cal turn. For the teacher educator, the book includes a website address that offers a "Syllabus Manager" and appropriate professional development links. For the student, the book includes a website that has a message board, topic overviews and a number of useful links as well.

M. Michele Pittard is the Lilly Teaching Fellow in teacher education at Wabash College, Crawfordsville, IN.

The Future of Middle School Literacy Education

Elizabeth Birr Moje and LeeAnn M. Sutherland

A title such as "The Future of Middle School Literacy Education" elicits any number of questions. First, what do people mean when they talk about literacy? Second, how do certain systems and contexts shape what teachers and students do as they teach and learn literacy? In particular, how is the literacy education influenced, for example, by the institutional structure of the middle school? How is literacy education shaped by changes in the world? Are such changes reflected in middle schools? Finally, what is the role of middle school English language arts teachers in the future of literacy education? What role, if any, do teachers in other content areas play in literacy education, particularly in the middle grades? And, with these roles in mind, what should middle school teacher education in literacy look like?

The future we envision positions literacy as a tool for navigating and reconstructing boundaries across discourse communities, with the ultimate goal of teaching early adolescents how to participate in and construct a just and democratic world from the complex world into which they are venturing.

In this essay, we draw from our research, our work with pre- and inservice teachers, and our always-evolving literacy theories to argue for a particular future for middle school literacy teacher education. The future we envision positions literacy as a tool for navigating and reconstructing boundaries across discourse communities, with the ultimate goal of teaching early adolescents how to participate in and construct a just and democratic world from the complex world into which they are venturing. We argue that such a future is not an idealistic or radical vision, but a necessary one as the youth of today deal with increasing diversity in their communities and classrooms; changes in

national boundaries, political systems, and economies; and rapid growth in information production and exchange. If learning is viewed as the development of and experimentation with the different discourses and identities that accompany such changes, and if literacy is viewed as a tool for learning how to grapple with and shape these changes, then the ways literacy is taught in schools will change radically. More to the point of this special issue on middle school literacy education, if the education of early adolescents is taken seriously, and if the developmental changes that occur in early adolescence are not simply dismissed as the vagaries of a "bunch of raging hormones" (see Finders, 1998/1999), but are seen as changes in response to changing spaces and relationships that early adolescents experience, then we also will have to reconsider how we teach literacy to young people in middle schools. Concomitantly, the way middle school literacy teacher education is offered also will need to change.

What Is the Goal of Middle School Literacy Education?

When one thinks about literacy education in a middle school English language arts classroom, it is necessary to clarify the goal of the education being offered. Is the goal of literacy education simply to teach young people how to comprehend texts that they read in literature classrooms? Is the learning of grammar and sentence construction the goal? Are we striving to teach young people to be expressive, persuasive, or informational writers? Or do the changes of a new world in new times (Hall, 1995; Luke & Elkins, 1998) require that we not only teach reading and writing of print, but that we teach youth how to use reading and writing in conjunction with many other forms of representation to construct a socially just and democratic society? To settle on a goal for literacy education requires that we settle on a definition of literacy.

A recent review of several texts on literacy, however, revealed that our definitions and perspectives on literacy run the gamut (Moje, 2002). Some view literacy as the decoding and encoding of alphabetic print; others see literacy as any form of communication, whether written, oral, or visual. Still others—and we count ourselves among this group—theorize literacy as the practice of navigating many different symbol systems and discourse communities to make meaning from and with written text. That is, we posit that symbol systems ranging from oral to visual to performative play a role in how written texts are understood and interpreted. Moreover, we see written texts as situated in and mediated by the group, or discourse community, for whom a text is written or by whom a text is read. This focus on "discourse community" acknowledges that texts are constructed and made sense of in social settings and for social purposes, and that there are ways of writing and reading texts, dependent on one's community. A focus on discourse communities also has important implications for middle school education, for it is in middle school that young people first experience distinctions among the discourse communities represented by the disciplines or content areas.

