

Violence in the Curriculum: Compulsory Linguistic Discrimination in the Arizona-Sonora Borderlands

Kirstin Ruth Bratt

Penn State University, Altoona Campus, Pennsylvania, USA

In the small border town here focalized, just north of the Mexican and US border stations, daily businesses, including city council meetings, retail, and public services, are conducted in Spanish. Only the schools insist upon English, this insistence backed by state proposition 200, funded primarily by Ron Unz, but passed by Arizona voters in 2000. This is the type of policy Valdéz criticizes when she explains the great burden that is placed on bilinguals through public policies. She identifies these policies as symptoms of public anger, writing that bilinguals “provoke the wrath of those who view concessions to linguistic diversity as fundamentally un-American” (p. 164). Furthermore, Corson explains that English-only policies reduce the status of minority-language speakers in every public context (p. 105). While racial discrimination was once openly condoned and practiced under legal protection in the United States, Espinosa-Aguilar explains that it now continues under less blatantly racist guises, such as legal discrimination that is “masked as language policy” (p. 269).

As Di Bella describes it, the border has always been used to exploit the self-interests of the powerful, creating “a hotbed for contempt and racism” (429). He writes that the border divides people who have similar concerns, such as education, health, and shelter, creating enemies of people who could instead work together. He describes these divisions as creating a climate of “estrangement and mutual negation”: an ideal climate for deal making and exploitation whose “spirit and objectives have nothing at all to do with the strengthening of the population but only with their own very private interests, based on predatory speculation of capital and the exploitation of the majority” (430). He writes that a border divides people who have similar concerns, such as education, health, and shelter, creating enemies of people who could instead work effectively together to improve their conditions. He describes these divisions as

creating climates of “estrangement and mutual negation,” making space for deal-making and private interests, for “predatory speculation for capital and the exploitation of the majority” (430).

Manifestations of such antagonism can be witnessed in recent voter initiatives in Arizona, such as proposition 203 in 2000, banning bilingual education, or proposition 200 in 2004, banning public services to undocumented immigrants and threatening public servants with jail time for providing assistance to such immigrants. Prop 200 was tested within days of its passage when an undocumented worker appeared at the Yuma Regional Medical Center with advanced symptoms from tuberculosis. Despite the public health threat and the Hippocratic oath of the doctors, the office of the governor of Arizona could not find a legal way to allow treatment for the patient, protect public safety, and grant immunity to the health providers.

Arizona’s voter initiatives, once passed, are impervious to legislative or executive intervention. As such, they are touted as quick-fix solutions to Arizona’s abundant social problems; however, they are, at their core, attempts to maintain power in the hands of a racist majority. As Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, and Álvarez aptly state, “The English-only movement is imbued with racist discourse” (223). Rodolfo Acuña’s incisive critique of American racism, through legal, institutional, social, and economic perspectives, states that these propositions mask their racism behind the guise of equal opportunity and merit. He writes that these seemingly color-blind policies encourage racial discrimination by preventing race-conscious remediation for current and historical problems related to racism.

Juan Perea asks teachers to become activists for linguistic and cultural diversity, writing, “Educators who care about linguistic and cultural diversity must educate the public about why languages other than English matter, and why it is foolish to squelch, rather than nurture, the linguistic resources extant in the various heritages of Americans” (Perea, 137). Indeed, bilingualism is universally treated as a resource, yet somehow the American Southwest holds a different view. Bianco writes that domestic multi-lingualism is considered problematical, while language diversity for travel and business purposes is fine (Bianco, 2001). Gutiérrez, et al, explain that diversity is not considered a resource but rather a political challenge (2001).

When a student reaches out to a teacher, the teacher must have the opportunity to respond. Yet sometimes Arizona law prevents this reaching out. Linguistic discrimination, legalized, prevents students and teachers from one another and creates an antagonism that cannot be resolved.

