

- Starfield, S. (2002). "I'm a second-language English speaker": Negotiating writer identity and authority in sociology one. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 1, 121–140.
- Thompson, B. (2003). Beth Thompson responds. In J. Sharkey & K. E. Johnson (Eds.), *The TESOL quarterly dialogues: Rethinking issues of language, culture, and power* (pp. 64–69). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Thornbury, S. (2001). The unbearable lightness of EFL [Electronic version]. *ELT Journal*, 55, 391–396.
- Thorne, S. (2000). Second language acquisition theory and the truth(s) about relativity. In J.P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 219–244). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Toohey, K. (2000). *Learning English at school*. Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Weinstein, G. (2001). Developing adult literacies. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed., pp. 171–186). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Zou, Y. (1998). Rethinking empowerment. *TESOL Journal*, 7(4), 4–9.

Second/Foreign Language Program Preservation and Advancement: Literatures and Lessons for Teachers and Teacher Education

Graham Crookes
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

Steven Talmy
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

In a period of declining state support for education, we argue S/FL teachers and teacher educators would do well to become oriented to language program preservation and advancement. We discuss three areas such an orientation could take, namely organizing, direct action, and fund-raising, so that teachers and students can become more involved in decisions affecting their programs. Following a brief review of literatures in these three areas, we describe the efforts of some K-12 ESL educators in Hawai'i, who suddenly found themselves thrust into the position of defending their program from the budgetary axe. We use the experiences of these educators as a point of departure for a discussion of how a program preservation and advancement orientation could be implemented.

In the U.S., this is an era of decreasing state support for education in general (Engel, 2000, *inter alia*). While certain aspects of second/foreign language (S/FL)¹ education receive encouragement from the federal government,² regular S/FL programs in elementary and high schools are strongly supported by a minority of state governments (cf. Rosenbusch, 2002). Bilingual education programs have been greatly reduced, and funding for ESL is growing ever more scanty (Crawford, 2002); many S/FL teachers (particularly ESL teachers) work under inadequate conditions (Crookes, 1997). Perhaps relatedly, a growing set of associated literatures that address the sociopolitical dimensions of S/FL instruction is becoming available as an alternative to the technicist curricula of many S/FL teacher education programs. Examples include macro-level analyses concerning language policy and planning (e.g., Huebner & Davis, 1999; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004; Wiley & Wright, 2004), in addition to an increasingly diverse

range of studies examining the more micro-political character of our work, from inquiries into the fundamental interconnectedness between legislative, political, and institutional processes and classroom policy and practices (e.g., Auerbach, 1995; Hall & Eggington, 2000; Pennycook, 1989; Ricento & Hornberger, 1996; Rosenbusch, 2002) to the developing literature on critical applied linguistics and critical and radical pedagogies in S/FL education (e.g., Benesch, 2001; Crookes & Lehner, 1998; Morgan, 1998; Pennycook, 2001; Reagan & Osborn, 2002).³

One area that remains underrepresented in sociopolitically-oriented S/FL literatures involves the ways that S/FL teachers might advocate for and thus preserve their programs (and jobs). In this paper, we argue that S/FL teachers and teacher educators need to become oriented to this issue, which we call "program preservation and advancement." We first provide an overview of a scattered collection of literatures that could be drawn upon for this task.⁴ We then excerpt data from an ongoing study that illustrates problems that can arise when S/FL teachers are not oriented to advocating for their programs. We conclude by summarizing key points under a tripartite rubric of organizing, fundraising, and action, which derive both from the literature and our experience and which S/FL teacher education curricula might do well to emphasize.

The literatures of program advancement

A range of varied literatures exist which S/FL educators could draw upon for reports and advice concerning how to preserve their programs, although these often appear under labels that are not transparent. These literatures are usually separated both by level of institution (post-secondary vs. K-12 education) and by the major thrust or conception of the activities involved.

The term "institutional advancement" has been defined by Rowland (1986, p. xiii) as "all activities and programs undertaken by an institution to develop understanding and support from all its constituencies in order to achieve its goals."⁵ Though the term may apply to the full range of literatures we are about to refer to, because we apply it to S/FL *departments* or *programs*, that is, to components of institutions, we will replace the word "institution" with "program," to give us "program advancement." "Advocacy" is another commonly appearing term, though when used in S/FL literature, it tends to refer to activist research (e.g., Cameron et al., 1993) rather than the promotion of S/FL programs. In their important review, Forhan & Scheraga (2000) use it as a synonym for "becoming sociopolitically active" (p. 195). As senior past members of the TESOL Sociopolitical Concerns Committee, their major emphasis is on advocacy conducted by a professional organization on behalf of its members.⁶ This is also the case for the handful of references to program advocacy in the older TESOL literature, which are mainly associated with the activist past-president of TESOL, Mary Ashworth (1991a, 1991b; Murray, 1992).

Post-secondary S/FL program advancement

Post-secondary FL education tends to see its program advancement efforts mainly in terms of getting a share of the resources that a university or college itself raises or is allocated (cf. Jenks, 1997). Its leaders are accustomed to a measure of internal bargaining or politicking, but do not necessarily expect to negotiate with or appeal to stakeholders outside their institution. According to reports in this area, resources can be gained by a S/FL program's "visibility" (Roche, 1999), which is enhanced by "assuming a leadership role on campus" (p. 10). This means, according to Roche, becoming all-round good at the job (also see Jenks, 1997). Reports also refer to engaging in public relations efforts, and creating alliances, notably with powerful programs (e.g., business or engineering—Melton, 1994; Voght, 2000). Some recent discussions of the matter within FL circles (further) reflect the importation of business concepts into the academy (Lindenberger, 1998; Sullivan, 1998). For example, the "outreach program" of FL programs at Boise State University includes a translation and interpreting service, on-site teaching for companies, and consulting service (Loughrin-Sacco, 1996).