To take a discursive view of literacy a step further, we (along with many others) argue that a deeply literate individual not only uses multiple symbol systems and discourses to participate in or navigate the reading and writing of different discourse communities, but also to engage in a "critical literacy" that can deconstruct, challenge, or disrupt communities, particularly when certain systems or communities operate in unjust or oppressive ways (Gee, 1997; Luke, 2001). If social justice—accomplished by the development of critical literacy practices among young people—is a goal of literacy education for the future, then educators have some difficult work to do. As Bloome (2001) has argued, the field of education—and society in general—does not have a clear vision of what it means to read and write in and toward a just and democratic society. And, more to the point, we do not have a well-developed understanding of what it means for youth to read and write for social justice.

If social justice—accomplished by the development of critical literacy practices among young people—is a goal of literacy education for the future, then educators have some difficult work to do.

Specifically, although it has been well documented in past research that people use and understand reading and writing in diverse ways (see Heath, 1983, for example), these different ways of reading and writing are not essential or innate qualities of particular cultural groups. "Ways with words" (Heath, 1983) are socially and culturally constructed and can be socially and culturally shifted, changed, and deconstructed. With increased access to other people, communities, or media and information structures afforded by various technological advances, different groups—especially groups of young people—are developing hybrid and fluid reading and writing practices (Lewis & Fabos, 1999; Moje & McIntosh Ciechanowski, 2002). The middle school youth we work with draw from many different discourse communities (e.g., ethnic and cultural communities, urban communities, Internet communities, popular cultural communities, to name a few). In short, although it is important that teacher education emphasizes the different literacy practices that may be engaged in diverse classrooms, it is also important, especially when working with early adolescents, that we do

not essentialize these practices by reducing them to a formulaic, "Kids from Group X learn only when teachers do Y."

In addition, it is critical that those interested in middle school literacy education for a just world recognize that particular forms of literacy, or particular "ways with words," have more linguistic and cultural capital than do other forms (see Bourdieu, 1980; Heath, 1983). That is, youth can be economically and politically advantaged or disadvantaged as a result of their linguistic practices, regardless of the other social and cultural rewards those practices bring to them in their own homes and communities. This point is particularly important for early adolescents. As young people move toward more independent relationships with family and into more diverse relationships with other communities, they need to be equipped with practices that allow them to navigate those different physical and social spaces. They need to learn which tools and practices have linguistic and cultural capital in which communities and why those tools and practices have such capital. Such an acknowledgment should not be read as a devaluing or dismissing of local social and cultural practices, but as a recognition of how power and dominance work even in the learning and practice of literacy, as well as a recognition of the unique position of early adolescents as people beginning to venture across discourse communities.

As young people move toward more independent relationships with family and into more diverse relationships with other communities, they need to be equipped with practices that allow them to navigate those different physical and social spaces. They need to learn which tools and practices have linguistic and cultural capital in which communities and why those tools and practices have such capital.

Understanding literacy as a form of capital is especially important as economic systems shift and change from traditional forms of capitalism to what some have identified as "fast" or "new" capitalism. In fast capitalism, workers are positioned as partners in production, and the focus of production shifts from objects to information, thus requiring workers to engage in radically different literacy practices than required under traditional forms of capitalism (see Hull, 1998). Such workplace practices demand literacy skills and facility with forms of representation that are not typically captured in current middle school literacy practices.

Moreover, some have argued that the discourses of fast capitalism can disguise the privileging of some people or groups over others (Lankshear, 1997; New London Group, 1996), suggesting the need for critical literacies, or the ability to question and challenge both obvious and more subtle discourses and structures of power. The learning of critical literacy practices

applies not only to workers, but also to consumers, as the discourses of fast capitalism also demand fast consumption, or the constant need for more and better information and more rapid access to information. Even those youth who do not seem immediately destined for the world of work need to be taught how to engage in and critique literacy practices embedded in information technologies and the mass media. These points are particularly salient for early adolescents in our changing economic systems because they will not have the framework of "old capitalism" to which to compare their work and consumers. Fast capitalism is, in effect, the only economic system they know (at least for now), and they need to have a sense of how such economies have evolved and of what such an economic system means for their work and social lives.

What Does This Mean for Middle School Literacy Education?

