while they learn critical literacy skills.

Nicholas Coles and Susan Wall employ discourse analysis of students' discussion, reading, and writing in order to illustrate how students in a transitional English class talk, write, and read about the tensions and contradictions between their ideas and the critical ideas in texts. All of the students in the course came from working-class backgrounds and had been in work settings where they had problems, so the authors chose the subject of work as the course theme. The issue of work was inextricably tied to the students' experiences and the reasons for their participation in the course—all were enrolled in the course in order to find better jobs or to improve the situation in their current jobs. Coles and Wall engaged the students with texts that included built-in critiques about the world of work, such as George Orwell's *Down and Out in Paris and London*, Studs Terkel's *Working*, Richard Wright's *American Hunger*, Thomas Bell's *Out of This Furnace*, Robert Coles and Jane Hallowell Coles's *Women of Crisis*, and Rosabeth Moss Kanter's *Men and Women of the Corporation*. The researchers encouraged the students to rely on their own background knowledge, experiences, and interests during their reading, which allowed them the authority to identify with people and issues. In addition, the texts embodied built-in critique, allowing students to make connections between their own struggles with work-related issues and the struggles of others. Students became more effective readers, as evidenced by their ability to identify and make generalizations linking their own experiences, the experiences of others, and the systemic issues involved in their problems with work. Coles and Wall's study demonstrated how students were able to "see," that is, to analyze, the language and the messages in dominant and oppositional texts. This is the critical language awareness that Fairclough discussed. Not only were students engaged in analysis of the literary theme of work, but they were also engaged in analysis of how power and ideology are tied up in the dominant messages about the world of work. The students evolved from being readers who read the texts exclusively from the perspective that the author has the ultimate authority and that they, as readers, must submit to that authority into readers who could comprehend and also be critical of the message. In this way, they became more effective and critical readers, a skill that would help them in both academic and workplace contexts.

Glynda Hull's case study ("Critical Literacy") reported on community college students enrolled in a banking and finance program. All of the students in the course were minorities: African American, Hispanic, and Asian, and 95% were women. The program curriculum consisted of basic skills necessary to find a job as a bank proof operator or teller. Hull described the working conditions of a bank proof operator as high stress, in the sense that the "high demands to produce and be accurate [...] and strict rules of tardiness" (383), compounded with the monotony of unskilled work, amounted to the kind of work that Vygotsky would see as intellectual crippling (178). To this end, the job had a high turnover rate. Therefore, although the basic skills that the students received in the program got them a job, it did not help them keep the job. The significance of this study comes from Hull's illustration of these contradictions and is two-fold: that basic skills are not sufficient

for the world of work and that students from nondominant backgrounds need critical literacy skills in order to access personal empowerment and social change.

Ernest Morrell's descriptive case study was conducted with a population of "at-risk" first-year college students. Students came from underrepresented schools and communities serving racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic minority groups in urban Los Angeles (10). Students learned the language of academic literacy through research on critical themes that included the media's negative portrayal of urban youth, the potential role of hip-hop music and culture in school curricula, teen access to a livable wage, teacher quality, school safety, and the digital divide (14). Morrell demonstrated that students deemed "at-risk" engaged in sophisticated critical thinking and critiqued and composed texts that provided both liberating counternarratives and evidence of academic literacy growth.

Bernstein's study ("Writing and White Privilege") asks students in a college transitional English course to read and write about the contradictions inherent in preparing for high-stakes testing and for learning to be critical readers, writers, and thinkers. She uses the case study of Michael, a student in her developmental English course. Bernstein describes Michael, the only white working-class student in the class, as being an "insider/outsider" (130) in that, although his race may have allowed him the benefits of white privilege, because of his working-class background he shared some of the same negative experiences with schooling and standardized testing as his fellow nonwhite classmates. She includes his writing, which illustrated the way that Michael was able to critique the zealous overreliance on high-stakes testing and its implications for his presence in a developmental course. Similarly, Bernstein ("Teaching and Learning") illustrates how developmental students in an English class use reading and writing to advocate for social change. In particular, she includes Noah's writing to illustrate his engagement with critical themes, those having to do with the problematic notion of high-stakes testing and its implications for himself as a Latino student and for other students of color like himself. Bernstein was able to cultivate academic literacy in a developmental classroom while engaging with texts, such as "Theme for English B" by Langston Hughes, that embodied the experiences of the students. Therefore, the texts were both personally and critically relevant to the students' access to academic literacy.