A separate set of concerns shows up, sketchily, in occasional S/FL post-secondary reports regarding teachers' employment status. For example, recent discussions in the post-secondary FL area have referred to the movement of part-timers to full-time positions with contracts and union protection (Sullivan, 1998; Warhol, 1997). The TESOL literature, however, has only older entries in this area ("Better deal for teachers," 1989; DeLuca, 1982; Shulman, 1982).

It is noteworthy that reports on program advancement rarely appear in the more prestigious, research-oriented journals of our field. The US post-secondary FL program advancement literature appears mainly in *ADFL Bulletin*⁷ and *Profession* (with more fragmentary reports in *MLA Newsletter*), as opposed to *Modern Language Journal* or *Foreign Language Annals*. The ESL publications are of the order of *TESOL Newsletter*, *TESOL Matters*, and the *EFL Gazette*, rather than *TESOL Quarterly*. This is illustrative of the scant attention (and, perhaps, lack of concern) that program preservation and advancement has received to now, both by educators and researchers, and by the editorial boards of refereed journals.

Program advancement in K-12 education

Most of the literature concerning "institutional advancement" is related to post-secondary education. Perhaps because the separation into autonomous departments is less complete outside higher education, we hear comparatively little concerning how FL specialists advance K-12 programs.⁸ However, the areas which do feature prominently are those of ESL and bilingual education. In the U.S., and elsewhere, ESL programs are often marginal, physically and in terms of curriculum and staffing. And as is well-known, bilingual programs in the U.S. have a similarly non-mainstream status, having frequently been implemented

through legal action,⁹ and over the past few years, increasingly eliminated through political action.

A particularly useful example of this literature is McGroarty's (1998) extensive report for TESOL: *Partnerships with linguistic minority communities*. In it, McGroarty reviews how the learning needs of minority communities can be met when teachers, academics, and community members work together; she also considers some of the difficulties existing in such partnerships. These alliances, she writes, extend beyond traditional PTAs "to multiparty relationships involving teachers, students, classrooms, schools with community organizations, teacher training institutions, universities, and even businesses." Such alliances may go so far as to "restructure the curriculum and the organizational hierarchy of the school." McGroarty concludes that they "are especially important in light of the myriad problems faced by many school systems, from the alienation experienced by many learners... to the frustration of educators who find that past ways of teaching are insufficient to engage today's students effectively" (1998, p. 2).

McGroarty's analysis, the accounts she refers to, and the advice she gives, emphasize the need to bring together an institution's various constituencies in efforts to promote it. These constituencies are to be *organized*: into partnerships, into coalitions. Clearly, the literature of (educational) program advancement has a distinct conceptual overlap with the literature of (community) organizing. This time-honored term refers simply to bringing individuals together in formal or semiformal arrangements that help address problems, though it is true that it is mainly applied to communities which are in need of help; which are, perhaps, marginalized.

Within the community organizing literature, organizing often appears in connection with "action." Organizing occurs to enable decision-making about what needs to be done, what goals should be set, and so on, and it also occurs as a prelude to action to achieve those goals. Visible action, such as the physical manifestation of bodies on the streets is, if peaceful, a legitimate form of behavior in pluralist democracies, and has certainly been effective when other means of influence have proved unsuccessful. It hardly needs mentioning that there is a long, honorable history of this kind of action in support of education in many countries, including the US.

As we outlined earlier, the S/FL literature is short on accounts of program advancement and advocacy. Given the absence of such stories, we now briefly summarize one that brought together various aspects of program advancement, notably organizing and action. We then report on much less of a success story.

A success story

Ferguson (1998) provides a vivid and fast-paced account of her efforts at Yakima Community College to rescue an ESL program (serving Mexican immigrants) from elimination. This program was structured consistent with the general mandate of community colleges, that is, to connect with less-privileged community populations (Cain, 1999). Ferguson had been implementing a critical

pedagogy in her class, and at the same time had been involved in the college's efforts to lobby legislators, as the college was facing budget cuts. Ferguson writes,

Students were brought into the concerns for program funding. They learned that the problems were not just mine, but theirs as well. Intermediate ESL students learned to write letters to the editor of the newspaper and to the legislature, and to speak on television. An ESL student was chosen by his classmates to accompany me and other faculty and the college president to visit the state legislature and meet with representatives and senators from the college's service district. (1998, p. 9)

Just the same, two weeks before the end of the legislative session, ESL funding was dropped, and attempts were made to hide this fact from Ferguson and her colleagues and students. She provides a narrative account of the various lobbying efforts she and her students then engaged in, and the happy ending is that the money was returned. A politician is quoted as admitting that in the lobbying effort, "they hammered the heck out of us" (Ferguson, 1998, p. 11).

In an era of declining state support, we can expect more of the kinds of situation that Ferguson had to contend with. Accordingly we present the following brief case study, offered as something of a warning, or counterweight, to Ferguson's report.