These perspectives on the kinds of literacy needed for a just and democratic world offer a framework for a future-oriented middle school literacy teacher education (we include in this category both English education and content-area literacy courses required in many states). First, because people engage in literacy in different ways, we need to broaden our sense of what it means to be literate. Although we do not subscribe to a view that suggests that literacy is everything and anything (see Moje, 2000, for a more precise definition), we do argue that a deeply literate individual is one who can use a variety of representational forms to make meaning of written texts. Such a view of literacy suggests that we should teach multiple forms of representation, in conjunction with the reading and writing of print-based texts.

The Power of Multiple Forms

The use of multiple forms requires that as we teach print literacy, we also should draw from different ways of making meaning in the world and different forms of linguistic capital (Bourdieu, 1980); "literate currency" (Obidah, 1998); or "ways with words" (Heath, 1983) that young people bring to school learning (see also Hartman, 1997; Finders, 1997; Mahiri, 1994; Moje, 2000). Forms of representation other than literacy—such as art, dramatic interpretation, and video representations—can be used as a means for acknowledging and valuing multiple ways of communicating meaning and of making sense of written text, thus generating spaces for all students to be successful in school (Eisner, 1994; Gardner, 1983; Smagorinsky & O'Donnell-Allen, 1998). Most important, drawing from multiple forms is especially important because middle school students must not only navigate print, but

must also navigate disciplinary discourses and the confusing space of the middle school with its changing classes and changing teachers, often for the first time in their school lives.

We should offer some caveats to the idea of using multiple forms of representation, however. First, using multiple forms of representation needs to be carefully modeled by teacher educators. It is easy enough to tell preservice teachers to use multiple forms in their classrooms and even to push them to seek out such forms. Moje, for example, assigns a "multiple forms bibliography" in which content-area literacy preservice teachers are required to locate five different materials for each of five forms of representation (print, art, music, film, oral/aural) for one concept they might typically teach in their content areas. It is much more difficult, however, to use many different forms in one's own teacher education course work. And yet, such modeling is critical, not only to avoid the "do as I say" concern, but also to model the productive use of different forms across content areas. It is far too easy for different forms of representation to become mere gimmicks or motivational tools, rather than to work as tools for expressing and making meaning.

In addition, our research indicates that even when different forms are used as learning tools, they may be used in ways that actually work against a teacher's intentions. In a recent study (Moje, Collazo, Carrillo, & Marx, 2001), data analysis indicated that a seventh-grade classroom teacher used multiple forms of representation extensively, but that at times these different forms of representation each communicated a different bit of a concept and were not used to support one another. That is, written texts were not read aloud, oral texts were not written, iconic texts were not "read" or interpreted, and yet they all were often dependent on one another. The forms each communicated different parts of the concept, rather than scaffolding students by providing many different ways into a concept. To fully understand an overall concept (and at times even simply to participate in a discussion), a student would have to be a fluent reader, fluent in the dominant language of the classroom, and fluent in making meaning from drawings (or iconic texts).

Electronic technologies, another form of representation, merge many different forms in ways that have great potential for advancements in literacy education. And yet, electronic technologies, as useful as they are, can further complicate learning to read and write in the ways of the discipline (Lankshear, 1997). Young people—and their teachers—need to learn the different kinds of literacy practices required for surfing and searching the Internet and other electronic learning technologies (cf. Goldman, 1997; Marx, Blumenfeld, Krajcik, & Soloway, 1997). However, few teachers or literacy teacher educators have a strong sense of how to evaluate or monitor the quality of text that young people are exposed to. Internet texts represent a special area of concern because they are generally unedited for considerateness, quality and accuracy of information, or appropriateness of ideas or concepts conveyed. What's more, although early adolescents are quite facile with navigating Internet communication systems for social purposes (see Lewis & Fabos, 1999), they are not necessarily equipped with skills for navigating hypertexts and media in ways that support the synthesis, evaluation, analysis, or critique of the information and ideas they gather. If early adolescents are not provided with opportunities to practice synthesizing the meanings of the different forms, they may walk away from electronic technologies with partial or inaccurate understandings of important content concepts.

Crossing Discourse Communities

Another important move in teaching literacy for a just and democratic world is to teach literacy across a variety of discourse communities. This move has rather far-reaching implications. To teach across discourse communities requires middle school English language arts teachers to envision their work more broadly. Literacy teachers (both English language arts teachers and teachers of other content areas) and literacy teacher educators can think about crossing at least two kinds of discourse communities: (a) those represented by the different disciplines of the middle school, and (b) those represented by the different ethnic, cultural, and socioeconomic groups represented in the student and teacher population of the school.