Southern Arizona, Specifically

As an educator, I found Arizona a frustrating place to work. So many voter initiatives were passed during my tenure there, all of which seemed counter-intuitive to me as a teacher. Schools were forced by law to enact policies that prevented children from studying in their home languages. While educational research has largely supported bilingual education as a way to help students become competent in English, public policies in Arizona were forcing schools to discontinue their bilingual programs. I was also troubled to learn that businesses often required bilingual workers but that they had no interest in promoting bilingual education or Spanish instruction in the schools. While I normally resent business interests interfering in public schools, I was puzzled by their lack of interest in this particular area.

Since over 50% of Arizona's voters live in the Phoenix metropolitan area, the state's political scene is almost completely controlled from the geographical center, with the border region yielding very little political power in the state. Arizona schools along the Arizona-Sonora border, in particular, have tried to educate immigrant children in compliance with laws banning bilingual education while lacking in the resources of the wealthier, more centralized school districts. Rather than explore their rich potential to become leaders in bilingual education, the schools of southern Arizona have been weighed down by counter-intuitive policies that consider the use of Spanish a transgression of students and teachers. In an effort to avoid legal trouble with the state government, school districts on the border enact policies even stricter than the state law requires, often preventing the use of Spanish on school grounds, even for disciplinary interventions or emergency situations.

Bilingual students on the border suffer political consequences beyond their control. Those who work alongside their parents in the fields from elementary school age, a common occurrence in rural Arizona, find that neither their rights as workers nor as learners are protected. Rather than concern themselves with the needs of bilingual

students, the institutions of the borderlands region reflect the interests of the powerful: Although businesses often require bilingual workers, their need for bilingual workers does not trump their need to keep power out of the hands of the bilingual population. In the borderlands region, schooling is not only reproductive, in the sense that the school is designed to replicate, support, and normalize the status quo, but it is also subtractive in the way that Angela Valenzuela describes subtractive schooling: “It divests these youth of important social and cultural resources, leaving them progressively vulnerable to academic failure” (Valenzuela, p. 3).

Due to the voter-mandated language discrimination in Arizona, predominantly English-speaking students are allowed to develop an unhealthy superiority over Spanish-speaking or other students with home languages other than English. Solorzano and Yosso write that Chicana and Chicano children attend schools whose “educational conditions are some of the most inadequate in the United States (p. 37). They say that the elementary schools that serve most Chicana and Chicano children emphasize remediation, the slowing of instruction, and rigid ability grouping; these schools generally do not have quality programs for second-language students, they use books that either exclude or reinforce negative stereotypes, and they are large, segregated schools that receive less money per child than the national average (Solorzano & Yosso, 2000). Students, no matter their talent at transferring between languages or contextual learning, are not educated formally to translate their talents into academic success. As Lisa Delpit explains, the education system is built upon a culture of power (Delpit, 1995). Borderlands schools are easier for English-proficient students because they understand the cultural and linguistic environment and are able to acclimate more easily to the classroom environment. As Peggy McIntosh writes, the white students are given the benefit of the doubt, while the non-white students must counter negative stereotypes designed to limit their success (1990). Negative stereotypes abound, as Villenas, Deyhle, and Parker state, against the parents of Spanish-speaking children, as popular rhetoric states that Latino parents do not care about their children’s education (Villenas, Deyhle, Parker, 1999).

Since 1980, conservative educational policies have shifted attention away from the progress that was made by bilingual students and parents in the 1960s and 1970s. As conservatives push their English-only movements, research on bilingual education has

shifted. No longer do researchers have many bilingual classrooms to study: now those who are interested in bilingual education find themselves fighting to defend or resurrect programs. The attention of researchers has been distracted from classrooms and away from the needs of bilingual children. This distraction has had strong and disastrous consequences.

If anyone doubts the real need for educational research, the borderland region proves its dire necessity. For anecdotal evidence, I offer this dramatic example: an example that, for me, demonstrates the need for a synthesis of theory, practice, research, and reflexivity. This example, out of context, seems coarse and unreal. In its original context, it seems grievous, yes, yet somehow less than shocking. Ironically, this incident occurred as I gathered information about borderland educational research, and for me it demonstrated very clearly the disconnection between the educational research community and the school personnel working in the borderlands. Perhaps surprisingly, perhaps not, this event had a relatively small impact. It failed to catalyze the school personnel or to challenge anyone's preconceived notions about how the school operates.