Not really a success story: "Perhaps this is a lesson for us"

In Hawai'i, the public schools' English for Second Language Learners (ESLL) program recently faced its own budget crisis. This program serves approximately 16,000 K-12 language minority students from more than 40 different language backgrounds, and does so on a slim budget of \$9 million. The following account describes the modest efforts made by teachers and students at one Hawai'i high school to prevent budget cuts that would have decimated the ESLL program statewide.¹⁰

In early April 2002, Mr. Park and Mr. Saunders, two ESLL teachers at Islands High School (all pseudonyms), discovered that in a matter of weeks, the state legislature would be considering a \$3.6 million cut in funding to the Department of Education's (DOE) ESLL program. This cut was one of many that had been proposed in an effort to contend with a multi-million dollar shortfall in the education budget. The 40% cut to the ESLL budget would translate into the elimination of 10 full-time ESLL positions, the termination of all 287 part-time (non-union) teachers (PTTs),¹¹ and the elimination of the budget for supplies and testing materials.

The state ESLL program response was not all that might have been expected in the face of such a drastic budget reduction. Mr. Park, a high school ESLL teacher for over 15 years and an active member of the Hawai'i teachers union, and Mr. Saunders, an untenured teacher, were two important, if reluctant,

figures in this response, and they remember it with frustration. A newspaper article that appeared in the April 4th *Honolulu Star-Bulletin* (Asato, 2002) was the first that many associated with the ESLL program in Hawai'i had heard of the cuts. At a mid-April meeting with ESLL district administrators, several teachers expressed disbelief that they had not received official word about the situation earlier. Yet, according to those administrators, the April 4th article was the first that *they* had heard of the cuts themselves.

The mid-April ESLL administrators' meeting was the first organized response to the proposed cuts. A state representative had been invited to address the 35 or so assembled ESLL teachers, PTTs, students, and administrators. Though the representative stated that he had warned fellow legislators that Hawai'i would likely "get hit with a class action lawsuit" if the proposed reductions to ESLL were made,¹² he told the teachers that immediate action was needed to forestall the cuts. He suggested sending letters, emails, and faxes to lawmakers, giving the names of several that teachers needed to contact.

Though this meeting served its informational purposes, little else was done. Teachers had lawmakers' email addresses, but no plan was made. No strategy was plotted and nothing was discussed about disseminating the information about the budget cuts to others. Following the meeting, a few teachers contacted legislators. Mr. Park and Mr. Saunders engaged students in a small-scale letter-writing campaign. Until a rally that was organized last-minute days later (which we discuss below), this would be the extent of the Hawai'i ESLL program response.

Mr. Park and Mr. Saunders looked on the mid-April ESLL administrators' meeting as an opportunity wasted. They noted that administrators should have developed a plan of action. "That should have happened at that meeting," concluded Mr. Saunders. "Right there."

It didn't. The two teachers attributed this to poor direction from the district ESLL administrators. "We need leadership," Mr. Park contended. "Okay? We do. We need time to meet and organize and plan and I don't know what District—I don't know what they're waiting for. They have to do something!" He shook his head. "Nobody wants to come out front. No one wants to take the risk."

The lack of leadership, and the lack of communication about it, were primary sources of the teachers' frustration. "I know [the district administrators] were pointing fingers at me to do something," said Mr. Park. Yet, he went on, "regular classroom teachers expected the district people to do it." He and Mr. Saunders gave several reasons for this expectation, including teachers' workloads and schedules. Indeed, and with no small amount of irony, at the time these budget cuts were being considered, the DOE was piloting a round of new standardized tests the state had developed to comply with the *No Child Left Behind Act*. Thus, in addition to regular duties as a teacher and club advisor, Mr. Park was at this time coordinating the "special accommodations" for dozens of ESLL students taking these tests, as well as the usual batteries of placement exams for the remainder of Islands' ESLL students. Mr. Saunders was busy assist-

ing Mr. Park, in addition to his own regular teaching and advisory responsibilities. Neither relished the prospect of developing a plan for action and coordinating it within such a tight time-frame. As Mr. Saunders said,

I would prefer if we didn't have to [coordinate and lead a protest]. I mean, it's sad that it's come to this, that we have to get active and start lobbying for something that's necessary for the kids, that's federally mandated. And we have to basically go and do these kinds of things *in addition* to what we're doing? I don't think that's right.

Compounding concerns about workload, however, were fears about job security and professional reprisal. As an untenured teacher, Mr. Saunders worried about his place in the DOE hierarchy, fearing he might jeopardize his position by coordinating such a campaign.¹³ "It's not my place, I don't think, to do that," he said. "I don't think I have the authority or the clout."

The most organized part of the ESLL response to the proposed cutback wound up being a rally that was organized last-minute at the urging of a district administrator. This was to be held at the state Capitol, timed to coincide with the budget vote. Mr. Park and Mr. Saunders recruited students to make signs and attend. It was their understanding that several other schools would be involved.

The afternoon of the rally, Mr. Park and Mr. Saunders were astonished to see that most of the protestors were the 50 or so students they had recruited from their school. Mr. Park later noted with frustration that the district ESLL administrators needed "to disseminate information to all schools, which they haven't done about these rallies and these meetings. [They have to contact] *all* the ESL teachers, not just a couple." The poor turnout extended to PTTs as well as administrators and non-ESLL faculty at Islands (and elsewhere), hardly any of whom participated in the demonstration.

An additional problem developed when TV-news crews arrived to cover the protest and reporters went in search of someone to interview. Mr. Saunders shook his head at the memory.

The cameras were desperately looking for people to talk to, and then I was, 'well, I don't know if I'm the right person,' and then I tracked down [a district administrator], and he was like, 'no, no, no' and he started looking for someone else. And the reporter is like, 'huh? he doesn't want to talk to me?!'

