CHAPTER 1

Navigating Cultures and Identities to Learn Literacies for Life

Rethinking Adolescent Literacy Teaching in a Post-Core World

ELIZABETH BIRR MOJE, CAROLYN GIROUX, and NICK MUEHLING

There was a time when those who studied adolescent literacy had to work hard to make an argument for attention to the literacy development and learning of youth past age 10. Adolescent literacy researchers and educators argued for specific ways of reading and writing in "content areas." We claimed that literacy development continues throughout one's life as one enters new and different domains. We wrote about the need to keep learning new ways of reading and writing to participate in a global society. We wrote about the need for critical literacy in an age of information or access to knowledge in a fast capitalist economy. We argued for access and opportunity for those who had not achieved reading proficiency at an early age.

Those days are over. Now the argument is simple: Calls for attention to adolescent literacy teaching across the curriculum rest their legitimacy on the need to meet the Common Core State Standards (CCSS; National Governors Association & Council of Chief State School Officers [NGA & CCSSO], 2010) and, more recently, on the Next Generation Science Standards (Next Generation Science Standards Lead States, 2013) and the College, Career, and Civic (C3) Life Framework (National Council for the Social Studies, 2013). Indeed, so commonplace is this call to the Common Core and other standards[1] that many readers are likely now to skip reading the CCSS-driven arguments of researchers and go straight to the particulars of whatever study or program the authors

[1]Although all standards are increasingly called upon to justify attention to adolescent and disciplinary literacy teaching, for simplicity's sake we use the "the Core" to refer to standards documents, and more generally to the standards movement. The Core launched this movement, so it seems fitting to attribute the current status of adolescent and disciplinary literacy teaching to it.

are addressing. To be fair, the CCSS embed many of the learning demands implicated by our prior arguments in calls for close reading (to build critical literacy) or for developing skills in evidence-based argument (to allow for the careful exchange and evaluation of information). The premise is that if teachers hew to these standards, then students will learn all they need to learn to succeed in college and careers.

One wonders, however, is this as good as it gets? That is, do the CCSS provide all the warrant needed for educators, policymakers, parents, and researchers to care about the literacy learning and development of youth? Despite the claim that the Core will help develop in students the abilities to "understand other perspectives and cultures" (NGA & CCSSO, 2010), the CCSS, in fact, do not attend explicitly to the social, emotional, or cultural development of young people, nor do the standards call for attention to adolescent students' personal, social, and cultural connections to or purposes for the texts they read or write. What is our evidence that advancing the skills outlined in the standards is enough to meet the needs of young people in our society, especially the future society whose values and needed skills we cannot predict? In particular, world events of the early 21st century should ask us whether teaching youth to read complex texts closely or to offer evidence-based arguments will meet the needs of a fractured world filled with injustice and violence.

Lest we appear to be "Core-bashing," we want to underscore that we think the CCSS have made an important impact on education reform, particularly secondary education reform, by drawing attention to the role of language and literacy skill development in all curricular areas. We also respect the demand for developing sophisticated reading and writing practices among all youth, across all domains. What concerns us, however, is how the CCSS have been taken up; they were intended to be a set of goals for expanding and enhancing student learning, but have instead become the end in themselves for many educators. Teachers are exhorted to engage in close reading for the sake of close reading; they are being told to make sure that students can produce evidence-based arguments without a reason to argue and without attention to many other reasons and genres people write to and for audiences. Students are not learning to think, read, and communicate when the goal is to achieve the Core, particularly when students' social, cultural, and emotional needs, interests, and demands are left out of the equation. Without attention to the complex intersection of students' backgrounds and interests with the goals of reading, writing, and communicating complex texts with and across multiple audiences, the goals of the Core feel empty.

To counter this trend, we offer a "post-Core" view, one that recognizes the value of the skills laid out in the CCSS and moves those forward to help students learn literacies for life. To be clear, by "post-Core" we do not mean to suggest an "anti-Core" view, but one that expands the standards and equips teachers to help young people achieve not only the standards, but also literacy skills that will allow them to live satisfying lives and work together to rebuild a troubled world. Thus, in this review, we use research from cultural studies of youth and disciplinary literacy to show that adolescent literacy scholars and practitioners should not just engage in literacy instruction so that we can achieve a set of national standards, but instead that fluency with and the ability to navigate across domain-specific literacy and cultural practices is critical to educate young people for life.

By focusing on literacy "for life" we want to suggest that youth should learn literacy in a way that helps them not only in passing state tests or college entrance exams, but also in managing their personal lives; serving others in the community; making reasoned

familial, social, and political decisions; or taking action to end injustices in the world. We use research studies to show that thinking about literacy for life—rather than for national standards movements—can carry youth forward to be informed adult citizens.

The research we present makes clear that to do that kind of literacy learning for life, adolescent literacy development needs to be about more than learning words, or even the ways with language, of a discipline or domain. Because learning is always situated in and mediated by social and cultural practices, individual learners bring social and cultural practices to their learning in the disciplines. Moreover, the disciplines are themselves cultures, with their own ways with words. Rather than assuming that we should treat youths' ethnically mediated literacy practices as "cultural" but treat disciplinary literacy practices as somehow natural, true, or objective, we argue that all of the different language and literacy practices youth engage on a daily basis are embedded in particular cultures. Thus, any teaching of literacy requires the practice of teaching youth to navigate among and across the many different cultural groups (i.e., disciplines) they experience every day in school and among and across those groups and the groups in which they hold membership outside of the classroom and outside school.

In what follows, we offer brief reviews of research on how young people navigate the world in many different ways and how those navigations implicate a different kind of literacy learning—and teaching—than is demanded by most standards documents. We knit these research findings and theories together in a way that illustrates the power of navigating across social and cultural identities, discourses, cultures, and relationships, and that makes the lack of attention to the social and cultural dimensions of disciplinary literacy learning in various standards documents inexcusable. These areas include (1) navigating identities; (2) navigating home, youth, and school cultures; and (3) navigating networks and relationships of power and privilege. Although we divide these studies into the three categories named here for the purposes of highlighting particular dimensions (identity, culture, and power), identities, cultures, and power relations are always intertwined in the lived world, especially in regard to the ways they shape literacy practices. As a result, the sections may appear a bit imbalanced in treatment, with the third category being the briefest, largely because all of the studies speak to issues of power and privilege.