Can I prove, based on one small incident on one particular day, in one small school that Arizona's English-only policies encourage violence by their innate racism and the discriminatory practices they demand? I set forth here to try.

But let's begin the story without victims, enemies, heroes, and villains: The principal and the teachers are not cruel people. They give of their time and energy to impoverished and under-prepared students in a place where most of us won't give but a passing glance: the hottest and driest part of the country, the southwest corner of Arizona, where even a cactus cannot survive without human intervention.

Proposition 200 closed any fissures in English-only activist Ron Unz's earlier state initiatives in Colorado or California. Carefully tested and rehearsed in other states, Arizona's English-only proposition is fairly airtight, and it is chilling in its application. Schools who do not want to face the consequences of an inadvertent error go to extremes to prevent problems. Districts create strict English-only policies that surpass the state initiative in their fervor: teachers in more than one elementary district

in rural Arizona are summarily fired if they are heard speaking Spanish, even to prevent an accident on the playground.

Similarly, students are prohibited from speaking Spanish in the school, a rule that they break with great frequency throughout the day. They are expected to be well-behaved in their classes, and the staff of the school includes various full-time disciplinarians. Students are told that if they follow the program and the rules of the school, they will eventually become successful readers and useful members of society.

The problem is not necessarily in the promise, because for all we know it might be true. The problem begins when the theory breaks down and the school day begins. Think of a teacher, in general a kind person, in the sense that she gives unselfishly to children without great financial reward; but sometimes she is tired, and sometimes impatient. Her assignment is to teach reading to eighth graders. Her group consists of what is called the “low” readers. They are selected for the class primarily by on their standardized test scores. The class meets in the last period of the day. These “low” readers who reach their reading teacher at the end of the school day are tired of the promises and tired of English – a language that has failed to engage them in both spoken and printed word. They are simply tired after a long day – tired of being “low” – and they are ready to retreat to their safe, loving, Spanish-speaking community – a world in which they feel competent, useful, and communicative.

The teacher had already retired from one career, and her job in the middle school was supposed to be a short-term assignment helping her to bridge the gap between retirement and social security. The job was difficult for her: more difficult than she had expected, although she had expected to be challenged on personal and professional levels. Indeed, she welcomed these new challenges, as she always has.

This middle school teacher, who takes care to treat each student fairly, does not necessarily treat them lovingly. This has never been her way; she is simply not that kind of person. She tells me with a shudder how her female students like to touch her, rearrange her hair, physically examine her clothing and jewelry. I remember as a child how I was discouraged from touching my mother, how she would flinch at my touch, and I wince with empathy at the thought of these affectionate young women trying to touch their teacher. I remember the painful rebuffs of my mother, and I understand the

additional layer of cultural insensitivity that this must add to the problem between white teachers and their Mexican-American students at the middle school.

As an outsider to her classroom but as a researcher working on the border, I try to see the teacher through the eyes of these teenagers. They are confused by her detached fairness. They don't understand her English. When they reach out to understand her, they feel reproached. They must wonder why she never touches anyone – never greets anyone with a handshake nor kiss nor hug. She must surprise and confound them.

What does it mean to be a bilingual student? What does it mean to be a monolingual teacher of bilingual students? As she insists they learn to read, they are overwhelmed by English words. They have a secret world of Spanish through which to connect with their classmates. The teacher becomes angry. She feels they are using their secret language to exclude her – and perhaps they are. Every day the teacher writes five or six detention slips for students who are not following the rules. Every day she spends another hour after school trying, without luck, to enforce the same rules. These are rules she enforces fairly. These are rules she would enforce equally if the students were white. These are rules she feels are right, rules she feels are important.

On this particular day, however, she suffers lacerations to the back of her head and sends a child, a child under her care, to jail. It is unpleasant. It is disconcerting. It is the day before Thanksgiving, and it changes things. It will change the life of the teacher and the child who spends a holiday in jail.

