English, literacy and neoliberal policies:
Mapping a contested moment in the United States

JORY BRASS
Arizona State University

ABSTRACT: *This essay maps some of the ways in which the professional knowledge of English teaching has been defined and positioned in the present moment in the United States. The first part of the essay traces multidisciplinary shifts in English education/literacy research that have expanded and shifted the discursive boundaries of teacher education and ordered new ways for English educators to understand the English language arts, to structure methods courses, and to fashion themselves as teacher educators. The second part of the paper traces neoliberal policies that aim to reform teaching and teacher education through professional standards, national assessments, corporate managerialism, and free market competition. The essay then highlights some of the ways in which these discourses and practices have worked together to create new conditions of possibility in English education, to intensify old divisions in the field, and constitute new forms of professional knowledge and subjectivity. My goal is to heighten English educators' sense of this contested moment to provoke more informed and strategic engagements with the possibilities, constraints, tensions and transformations facing the English teaching professions.*

KEYWORDS: *English teaching, literacy, education policy, education reform.*

INTRODUCTION

The professional knowledge of teaching and teacher education has emerged as a key policy issues across a number of continents and countries (Furlong, Cochran-Smith, & Brennan, 2009). In the United States, English education conventionally has been understood as an academic field comprised of university faculty, whose scholarship and teaching are related to pre-service or in-service teachers of the English language arts (Alsup, Emig, Pradl, Tremmel & Yagelski, 2006). Here, English teacher education faculty—"English educators"—recognise a professional knowledge base derived from "systematic, interdisciplinary inquiry in English studies, education, the scientific study of human behaviour, and related fields" (Alsup et al., 2006, p. 281). English educators see their work as conducting interdisciplinary inquiry, transforming this scholarship into a basis for teachers to understand and enhance their practice, and supporting pre-service and in-service English teachers in primary, middle and secondary schools. At the same time, English educators also concede that research on English teaching has often had negligible effects on education policies or teachers' classroom practices (Alsup et al., 2006).

The limited uptake of English education scholarship stems in part from the positioning of academic research within the professional discourse of English education in the United States. In comparison to other Anglophone countries, the U.S. draws stronger distinctions between primary, middle and secondary school teachers, teacher education faculty, education researchers, and faculty in English studies and

composition studies (Doeke, Homer, & Nixon, 2003; McComiskey, 2006; Yagelski, 2006). This professional differentiation maps onto traditional theory-practice binaries in education (Green & Reid, 2008) and gets reproduced through institutional divisions and practices of educational organisations, such as the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), the large professional organisation focused on English teaching in the U.S. The NCTE, for example, sponsors separate conferences and professional journals for empirical researchers (annual meeting of the NCTE Assembly for Research and journal, *Research in the Teaching of English*), English educators (bi-annual Conference on English Education and journal, *English Education*), and scholars of English (*College English*) and composition studies (*College Composition and Communication*). Conversely, college and university faculty generally assume marginal roles in NCTE's large annual convention, which is dominated by commercial vendors and interactive sessions focused on "practical" ideas and teaching strategies for classroom teachers. The Council also publishes three "practitioner journals" for elementary, middle and secondary teachers—*Language Arts, Voices in the Middle,* and *English Journal*—that also emphasise classroom ideas and strategies.

In this differentiated professional landscape, English educators conceive of themselves as mediating teachers' professional knowledge (Alsup et al., 2006). However, these professional divisions work against ideas and practices moving across different contexts of English teaching and create conditions in which teachers, education researchers, disciplinary faculty, and teacher educators often work from competing epistemologies and politics. Positioned as intermediaries, English educators are often pressured by schools, professional organisations, and state policies to acculturate beginning teachers into the professional norms and practices of K-12 schooling. At the same time, English education faculty also may be expected to publish research and secure external funding like faculty in other academic disciplines (Yagelski, 2006). This has often led to a kind of double marginalisation, in which university-based teacher educators neither produce the "practical" knowledge of K-12 schools nor rigorous scholarship that meets the inquiry norms of academic disciplines outside of education (Labaree, 2004).