The rally lasted about 45 minutes, with students and teachers parading around the State Capitol rotunda, chanting, shouting, and waving signs. Later, they went up to individual senators' and representatives' offices to talk with legislators. Said Mr. Saunders:

It was really neat to see in the students' eyes the energy and the excitement. I think they really learned a lot. They saw that they can make a difference. The fact that they might have been on the news and they got people's attention and that they'd never been to the Capitol before. Having 50 kids marching down the street with signs. You could see the progression: at first they didn't want to show their signs, they had them folded over their head to keep off the sun, to hide their faces. And then as we lined up along the road and then people honked and yelled—they sort of—yeah, that unified them.

Yet even the most successful component of the response to the cutbacks was marked by confusion: Mr. Saunders reported that at the end of the rally, several people approached him: they did not know what "ESLL" meant, what the program was for, or the reason for the protest. Neither the group nor the purpose of the rally had been communicated clearly.

Despite problems such as these, just a week after the protest, the proposal for the \$3.6 million ESLL cutback was withdrawn by the legislature. While the Hawai'i ESLL administrators, teachers, and students likely played a part in this, it is unclear how much a part. And though they should be applauded for their commitment and determination—they helped defend a program that would have been eviscerated otherwise—the overall response to the proposed cutbacks can be fairly characterized as haphazard, undersized, and in a number of ways, ineffectual. Next time the budgetary axe threatens, a response like this may not engender such a successful outcome. As one ESLL teacher at the first ESLL administrators' meeting noted ruefully, "we're not as politically active as we should be; perhaps this is a lesson for us."

Implications for S/FL teacher education content

We believe it is important that S/FL professionals be prepared to deal with the political exigencies that teachers and administrators are more and more likely to encounter in their S/FL careers. One obvious starting point for this preparation is in teacher education courses, which, as noted earlier, are increasingly engaging the sociopolitical dimensions of S/FL instruction (and which, without future jobs for their students, would be rendered superfluous).

We organize our discussion under the following three-part rubric: organizing, fundraising, and action. Most of our comments are reserved for the topic we discuss first, organizing, since this area is arguably the one which in large part determines (a) whether fundraising takes place, and if so, how; and (b) what sorts of action can or need to be taken. We would like to emphasize that our brief sketch of some S/FL teachers' experience in Hawai'i should in no way be construed as a kind of censure. In fact, we believe that the Hawai'i teachers' relative state of (un)preparedness is more the norm than the exception in S/FL circles.

Organizing

A general piece of advice that has been offered repeatedly is to network (cf. Ashworth, 1985), find allies and make partnerships (McGroarty, 1998). This is all the more crucial since the old implied alliance between institutions of public education and the public has been derailed, and language programs of all kinds are among the first to be jettisoned when education budgets tighten. The three most obvious constituencies with whom teachers can network are colleagues, parents, and community leaders. The ESLL teachers in Hawai'i had not substantially cultivated their connections to any of these groups, which, as should be clear from the account above, undermined their attempts at timely, effectual action.

Develop institutional networks. Perhaps the most immediate connection the teachers at Islands High School could have developed was the one with their own colleagues. Cuts to the ESL program would have involved a great many at the school, with administrators, teachers, and students all affected by more crowded classrooms, the lack of language assistance or tutoring for students who needed it, the absence of bilingual staff who could be in contact with students' families, and so forth. Generating such awareness among one's teaching colleagues and school administrators is a relatively simple measure to take, yet one that is likely to be effective. This is valid for teachers in university programs as well, who can develop "cooperative linkages" to other programs and departments and to administrations that have eyes toward maintaining or increasing international student populations (see, e.g., Jenks, 1997). It also applies to stand-alone language programs outside of larger institutions: the more colleagues who can be brought aboard, the more help that will be available when needed. Of course, this does not apply only to times of trouble: help from colleagues can take many forms, be it presence on the streets carrying signs, increased collaboration within the school, or assistance with particular students. Finally, if these liaisons among colleagues are reciprocal, as we believe they need to be, there is potential benefit for everyone involved, especially students.

Networks with colleagues can be cultivated not just intra-institutionally, but across schools and with professional associations, too (e.g., state or local branches of TESOL; cf. McGroarty, 1998). In contrast to the Hawai'i case sketched above, Castro Feinberg (1999) writes of the political might a united front of educators can wield in the effort to protect language programs (also see Shirley, 1997). In the late 1970s and early 1980s, in response to efforts to dismantle bilingual education in Florida, proactive teachers formed the American Hispanic Educators Association of Dade (AHEAD). In 1982, AHEAD succeeded in forestalling the elimination of an important bilingual education program in Miami by filling school board meetings with supporters, deluging the board office with letters and phone calls, and gaining the support of local Spanish language media outlets. That is, AHEAD developed skill in grass-roots organizing, direct action, and by "supporting those candidates for public office . . .

whose views were supportive of the organization's mission" (Castro Feinberg, 1999, p. 57).