June Jordan chronicles the awareness of language—Black English in particular—that students in an undergraduate English course gained when she worked with the tensions of students who encountered Black English in Alice Walker's *The Color Purple*. When her students translated passages from *The Color Purple* from Black English to Standard English, she notes that "the students pushed me to explain their own negative first reactions to their spoken language on the printed page" (343). Rather than ignore the social and critical aspects of literacy, she collaborates with students to foster an awareness of how language is tied up with identity, values, and power, reflecting an important component of CLA.

The culmination of this work came when the students chose to write a letter of protest to newspapers after a fellow classmate's brother was killed by police.

Although Jordan did not use the term CLA in the article, her decision to make visible the politics of language and to give students the choice of whether to use Black English or Standard English in the letter illustrates a CLA pedagogical approach. An explicit awareness of Black English was not separate but, rather, inextricably tied to the social situations of Black English speakers in the course because Jordan foregrounded the issue of police violence—an issue that she argues is “endemic to Black life” (351). That Jordan chose to foreground the literacy work that students did around a societal theme that was authentic and pertinent to the students seems to be an essential principle in critical pedagogy and critical literacy work, respectively.

The question that she posed to her students—“Should the opening, group paragraph be written in Black English or Standard English?”—makes explicit to the students the rhetorical choices and the real-life consequences that those choices have. To be sure, the students understood the ramifications of their choice to write the letter in Black English. They knew that their voices would not be heard, but they chose to write in Black English anyway, to honor the young man who had been killed. With Jordan’s help, the students discovered how language is connected with social reality and issues of justice, and they were conscious of their rhetorical choices available.

Lesley Lancaster and Rhiannan Taylor adopted a CLA curricular approach in a study of working-class students in a secondary English classroom in the United Kingdom. Their study is grounded in a sociocultural and critical perspective on literacy learning, in that they based the curriculum on the great deal that they assumed the students already knew about language, as opposed to what they assumed students did not know. This sociocultural approach opposed a deficit view of students’ language abilities and looked instead to explore the ways in which their existing knowledge of language could bring about a bridge to a better awareness of critical themes. Two of the goals of the course were “to explore the way language is used in school, at home, in the street and in the community, and to encourage students to explore attitudes to language and dialects” (268). Lancaster and Taylor raised questions such as the following: Why has language changed? Who determines those changes? How have those changes taken place? (268). Through these questions, the authors hoped to raise the students’ awareness of how language is socially constructed and produced and help them understand and challenge why some languages have more prestige than others (268). What they found from the CLA activities implemented in the course was that students developed an increased level of awareness of many different languages. The students also stopped referring to local languages by using pejorative terms, and their attitude toward their own local accent changed. The significance of this study is that, when the tools for critique are fostered in a classroom, students at the secondary level are capable of critiquing and challenging dominant and hegemonic perspectives that negatively affect them. Similar to students in Romy Clark’s study, the students left the course with a better awareness of their language choices and how these choices were related to social and critical aspects of language in use. We include Lancaster and

Taylor's study (in a high school setting), even though the study was not conducted with a population of underprepared college students, because it might speak to critics who argue that underprepared students are not ready for the cognitive demands of critical analysis (see Traub; D'Souza).

In a qualitative study of underprepared college students in a developmental reading course, Mellinee Lesley investigated how students in a required college study skills course accessed the dominant conventions of academic writing and, at the same time, challenged those conventions. She employed a critical literacy approach with the following justification: "literacy at all levels always begins with the impetus of the context for reading, writing, and speaking. The impetus of the context for students in developmental reading courses exists within a system of social stratification" (184). Therefore, Lesley chose to situate the theme of the course within the reasons why students are in transitional literacy courses in the first place. These reasons include issues of power, such as unequal schooling conditions, resegregation, unequal funding, and tracking. Although Lesley does not cite CLA in the study, it is a component. For example, Lesley provides evidence from students' in-class reader-response essays about excerpts from Mike Rose's *Lives on the Boundary*. She asked students to revise a previously written essay from earlier in the quarter and she asked them to look closely in their revision at the language and respond to the ways that social class is enacted in discourse. Students were learning the language of academic discourse, but they also used this language in their examination and critique of how language is tied to unequal societal issues (186). In this way, CLA was an important curricular component of the course. Lesley demonstrates how students deemed "remedial" can access academic literacy and the tools for critique and how these tools do not have to be deferred for later composition courses. Similar to students in Bernstein's two studies, Lesley's students began to reflect on their own unequal educational experiences and how literacy and language practices play a part in the construction of unequal educational experiences.