A vast body of research suggests that the literate practices embedded in and demanded by one discipline are often different from the literate practices of another discipline. It is critical that middle school teachers and literacy teacher educators keep in mind that the types of texts to which students are exposed or are asked to produce in middle school classrooms differ in subtle ways with each class period, as texts typically conform to different disciplinary discourses—or ways of knowing, doing, believing, acting, reading, and writing privileged in the discipline (Gee, 1996; Lemke, 1990; Myers, 1989; O'Brien, Moje, & Stewart, 2001).

As a consequence, becoming a member of a school-based disciplinary discourse community can be challenging for all students as they encounter different discourses across the school day (Alvermann, 1991; Bean, 2000; Hicks, 1995/1996; Lemke, 1990; Moje, 1995, 1997; Moje, et al., 2001). The

demand to move across multiple discourse communities (different disciplines, teachers, students, and physical spaces) in a single day is especially important to think about in middle school education. Middle school is the time when young people may first encounter these differences in all their complexity. In fact, a significant body of research indicates that most middle schools are inadequately matched to the developmental needs of early adolescents (Eccles, Lord, & Midgley, 1991; Eccles, Wigfield, Midgley, Reuman, MacIver, & Feldlaufer, 1993), a point that underscores the need to attend to how middle school students experience the different discourse communities they encounter each day. Middle- school students are expected to enter the discourses of the disciplines, to forge—or at least try on—new identities as they take up those discourses, and to incorporate those discourses with others they experience throughout the school day. What role might middle school English language arts and literacy teachers play in helping young people negotiate this transition and learn to navigate the different literacy practices of the disciplines and the middle school?

First, ELA and literacy teachers can work within their own classrooms to plan writing and reading lessons around textual materials from other content areas. One middle school teacher Moje works with in Detroit offers students readings about the greenhouse effect as part of her regular ELA curriculum. In one class, after reading and discussing an article, the students wrote essays and constructed dioramas on the importance of saving the Rain Forest to inhibit the depletion of the ozone layer and to prevent the destruction of native plants, animals, and peoples in the Rain Forest. Working within her own classroom, this teacher drew from concepts related to air quality that the students had learned in their science class the prior year. Their work also centered on a geographic region that many of them had a special interest in because of their ethnic heritage as Latino/as. Thus, this teacher brought together four discourse communities—English language arts, science, geography, and Latino/a culture—in ways that allowed students to develop and practice literacy across multiple forms of representation, while also exploring concepts across discourse communities. What this means for literacy teacher education is that ELA teachers need to have opportunities to plan lessons around texts of other disciplines, as well as around the texts traditionally considered the purview of English language arts.

Another role that ELA and literacy teachers can play is to bring different content area teachers together to develop interdisciplinary units around important concepts in the middle school classroom. In other Detroit schools that we have studied, middle school science teachers are teaching scientific literacy skills to their seventh- and eighth-grade students as they engage in

project-based science curricula. As part of their inquiry on communicable disease, for example, students use web-based science browsers to locate articles about different diseases. Though dedicated to scaffolding students' textual inquiry, the science teachers struggle to find time in their already-packed inquiry-based curricula to teach students how to focus their searches on particular research questions, to abstract information from the articles they find, to summarize within and across articles, and to synthesize main ideas and concepts related to their research questions. Each of these skills could be taught as part of the ELA or literacy classroom curriculum in the context of the science (or other content area) inquiry. Similarly, as science teachers and students practice communicating findings, ELA and literacy teachers could engage them in lessons that examine how the same findings might be presented in different ways depending on the genre of the text, the audience reading the text, and the political and historical context in which information is being presented. This last point—regarding the political and historical context in which information gets presented—is especially important to developing the critical literacies that our changing world demands. Young people need to have opportunities to examine how "facts" of the discipline are shaped by what the discipline counts as knowledge (how the data of natural science might be differently interpreted from an economic perspective, for example) and by the contexts in which the "facts" are reported. Students might examine, for example, how a newspaper might report findings of a study differently than would the scientist engaged in the study, or how an attorney might use the evidence garnered by an historian in a different way when arguing a case.