So let's arrive now at one critical moment – when the frustration of all these people and the oppressive school system they have together sustained culminates in a bloody and painful event. (Remember, this is only one critical moment, one of many, not the end of anything nor the beginning of any real reform – the most we expect from this trauma is a reshuffling of names and numbers and a continuation of the same grinding system of indoctrination). The moment is this: the teacher faces him, we'll call him Juan, a rule-breaker. He has defied the rules – knowingly, laughingly, and exasperatingly. It is the last day of school before Thanksgiving. Let's also remember that Thanksgiving is a European-American holiday that means little to Mexican and Mexican-American students who have just finished celebrating their revolution against Porfirio Díaz on 20 November, and might be a devastating reminder to

Cocopah students, for whom Thanksgiving could be considered a day of mourning and loss – a day when Native Americans around the country are reminded of the great betrayal they sustained at the hands of the white settlers on the east coast of the North American continent, several hundred years after Spanish explorers began wreaking havoc among the native population as they made their journey across the Southwest desert searching for the Seven Cities of Cibola.

It is on this festive and devastating day that the critical moment occurs: in this moment that Juan grins at his teacher from his perch atop his skateboard and dares her to enforce the rules. The teacher, being fair and conscientious, takes the dare, and rather than call to her side any number of rule-enforcers that she could have had at her disposal – police and security officers, administrators, disciplinarians, school counselors, or custodians (the middle school considers itself a place of many rules, and therefore many rule-breakers, in much need of discipline and security), takes it upon herself to confiscate the skateboard. Juan, who in the moment (the impulsive moment reserved for teenagers – the impulsive moment that causes any number of teenage jailings, pregnancies, accidents), in that fateful and impulsive moment that anyone who has been a teenager ought to remember but prefers not to, first relinquishes the skateboard then tries to wrestle it back. While the teacher, in an equally impulsive, perhaps fearful and angry, moment, holds on to the skateboard with the intention, I believe, of winning what she probably considers an important struggle for power.

Who comes to their senses first? It seems that Juan, after a few moments of gripping and tugging, considers his future and lets go – at which point the teacher falls against the school building with a terrific force that causes the lacerations and gushing blood. Soon the school officials, police officers, ambulance workers, district officers, and social workers, all rush to her side, save her life, and carry the young offender off to jail.

How did it happen, and whom do we implicate in this horrible altercation between teacher and child? The incident evokes, for me, questions of virtue and rectitude, but also questions of relativity and sensitivity. Is the teacher fair? What does that mean? Is she caring? How does she express it? Is she sensitive, thoughtful, kind? Does it matter?

Certainly the child was wrong for breaking school rules, and it will probably all stop there. The principal will change a few students to other classrooms, perhaps by seeking a few other “low” readers from his list. Various people will apologize to the teacher, a public court trial will be held to sort out the details and punish the child, and maybe now her detention slips to the office will be attended to by the disciplinarian who has been paid all along to do so. But let’s take the question a bit further. Let’s consider the voter mandate against Spanish that led, not only to this particularly climactic moment, but to the many momentary clashes that occur along the cultural, economic, linguistic, and geographic borders that exist, both physically and metaphorically, in the schools of the US-Mexico border.

What questions do we need to answer about borderland educational systems? How do we talk about institutionalized racism? Bilingual education? Literacy? The teacher considers herself a non-racist and a fair person. Her white principal and the people she surrounds herself with – friends, family, co-workers – all believe her, as they know that she is meticulously fair and conscientious. What I think led up to the teacher’s accident, however, has a great deal to do with institutionalized racism, in which she is seen as complicit by her students and her families. It is a cultural rift that she has been unable to bridge. When Ivan Illich and Jonathan Kozol began challenging the schooling of society in the popular press, and when critical educational theorists like Apple, McLaren, Giroux, and Freire, began applying neo-marxist principles to educational research, educators began to understand schooling differently. English-only policies have been exposed as discriminatory – racist intents and undertones. Many schools made changes based on these theories, but many did not.

As a researcher on the border who had a professional connection to this teacher, I had a deeply angry reaction to this incident that included anger at the teacher and her student, but more – anger toward the state policies against bilingual learning and the even more stringent anti-Spanish policies of the school, put in place to avoid any potential problems with state agencies.