NAVIGATING IDENTITIES

The identities that youth bring to and enact in school are central to their reading and writing practices (Moje & Luke, 2009). Numerous studies have shown the impact that identities can have on youth reading and writing practices in and out of school. Here we offer two exemplars of this work focused on youth identities as readers and writers.

In a case study of three teachers and three students that the teachers had marked as "struggling," Hall (2010) found that students purposely disengaged from classroom instruction designed to teach aspects of reading because by participating they would take on the identity of "bad reader." Through separate interviews with teachers and students and observations of their interactions in whole-class observations, Hall documented teachers' definitions of what it meant to behave like a good reader; she also noted through observation of instruction that the teachers were more likely to engage with students who fit their definitions of "good reader." Conversely, students were aware that displaying some of the behavior of good readers, such as asking questions and participating in group

discussion, would position them as bad readers because through this kind of participation they would show that they needed help. As a result, they refrained from this kind of participation in class even though it could help them to develop their skill in reading. This study suggested that the ways teachers position students either inadvertently or purposefully as good or bad readers can have a direct effect on the students' participation in class and development in reading.

The title of a recent study, "Feeling Like I'm Slow Because I'm in This Class" (Learned, 2014), poignantly captured the ways that reading identities shape and are shaped by reading experiences. Youth of different achievement levels and different race and class backgrounds were positioned and positioned themselves as readers in the various contexts they traversed in a typical high school day, from literacy "remediation" classes to English language arts, to social studies, and to mathematics. Learned observed the youth as they interacted with teachers and other adolescents across those varied high school classrooms, interviewed focal students, and administered a range of reading assessments. She documented what, why, and how these youth read, with a focus on analyzing why and when they read the way they did; how they saw themselves as readers, learners, and human beings; and how their teachers saw them, which was often in ways that did not align with observed and measured skills. Learned's research showed clearly how identities as readers (or not) were constructed in the spaces of school, how those reading identities shaped future possibilities for youth, and how teachers might learn from and about students' identities in ways that could reposition and reshape young people's reading achievement. Of particular importance, students' race, social class, and gender intersected with determinations of reading ability on the basis of test scores and those qualities of difference shaped teachers' interactions with students. This study offers a powerful example of the intersection of identities and contexts or cultures. The contexts of learning—including the relationships, interactions, and power relations of those spaces—shaped how young people in this study were seen and saw themselves as readers and as learners.

NAVIGATING AMONG HOME, YOUTH, AND DISCIPLINARY CONTEXTS AND CULTURES

In this section, we draw attention to the ways that the different contexts and cultures young people move through on a daily basis shape how they engage with literacy. Within the category of context and culture we examine several important constructs, including discourses, funds of knowledge, and linguistic codes.

Understanding and Using Differences between Home and School Discourses

Researchers have documented differences between home and school discourses, that is, ways that people use language and other communication cues, in many communities over the past 40 years of work on the social and cultural contexts of learning. In work in reservation schools and homes, for example, Philips (1972) documented that cultural participation structures governed how students were viewed by teachers and the amount of student participation. Similarly, Heath's (1983) study of the language practices of two communities—one mainly White; the other mainly Black; both working class—in the

Caroline Piedmont demonstrated that rich traditions of oral and written language were not recognized or valued in the White, middle-class schools the children of those communities attended (Heath, 1982a, 1982b).

Heath's work is often taken up as an explanation for different ways with words shaped by race and socioeconomic status. Less often acknowledged is the important work Heath did with teachers and parents to build practices for helping children learn to navigate the language and literacy differences between their home and school lives. Heath engaged teachers, parents, and students in community-based science learning projects that expanded the discursive repertoires of all involved, suggesting the power of teacher–parent partnerships in working toward achieving the standards laid out in the current Core documents. Teachers in Heath's study learned to understand, respect, and incorporate a range of language practices in their instruction; parents learned the expectations for school language; and the children learned new practices.

Others have written about building hybrid or syncretic practices that not only employ but also bridge and critique different discourses. Gutiérrez and her colleagues have offered richly detailed accounts of teachers helping children and youth learn to merge official classroom scripts with their "counterscripts" drawn from their own lived experiences (Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003; Gutiérrez, Rymes, & Larson, 1995). These teachers actively listened for students' underground, whispered talk and employed it as a tool for helping students learn other ways with words, both from the disciplinary domains of school and from the lives of others in the classroom.

In relation to science learning, many scholars have studied the ways that young people's cultural and linguistic practices shape the sense they make of classroom science. The Chèche Konnen team at TERC (Technology Education Research Center; e.g., Warren, Ballenger, Ogonowski, Rosebery, & Hudicourt-Barnes, 2001) offered a range of inquiry-based curricular tools designed to help teachers help students navigate the differences in discourse from everyday home discourses to those of school science. Much of the Chèche Konnen work has been conducted at the elementary level, but the principles of practice are similar whether supporting children's or adolescents' navigations across discourse and language communities. Indeed, attention to the multiple discourse communities of adolescents seems critical if educators hope to help them achieve the specialized reading, writing, and communication skills outlined in the various standards. Adolescents have much to learn about transferring their language and literacy skills across many domains, and they have much to offer from their home, youth, and popular cultural experiences as springboards for instruction, if we listen closely.

In contrast to studies that leverage youths' everyday cultural discourses, Ives (2011) focused on the home and everyday discourses that are available in the classroom and not used (see also Moje et al., 2004). These "foolbirds" are discourses and literacies of students that they learn to hide from their teacher in order to follow the norms of classroom routine, classroom discourse patterns, and the expectations of the teacher. Ives documented that home discourses and literacies are present in the classroom, but students learned to camouflage and silence these discourses because they believed it was necessary to position themselves as good students. For example, in a lesson on metaphor, one student, Jamal, engaged in metaphorical wordplay with his friends in his group of desks. When the teacher asked him to define the difference between a simile and metaphor, Jamal could not provide the right answer. The teacher scolded him for not listening to her, but Jamal was listening and interacting with the material. He simply could not

provide the answer in the discourse that the teacher recognized as correct. His fluency with figurative speech could not be a starting point to learn about navigating between language play with friends and English language arts content because he chose to hide his language play, keeping his voice low with friends and not realizing that an example of this language play might serve to answer part of the question his teacher asked.