Each of these skills is a critical English language and literacy skill, but can be taught as embedded in the other content areas that young people experience throughout their school days, thus bringing a sense of coherence and meaningfulness to students' overall school learning. None of these suggestions is intended to replace the literature and creative or personal writing curricula, however. These ideas for a middle school literacy education are meant simply to broaden and diversify the teaching of genre, discourse, and rhetoric that young people experience in middle school ELA and literacy classrooms.

To support teachers in these cross-disciplinary teaching practices, literacy teacher education needs to offer teachers opportunities to engage with, analyze, and critique texts of the other content areas and to practice planning ELA units around such texts, analyses, and critiques. Preservice teachers also need the chance to engage in interdisciplinary planning with colleagues from other content areas, which can occur quite productively in

To enhance interdisciplinary collaborations, teacher education programs might be developed to link more explicitly content-area literacy courses with the methods courses of the different disciplines, and in particular, with ELA methods courses.

content-area literacy courses because of their typically interdisciplinary class composition. To enhance interdisciplinary collaborations, teacher education programs might be developed to link more explicitly content-area literacy courses with the methods courses of the different disciplines, and in particular, with ELA methods courses.

Middle school literacy teacher education might also engage pre- and inservice teachers in explicit discussions of and practice in recognizing the many different and competing discourse communities in their own lives (cf. New London Group, 1996), so that they might also understand the complexity of those discourses at work in the lives of their students. Luke (in press) argues that educators need to have a "rigorous understanding" of the "zones of sociocultural and political power where language and literacy are acquired and used, gained and lost outside of schools." A focus on the discourse communities of people's lives turns attention toward the discourse communities represented in ethnic, cultural, gendered, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic affiliations, among others. For ease in discussion, we refer to these communities as "cultural discourse communities," assuming that culture can refer to the ways of knowing, doing, believing, and acting of many different kinds of groups.

Cultural Discourse Communities

Navigating discourses of culture can be a struggle for those preservice teachers whose own experiences are limited to monocultural settings or to contexts in which they have limited interaction with people of different backgrounds. The rigorous understanding Luke refers to goes well beyond that reflected in ethnic celebrations or in the addition of literature by and about people of color into an otherwise White-dominated curriculum. Preservice teachers who wish to prepare middle school students to navigate different cultural discourse communities first need experiences of their own that enable them to appreciate the diverse ways that people understand and use literacy in everyday contexts and within the complex worlds they negotiate. Alvermann (2001) writes that difference in "perception and interpretation plays a major role in how marginalized groups understand various Discourses (Gee, 1996) and the social power they legitimize" (p. 275).

As an exercise in examining culturally diverse discourses, Sutherland begins a literacy teacher education course by having students write a literacy autobiography. Students consistently report the value of the writing process itself. However, it is when the autobiographies are shared among peers—via multiple forms of representation—that a deeper understanding of culturally different discourse communities begins to take place. Preservice teachers in the course typically assume some degree of homogeneity among class members based on their shared presence in the university. Through this activity, they begin to learn that their experiences and perspectives are vastly different on many levels as a function of culture, gender, socioeconomic class, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, and religious preference. As they share their autobiographies with peers, students report that they understand the need to aim for rather than simply to hope for a just and democratic world.

Unfortunately, many approaches to multicultural education, which is how schools often take up the navigation of diverse discourses, do not give students "the tools they need to comfortably, empathetically, and fairly interact with diversity" (Derman-Sparks, 1995, p. 20). The lack of tools is exacerbated by the development of middle school youth. Most early adolescents are becoming more peer focused as they move into and through adolescence, and their focus on peers can make them reticent to speak out about difficult issues or to offer views that might position them as outsiders to the dominant youth culture of their schools. In addition, early adolescents are typically developing meta-cognitive abilities, both an advantage and disadvantage in classroom attempts to discuss difference. As young people learn to think about their thinking and learning, they come face to face with the challenges and opportunities in embracing difference. Consequently, the middle school years represent an important time for scaffolding young people's developing understanding of difference. Unfortunately, the lack of tools that teachers and students possess for examining difference is complicated further as discussions of difference are usually enacted within institutional and societal contexts that work against explicit talk about race, gender, socioeconomics, or, indeed, difference of any kind.