Implications for Using CLA as a Curricular Approach to Teaching English to Students in Transition

A few implications for teaching English to students in transition emerge from the previously discussed research studies. Texts of everyday life that illustrate issues endemic to the lives of students should be used as valid objects of analysis in the classroom. Deborah Hicks writes: "In order for working-class students to take up unfamiliar forms of literary practice, they first have to see a place for their voices within the dominant practices of reading articulated by teachers" (78). Many of the studies discussed illustrate how students were able to see a place for their own voices and engage in social critique through literacy assignments that allowed them to connect with texts and through questions that were meaningful to them and came as a result of their own inquiry. In addition, they were able to integrate their own voices within assignments that asked them to use the "basic" academic literacy

skills *and* the tools for critique—both of which are necessary for success in a baccalaureate program.

As the studies reviewed demonstrate, students in transitional English courses, often labeled “underprepared,” are capable of the critical thinking work necessary for college-level literacy. In addition, as many of the participants in the studies demonstrate, students are capable of engaging in critique of systemic issues, including schooling inequalities, because they have keen experiences that allow for a more critical awareness of how language practices are tied to unequal relations of power. The experiences of students should be validated and used to engage them in critical thinking work and to speak back to texts and language practices that position them in negative ways.

An example of CLA comes from a teacher/researcher study that Deborah Sánchez, the first author, implemented in a college transitional English class. In order to engage their critical thinking skills, she encouraged students to question assumptions or “common-sense knowledge” about the world that is tied to language practices. One CLA activity that she implemented centered on an excerpt from Jonathan Kozol’s book *A Shame of a Nation*. As a class and in small groups, students discussed in depth one of the chapters, entitled “Preparing Minds for Markets.” In this chapter, Kozol describes a visit to an urban elementary school, serving mostly students from minority backgrounds, in Columbus, Ohio, in which the teachers and administrators at the school used the word “manager” to encourage students to behave and act in certain ways. Kozol criticizes the school’s use of the word “manager” and its ties to what he believes are low expectations for the students and their futures after school.

Sánchez asked students to discuss in small groups the following questions: Do you see the word “manager” being used to position the students in a positive, negative, or neutral way. Explain why. What idea is being imposed on the students about their futures? Catherine Wallace asserts that “one advantage of CLA as essentially a classroom procedure is that it takes place within a ready-made interpretive community” (99). From her observational field notes, Sánchez, similar to Wallace, found that the dialogic nature of the classroom was a perfect place for students to engage in discussions about the socially constructed nature of language and the unequal social practices resulting from language practices at play in the real world. In small groups, students responded to the questions about “Preparing Minds for Markets” in lively and critical ways. Sánchez recorded in her observational field notes that, even before class started on the day of the planned discussion of “Preparing Minds for Markets,” she had heard students “buzzing” about the text. In addition, Kozol’s text, which included a built-in critique of schooling practices, allowed students, in groups, not only to engage in reading with and against the text but also to read their worlds into and onto the text, a tenet of CLA. Sánchez recorded that two students, Kerry and Damon, who both attended area public schools, commented that reading “Preparing Minds for Markets” reminded them of, and made them rethink, a schooling practice from their own childhoods—that of reciting the “seven pillars of character” every morning.

Students also responded to the text in writing. We include the following excerpt from Alex's essay because it demonstrates a growing CLA that resulted from his reading the text, discussing the class questions with his classmates, and reading his world into and onto the text:

After reading Kozol and talking to fellow classmates about some of the issues going on in this article, I understand some of the things going on in it. In our discussion group we had some controversy over some of the things said in this article [...] Kozol's Views on the Students from the Elementary school, made me think about when I was in Elementary. [...] I was one of maybe 5 black kids in the class, and the class size was about twenty to twenty-five kids in the class. In this class we moved at a faster pass than the district kids but we still had the manager system going on. We had a line leader, a pencil manager, an Attendance manager, a black board eraser manager. Back then, I thought it was a privilege to be a Manager in the class I never really thought about it in the negative sense. Reading his thoughts and views on the subject made me think maybe the teachers assigned these jobs because of the same reason the schools Kozol visit did. I want to believe that they were trying to teach us responsibility and possibly respect for others. [...] But to think the only reason they gave these jobs to us is because they think we might end up being felons is heartbreaking.