The last three decades have exacerbated these perennial struggles and effected new possibilities, tensions, and problems with respect to the professional knowledge of English teaching. The 1990s, in particular, spawned two contradictory movements that have largely configured struggles over professional knowledge in the current moment. On one hand, peer-reviewed research marked a "shift of seismic proportions" (Dressman, 2007) as multidisciplinary studies of language and literacy as social practices displaced cognitive and psycholinguistic paradigms as the dominant lines of research on literacy, writing and English teaching (Beach, Green, Kamil, & Shanahan, 2005; Brass & Burns, 2011; Dutro & Collins, 2011; Juzwik et al., 2006). On the other hand, the 1990s also gave rise to increased state, federal, and private sector involvement in education, with public education and university-based teacher education increasingly constructed as objects of public policy (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2001; Delandshere & Petrosky, 2004; Doecke, Wyse, & Zacher Pandya, 2012; Doeke et al., 2003; Hursh, 2007; Mayer, Luke & Luke, 2008; Taubman, 2009). These largely contradictory movements have continued into the early 21st Century to structure struggles over evidence and expertise in education and to intensify long-standing divisions between university faculty and K-12 teachers:

> What it means to be an "expert" researcher and teacher are only (at best) tenuously related. For example, the lives of new assistant professors at research focused colleges and universities and new secondary school teachers are becoming increasingly divergent—with specific and incommensurable reward structures built into them. The latter are increasingly judged by the test scores of their students....The former are increasingly judged by their ability to publish research reports in specific sets of journals and/or book presses, as well as their ability to acquire funding from specific kinds and types of granting agencies....This is a long-standing division, of course. But for a field often marked by movement between researcher and practitioner foci, this is a new kind of intensification. (Dimitriadis, 2012, p. 5)

This analytical essay offers a "topological and geological survey of the battlefield" (Foucault, 1980) to draw attention to intensified struggles over the professional knowledge of English teaching in the United States. The first part of the essay traces multidisciplinary shifts in English education/literacy research that have expanded and shifted the discursive boundaries of teacher education and ordered new ways for English educators to understand the English language arts, to structure methods courses, and to fashion themselves as teacher educators (Brass & Webb, 2014). The second part of the paper offers a partial map of neoliberal policies that have established a "new teacher education" (Cochran-Smith, 2009) patterned by standards, national assessments, and constructions of professional practice developed through policy networks comprised of state and federal policy-makers, venture philanthropy, and the private sector (Ball, 2012). The essay then highlights some of the ways in which these discourses and practices have worked together to create new conditions of possibility in English education, to intensify old divisions in the field, and constitute new forms of professional knowledge and subjectivity. My goal is to heighten English educators' sense of this contested moment to provoke more informed and strategic engagements with the possibilities, constraints, tensions, and transformations facing the English teaching professions.

MULTIDISCIPLINARY DISCOURSES OF ENGLISH EDUCATION

Since the onset of the 20th Century, the professional knowledge of education in the United States has primarily been derived from the educational sciences, particularly the "psy" disciplines (Popkewitz, 1991). Reforms of the Progressive Era of U.S. education (1880s-1920s) sought to "professionalise" education by employing psychological expertise to legitimate and guide the practices of curriculum, teaching and teacher education (Popkewitz, 1991). In the early 21st Century, scientific rationality and psychological research remain central to education reforms and the work of education faculty, who now may take up cognitive and neo-Vygotskian psychologies in addition to the behavioural, developmental and psychometric psychologies of the early 20th century (Popkewitz, 2008). More influential in the U.S. than in other Anglophone countries, educational psychologies have played a key role in organising English educators' views of learning, development, curriculum, assessment and teaching methods for most of the last century (Brass, 2009; Green & Reid, 2008).