Instead of focusing on the cultural practices of a specific group, some researchers have attended simply to everyday ways of thinking and doing to teach students to navigate between everyday and disciplinary ways with words. In a study of two high school English language arts (ELA) classrooms, Levine (2014) showed how teachers supported students to use out-of-school interpretive practices as a bridge to interpreting literature in disciplinary ways (Lee, 1993, 2007). In Levine's affective heuristic students were asked to

1. Draw on their everyday affect-based interpretative practices to identify language in a literary text that they feel is particularly affect-laden.
2. Ascribe valence (a range of positive and/or negative values) to that language.
3. Explain or justify their ascriptions. (Levine, 2014, p. 284)

For example, a student reading the final line of Morrison's *The Bluest Eye* would read about a girl searching "among the garbage and the sunflowers of [a] town" and would first identify the word "sunflowers" as a word that evokes emotion. After identifying that this word evokes a positive emotion, in the third step of the heuristic, students would connect "sunflowers" to concepts of beauty and hope (Levine, 2014, p. 284). As students worked through canonical text, they were coached to use the everyday reasoning that they already possessed to craft their own literary interpretations. At the end of the unit, students who were exposed to this heuristic were more likely to make interpretive statements about literature than students engaged in more traditional methods of literary interpretation.

A study of middle school science students (Bricker & Bell, 2011) similarly shows how and why everyday argumentative reasoning can be used teach students to make scientific arguments. Recognizing that students routinely make judgments and arguments as they navigate their out-of-school world, Bricker and Bell designed a 3-year ethnography involving 128 middle school students. They found that when students described "argument" within the context of their daily lives, their definition was more nuanced than the conventional idea of an argument as a fight.

What's more, they found that students attended to evidence and were able to link evidence to claims using a variety of linguistic markers. Most important, Bricker and Bell (2011) discussed the necessity of distinguishing between argument as weighing evidence and argument as verbal dispute. They also provided guidelines to make classroom debates "identity safe," that is, to treat multiple points of view as worthy of intellectual pursuit. Their final recommendation was to teach the practices of the scientific disciplines so students can take on the argumentative practices of the larger community of scientists while still in school. Bricker and Bell acknowledged the power differentials in the formal language and literacy practices of the science disciplines. They argued that navigation between everyday argumentation and argumentation as it exists in the discipline of sciences should be taught to children "in hopes that the sciences become more democratic and representative" (Bricker & Bell, 2011, p. 130).

Across a number of studies, Moje and colleagues (2004) make a case for helping youth navigate across the multitude of cultural groups they experience in daily life and the disciplinary cultures in which they are expected participate in secondary school and beyond. This long-term study followed youth outside school to examine how they engaged with the world outside school. The young people they studied engaged in many different activities that demanded skills often necessary in scientific practice (e.g., searching for objects in the park to hypothesize where they came from and what purpose they originally served; writing letters to protest a policy made by the school system).

A second study led by Moje (Moje, Overby, Tysvaer, & Morris, 2008) showed that 86% of a sample of over 800 young people in one urban community reported writing outside school. However, this kind of writing not only did not help them in school but it also was correlated to negative achievement in their languages arts classes. The authors hypothesized that the nature of the writing—journal entries, song lyrics, and poetry—did not prepare them for the writing they were asked to do in their language arts courses. The gap between the two types of writing was not mediated by their teachers, perhaps because the teachers did not realize what their students were doing outside of school or perhaps because they felt the stress of needing to prepare students for the only kind of writing valued on the state tests. Whatever the reasons, the students' writing scores (and their writing on samples the authors assessed independently) remained low over the 5-year period of the study.

In a related study, Stockdill and Moje (2013) interviewed a subsample (n = 26) of the same large group of students. They found that the youth read and wrote many different texts with themes that could easily be tied to history and social science learning (e.g., war, immigration, poverty, violence, and struggle). In most cases, however, these youth left those texts at the classroom door and reported an extreme distaste for studying social studies in school (i.e., it was routinely reported as students' least favorite class).

Finally, Moje and Speyer (2014) reported on a design-based research study of a unit on the history of U.S. immigration law that they cotaught in the same community, illustrating the many spaces in which students could insert their cultural experiences, concerns, and questions given an imminent immigration protest planned in the predominantly Latin@/o community. To avoid overlooking student input, as had occurred in other such studies, the unit design made space for students to draw from cultural texts and experiences as they read the different immigration laws enacted in the United States over time. To support students in reading those primary sources and connecting the historical laws to current experiences, the teachers engaged in whole-class close reading activities in which teachers scaffolded students' reading by attending to particular words and phrases, explicitly asked students whether the texts reminded them of anything in their own lives, and led students to note the differences in text. Thus, the teachers not only recognized students' experiences but also used the knowledge and discourses youth brought to the classroom to build a deeper understanding of U.S. immigration law.

Building on this idea of instructional designs that seek and make use of students' cultural experiences, practices, and ways with words, Athanases and de Oliveria (2014) showed that the practice of being a culturally relevant teacher goes beyond mere knowledge of student's cultural background. Helping students become prepared "for life" necessitates a connection with the larger disciplinary culture. Students cannot be prepared for life in a classroom where their home cultures are not a consideration in lesson

planning. Nor can they be prepared for life in a classroom where a teacher incorporates their cultures into instruction that lacks a disciplinary frame. In their study of two novice (less than 3 years' experience) teachers' scaffolding in an urban Latin@/o community, the teacher who used scaffolding to support student text engagement without a disciplinary literacy frame struggled to understand the purpose of her scaffolds. Although committed to social justice and willing to design instruction that would support students, she acknowledged that her scaffolds resulted in students merely mimicking her own process of thinking through text. Worse yet, when she pulled away the scaffolds at what she thought was an age-appropriate point ("juniors don't need sentence starters"), she was frustrated with her students' lack of independent skill. The other teacher, however, who employed scaffolding techniques within a disciplinary frame, was able to use scaffolding to support students to do their own thinking by providing texts for an activity and encouraging students to make and support their own claims. Although the teacher thought that the students were not prepared to be independent without her scaffolding, her scaffolding in connection with disciplinary inquiry was more effective in engaging students beyond the basic literacy practices.