Develop connections with parents. Developing reciprocal affiliations with parents and community leaders will perhaps take more time than cultivating connections among colleagues, but the effort can be extremely rewarding. Mr. Park and Mr. Saunders had few connections to parents they could draw on when needed, so when they attempted to summon parents' support, they had to resort to asking students to relay their request. Yet, Tsai (2002, p. 5), points out that "parents are natural advocates for their children"; some may be immigrants contending with a new educational system and thus may simply "not know when and how to get involved." She details some of the remarkable outcomes resulting from an affiliation with first-generation Asian and Middle Eastern parents in one school community. Parents there have joined the local PTA, served on the school board, developed "culturally responsive" curricula, and established a non-profit organization offering wide-ranging professional support to educators as well as scholarships to students. The partnership has also resulted in the creation of a two-way Mandarin-English bilingual program, reaffirming once again the power that parents and community leaders can wield, not only in preserving and advancing language programs, but in getting them established.¹⁴ As Tsai notes, the challenges of involving parents can be far outweighed by the mutual benefits these partnerships can engender, benefits that start with the children and continue into the community (also see McGroarty, 1998; Shirley, 1997).

Develop networks in the community. Community connections can have powerful consequences for a language program. Mr. Park and Mr. Saunders both lamented the absence of community leaders in the ESL response to the proposed cutbacks; many politicians, academics, professionals, and businesspeople in Hawai'i have ties to immigrant communities, or are immigrants themselves, and could have lent political and/or financial clout to their protest.

Castro Feinberg (1999) describes the turnaround in Florida—where bilingual education had been threatened for years—once business and political leaders understood what multilingualism might mean for business. In 1985, recommendations from a diverse group of politicians, educators, and business leaders led to the creation of an international studies program which included rigorous Spanish, French, and German FL curricula. Throughout the 1990s, as bilingual programs were shuttered around the country, FL and bilingual programs expanded in Miami. This included a proliferation of international studies programs as well as an increase in two-way bilingual schools and bilingual and FL programs within schools. Castro Feinberg (1999, p. 60) notes that these developments arose due to a confluence of factors that resulted in "a critical mass of influence . . . sufficient to generate program enhancements and support."

The successful cultivation of networks with colleagues, parents, and community leaders depends on an early, proactive start on the part of teachers, ideally before some form of response is required (i.e., before panic and desperation set in). This was a key advantage that Ferguson had: a community partnership

partly fostered by a curriculum that involved work with the relevant community. Also important is the need for reciprocation. As Castro Feinberg (1999) suggests: "support the issues and causes of other groups, and establish coalitions as needed" (p. 63). Implicit in the notion of a "partnership" is precisely this idea of mutual support.

Leadership. An important lesson for us was drawn from Ferguson (1998), who says of her experience:

The responsibility for political advocacy really comes down to the program level. There is no one at the state or federal levels whose primary responsibility is advocacy for adult ESL programs. Once I realized that fact, I stopped waiting for someone else to come forward to take the lead . . . It would be even better to move beyond reacting to crisis towards leadership for proactive change in support of . . . programs (p. 13).

Many of the problems encountered in the Hawai'i case can be traced to an absence of leadership, which affected organization and communication; no clear lines were drawn for either. Though we understand and in some ways agree with Mr. Park and Mr. Saunders' assessment that administrators rather than teachers ought to take responsibility for protecting language programs, the fact remains that *all* should. As Ferguson reminds us, it is folly to wait for "someone else."

Fundraising

The raising of money for projects of all kinds has developed into a specialized area of expertise—an art, if not a science—in many countries. This literature in turn is useful to us in initiating a rethink of the responsibilities of S/FL teachers. For example, Schneider & Nelson (1982), writing of fund-raising in general, illustrate the kind of information or guidance we think would be advantageous to S/FL programs. Their brief introduction to the area lists "the 13 most common fund-raising mistakes," of which #2 is: "thinking that fund raising is for fund raisers only" (Schneider & Nelson, 1982, p. 7). This may not mean that everyone in an organization goes out and asks for money, but it does mean (when applied to our area) that everyone in a S/FL educational program is oriented to budgetary concerns.

We note that fundraising in post-secondary education has an extensive literature—Rhodes (1997) is a good recent overview. There is plenty of empirical research as well as advice concerning how communities and educational institutions may relate (e.g., Shirley, 1997; Delgado-Gaitan, 2001; for fundraising and community organizing in general, see Mondros & Wilson, 1994). It could be useful for those in post-secondary S/FL programs to know more about this topic. Neither our own Hawai'i case, nor Ferguson (1998) allude to the need and use of funds in support of organizing and action. It is, nevertheless, essential to program advancement.

Action

As we noted above, the efforts that go into organizing will largely determine the forms of action that should or can be taken. If a program preservation response has been organized in advance, with appropriate networks cultivated, contacts made with various constituencies, etc., then action that best suits the local circumstances will already have been planned and readied for implementation. If, however, a response has not yet been planned, we offer the following simple suggestions as a guide, drawn from some of the studies we've noted throughout, as well as the Hawai'i case. In times of crisis:

(1) *Plan, no matter how cursorily.* Even in a compressed time frame it is still important to plan what needs to be done, who can be involved, who should be involved, where to write or call, and so on. While this plan may be limited in scope, it is helpful to outline the forms a response will take, set priorities, clarify where energies need to be expended (and where they should not), determine what resources are available for use and so on.

(2) *Determine roles.* At the minimum we think this should include some kind of coordinator, who will direct efforts in the event that action becomes necessary, as well as liaise with district administration, other schools, and other teachers, as well as a media representative, who will handle information dissemination and serve as a spokesperson.