Documenting the prevalence of psychological expertise in English education, Smagorinsky and Whiting's (1995) empirical study of secondary English methods

course syllabi from the early 1990s concluded that a vast majority of university-based English "methods" courses were governed by psychological and psycholinguistic frameworks that had been influential for several decades. Twenty years ago, the field was largely comprised of approaches influenced by developmental psychologies, constructivism, student-centred instruction, instructional scaffolding, cognitive reading and writing processes, whole language, and transactional theories of reader response. The field's struggles over professional knowledge were often ordered by a series of oppositions that primarily pitted "progressive" approaches to English education—that is, those derived historically from Progressive Era educational psychologies—against behavioural psychologies and transmission pedagogies. In Smagorinsky's words,

> If my study of English education methods classes (Smagorinsky & Whiting, 1995) is at all accurate, the overwhelming majority of preservice teachers in the United States learn teaching methods in their universities that are constructivist, student-centered, process-oriented, fluid-time, progressive, and therefore at odds with the highly predictable, structured, content-driven, form-oriented values that predominate in most schools. (Smagorinsky, 1999, p. 69)

These progressive/traditional oppositions have continued to influence mainstream conceptions of English teaching, divide the field, and structure how some teachers and teacher educators narrate experiences of professional conflict, tension, fragmentation and disjointedness (Moore, 2008; Smagorinsky, 2002). In the 1990s, however, leading research journals in the United States indicated a decisive shift away from the cognitive, developmental, and psycholinguistic paradigms that had dominated English language arts scholarship since the 1970s. Across the 1990s, the social turn in the humanities and social sciences expanded the field's academic knowledge beyond psychology to multidisciplinary perspectives influenced by scholarship in sociology, anthropology, sociolinguistics, history, composition studies, and other fields (Brass & Burns, 2011; Dressman, 2007; Dutro & Collins, 2011; Juzwik et al., 2006). Smagorinsky & Whiting's (1995) study suggests that this multidisciplinary turn in peer-review research had not yet manifested itself in English teacher education. Over the last twenty years, however, the rise of "literacy", the proliferation of "critical" fields of education, and the turn towards literary theories and cultural studies have expanded and shifted the terms by which teachers and teacher educators can understand and approach the English language arts.

Literacy

In the 1980s and 1990s, much of the educational language associated with texts changed from the terms "reading" and "writing" to "literacy" (Lankshear & Knobel, 2006). Some professional communities simply claimed literacy as a traditional focus of the English language arts (e.g., Alsup et al., 2006; Mayher, 2012) or appropriated the term literacy to name what they previously had been doing as reading researchers, educational psychologists and teachers (Lankshear & Knobel, 2006). For sociocultural scholars and educators, however, the term literacy explicitly rejected the psychological reductionism of "reading" research and foregrounded the social, cultural, and political dimensions of languages and texts-in-use (Lankshear & Knobel, 2006). In this sense, the rise of "literacy" as a governing frame for research, teaching, and teacher education constituted a more fundamental discursive break away, that

spawned a range of multidisciplinary frameworks of English language arts—if not ushered in a new paradigm of English-as-literacy (Green, 2006).

Across the 1990s, multidisciplinary scholars in the United States framed language and literacy studies as a "sociocultural" field that had converged around conceptions of literacy as social practice. James Gee dubbed this emerging, interdisciplinary field the "New Literacy Studies", which included multidisciplinary perspectives from linguistics, history, anthropology, rhetoric and composition studies, cultural psychology, education and related fields (Beach et al., 2005; Gee, 1996; Street, 1995). The NLS is no longer "new", and it is now associated with several strands of scholarship, including studies of local or situated literacies, multiliteracies, new literacies, social semiotics, cultural historical psychology, ethnography of communication, new composition studies, Bakhtinian dialogism, discourse analysis, and critical discourse analysis (Gee, 2009). Decades later, many teacher educators now identify as "literacy teacher educators" and position multidisciplinary scholarship in the New Literacy Studies, multiliteracies, and critical literacy as the professional knowledge of the English language arts (Kosnick, Rowsell, Williamson, Simon & Beck, 2013).