Was I alone in resenting these policies? Troublesome incidents had become commonplace at the school, where the students speak Spanish in spite of the rules, fully aware of the tension such a choice creates for school personnel.

And so I wonder – is this a typical middle school environment? Or is it more emotionally charged than usual? What does language policy have to do with a physical confrontation between teacher and student? How does language policy relate to the destruction of school property – the razor-blade marks through textbooks and desks, the fires set in the bathrooms, the menacing students in the parking lots after school?

Recently, a fight between students broke out on the middle school campus. The children do not only chatter in Spanish, but occasionally, they also fight in their home language. As this particular fight began, the school resource officer intervened by spraying the children with pepper, sending one to the hospital. The child was hospitalized not from injuries inflicted by his opponent, but because of the officer's unnecessary use of force against the children. I wonder whether the linguistic divide has played a role in this officer's decision to use excessive force. I wonder whether pepper spray is the only solution the officer can imagine. I wonder whether he has had other opportunities to predict and then prevent the tension between these children. If his full-time job is to prevent violence on school grounds, how is it possible that he cannot maintain a positive environment that might prevent such explosive incidents? And how is it possible that the officer becomes the most destructive person on the scene? Pepper spray allows for a safe distance from the children, much as another weapon, such as a gun, might provide. Rather than intervene verbally or even bodily, the officer stands back and sprays pepper in the eyes of the children. The children are fighting in Spanish, of course. Perhaps the officer is offended. Rather than a more reasoned intervention of minimal force, the officer stands back from the offending children and their strange language, and he wields the most powerful weapon at his disposal against them. What is the role of linguistic discrimination in this violent episode?

The liminal zone between this school and its community is a deep linguistic divide, strengthened by policy, by state law, by good and bad intentions. Even bilingual families are split about language policies in school. These are heated discussions that continue through the nights and into the days – in public debates and private moments. Families are torn between their love for their home language and their desire for their children to succeed economically in their country of residence. Tove

Skutnabb-Kangas explains that immigrants often assimilate to their adopted land by accepting the dominant language, but that this assimilation should never be understood as consensual; instead, she says, we must understand that immigrants are losing their home languages in response to economic and political pressures outside of their control (2002). Having felt very deeply the loss of my grandparents' language myself, I have a sense of this loss, although it seems that my white grandparents were rewarded for their assimilation with full, unquestioned citizenship and gifts of land to settle. I remember stories of their suffering, but I find I am not equipped enough information to make an adequate assessment of comparison of the suffering, loss, and benefits of immigrant families.

The promise of communicative moments

In a nation of immigrants, where the most common language, English, is also an immigrant from a far-away land, I wonder if there might be a touch of jealousy in the insistence that we all learn English. As Rodriguez writes, "most of us in this country are one or two generations from a grandparent who scolded us for losing her language. There is an enormous guilt in the American soul" (p. 216). The grand narrative about becoming an American includes the sacrifice of the home language and the menial labor that immigrants do so that their children can be successful. Ada writes that the children of immigrants often say, "My parents made it without bilingual education," but she explains that these comments fail to take into account the enormous grief of immigrants, whose "sacrifices and efforts are rewarded by estrangement from their grandchildren, with whom communication is limited, at best" (p. 238).

Lucy Tse (2001) claims that the real crisis in this debate is not whether or not children can learn English but rather "the systematic loss and eventual death of the heritage language in immigrant families" (p. 71). Ada (1995) agrees, adding that "Additive bilingualism, in which a second language is acquired while maintaining and continuing to develop the first, is a healthy and viable alternative to subtractive bilingualism" (p. 237). She writes that the benefits to additive bilingualism are many including a dual repertoire for organizing cognitive abilities, enhanced metalinguistic development and self-esteem, reinforcement of cultural identity, and strengthening of family and community ties (1995).

Many researchers and theorists have explained that bilingualism can only be seen as a benefit and a resource for children and their communities. Skutnabb-Kangas (1995) writes, “High levels of bilingualism/biculturalism benefit every child, but for minority children, bilingualism is a necessity” (p. 55). Delpit (1988) agrees, saying, “Each cultural group should have the right to maintain its own language style” (p. 280).