(3) *Involve students.* Too often, we forget that our language programs are our students' as well. Get students involved making signs, writing letters, making up slogans and chants, preparing and distributing informational leaflets, just as the ESL teachers at Islands High School did. Ask for input on #1 (planning) and #2 (roles). The circumstances surrounding the program threat may be reason for stress, but it is important to remember there is pedagogical potential here, as Mr. Park and Mr. Saunders found out, and as Ferguson (1998) detailed so compellingly: Connecting instruction to the program preservation effort can mean lessons about government, politics, economics, language arts, history, as well as a rousing introduction to the power people can have in the democratic process. Also, not only does involving students put a face on the issue, so to speak—legislators in Hawai'i, for example, wound up talking with the very students who would be affected by the cutbacks—but it can reduce teachers' stress levels (not to mention workload). Alumni, too, need to be involved, as they are (often voting) members of the community who can directly speak to the successes of the program.

(4) *As much as possible, involve parents and community leaders.* Letters and phone calls providing information about the threat and need for action—and participation—are essential. For parents, get the experts involved: the students. If the importance of involving their parents is understood, students may be far more persuasive than a letter from school.

(5) *Stay connected.* Obviously, it is important to stay informed so that action can be taken if a program is to be adversely affected.

(6) *Involve the media.* The media can be powerful allies in the program preservation process, as we note above.

Shifts in perspective needed

If terms such as organizing, fundraising, and action are to be seen as a natural part of the language of S/FL programs and even as teacher and student responsibilities, there will have to be some distinct shifts in perspective. This is indicated both by the absence of literature concerning program preservation and advancement in our field and the actual words of some of the Hawai'i participants quoted above. As we have noted, one way to bring about such a shift is in terms of curriculum, both at the level of the teacher and program, and at the level of teacher education.

At the teacher and program level: Ferguson's program used a critical pedagogy and this was important for the success of her action. If S/FL programs don't involve students in the program preservation process, they are denying themselves a powerful and symbolic resource. Critical pedagogy implies students acting on the world in an effort to improve it (see Freire, 1993). Other lines in curriculum theory, particularly those associated with service learning and experiential learning would also have these sorts of connections (e.g., Power & Khmelkov, 1999; Zlotkowski, 1998). It is important to note that this is an on-going process, one which not only should or could be integrated into teacher education curricula, but also into class curricula, for example, planning activities in which S/FL students write to legislators and community leaders to establish connections and represent the program that's being funded. In the increasingly-difficult financial and political climate, we cannot afford to be complacent; successfully overcoming one crisis is unlikely to obviate the need for a steady and on-going or processual orientation to program advancement and preservation.

At the teacher education curriculum level: We have already implied that a list of categories relating to S/FL program advancement could be compiled both from the general organizing literature and the handful of S/FL-related accounts, many of which are largely "common sense." However, for S/FL teachers and administrators to take action as quickly and effectively as Ferguson managed might be difficult, because this is not (as Forhan & Scheraga, 2000, note) how we have been trained to act, and has thus far not been part of our regular job descriptions (one more reason for starting the organizing process early). Ferguson (1998) remarks:

The politics outside our classrooms set to a large extent the structure of our classrooms, who will instruct, how they will instruct, who will be served, how long they will be served, and to what degree We often assume we are independent in our classrooms [but we don't] define our classroom worlds.

She continues, and this is a key point:

Few, if any, ESL teachers receive training in how to become politically aware and politically effective. We learn when we have to, usually when facing a crisis, on the job and with hit-and-miss success. However, we can educate ourselves. We can ask that the political realities of adult ESL be addressed at training seminars and conferences we attend. We can give presentations on political advocacy at these conferences. We can insist that this is part of what we need to know to be effective language teachers, and demand that it be part of our formal schooling. (p. 13)

She concludes that "the best pedagogy in the world is useless without students and without a classroom" (p. 14). One might add that the best research in the world is similarly useless under those circumstances, or the equivalent in terms of teacher pay, training, and working conditions.

Conclusion

There is a need to extend S/FL instructors' skills and sense of responsibilities so that they can persuade their relevant communities that what the instructional program has is something the community needs (and will support, with votes or money). Alternatively, S/FL instructors need to be ready to respond to community demands and use them to support their program or department. The skills needed to keep programs alive are not complex, but the need as a whole is too important (and too time consuming) to be left to program administrators alone.

In short, there are things that need to go into our teacher education curricula that have immediate relevance for a program preservation and advancement orientation. They aren't there at present—will they be there in the future? And if they're not, will we be?

Notes

1. We limit our discussion of S/FL education to the US, which therefore includes ESL, "foreign" language, and bilingual education programs.
2. For example, the National Security Education Program supports FL instruction, particularly in languages of current foreign policy importance, e.g., Pushtu, Korean, and Arabic.
3. Reagan & Osborn's (2002) publication is an indication of the FL field catching up with the more radicalized (because more oppressed) ESL sector. In the latter area, the trend now influences senior mainstream figures (e.g., Richards, 2001, p. 215: "A critical pedagogy informs TESOL professional practice").
4. Most of this literature comes from the US context. We note Forhan & Scheraga's (2000, p. 199) caveat: "Much of what has been learned about effective ESOL advocacy in the cultural context of the US may well be inappropriate and thus unproductive or, worse, counterproductive in other parts of the world."

5. Similarly, ERIC defines "institutional advancement" as "interpretation and promotion of an institution to its various constituencies—[includ[ing] fundraising, internal and external communications, government relations, and public relations."

6. Forhan & Scheraga (2000) is an extensive collection of reports and associated advice in this area. Though they emphasize the "power of one," they also stress the importance of joining and working through professional organizations. In anticipation of the case sketched further on: in Hawai'i, elementary and high school ESL teachers and members of the local and/or national TESOL organizations tend to be disjunct sets, who see themselves as having little in common. Thus, advocacy efforts with a program rather than a professional organization emphasis may not only be distinct, together they may not be practicable, at least in the short run (though there is room and need for both).