The middle school years represent an important time for scaffolding young people's developing understanding of difference.

Teachers and teacher educators may enact narrow interpretations of multicultural education due to their own discomfort with discussing difference and due to contexts that discourage such discussions. Haviland (2002), for example, found that her own discussions of race in an English language arts student teaching seminar were constrained by the nature of the context in which the seminar was enacted (a large university setting), by stu-

dent teachers' understandings of race and multiculturalism, and by her own trepidation about pushing students to confront their racist practices.

Turning to younger students and their teachers, Sutherland (2002) studied 6 African American adolescent girls reading literature by and about African American women in their English class. Their teacher indicated that her own multicultural education consisted of counting non-White faces in a textbook and learning that people of color are underrepresented or problematically represented. Her experience as a student was in predominately White schools, neighborhoods, and social settings. Reading Toni Morrison's *The Bluest Eye* for the first time the summer before she was to teach it, the teacher said she was "surprised" by "the prejudice even among Blacks." As a consequence, classroom reading, writing, and discussion activities generally overlooked the larger social issues raised by the novel including what counts as beauty, who makes that determination and why, and how women of color might be affected by the dominant standard in their everyday lives.

In interviews with Sutherland, the African American girls in the class shared multiple experiences of prejudice from non-Black people, but one young woman also revealed the "hurt" and "pain" she had suffered as people of her own race—including family members—considered her to be "too dark," and thus to be "ugly." Her history included being both teased and ignored due, at least in part, to having skin color that is not a mark of beauty in mainstream U.S. culture. "To be dark," she said in an individual interview, "is ugliness, really." While this young woman also fought against such self-definition in many ways, she did not publicly raise these issues with peers, and no class discussion challenged characters' or classmates' equating of ugliness with darkness. Middle school represents a crucial space for discussions of difference because it is during this time that young people are exploring new social and political alliances while they are also developing into more mature physical beings. Each of us, literacy teacher educator and middle school teacher alike, is likely to be able to share an experience of discomfort in discussing difference in our classrooms, and yet Sutherland's findings illustrate the importance of doing so, particularly in English language arts classrooms which use literature that presents images of raced, classed, and sexed characters that may be confusing, disconcerting, or traumatizing for our students. Unless we learn how to examine with students the issues of difference that are so clearly important to them—and which they talk about among themselves with some ease, but not necessarily with a critical stance (see Jervis, 1996; Moje & McIntosh Ciechanowski, 2002; Sutherland, 2002)—we risk actually doing some damage in our literacy education, and we certainly will fail to achieve the promise of literature and language arts education for a just and democratic society.

Because students' experiences of literature are vicarious, characters' issues can be addressed without students needing to name those issues as their own. However, Sutherland learned that the introduction of literature by and about people of color to the curriculum did not necessarily mean that the classroom teacher opened up spaces where real issues that mattered in her students' lives could be read about, talked about, and written about. The social context of the school—with a focus on standards and accountability—combined with the teacher's own lack of background about cultures other than her own—shaped the nature of activities she offered. For example, one routine assignment engaged the students in choosing a line or section of the novel that stood out to them and then writing a journal reflection on that selection. Although the activity seems ripe for encouraging students to make personal connections to the literature, students began to complete the activity as a mere homework assignment because these reflections were rarely discussed, either in class or with the teacher. Literature can, of course, be an excellent tool for opening those spaces when the sharing of multiple perspectives is encouraged and validated. But students—whether preservice teachers or the middle school students they will one day teach—need not only the space to bring their own diverse knowledges to bear, but also the understanding that such knowledges count for something in the classroom before they will be willing to open themselves up to examining those knowledges publicly.

Whatever else might be part of one's vision of middle school teacher education in literacy, aiming for—rather than simply imagining—a just and democratic world in our future will need to be central to the practices in which teachers engage.