Sociocultural studies of language and literacy initially focused on language and literacy practices outside of school. This work was useful in the sense that it attended to the cultural and linguistic resources of non-dominant groups that were often obscured, if not dismissed, by traditional psychological and linguistic frameworks that were often premised on deficit-constructions of cultural and linguistic difference. In addition, this work often accounted for the changing social, technological and semiotic contexts of contemporary communication and literate practice—especially noting the salience of cultural and linguistic diversity, multimodality and digital media in contemporary personal, social, civic and economic life (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000; Lankshear & Knobel, 2006).

Language and literacy studies did not initially foreground school-based literacies, educational contexts, or the relevance of literacy studies to curriculum, teaching, assessment and teacher education (Street, 2005; van Enk, Dagenais & Toohey, 2005). However, this scholarship offered at least three challenges and contributions to English teaching and teacher education. First, sociocultural scholarship leveraged studies of out-of-school literacies to challenge what counted as literacy in school:

> Traditionally, [literacy pedagogy] has meant teaching and learning to read and write in page-bound, official, standard forms of the national language. Literacy pedagogy, in other words, has been a carefully restricted project—restricted to formalised, monolingual, monocultural, and rule-governed forms of language....We want to extend the idea and scope of literacy pedagogy to account for the context of our culturally and linguistically diverse and increasingly globalised societies...[and] account for the burgeoning variety of text forms associated with information and multimedia technologies. (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000, p. 9)

Second, and related, this work generated overlapping approaches to bridge literacy and learning inside and outside of school (Gonzalez, Moll & Amanti, 2005; Hull & Schultz, 2001), to promote culturally sustaining pedagogies as part of the democratic project of schooling (Paris, 2012), and to leverage research on youth, literacy, and popular culture to reshape teaching and teacher education (Petrone, 2013). Over the

last decade, literacy scholarship has included a "classroom turn" (Larson & Marsh, 2005) that has moved beyond critique and a focus on out-of-school literacies to develop sociocultural frameworks for classroom teaching, assessment and teacher education (Street, 2005). Much of this work has been international in focus and authorship, including books that explore classroom pedagogies influenced by the New Literacy Studies, multiliteracies, critical literacy, sociocultural-historical psychology and new media/digital tools (Larson & Marsh, 2005; Pahl & Rowsell, 2005) and their implications for university-based teacher education (Kosnick et al., 2013; Rowsell, Kosnik & Beck, 2008).

Critical approaches

These latter approaches often combined literacy scholarship with a second key shift in the discourse of English/literacy education—the uptake of "critical" approaches in teacher education. Critical theories seemingly played little role in English teacher education in the early 1990s (Smagorinsky & Whiting, 1995). In contrast, the last few decades have spawned a proliferation of "critical" fields in education, including the new sociology of education, cultural studies, critical pedagogy, critical race studies, curriculum studies and the trans-disciplinary space of qualitative inquiry (Dimitriadis, 2012, p. viii). The impact of this work has not been pronounced in the teacher education field, which is often quite conservative (Giroux, 2010; Kumashiro, 2010); however, the discourse of "critical pedagogy" has expanded the theoretical horizons of teacher education, leading to more critical pedagogies of teacher education (Groenke & Hatch, 2009), calls for political action in English education (Alsup et al., 2006), critical pedagogies of urban education and popular culture (Duncan-Andrade & Morrell, 2010; Morrell, 2002), writing as praxis (Yagelski, 2012), and Freirean approaches to early childhood teacher education (Souto-Manning, 2010). A leading advocate of this movement, Ernest Morrell, defined a "critical English education" as a space where English educators and English teachers position themselves as activists and intellectuals:

> A critical English education is explicit about the role of language and literacy in conveying meaning and in promoting or disrupting existing power relations. It also seeks to develop in young women and men skills to deconstruct dominant texts carefully (i.e. canonical literature, media texts) while also instructing them in skills that allow them to create their own critical texts that can be used in the struggle for social justice. Further, critical English education encourages practitioners to draw upon the everyday language and literacy practices of adolescents to make connections with academic literacies and to work toward empowered identity development and social transformation. (Morrell, 2005, p. 313)