This excerpt demonstrates how teachers might encourage students' transactions with the texts as legitimate in order to give students who normally have not had sufficient practice with making assertions in academic writing the authority and confidence to make them.

We return to the beginning of the article in calling on Mina Shaughnessy in order to address the relevance and connection between pedagogy and access. Shaughnessy's foundational research study and guidebook for the teacher of basic writing, *Errors and Expectations*, emerged during a time that was ripe for social change. One of the most profound ideas that resulted from her research was that of the educability of students that she called "basic writers." Also, the implicit idea that resulted from her commitment to teach these students was the value of open-admissions programs at colleges and universities. Just as Shaughnessy wrote during a turbulent time in which there were detractors who did not support open-admissions policies, we are writing amid increasing attempts to remove transitional courses from four-year universities. Despite current detractors, we argue that educators should stay committed to the idea that resulted from Shaughnessy's legacy, namely, that students in transitional courses belong at the university. Although the proposed curricular approach does not address the issue of access at the state or institutional level, we hope that the studies reviewed and the example from Sánchez's classroom might influence how educators view the needs of students in transition at the pedagogical level. In addition, we hope that conversations about students and classroom pedagogies that oppose deficiency models might work interdiscursively to argue for continued access at the institutional level. The example from Alex's essay, along with the studies reviewed in this paper, demonstrate that students in transition can learn the language of academic literacy and, at the same time, use this

language in their critique of language practices that may at times position them in negative ways. ◀

Works Cited

- Alim, H. Samy. "Critical Language Awareness in the United States: Revisiting Issues and Revising Pedagogies in a Resegregated Society." *Educational Researcher* 34 (2005): 24–31.
- Armstrong, Sonya L. "Beginning the Literacy Transition: Postsecondary Students' Conceptualizations of Academic Writing in Developmental Literacy Contexts." Diss. University of Cincinnati, 2007.
- Bernstein, Susan N. "Re: Chipping Away." E-mail to Deborah M. Sánchez. 5 Dec. 2007.
- . "Teaching and Learning in Texas: Accountability Testing, Language, Race and Place." *Journal of Basic Writing* 23 (2004): 4–24.
- . "Writing and White Privilege: Beyond Basic Skills." *Pedagogy* 4 (2004): 128–31.
- Clark, Romy. "Principles and Practice of CLA in the Classroom." *Critical Language Awareness*. Ed. Norman Fairclough. London: Longman, 1992. 117–40.
- Clark, Romy, and Roz Ivanic. "Raising Critical Awareness of Language: A Curriculum Aim for the New Millenium." *Language Awareness* 8 (1999): 63–70.
- Coles, Nicholas, and Susan V. Wall. "Conflict and Power in the Reader-Responses of Adult Basic Writers." *College English* 49.3 (1987): 298–314.
- D'Souza, Dinesh. *Illiberal Education: Political Correctness and the College Experience*. Ashland, OH: Ashland UP, 1992.
- Emery, Kathy, and Susan Ohanian. *Why Is Corporate America Bashing Our Public Schools?* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2004.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Critical Language Awareness*. London: Longman, 1992.
- Fox, Tom. *Defending Access: A Critique of Standards in Higher Education*. New York: Boynton/Cook, 1999.
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum International, 1970.
- Gee, James Paul. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Hicks, Deborah. "Back to Oz?: Rethinking the Literary in a Critical Study of Reading." *Research in the Teaching of English* 39 (2004): 63–84.