7. For recent examples, see Spencer (2002), Wolf (2003).

8. For a handful of *extremely* brief reports, again appearing in a marginal publication, see Gramer (1999); Hewitt (1996, 1997); and Hodges & Redmond (2000).

9. See Crawford (1999) both for examples of and exceptions to this.

10. The case reported here is drawn from a larger ethnographic study conducted by one of the authors. The facts of the budget cut can be confirmed through media reports and readily available Hawai'i DOE documents. Since the present paper is not primarily a report of that study, but rather a proposal concerning a component of S/FL teacher education, we do not present more methodological detail concerning the collection and analysis of data or the derivation of findings from them, nor do we review the literatures on case study research or ethnography. Indeed, we have sought a simple narrative, or possibly a "journalistic" voice, in relating the Hawai'i case, which is intended to support and exemplify issues we allude to above.

11. PTTs are bilingual aides who assist teachers in the classroom, often providing small group instruction in L2 English and classroom 'content,' and serving as links to students' parents and communities. They are widely viewed as crucial to the success of ESLL in Hawai'i. They are not part of the teachers' union, and thus could be easily, indeed completely eliminated.

12. Plausible, as in the early 1990s, a class action lawsuit was brought against Hawai'i concerning compliance with federal laws assuring education and mental health services for special needs children. Hawai'i has similarly had difficulty in the past complying with federal laws that pertain to the education of language minority students (see, e.g., Haas, 1992).

13. A reasonable fear. Outspoken teachers, including tenured union organizers in this system, have been subject to administrative harassment, notably forced relocation (Honolulu Advertiser, 1994a, 1994b).

14. Parents were also instrumental in establishing French immersion programs in Canada, as well as early bilingual programs in the US (see, e.g., Crawford, 1999, for an overview).

References

- Asato, L. (2002, April 4). Cuts would hurt immigrant kids. *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*.
- Ashworth, M. (1985). *Beyond methodology: Second language teaching and the community* (pp. 85-113). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ashworth, M. (1991a). Internationalism and our "strenuous family." *TESOL Quarterly*, 25, 231-243.
- Ashworth, M. (1991b). Getting into the picture. *TESL Canada Journal/Revue TESL du Canada*, 9(1), 80-88.
- Auerbach, E. R. (1995). The politics of the ESL classroom: Issues of power in pedagogical choices. In J. W. Tollefson (Ed.), *Power and inequality in language education* (pp. 9-33). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Benesch, S. (2001). *Critical English for academic purposes: Theory, politics, and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- "Better deal for teachers." (1989). *EFL Gazette*, 112, p. 1.
- Cain, M. S. (1999). *The community college in the twenty-first century: A systems approach*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Cameron, D., Frazer, E., Harvey, P., Rampton, B., & Richardson, K. (1993). Ethics, advocacy, and empowerment: Issues of method in researching language. *Language and Communication*, 13(2), 81-94.
- Castro Feinberg, R. (1999). Administration of two-way bilingual elementary schools: Building on strength. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 23(1), 47-68.
- Crawford, J. (1999). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice* (4th ed.). Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services.
- Crawford, J. (2002). Obituary: *Bilingual Education Act, 1968-2002*. Available: <http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/jwcrawford/T7obit.htm>
- Crookes, G. (1997). What influences how and what second and foreign language teachers teach? *Modern Language Journal*, 81(1), 67-79.
- Crookes, G., & Lehner, A. (1998). Aspects of process in an ESL critical pedagogy teacher education course. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 319-328.
- DeLuca, S. (1982). Collective bargaining: A viable alternative for ESL/EFL teachers in higher education. *TESOL Newsletter* 16(6), 17.
- Delgado-Gaitan, C. (2001). *The power of community: Mobilizing for family and schooling*. Lanham, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Engel, M. (2000). *The struggle for control of public education*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Ferguson, P. (1998). The politics of adult ESL literacy: Becoming politically visible. In T. Smoke (Ed.), *Adult ESL: Politics, pedagogy, and participation in classroom and community programs* (pp. 3-16). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Forhan, L. E., & Scheraga, M. (2000). Becoming sociopolitically active. In J. K. Hall & W. G. Egginton (Eds.), *The sociopolitics of English language teaching* (pp. 195-221). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). New York: Continuum. (Original work published 1970)
- Gramer, V. (1999). Advocacy for early language education: a school board presentation. *Learning Languages*, 4(3), 4-8.
- Haas, M. (1992). *Institutional racism: The case of Hawai'i*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Hall, J. K., & Egginton, W. G. (Eds.). (2000). *The sociopolitics of English language teaching*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Hewitt, K. (1996). Political action and advocacy. *Learning Languages*, 2(1), 44-45.
- Hewitt, K. (1997). NNELL members work locally to promote languages. *Learning Languages*, 2(2), 18-19.
- Hodges, C., & Redmond, M. L. (2000). Diary of a state foreign language lobbyist. *Learning Languages*, 5(3), 13-17.
- Honolulu Advertiser. (1994a, January 19). Kailua teacher's forced exit sparks jeers, tears. (p. A1).
- Honolulu Advertiser. (1994b, January 20). Forced transfer is blocked. (p. A1)
- Huebner, T., & Davis, K. A. (Eds.). (1999). *Sociopolitical perspectives on language policy and planning in the USA*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Jenks, F. L. (1997). The quest for academic legitimacy: Building for language program entry into institutional and community infrastructures. In M. A. Christison & F. L. Stoller (Eds.), *A handbook for language program administrators* (pp. 107-121). Burlingame, CA: Alta.
- Lindenberger, H. (1998). Must we always be in crisis? *ADFL Bulletin*, 29(2), 5-9.
- Loughrin-Sacco, S. J. (1996). Redefining the role of the foreign language department chair: the chair as fund-raiser, program developer, and entrepreneur. *ADFL Bulletin*, 27(2), 39-43.
- McGroarty, M. (1998). *Partnerships with linguistic minority communities* (TESOL Occasional Paper #4). Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Melton, J. M. (1994). Foreign language interdisciplinary programs and alliances: some observations. *ADFL Bulletin*, 26(1), 19-24.
- Mondros, J. B., & Wilson, S. M. (1994). *Organizing for power and empowerment*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Morgan, B. (1998). *The ESL classroom: Teaching, critical practice, and community development*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Murray, D. (1992). Making it happen: An ESL professional organization's advocacy for teachers and learners. *ELT Journal*, 46(1), 92-95.
- Pennycook, A. (1989). The concept of method, interested knowledge, and the politics of language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23, 589-618.
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Power, A. M. R., & Khmelkov, V. (1999). The effects of service participation on high school students' social responsibility. *Research in sociology of education*, 12, 185-210.
- Reagan, T., & Osborn, T. A. (2002). *The foreign language educator in society: Toward a critical pedagogy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Rhodes, F. H. T. (Ed.). (1997). *Successful fund raising for higher education*. Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education/Oryx Press.
- Ricento, T. K., & Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30, 404-427.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). The ideology of TESOL. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 213-217). London: Cambridge University Press.
- Roche, M. W. (1999). Strategies for enhancing the visibility and role of foreign language departments. *ADFL Bulletin* 30(2), 10-18.
- Rosenbusch, M. H. (2002). The impact of national and state policy on elementary school foreign language programs: The Iowa case study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35(5), 507-517.
- Rowland, A. (Ed.). (1986). *Handbook of institutional advancement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schneider, P. H., & Nelson, D. T. (1982). *The thirteen most common fund-raising mistakes*. Washington, DC: Taft Corporation.
- Shirley, D. (1997). *Community organizing for urban school reform*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Shulman, M. (1982). Collective bargaining: A viable alternative for ESL/EFL teachers in higher education. *TESOL Newsletter* 16(5), 26.
- Spencer, S. (2003). From crisis to opportunity: French and Foreign language studies in the twenty-first century. *ADFL Bulletin*, 34(2), 47-49.
- Sullivan, C. A. (1998). The corporatized research university and tenure in modern language departments: notes from Minnesota. *ADFL Bulletin*, 30(1), 59-63.
- Tollefson, J. W., & Tsui, A. B. M. (Eds.). (2004). *Medium of instruction policies: Which agenda? Whose agenda?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Tsai, D. (2002). Valuing diversity through educational partnerships with school, family, and community. *NABE News*, 25(5), 4-7.
- Voght, G. M. (2000). New paradigms for US higher education in the Twenty-first Century. *Foreign Language Annals*, 33(3), 269-277.