Alma Flor Ada (1995) explains the need to feel competent in one’s language. She writes, “Since language performance plays a major role in the perception that others have of us and thus may affect our personal and professional success, feeling inadequate in the use of language is a painful experience” (p. 239). Ada (1991) claims that children who do not attend schools in their native languages are often frustrated with school and not motivated to learn to read. Children must be offered attractive and interesting books in their home languages, according to Ada, because part of the joy of reading is the ability to predict, to see one’s predictions realized, or to be surprised by outcomes. Young people who have never had the opportunity to enjoy reading become adults who are disillusioned and disinterested in the literary world (Ada, 1991). Houtchens (2001) blames student dropout statistics on this failure to engage Latino students in reading, claiming, “Dropout statistics clearly reflect the lack of relevance that schools have had for most Latinos. Schools do a good job of teaching Latino students to decode written text, but fail in the areas of developing comprehensive literacy and an academic consciousness” (p. 200).

While conservative explanations for the under-achievement of Latinas and Latinos in education tend to blame the parents for using Spanish at home or the lack of motivation and ability on the part of the children (Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, and Álvarez, 2000), it is also quite probable that linguistic discrimination dampens the children’s enthusiasm for learning. As various students have expressed to me, the pressure to read and write only in English prevents them from her full expression. While they may find joy in reading and writing in Spanish, the emphasis on English only makes them feel less capable.

If joy is a factor in learning to read, then bilingual students must be encouraged to develop literacy skills in their home languages. One’s home language is the best source of passion, whether that passion includes joy or pain, and one’s home language is the best source for other necessities of learning: conceptual understanding,

predictions and surprises, and communal, familial, and personal histories. As a Spanish learner, I have become sympathetic with the difficulties implicit in learning to read and write in a second language. I find Spanish reading and writing difficult, preferring to learn Spanish through the modes of speaking and listening. Reading in Spanish, for me, is a chore rather than a joy. Writing in Spanish is uncomfortable: I always feel that my intelligence will be judged by my fluency, and I am certain that I will appear childish and foolish in my writing. If I write to a person in Spanish, I make various attempts, erasing much more than I ever use. I look up many of the words and then use the safest word rather than the most expressive. I end up apologizing for my Spanish and feeling that even the simplest phrase is an unfortunate risk.

Joy and pain take extreme forms. Both joy and pain result from passion, extremes that can either augment or impede a child's literacy development. Passion, in its joy or its pain, is responsible for creating pathways and barriers into the developing literacy of learners. Passion can be created by external forces, such as praise or scolding, but it can also come from internal sources. For those who are passionate about reading and writing, who are driven to laughter or tears in the midst of their literacy activities, the development of vocabulary and technical literacy skills is a support for their passions and therefore a development willingly attempted and lovingly embraced. For those who are driven to tears by a painful learning process, the development of technical literacy skills and vocabulary becomes a barrier to their development.

Arizona schools along the Arizona-Sonora border, particularly, have been slow to take charge of their own needs. Not only are they weighed down by quotidian responsibilities, and intimidated by the city schools, whose test scores are always higher and who hold more political power in Phoenix. Rather than use their rich potential to become leaders in bilingual education, these schools have had to find ways to educate bilingual or Spanish-speaking students in spite of laws that prohibit bilingual education. In many ways, the schools of southern Arizona have had to deny their own potential for leadership.

True democracy depends on each of its members thinking critically, acting responsibly, and reflecting upon the meaning and significance of what it means to be a citizen in a true democracy. Nothing about freedom is free, and nothing about

freedom is easy. Freedom implies a great deal of responsibility: to oneself, to the community, to the world. Socrates, in his dialogic reflections with students, teaches us that the unexamined life is not worth living. Like some of Freire's work, most texts associated with Socrates are written in dialogic form. To carry out one's reflection in such a reciprocal relationship with others requires a willingness, a bravery, and an openness that critical literacy encourages and that reproductive schooling does not.