The rise of "critical literacy" represents a related term and turn in English/literacy teacher education—even as the critical literacy movement has been slow to take hold in U.S. teacher education (Rogers, 2013). Allan Luke (2012) has traced the lineage of critical literacy from the 1970s uptake of Freirean critical pedagogy in the U.S. to more recent work in critical discourse analysis that is more pronounced in England and Australia (Luke, 2012); thus, "critical pedagogy" and "critical literacy" often overlap in education discourses, particularly in the United States (Muspratt, Luke & Freebody, 1997; Phelan & Sumison, 2008). However, later models of critical literacy—especially those developed in England, Australia, and South Africa—have marked partial breaks from Freirean critical pedagogy with more linguistic and

pedagogical emphases on developing specific practices for teachers and students to engage languages, texts and discourses from critical standpoints (Janks, 2009; Luke, 2012). In the current moment, international constructions of critical literacy may draw from different scholarly literatures but generally share three elements:

1. a focus on ideology critique and cultural analysis as a key element of education against cultural exclusion and marginalisation;
2. a commitment to inclusion of working class, cultural and linguistic minorities, indigenous learners, and others marginalised on the basis of gender, sexuality, or other forms of difference;
3. an engagement with the significance of text, ideology and discourse in the construction of social and material relations, everyday cultural and political life. (Luke, 2012, p. 6)

Critical literacies are not dominant in U.S. scholarship in English education and have been taken up unevenly in teacher education programs and K-12 classrooms. However, a range of teacher educators and researchers continue to draw from the work of Paulo Freire and neo-Marxist critical theories, and have also taken up international scholarship in critical literacy, particularly the work of Allan Luke, Barbara Comber and Hilary Janks.

Literary theory and cultural studies

Finally, research journals in English education explicitly broke from humanities-based research five decades ago in the interest of legitimating English education as a social science (Brass & Burns, 2011). Given this historical break, work in schools and colleges of education has often unfolded with little consideration of the ways that literary and cultural theories might influence K-12 practices of reading and literature. Likewise, literary and cultural theorists were generally not concerned with the kinds of reading and literary instruction taking place in K-12 schools (McCormick, 1994; Rabinowitz & Smith, 1998). This traditional division weakened somewhat by the 1990s, however, creating conditions in which traditional, psycholinguistic frameworks for reader response and literature instruction could be put into dialogue with literary theories to account for the ways in which reading positions, texts and classroom practices were constituted in and by discourses or discourse communities (Freebody, Luke & Gilbert, 1991; McCormick, 1994; Mellor & Patterson, 1994; Rabinowitz & Smith, 1998). This relaxed distinction enabled many teacher educators and teachers to move away from older theoretical frameworks, such as whole language, schema theory, and transactional theories of reader response, that offered limited notions of social context, apolitical conceptions of texts, and individualistic notions of readers (Galda & Beach, 2001; McCormick, 1994).

This weakened division between literary scholars and teachers enabled some work in literary theory and cultural studies to seep into English teacher education. In the aftermath of the theory wars in English studies, English educators developed classroom reading practices influenced by critical literary theory (Appleman, 2000; Schade-Eckert, 2006; Scholes, 1985; Slevin & Young, 1996), cultural studies (Carey-Webb, 2001; Morrell, 2008), media studies (Beach, 2007; Morrell, Duenas, Garcia & Lopez, 2013), and youth studies (Petrone, 2013; Petrone & Lewis, 2012; Sarigianides, 2012). In many cases, however, these movements remain less influential and

pronounced than related work in England, Canada and Australia, that have introduced teachers to cultural studies frameworks and to reading practices and positions that have equipped teachers and students with multiple ways to approach literary, non-fiction and media texts in order to interrogate received notions of "literature," to foster resistant and oppositional readings, and to help readers see how readers and texts have been constituted and positioned through discursive practice (Buckingham & Sefton-Green, 1994; Mellor & Patterson, 2004; Pirie, 1997; Storey, 1996/2003/2010).