In short, a long tradition of practice-based research has demonstrated that home, youth, and disciplinary discourses are often different in kind, and also in the nature and amount of discourse between peers and older authority figures. That same research, however, has often demonstrated the ways that teachers can draw from and expand on the discourse practices in young people's home lives to expand their repertoires. Perhaps most important, teachers can recognize that discursive difference does not equal cognitive (or discursive) deficit. Teachers can also recognize that their discourse practices are socially and culturally mediated, including those most valued in schools. We need to consider the cultural or social mediators of students' speaking, reading, writing, and listening and then seek out and enact strategies to support them in learning the language and literacy practices exhorted by the Core—without devaluing their home, community, and youth cultural practices.

Incorporating Funds of Knowledge

Closely related to the work on home and school discourse differences is another form of navigating among home, youth, and school cultures. This work involves incorporating the various funds of knowledge (Moll & Gonzalez, 1994; Moll & Greenberg, 1990) available to students in their everyday lives into classroom instruction. Here is it critical that we distinguish between knowledge itself and the funds of knowledge youth have available in their everyday lives. In a funds of knowledge framework, the funds themselves are as important as—if not more important than—the knowledge itself. People learn new knowledge in social networks, communities, and relationships. Time and time again, youth literacy researchers have documented the power of the network, community, or relationship to engage youth in literacy practices (Moll, Veléz-Ibañéz, & Greenberg, 1989). As Moje et al. (2008) documented, an analysis of thousands of youth describing their reasons for reading and writing showed that reading and writing practices played important roles within their social networks and funds of knowledge; their motivation to engage with certain texts stemmed largely from the contexts—or funds—in which the texts were embedded. Thus, becoming aware of and, when appropriate, employing, youths' funds can both motivate and scaffold their reading and writing. There are many

different kinds of funds, three of which we highlight here because of recent research on these funds: transnational communities, out-of-school reading groups, and religious groups.

Transnational Communities as Funds

In a study of a classroom multimodal writing project, Honeyford (2014) documented that as English learners in the class created presentations to prepare for the literacy demands of joining a mainstream class, they also were able to write their own narratives, many of which provided counternarratives to the larger immigrant experience. In particular, the visuals in the multimodal project helped students to position and reposition themselves in their communities, affording students the agency to define their own identity in school spaces. Lam (2009; Lam & Rosario-Ramos, 2009) found that students who were learning English as an additional language also used social media as a way to communicate with other youth. These youth used instant messaging, chatrooms, e-mail, and other social media in both their newly acquired language and their first languages, using the sites to work on their language and also to connect with others who accepted and supported them (see also Black, 2006; McLean, 2010). In many of these studies, both the transnational and digital communities were important funds for youth not only to feel connected but also to learn new language while maintaining their first languages.

Out-of-School Reading and Writing Groups as Funds

One important fund of knowledge for teachers wishing to enhance students' reading and writing engagement and skill is out-of-school reading and writing groups. Many teachers appear to assume that young people do not read or write outside of schools, but a number of studies contest this assumption. For example, Alvermann, Young, Green, and Wisenbaker (1999) offer an analysis of what drew young people to—and kept them in—an out-of-school book discussion group. Simply put, they appreciated not only the opportunity to choose texts they wanted to read but also the freedom to explore the books as they chose. Worth noting was that they did not go their own ways or deviate radically from the texts in their discussions. They managed to read closely without an adult telling them how, when, why, and what to read. Equally important, they drew from and connected to their own experiences. As other scholars have suggested, it is impossible to read a text closely without connecting the ideas of a text to one's own experiences and to other texts (Hartman, 1995).

In a study with Latin@ youth in a large urban area, Moje, Peek-Brown, Sutherland, Marx, Blumenfeld, et al. (2004) drew attention to the young men's participation in Lowrider car and bike clubs.[2] The Lowrider clubs were particularly significant funds of knowledge because they were spaces in which older men—fathers, brothers, uncles, and others—engaged with the younger men around a shared interest. Club activities included reading *Lowrider* magazine (and, to a lesser extent at the time of the study, the Lowrider website) and trading information gleaned from the site as a resource for working on the cars. This fund was particularly powerful for the young men in the study because it

[2]Latin@s in the study also talked about Lowriders and reported sometimes reading the magazine, but this particular group—or fund—was male-dominated in this setting.

brought together gendered relationships, ethnic cultural symbols and practices, and the reading of complex texts about automotive concepts and information. These and other community-based funds, and the knowledge and skills they produce, could be called upon in both social and natural science teaching as a way of connecting and extending students' disciplinary learning. They could also be used to raise questions about the values and assumptions embedded in social and natural scientific thinking (Moje, Collazo, Carrillo, & Marx, 2001).

An analysis of literature discussion groups in an LGBTQQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, questioning) youth center demonstrated the complicated nature of such groups as funds of knowledge, illustrating both the possibilities and limitations of out-of-school reading groups (Blackburn & Clark, 2011). In this study, the students in the reading group worked through many canonical (and noncanonical) works in a queer-friendly environment. Analysis of the discourse showed that group members supported and challenged each other as they explored complex issues but their discourse also constrained some aspects of the conversation. For example, students were more likely to question heteronormativity in the text but at other times, they reinforced dichotomies, for example, between masculine and feminine gay men. Although overall this study shows the possibility of drawing on these funds to promote text-based discussion, teachers need also to be cautious because discussion of text in a supportive environment for LGBTQQ youth is not enough. Attention to discourse is essential if teachers wish to build both safe and brave spaces for all students to discuss sexual identities in school settings.