Whatever else might be part of one's vision of middle school teacher education in literacy, aiming for—rather than simply imagining—a just and democratic world in our future will need to be central to the practices in which teachers engage. Helping students navigate the multiple discourse communities of a complex world, including the discourses of the disciplines and those of different cultural groups, will become a primary task of literacy education in the future. To do so does not mean that teacher education needs to neglect the familiar and the traditional concerns of the English Language Arts but that teacher education will need to reach beyond the boundaries of anthologies, grammar books, mandated curriculum, and standardized tests. Those who model how to use multiple representations in the service of learning and who provide experi-

ences that enable preservice teachers to navigate, examine, and challenge various discourse communities, have begun to prepare educators for the future of literacy education. We have struggled with accomplishing these ends in our own teaching, in part because the demands of literacy education increase, but the time allotted for such education does not. Nonetheless, we believe that as difficult as this future-oriented middle school literacy education might be to achieve, our changing world demands these changes, just as our world is demanding new skills and practices of the young people we educate.

References

Alvermann, D. E. (1991). Secondary school reading. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 2, pp. 951-983). New York: Longman.

Alvermann, D. E. (2001). Reading gender and positionality into the nine case studies: A feminist poststructuralist perspective. In E. B. Moje & D. G. O'Brien (Eds.), *Constructions of literacy: Studies of teaching and learning in and out of secondary schools* (pp. 263-285). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Bean, T. (2000). Reading in the content areas: Social constructivist dimensions. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research* (Vol. III, pp. 629-644). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bloome, D. (2001). Boundaries on the construction of literacy in secondary classrooms: Envisioning reading and writing in a democratic and just society. In E. B. Moje & D. G. O'Brien (Eds.), *Constructions of Literacy: Studies of teaching and learning in and out of secondary schools* (pp. 287-304). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bourdieu, P. (1980). *The logic of practice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Derman-Sparks, L. (1995). How well are we nurturing racial and ethnic diversity? In D. Levine, R. Lowe, B. Peterson, & R. Tenorio (Eds.), *Rethinking schools: An agenda for change* (pp. 17-22). New York, NY: The New Press.

Eccles, J. S., Lord, S., & Midgley, C. (1991). What are we doing to early adolescents? The impact of educational contexts on early adolescents. *American Journal of Education, 99*, 521-542.

Eccles, J. S., Wigfield, A., Midgley, C., Reuman, D., MacIver, D., & Feldlaufer, H. (1993). Negative effects of traditional middle schools on students' motivation. *Elementary School Journal, 93*, 553-574.

Eisner, E. W. (1994). *Cognition and curriculum reconsidered* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Finders, M. J. (1997). *Just girls: Hidden literacies and life in junior high*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Finders, M. J. (1998/1999). Raging hormones: Stories of adolescence and implications for teacher preparation. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 42*, 252-263.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind*. New York: Basic Books.

Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (2nd ed.). London: Falmer.

Gee, J. P. (1997). Foreword: A discourse approach to language and literacy. In C. Lankshear with J. P. Gee, & C. Searle (Eds.), *Changing literacies* (pp. xiii-xix). Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Goldman, S. R. (1997). Learning from text: Reflections on the past and suggestions for the future. *Discourse Processes, 23*, 357-398.

Hall, S. (1995). The meaning of new times. In D. Morley & K.-H. Chen (Eds.), *Stuart Hall: Critical dialogues in cultural studies* (pp. 223-337). New York: Routledge.

Hartman, D. (1997, September). *Doing things with text: Mapping the textual practices of two African-American male high school students.* Paper presented at the Fall Forum of the National Academy of Education, Boulder, CO.

Haviland, V. (2002, April). How white teachers (don't) talk about race. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

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

Hicks, D. (1995/1996). Discourse, learning, and teaching. In M. W. Apple (Ed.), *Review of research in education* (Vol. 21, pp. 49-95). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Hull, G. (1998). The changing world of work. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 42*(1), 26-29.

Jervis, K. (1996). "How come there are no brothers on this list?": Hearing the hard questions all children ask. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*(3), 546-576.

Lankshear, C. (1997). *Changing literacies*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Lemke, J. L. (1990). *Talking science: Language, learning, and values*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Lewis, C., & Fabos, B. (1999, December). *Chatting on-line: Uses of instant message communication among adolescent girls*. Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Orlando, FL.