In summary, these discursive breaks of the past three decades have changed the ways in which it is possible to think and act in English education. Traditional psychological frameworks of English education remain operative in the field, and the relatively strong demarcations among teachers, teacher educators, and scholars in the U.S. have often worked against academic research and theory being taken up in teacher education, much less primary, middle and secondary schools. At the same time, multidisciplinary perspectives have expanded the discursive boundaries of English education and expanded the ways in which teacher educators might understand the English language arts, structure methods courses, and fashion themselves as teacher educators (Brass & Webb, 2014).

NEOLIBERAL DISCOURSES OF "EDUCATION REFORM"

The last three decades have also witnessed the discourse of "education reform", which has ushered in very different constructions of the professional knowledge of English education. Most scholars mark the onset of the current education reform movement in the United States with the National Commission of Excellence in Education's publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983. ANAR invoked national panics about declining standards of education in the United States that were evidenced by alleged declines in standardised test scores and concerns that other countries were threatening the economic and military dominance of the United States. This discourse of education reform combined educational and economic aims, increasingly defining education in terms of human capital development and positioning education as central to individual social mobility, to job creation, and to U.S. corporations' abilities to compete in the global economy.

The mainstream media has now popularised this narrative of education reform in the U.S., repeating tropes of educational "crisis" and framing the present state of education reform as a struggle between the "education establishment"—teachers, professional organisations, unions and teacher education faculty—and "reformers," who are comprised of entrepreneurs, philanthropists, neoliberal economists, state governors, neoconservative think tanks, corporate foundations, test-makers, and business leaders who have named themselves "education experts". In this discourse, it is not academic knowledge and theory, but professional standards, free market competition, data-driven decision-making, and entrepreneurialism that drive excellence, leadership and innovation in educational practice:

> Corporate school reformers like to call themselves just "reformers" and counterpose themselves to the "status quo". And there's no doubt that the corporate/foundation crowd has successfully captured the media label as "education reformers". If you support testing, charters, merit pay, the elimination of tenure and seniority, and control of school policy by corporate managers, you're a "reformer". If you support

increased school funding, collective bargaining, less standardised testing, and control of school policy by educators, you're a "defender of the status quo". (Karp, 2012, para. 1)

In an early analysis of the discourse of "education reform" in teacher education, Cochran-Smith and Fries (2001) identified two national agendas that dominated policy debates of the 1990s: the "professionalisation agenda" and the "deregulation agenda". The standards-based professionalisation movement was led by educational psychologists, particularly Linda Darling-Hammond, and a series of teacher education consortia—most notably, the National Commission on Teaching and American's Future, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, and the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium—that developed standards for teacher education and assessments for preservice and inservice teachers that were based on performance measures. The standards movement was positioned as a defence of teacher education against the "deregulation" movement, which was led by neoconservative foundations (e.g., Fordham Foundation, Abell Foundation, Heritage Foundation) and neoliberal economists who sought to eliminate universities' "monopoly" on teacher education. Economists and neoconservatives argued that teaching required no special training other than "content knowledge" of school subjects; thus, teacher education programs that required courses on pedagogy, social foundations of education, educational psychologies, and extended field placements posed unnecessary "barriers" to qualified persons entering the teaching profession (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2001). This movement gave rise to "alternative routes" to teacher certification that provided fast tracks for college graduates to enter the teaching profession with little or no university course work, as well as explicit calls to eliminate university-based teacher education.

Over the last two decades, standards and deregulation have been joined together in a series of influential policies, including the *No Child Left Behind* Act of 2001 and the Obama administration's *Race to the Top*. NCLB, for example, leveraged federal funding to compel the fifty states to adopt subject-area standards and high-stakes standardised testing as a centre piece of education reform; this legislation also provided federal funding for alternative routes to teacher certification (such as Teach for America), and for-profit and fast-track certification programs that would enable career-changers and military veterans to bypass university-based teacher education and acquire teaching licenses in a matter of weeks. This was facilitated in part by NCLB's definition of "highly qualified teachers" as college graduates who passed standardised tests—which did not require graduating from university-based teacher education programs. Largely extending these policies, the Obama administration's federal *Race to the Top* grants limited states' eligibility for federal funding unless they adopted Common Core State Standards and associated high-stakes tests, switched to test-based ("value-added") teacher evaluation systems, and provided additional public funding for for-profit schools and for-profit teacher education programs to compete with the public education system and university-based teacher education.