- Warhol, R. R. (1997). How we got contracts for lecturers at the University of Vermont: A tale of (qualified) success. *ADFL Bulletin*, 29(1), 48–51.
- Wiley, T. G., & Wright, W. E. (2004). Against the undertow: Language-minority education policy and politics in the "age of accountability." *Educational Policy*, 18(1), 142–168.
- Wolf, G. (2002). A reevaluation of the Language House: Foreign language curriculum, advocacy, articulation, and outreach. *ADFL Bulletin*, 33(2), 81–85.
- Zlotkowski, E. (Ed.). (1998). *Successful service learning programs*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Zou, Y. (1998). Rethinking empowerment. *TESOL Journal*, 7(4), 4–9.

Reflections on Critical Language Studies and the Genesis of a Counter Paradigm

Timothy Reagan
Roger Williams University

Terry A. Osborn
University of Connecticut

The case of South Africa is implicative for language studies. Although there has been a growing sensitivity among some scholars and policy makers with respect to the need to address the historically disadvantaged condition of the African languages in South Africa, these developments have been overshadowed, occurring within the context of the overwhelming dominance of English, a dominance supported by both economic factors and by tacit government acquiescence. The dilemma posed by the South African case is in many ways analogous to that which underlies the purposes of Critical Inquiry in Language Studies as a new journal, serving and addressing not so much a new disciplinary field as a multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary approach to understanding issues of language in society broadly conceived. The authors argue that, to some extent, language studies should be viewed as a counter paradigm, rather than a paradigm shift. Its usefulness is inherently limited to its ability to intentionally position itself as the "Other" in relation to "mainstream" scholarly discourse.

In 1994, the apartheid regime in South Africa ended not so much with a bang, but rather, with more of a whimper, in a democratic election in which, for the first time in the country's history, all adult South Africans were able to participate. In the aftermath of the 1994 election, the Government of National Unity, as well as the new South African Constitution, recognized eleven official languages, rejecting the historical bilingual policy (which reflected only the linguistic diversity of white South Africa) with a multilingual policy more accurately reflecting the demographic reality of South African society. The challenge that the new government and Constitution were attempting to meet was the need to ensure individual language rights and to emphasize symbolically the multilingual and multicultural nature of the society, while at the same time allocating resources in an economically and politically responsible manner. The South African government made a significant commitment to the promotion of multilin-