Studies of youth writing outside of school also show clearly that many young people learn from and teach others about written language through out-of-school funds for writing and using digital social media. Ingalls (2005) examined college-age youths' engagements in spoken word poetry, comparing their experiences with the writing experiences they had in introductory college writing courses. Ingalls found that although both contexts had strict norms for writing, the college writing courses contained (Bowden, 1993) students' writing in ways that also constrained the students, whereas the spoken word contexts, or containers, seemed to generate new ideas and new ways of writing and performing. Some of the differences were a matter of youth having choice in the spoken word funds, but Ingalls also documented the power of the social interaction, which produced a reason to communicate, in the spoken word spaces.

A study of young people writing fanfiction on line (Shultz, 2009) yielded similar findings, documenting that college writers engaged in fanfiction, despite tightly established norms and rules for both content and language use, because the fanfic writing funds offered student writers a community who would weigh in on both the language and the content of the stories they wrote. Notably, even when "beta readers" (i.e., online readers akin to editors or even teachers who comment on and edit drafts) critiqued the fanfic products, writers maintained their enthusiasm, suggesting that young people will write and revise when they have something to say and an audience who cares to read it.

For teachers, this work can serve as a reminder that youth who might appear to be struggling with school writing may be embedded in and connected to funds of knowledge—such as spoken word poetry groups, fanfiction sites, or other social media—outside of school that could be productively engaged to support students' learning. In addition, teachers need to be reminded to ask themselves what skills youth might possess within out-of-school contexts but not know how to transfer to school learning. Finally, given findings that out-of-school writing can actually detract from in-school writing

achievement, teachers should consider what they can do to explicitly teach the different epistemologies and assumptions of various types of school-based writing.

Religious Communities as Funds

Of increasing interest over the last few decades are youth religious literacies and the funds of knowledge that shape them. This interest was perhaps first spurred by Heath's (1983) finding that the interpretive and critical reading practices of children in the White, working-class community of her study were shaped by the ways of reading in their church communities. Or perhaps a recognition that religious communities produce cultural values and norms, and thus shape youth literacy practices, prompted this turn to religious funds. Whatever the reason, a number of youth researchers have investigated what religious funds mean for young people's literacies in and out of school. At least three recent studies offer important considerations for classroom teachers.

Sarroub's (2002) study of young women who not only practiced the tenets of Islam, but also followed the dress codes by wearing the *hijab,* showed ways in which these young women often found themselves "in between" multiple cultures. This was especially demonstrated as they tried to navigate what Islam deems appropriate for women's interactions with men and what their teachers wanted them to do in classroom discussions and activities.

Likewise, a study of two groups of religious youth—one Methodist and the other Mormon—documented both similarities and differences in their text reading practices (Rackley, 2014). Navigating the demands of interpretive work, in particular, was challenging for the students who followed Mormon traditions, not because the work was cognitively challenging, but because interpretation—especially critical interpretation—was not promoted in church-based reading activities. Like Heath's students whose families practiced fundamentalist religions, critique and interpretation were discouraged in church reading.

Finally, a study of Catholic and Protestant youth in a public school classroom (Skerrett, 2014) showed that students were able to recruit their religious funds of knowledge, discourse, and literacies to understand secular literature. Equally important, however, the teacher's attention to multiliteracies and discussion of multiple ways to make meaning of text allowed students to use religious knowledge to interpret literature and engage in academic writing. For example, one student learned to write memoir by explaining the religious significance and impact of her grandmother's life. Other students were able to use religious frames to recognize and interpret symbols in classroom text, such as an image of a poor man stretching out his arms as reminiscent of Jesus on the cross. The teacher, who did not share the students' faith, supported students to by emphasizing their shared human empathy, voicing a simple, "It's OK," when she saw disagreement among student ideas and her own. Following the teacher's example, students learned to ask questions about different perspectives, and look for commonalities across experience as a way to maintain their classroom community. This study shows that attention to the funds, knowledges, and discourses the students possessed, and to multiple ways of interpreting and generating text, allowed the teacher to recruit religious literacies without privileging any one religious culture. Equally important, her use of multiple texts and her drawing out of multiple perspectives also prepared students to go beyond these literacies and acquire other ways of engaging with various academic texts.

Code Switching and Code Breaking

Complementary to findings about the differences among home, school, and youth cultures and discourses is a robust set of studies that make a case for thinking of the movements across spaces as a matter of knowing where, when, and how to use the linguistic and other "codes" valued in one culture or another. Much of the work that focuses on code switching and code breaking revolves around teachers (and others, including youth themselves) using everyday linguistic codes to teach academic linguistic codes. The work is distinct from simply recognizing that discourses and literacies might differ or that students have important funds that can be brought to the classroom. This code-switching work makes the power of the codes central. Lisa Delpit (1988) wrote, for example, about a teaching colleague who helped her students understand how to code-switch by using the metaphor of a picnic versus a formal dinner party. Her goal was to convey the idea that both settings are important and valuable, but that the location, the food one serves, the plates one uses, and even one's behavior are likely to shift from one setting to another. She likened those differences in dining practices to the different ways her students might need to talk, read, or write in different contexts.

Cross and Strauss (2003) offer an analysis of the kind of code switching older adolescents engage in at elite postsecondary institutions as they move across contexts of their everyday lives. Recognizing the threat of stereotype (Steele & Aronson, 1995) in certain contexts, these high-achieving young people knew to change their language practices much as the teacher Delpit described taught young children. Code switching, thus, can be a form of teaching youth to navigate different contexts. However, the teaching of multiple codes is always a risky business, requiring careful attention to validating the different codes for their usefulness so that one is not seen as inherently more powerful than another, but instead is understood to be powerful in context and because of the unequal power relations in social interaction (Alim, 2007). In other words, students can learn that certain codes are useful not only because they are efficient (as in technical language of the disciplines) or evocative (as in the language and discourse practices of the arts), but also because someone in power has determined one code to be more appropriate than another. Students can also be taught to challenge the codes of power (Delpit, 1988). In support of such work in disciplinary literacy teaching, Moje (2015) recommends a heuristic in which examining and evaluating words, and ways with words, for their usefulness and power in different contexts are critical components of instruction that helps youth learn to navigate multiple disciplinary and life domains.