Luke, A. (in press). Literacy and the other: A sociological approach to literacy research and policy in multilingual societies. *Reading Research Quarterly*.

Luke, A. (2001). Foreword. In E. B. Moje & D. G. O'Brien (Eds.), *Constructions of literacy: Studies of teaching and learning in and out of secondary schools* (pp. ix-xii). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Luke, A., & Elkins, J. (1998). Reinventing literacy in "new times". *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 42*, 4-7.

Mahiri, J. (1994). Reading rites and sports: Motivation for adaptive literacy of young African American males. In B. J. Moss (Ed.), *Literacy across communities* (pp. 121-146). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Marx, R. W., Blumenfeld, P. C., Krajcik, J. S., & Soloway, E. (1997). Enacting project-based science. *The Elementary School Journal, 97*, 341-358.

Moje, E. B. (1995). Talking about science: An interpretation of the effects of teacher talk in a high school classroom. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 32*, 349-371.

Moje, E. B. (1997). Exploring discourse, subjectivity, and knowledge in chemistry class. *Journal of Classroom Interaction, 32*, 35-44.

Moje, E. B. (2000). To be part of the story: The literacy practices of gangsta adolescents. *Teachers College Record, 102*, 652-690.

Moje, E. B. (2002). But where are the youth: Integrating youth culture into literacy theory. *Educational Theory, 52*, 97-120.

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. & McIntosh Ciechanowski, K. (2002). Literacy, language, and life in the millennial world: A study of Latino/a youth literacy in one urban community. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Myers, G. (1989). The pragmatics of politeness in scientific articles. *Applied Linguistics, 10*, 1-35.

New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*, 60-92.

Obidah, J. E. (1998). Black-mystory: Literate currency in everyday schooling. In D. E. Alvermann, K. A. Hinchman, D. W. Moore, S. F. Phelps, & D. R. Waff (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing the literacies in adolescents' lives* (pp. 51-71). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

O'Brien, D., Moje, E. B., & Stewart, R. A. (2001). Exploring the contexts of secondary and adolescent literacy: Literacy in people's everyday school lives. In E. B. Moje & D. O'Brien (Eds.), *Constructions of literacy: Studies of teaching and learning in and out of secondary schools* (pp. 27-48). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Smagorinsky, P. & O'Donnell-Allen, C. (1998). Reading as Mediated and Mediating Action: Composing Meaning for Literature through Multimedia Interpretive Texts. *Reading Research Quarterly, 33*(2), 198-226.

Sutherland, L. M. (2002). *African American girls reading African American women: A study of literacy, identity, and multicultural education.* Unpublished Dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Elizabeth B. Moje is an associate professor of Educational Studies at the University of Michigan.

LeeAnn M. Sutherland is a postdoctoral research fellow at the University of Michigan.

Announcements

CEE Award Announcements

A number of awards were presented by the Conference on English Education at the NCTE Annual Convention in Atlanta, Georgia. The 2002 **James N. Britton Award** for Inquiry within the English Language Arts was presented to John Gaughan, *Reinventing English: Teaching in the Combat Zone* (Boynton/Cook, 2001). The 2002 **Richard A. Meade Award** for Research in English Education was presented to Todd DeStigter, *Literacy, Democracy and the Forgotten Students of Addison High: Reflections of a Citizen Teacher* (NCTE, 2001) and Cathy Fleischer, *Teachers Organizing for Change: Making Literacy Learning Everybody's Business* (NCTE, 2000). The 2002 **James Moffett Award** for Teacher Research was presented to Kim Douillard, Jan Hamilton, and Danan McNamara of Cardiff Elementary School, Cardiff, California.

TYCA Fame and Shame Nominations

The Two-Year College English Association is accepting nominations for the 2003 TYCA Fame and Shame Awards. Nominations for the TYCA Fame Award should be representations of two-year students and faculty that reflect truthfully on the community college at its best. Nominations for the TYCA Shame Award should be representations that perpetuate negative stereotypes or insult the work of students and faculty at two-year colleges.

The mentions or portrayals of two-year colleges must have been made publicly between March 2002 and March 2003 and in verifiable form—a news story, magazine reference, movie scene, or TV remark. Winners of the 2003