When we advocate for critical literacy we say that we can make things happen: alone we can begin, and together we can finish. We can make things happen in our actions, in our practices, in our reflections, in our readings, in our writings, in our speech, and in our listening. Peter Elbow is right to say that everyone, under certain conditions, has the ability to speak clearly and with power. It is the responsibility and privilege of educators to work together with parents, community, and students to eliminate the barriers and promote the skills and confidence necessary so that each students can fulfill this basic human need: to communicate clearly, honestly, and with power.

Bibliography

- Acuña, R. (1998). *Sometimes there is no other side: Chicanos and the myth of equality*. Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame.
- Ada, A. F. (1995). Creative education for bilingual teachers. In O. Garcia & C. Baker (Eds.), *Policy and practice in bilingual education: Extending the foundations* (pp. 237-244). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Bianco, J. L. (2001). Language policies: State texts for silencing and giving voice. In P. Freebody, S. Muspratt, & B. Dwyer (Eds.), *Difference, silence, and textual practice: Studies in critical literacy* (pp. 31-70). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Corson, D. (2001). Social justice, language policy, and English only. In R. Dueñas-González & I. Melis (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Critical perspectives on the official English movement* (pp. 95-120). Urbana, IL: NCTE, & Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Delpit, L. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58 (3), 280-298.

Elbow, P. (1998). *Writing with power: Techniques for mastering the writing process*. New York: Oxford.

Espinosa-Aguilar, A. (2001). Analyzing the rhetoric of the English only movement. In R. Dueñas-González & I. Melis (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Critical perspectives on the official English movement* (pp. 268-288). Urbana, IL: NCTE, & Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin Garvey.

Greene, M. (2000). The passions of pluralism: Multiculturalism and the expanding community. In J. Noel (Ed.), *Sources: Notable selections in multicultural education* (pp. 38-46). Guilford, CT: Dushkin/McGraw-Hill. (Reprinted from *Educational Researcher* 22.1, 1993).

Gutiérrez, K. D., Baquedano-López, P., & Álvarez, H. H. (2000). The crisis in Latino education: The norming of America. In C. Tejeda, C. Martínez, & Z. Leonardo (Eds.), *Charting new terrains of Chicana(o)/Latina(o) education* (pp. 213-232). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.

Gutiérrez, K. D., Baquedano-López, P., & Álvarez, H. H. (2001). Literacy as hybridity: Moving beyond bilingualism in urban classrooms. In M. de la Luz Reyes & J. J. Halcón (Eds.), *The best for our children: Critical perspectives on literacy for Latino students* (pp. 122-141). New York: Teachers College.

McIntosh, P. (1990, Winter). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. *Independent School*, 49 (2).

Perea, J. F. (2001). The new American Spanish war: How the courts and the legislatures are aiding the suppression of languages other than English. In R. Dueñas-González & I. Melis (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Critical perspectives on the official English movement* (pp. 121-139). Urbana, IL: NCTE, & Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Solorzano, D. & Yosso, T. (2000). Toward a critical race theory of Chicana and Chicano education. In C. Tejeda, C. Martínez, & Z. Leonardo (Eds.), *Charting new terrains of Chicana(o)/Latina(o) education*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.

Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S.-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. New York: SUNY.

van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. London, ON: U Western Ontario.

Villenas, S., Deyhle, D., & Parker, L. (1999). Critical race theory and praxis: Chicano(a) / Latino(a) and Navajo struggles for dignity, educational equity, and social justice. In L. Parker, D. Deyhle, & S. Villenas (Eds.), *Race is . . . race isn't: Critical race theory and qualitative studies in education* (pp. 31-52). Boulder: Westview.

Author's Details

The primary concern of my research is to uncover the effects of linguistic discrimination suffered by bilingual or monolingual Spanish speakers in the border region, discrimination that I believe is one of the accepted, frequently-defended, and now legally mandated forms of prejudice remaining since the US Civil Rights Act of 1965 made race discrimination illegal. I currently work in teacher education, specifically in language arts and children's literature. My hope is to facilitate pre-service teacher activism: preparing teachers to defend banned or challenged books from censorship in public schools; supporting them in their work of community building and advocacy for children; encouraging the local production of student-centered curricula; and examining our methods of evaluation in an effort to promote student-mediated progress reporting that creates a responsive community around the public schools.