Leveraging Resources of the African American Verbal Tradition in Writing

The African American Verbal Tradition (AVT) is a rich source of language that teachers can leverage in order to teach academic writing (Lee, 1993, 2007). In fact, students who use African American discourse styles score higher on national assessments of writing (Smitherman, 1993). Since the Students' Right to Their Own Language resolution (endorsed by the Conference on College Composition and Communication, 1974), both researchers and practitioners have worked to develop curriculum that allows students to use their home language in academic environments. Although this work has yet to focus on the middle and high schools, there is a lot to be learned from first-year college-writing instruction that is applicable within the K–12 context. One of these studies (Williams,

2013) introduced African American English rhetorical patterns, narrativizing and signifying, to two cohorts of first-year college-writing students with varying levels of familiarity with African American English rhetoric. Through lectures, activities, and writing workshops, students improved their own academic writing by integrating these rhetorical features.

Perryman-Clark's (2013) study of three students in an Afrocentric first-year writing course also shows that African American English speakers demonstrated sophisticated knowledge of audience and purpose and critical awareness of language when allowed to code-switch in their writing. However, she also questions why African American rhetoric is seen as strength while African American phonology and syntax are seen as error. Taken together, these two studies of first-year writing courses not only document the power of allowing code switching in writing but also highlight the need for teachers to foster a critical viewpoint when teaching and leveraging code-switching practices so students can value and assert their home language in a variety of academic contexts.

Leveraging Resources of Bilingual and Bidialectal Students

In line with Gutiérrez's (2008) work in sociocritical literacy, Alim (2007) designed a unit of study in which students take on the work of linguists and ethnographers in the "third space" of the classroom, an environment that for many marginalized linguistic groups can be a battleground between their home language and the hegemony of Standard English. In the first two stages of the project, students increase their metalinguistic knowledge by investigating their own language use and the language of their peers, families, and communities. At the third stage of the project students discuss the relationship between language and power. In this stage students use examples from interviews with community members to illustrate how language can be used to marginalize and disempower those that do not speak the standard dialect. Alim's work illustrates that code-switching pedagogies do not support students unless they teach students to navigate and transform the contexts that marginalize their home language.

NAVIGATING NETWORKS AND RELATIONSHIPS OF POWER

In this section, we explore the dilemma between teaching students to navigate so that they can participate in dominant power structures/relations (Delpit, 1988; Hirsch, Kett, & Trefil, 1987) and teaching students to navigate in a way that teaches skills for speaking back to or resisting the dominant (Freire, 1970; Freire & Macedo, 1987). Assisting students with understanding and living within this tension empowers students to live as informed citizens beyond their years of schooling and encourages them to participate in the further labor needed for equity and justice in our current global context, where the lack of equity and justice is maddening.

This is work that can have social and political impact on a grand scale. However, it begins with the difficult work of teaching navigation in individual classrooms. Delpit (1988) makes a strong theoretical case for giving students access to the culture of power that is in operation in every classroom. In classrooms, the rules of written and oral discourse, personal interaction, and dress are reflective of the rules of those who have power outside of the classroom. However, these rules are often invisible. Students should,

therefore, be explicitly taught the rules of the culture of power, not to abandon their own cultures, but so they might be empowered through having access to their home and youth cultures together with the cultures of power. The goal is to enable full student participation in multiple cultures, multiple worlds, and multiple domains of life.

Full participation in cultures of power is more than a matter of learning unwritten rules and discourse patterns, however. Hirsch et al. (1987) argued that a body of general cultural knowledge is also necessary. The point is not the piling up of facts in the heads of individual students. Instead, Hirsch et al. asserted that all communities are founded on shared knowledge. Consequently, "Only by piling up specific, communally shared information can children learn to participate in complex cooperative activities with other members of their community" (p. xv). From their perspective, such information is the necessary background information, and is alluded to and referenced in the discourse of the culture of power. Having the knowledge is one of the keys to gaining access to dominant discourse and culture. However, gaining the knowledge of the culture of power has its risks. First, who decides what gets counted in a list of powerful cultural texts? How might teachers help students access power without giving up their existing cultural and language practices? How do we add to students' discourses, knowledge, and literacies without subtracting from the practices students already possess and value (Valenzuela, 1999)?

Teaching students the unwritten rules, discourse patterns, and knowledge of the culture of power is going to have little impact if students see no reason and have no interest in navigating power and relationships. Learning to navigate networks and relationships of power must be an act of hope and vision for students. Gutiérrez (2008) shows how powerful this can be in her work with the Migrant Summer Leadership Institute, a summer educational program for the children of migrant workers. These students were taught to place themselves socially and historically as individuals and as members of a group. This work gave students a sense of inequality in the past and the present as power structures were illuminated. Students then found methods of empowerment for the future. In the vignettes Gutiérrez offers, empowerment came from the understanding that higher education was a realistic possibility and a way to gain individual power and affect social change. In only 4 weeks, students increased access to the culture of power and dominant discourse, while also developing hope and vision for social change.

Finally, Hull and Stornaiuolo's (2014) account of a 3-year design research study with high school-age youth from the United States, India, South Africa, and Norway illustrates the way that power flows through seemingly simple academic tasks such as learning to write argument (a significant demand across the standards documents). The young people in this study used multimodal tools embedded in diverse social networks to engage audiences in understanding others across social networks and power differentials. Of particular importance, the youth composed multimodal products so that they could engage and collaborate, rather than persuade and dominate. Such moves changed the typical workings of power in traditional views of writing and rhetoric, in which the goal is to argue, or to persuade a reader to change perspective. Interestingly, students did change their perspectives, but they did so as they sought to understand, rather than to persuade, which seems at odds with the current standards focus on evidence-based argument.