- Hull, Glynda. "Critical Literacy and Beyond: Lessons Learned from Students and Workers in a Vocational Program and on the Job." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 24 (1993): 373-96.
- Hull, Glynda, Mike Rose, Kay Losey Fraser, and Marisa Castellano. "Remediation as Social Construct: Perspectives from an Analysis of Classroom Discourse." *College Composition and Communication* 42 (1991): 299-329.
- Hull, Glynda, Mike Rose, Cynthia Greenleaf, and Brian Reilly. "Seeing the Promise of the Underprepared." *Quarterly of the National Writing Project and the Center for the Study of Writing and Literacy* 13 (1991): 6-15.
- Jordan, June. "Nobody Mean More to Me Than You and the Future Life of Willie Jordan." *Teaching Developmental Writing*. Susan N. Bernstein, Ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2007. 340-55.
- Kozol, Jonathan. *Savage Inequalities*. New York: Harper Perennial, 1991.
- Lancaster, Lesley, and Rhiannan Taylor. "Critical Approaches to Language, Learning and Pedagogy: A Case Study." *Critical Language Awareness*. Norman Fairclough, Ed. London: Longman, 1992. 256-84.
- Lesley, Mellinee. "Exploring the Links between Critical Literacy and Developmental Reading." *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy* 45 (2001): 180-89.
- Luke, Allan. "When Basic Skills and Information Processing Just Aren't Enough: Rethinking Reading in New Times." *Teachers College Record* 97 (1995): 95-115.
- McNenny, Gerry, and Sallyanne H. Fitzgerald, eds. *Mainstreaming Basic Writers: Politics and Pedagogies of Access*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2001.
- Meier, Deborah, and George Wood, eds. *Many Children Left Behind*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2004.
- Morrell, Ernest. "Writing the Word and the World: Critical Literacy as Critical Textual Production" ERIC document # ED475208, 2003.
- Ohio Senate. 126th Assembly. Amended Substitute Ohio Senate Bill Number 311. 2006: 24-31. <http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/bills.cfm?ID=126_SB_311>
- Remedial Education in Degree-Granting Postsecondary Institutions in Fall 2000* Ed. National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, D.C., 2000.
- Rose, Mike. *Lives on the Boundary*. New York: Free Press, 1989.
- Shaughnessy, Mina. *Errors and Expectations: A Guide for the Teacher of Basic Writing*. New York: Oxford UP, 1977.
- . "Some Needed Research on Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 28 (1977): 317-20.

- Shor, Ira. "Errors and Economics: Inequality Breeds Remediation." *Mainstreaming Basic Writers: Politics and Pedagogies of Access*. Ed. Gerri McNenny. Mahwah NJ: Erlbaum, 2001. 29–54.
- . "Our Apartheid: Writing Instruction and Inequality." *Journal of Basic Writing* 16.1 (1997): 91–104.
- Traub, James. *City on a Hill: Testing the American Dream at City College*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1994.
- UC 21: The President's Report Card to the Board of Trustees, Sep. 2007, <http://www.uc.edu/reportcard/>. September 15, 2007.
- Vygotsky, Lev. "The Socialist Alteration of Man." René Van Der Veer and Jaan Valsiner, eds. *The Vygotsky Reader*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell. 1994. 175–84.
- Wallace, Catherine. "Critical Language Awareness: Key Principles for a Course in Critical Reading." *Language Awareness* 8 (1999): 98–110.

Deborah M. Sánchez is a doctoral student in literacy education at the University of Cincinnati. **Eric J. Paulson**, associate professor of literacy education and Director of Graduate Studies for Teacher Education at the University of Cincinnati, taught reading and writing at community colleges for nine years before assuming his current positions.

CALL FOR PROPOSALS: NCTE THEORY AND RESEARCH INTO PRACTICE (TRIP) BOOK SERIES

The NCTE Books Program invites proposals for its TRIP series (Theory and Research into Practice). These books are single-authored and focus on a single topic, targeting a specified educational level (elementary, middle, or secondary). Each book will offer the following: solid theoretical foundation in a given subject area within English language arts; exposure to the pertinent research in that area; practice-oriented models designed to stimulate theory-based application in the reader's own classroom. The series has an extremely wide range of subject matter; past titles include *Creative Approaches to Sentence Combining*, *Unlocking Shakespeare's Language*, and *Enhancing Aesthetic Reading and Response*. For detailed submission guidelines, please visit the NCTE website at <http://www.ncte.org/write/books>. Proposals to be considered for the TRIP series should include a short review of the theory and research, as well as examples of classroom practices that can be adapted to the teaching level specified. Send proposals to Acquisitions Editor, NCTE, 1111 W. Kenyon Road, Urbana, IL 61801-1096.