Equally at odds with the standards is the underscoring of communication in this cosmopolitan (Hull & Stornaiuolo, 2014) view of composition. Although evidence-based argument is a form of communication, it is often framed in terms of parts of a rubric, such

as "claim, evidence, and reasoning" (Moje, Ciechanowski, et al., 2004). When students struggle to address one of these rubric parts, it is often because they fail to recognize that they are writing for a disciplinary or other community, and they fail to understand the power of the other and of the argument they hope to make. By contrast, composing in a cosmopolitan world is all about communication across networks and relationships of power. It is also all about trying to understand.

IMPLICATIONS FOR ADOLESCENT LITERACY TEACHING IN A POST-CORE WORLD

The first implication for literacy teaching in a post-Core world is the need for teachers, school leaders, and policymakers to recognize that even seemingly struggling students can possess a repertoire of literacy practices, are familiar with multiple discourses, and have access to background knowledge that is as deep and rich as the multiple worlds and social networks they inhabit. If the various standards are to be a framework for planning meaningful instruction, then students must learn to navigate and transform their own worlds rather than learning skills in isolation. And for students to learn to navigate and transform their own worlds, the standards need to be applied to the real, lived experiences of students rather than asking students to leave their knowledge and identities behind to learn disconnected academic literacy skills.

Second, it is important to acknowledge that whether a student recruits this knowledge to apply within the classroom depends heavily on teachers and learning contexts. As our review illustrates, students make choices not to use or to disguise literacy practices and change their behavior to adapt to what the teacher deems valuable; therefore, teachers need to actively invoke and leverage home, youth, or community literacy skills and practices and help students see how these skills and practices can be employed both to learn and to critique new skills and practices. Such teachers need to include multiple literacy practices and be aware that students can take on multiple identities. The work cited in our review lays out examples of what it looks like to teach students to navigate these multiple discourse communities inside classrooms (see especially Alim, 2007; Alvermann et al., 1999; Gutiérrez, 2008; Levine, 2014; Moje & Speyer, 2014). The work is respectful of students' experiences, even as it is intentional about expanding those experiences.

Finally, if the CCSS, or any other standards, are to be relevant to and made use of in the real, lived experiences of youth, then it is necessary to discuss the relationship between literacy and power that exists in and across cultural groups. Teachers can help students build the skills to navigate across and into more powerful discourse communities by teaching the codes of power and giving students the tools to critique and even change these powerful codes and cultures. Without a conversation about discourse and power that attends to students' cultural backgrounds, however, the standards are not just disconnected from students' lives but also are in danger of reproducing inequalities. Although many see the establishment of standards as a way to equalize the playing field for all, achieving standards that do not attend to the power differentials in society and in students' lives will not ensure that students are equipped to grapple with and redress those imbalances. When teachers help students to navigate among multiple discourse communities and cultures, they can then begin a discussion of the power relationships that students encounter in this navigation. In so doing, they will teach students to identify

and work against inequality in their own lives and in the world. We can teach them literacy for life.

REFERENCES

Alim, S. (2007). Critical hip-hop language pedagogies: Combat, consciousness, and the cultural politics of communication. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 6*(2), 161–176.

Alvermann, D. E., Young, J. P., Green, C., & Wisenbaker, J. M. (1999). Adolescents' perceptions and negotiations of literacy practices in after-school read and talk clubs. *American Educational Research Journal, 36*(2), 221–264.

Athanases, S. Z., & de Oliveria, L. C. (2014). Scaffolding versus routine support for Latina/o youth in an urban school: Tensions building toward disciplinary literacy. *Journal of Literacy Research, 46*(2), 263–299.

Black, R. W. (2006). Language, culture, and identity in online fanfiction. *E-Learning, 3*(2), 170–184.

Blackburn, M., & Clark, C. (2011). Analyzing talk in a long-term literature discussion group: Ways of operating within LGBT-inclusive and queer discourses. *Reading Research Quarterly, 46*(3), 222–248.

Bowden, D. (1993). The limits of containment: Text-as-container in composition studies. *College Composition and Communication, 44*(3), 364–379.

Bricker, L. A., & Bell, P. (2011). Argumentation and reasoning in life and in school: Implications for the design of school science learning environments. In M. S. Khine (Ed.), *Perspectives on scientific argumentation: Theory, practice, and research* (pp. 117–134). New York: Springer.

Conference on College Composition and Communication. (1974). *Students right to their own language*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Cross, W., & Strauss, L. (2003, June). *Transacting Black identity in everyday life*. Presented at the William T. Grant Faculty Scholars Retreat, Charlottesville, VA.

Delpit, L. D. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Pedagogy and power in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review, 58,* 280–298.

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

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

Gutiérrez, K. D. (2008). Developing a sociocritical literacy in third space. *Reading Research Quarterly, 43,* 148–164.

Gutiérrez, K. D., & Rogoff, B. (2003). Cultural ways of learning: Individual traits or repertoires of practice. *Educational Researcher, 32*(5), 19–25.

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

Hall, L. A. (2010). The negative consequences of becoming a good reader: Identity theory as a lens for understanding struggling readers, teachers, and reading instruction. *Teachers College Record, 112*(7), 1792–1829.

Hartman, D. K. (1995). Eight readers reading: The intertextual links of proficient readers reading multiple passages. *Reading Research Quarterly, 30,* 520–561.

Heath, S. B. (1982a). Questioning at home and at school: A comparative study. In G. Spindler (Ed.), *Doing the ethnography of schooling*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Heath, S. B. (1982b). What no bedtime story means: Narrative skills at home and school. *Language in Society, 11*(1), 49–76.

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hirsch, E. D., Kett, J. F., & Trefil, J. S. (1987). *Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Honeyford, M. A. (2014). From Aquí and Allá: Symbolic convergence in the multimodal literacy practices of adolescent immigrant students. *Journal of Literacy Research, 46*(2), 194–233.

Hull, G. A., & Stornaiuolo, A. (2014). Cosmopolitan literacies, social networks, and "proper distance": Striving to understand in a global world. *Curriculum Inquiry, 44,* 15–44.

Ingalls, R. L. (2005). *Taking a page from their books: Negotiating containment and resuscitating rhetoric in writing across academic and spoken-word genres*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Ives, D. (2011). Spotting foolbirds: Literacies hiding in plain sight in an urban English language arts classroom. *Journal of Literacy Research, 43*(3), 250–274.

Lam, W. S. E. (2009). Multiliteracies on instant messaging in negotiating local, translocal, and transnational affiliations: A case of an adolescent immigrant. *Reading Research Quarterly, 44*(4), 377–397.

Lam, W. S. E., & Rosario-Ramos, E. (2009). Multilingual literacies in transnational digitally mediated contexts: An exploratory study of immigrant teens in the United States. *Language and Education, 23*(2), 171–190.

Learned, J. E. (2014). *"Feeling like I'm slow because I'm in this class": Secondary school contexts and the identification and construction of struggling readers*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI. Retrieved from *http://hdl.handle.net/2027.42/108819 http://mirlyn.lib.umich.edu/record/013578462*.

Lee, C. D. (1993). *Signifying as a scaffold for literary interpretation: The pedagogical implications of an African American discourse genre* (NCTE Research Report No. 26). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Lee, C. D. (2007). *Culture, literacy, and learning: Taking bloom in the midst of the whirlwind*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Levine, S. (2014). Making interpretation visible with an affect-based strategy. *Reading Research Quarterly, 49*(3), 283–303.

McLean, C. A. (2010). A space called home: An immigrant adolescent's digital literacy practices. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 54*(1), 13–22.

Moje, E., & Luke, A. (2009). Literacy and identity: Examining the metaphors in history and contemporary research. *Reading Research Quarterly, 44,* 415–437.

Moje, E. B. (2015). Doing and teaching disciplinary literacy with adolescent learners: A social and cultural enterprise. *Harvard Educational Review, 85,* 254–278.

Moje, E. B., Ciechanowski, K. M., Kramer, K. E., Ellis, L. M., Carrillo, R., & Collazo, T. (2004). Working toward third space in content area literacy: An examination of everyday funds of knowledge and discourse. *Reading Research Quarterly, 39*(1), 38–71.

Moje, E. B., Collazo, T., Carrillo, R., & Marx, R. W. (2001). "Maestro, what is 'quality'?": Language, literacy, and discourse in project-based science. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38*(4), 469–496.

Moje, E. B., Overby, M., Tysvaer, N., & Morris, K. (2008). The complex world of adolescent literacy: Myths, motivations, and mysteries. *Harvard Educational Review, 78,* 107–154.

Moje, E. B., Peek-Brown, D., Sutherland, L. M., Marx, R. W., Blumenfeld, P., & Krajcik, J. (2004). Explaining explanations: Developing scientific literacy in middle-school project-based science reforms. In D. Strickland & D. E. Alvermann (Eds.), *Bridging the gap: Improving literacy learning for preadolescent and adolescent learners in grades 4–12* (pp. 227–251). New York: Carnegie Corporation.

Moje, E. B., & Speyer, J. (2014). Reading challenging texts in high school: How teachers can scaffold and build close reading for real purposes in the subject areas. In K. Hinchman & H. Sheridan-Thomas (Eds.), *Best practices in adolescent literacy instruction* (2nd ed., pp. 207–231). New York: Guilford Press.

Moll, L. C., & Gonzalez, N. (1994). Critical issues: Lessons from research with language-minority children. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 26*(4), 439–456.

Moll, L. C., & Greenberg, J. (1990). Creating zones of possibilities: Combining social contexts for instruction. In L. C. Moll (Ed.), *Vygotsky and education* (pp. 319–348). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Moll, L. C., Veléz-Ibañéz, C., & Greenberg, J. (1989). *Year one progress report: Community knowledge and classroom practice: Combining resources for literacy instruction* (IARP Subcontract No. L-10). Tucson: University of Arizona.

National Council for the Social Studies. (2013). *The college, career, and civic life (C3) framework for social studies state standards: Guidance for enhancing the rigor of K–12 civics, economics, geography, and history*. Silver Springs, MD: Author.

National Governors' Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers (NGO & CCSSO). (2010). *Common Core State Standards for English language arts and literacy, history/social studies, science, and technical subjects*. Washington, DC: Authors.

Next Generation Science Standards Lead States. (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. Retrieved from *www.nextgenscience.org/next-generation-science-standards*.

Perryman-Clark, S. M. (2013). *Afrocentric teacher-research: Rethinking appropriateness and inclusion*. New York: Peter Lang.

Philips, S. U. (1972). Participant structure and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classroom. In C. Cazden, D. Hymes, & W. J. John (Eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom* (pp. 370–394). New York: Teachers College Press.

Rackley, E. R. (2014). Scripture-based discourses of Latter-Day Saint and Methodist youths. *Reading Research Quarterly, 49*(4), 417–435.

Sarroub, L. (2002). In-betweeness: Religion and conflicting visions of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly, 37*(2), 130–148.

Shultz, S. (2009, March). *Legitimizing and marginalizing: How the Internet has shaped responses to online fan communities and practices*. Paper presented at the Conference on College Composition and Communication, San Francisco, CA.

Skerrett, A. (2014). Religious literacies in a secular literacy classroom. *Reading Research Quarterly, 49*, 233–250.

Smitherman, G. (1993). *"The blacker the berry, the sweeter the juice": African American student writers and the national assessment of educational progress* (ERIC No. 366944). Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse for English Language Arts.

Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personal Social Psychology, 69*(5), 797–811.

Stockdill, D., & Moje, E. B. (2013). Adolescents as readers of social studies: Examining the relationship between students' everyday and social studies literacies and learning. *Berkeley Review of Education, 4*, 35–68.

Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S.–Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Warren, B., Ballenger, C., Ogonowski, M., Rosebery, A., & Hudicourt-Barnes, J. (2001). Rethinking diversity in learning science: The logic of everyday languages. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38*, 1–24.

Williams, B. J. (2013). *Students "write" to their own language: Teaching the African American verbal tradition as a rhetorically effective writing skill*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.