Standards and accountability

Most transformations in education since the late 1990s have fallen under the umbrella of "standards and accountability" (Taubman, 2009). The optional standards movements of the late 1980s and early 1990s were largely controversial and

culminated in NCTE/IRA (1995) guidelines for English Language Arts that were largely unpopular (Mayher, 1999). Since NCLB, however, the discourse of standards and accountability has reshaped the common sense of education and enmeshed teaching and teacher education in new languages and networks of relations:

> The demands for higher standards and more accountability, the incessant talk of measurement, numerical data and quantification, the claims that teachers and, thus, teacher education are responsible for the nation's economic, racial, and political state, the contention that teaching is a science and that we know what works in classrooms, the calls for professionalisation, all these are only a few of the linguistic nodal points in an elaborate discursive web of statements which find support mainly in their reiteration. (Taubman, 2009, p. 85)

This discourse has restructured the professional knowledge of teaching and teacher education by subjecting teachers and teacher educators to a series of standards emanating from a range of stakeholders inside and outside of the field of education. The languages and practices of standards and accountability have emanated from the work of neoliberal economic policies, neoconservative social agendas, corporate business practices, and work in the learning sciences that has made it possible to align curricula, teaching and teacher education with corporate interests and economic aims (Taubman, 2009). Most state and federal education policies passed, from the late 1990s to the present, standards and accountability measures that have positioned classroom teachers as implementers of content and pedagogy that have been determined by policy-makers, standards writers, and standardised testing companies. The Common Core State Standards, for example, were developed through networks of entrepreneurs, venture philanthropists, business leaders, and standardised testing companies, who established standards now effect in all but a few U.S. states (Rothman, 2011). In contrast to the proliferation of professional frameworks described earlier, English language arts standards claim a professional consensus in English education and define English teaching in behavioural terms of fixed knowledge and generic skills that teachers should implement in all contexts. In standards-based education, the work of English teaching then is to align curriculum, teaching, and classroom assessments with behavioural objectives that are aligned with state standards that are aligned with state-sanctioned tests of academic achievement.

Similarly, professional standards have also been positioned to govern teacher education coursework, field placements, and student teaching/internship experiences. In the standards and accountability era, for example, teacher educators have needed to rewrite course syllabi in the language of professional standards, document assignments that can be used as evidence that prospective teachers have "met standards", and demonstrate that courses and field experiences have been "aligned" and "mapped" to standards sanctioned by state, university and professional accreditation bodies (Delandshere & Petrosky, 2004, pp. 3-4). With standards being developed for assessment purposes, teachers and teacher educators must match what they do to the language of standards that represent English teaching in terms of generic skills and competencies, universal content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, and dispositions that are disconnected from broader conceptual structures (Delandshere & Petrosky, 2004)—such as the multidisciplinary frameworks outlined in the first section of this paper.

Technical-instrumentalist discourses of education

With standards now coupled with assessment practices in the interest of holding teachers and teacher educators "accountable" for educational outcomes, the language of standards documents has framed the professional knowledge of education in primarily technical terms. Those who adhere to technical views of teaching have historically distrusted teachers, sought to restrict the scope of teachers' decision-making with respect to curriculum and teaching, called for increased standards, and have subjected students and teachers to performance evaluations that are conceived as objective (Prakash & Waks, 1985; Schiro, 2013). In technical discourses, educational aims have been defined as observable outputs that can be assessed quantitatively through measures understood as objective; outputs are generally stated in terms of behavioural objectives that represent observable and/or measurable skills and behaviours, such as measures of cognitive competencies, mental skills, content knowledge, and especially standardised test scores. The technical orientation of early 21st century policies overlap in important ways with early 20th century reforms, including Taylorist industrial models of education reform (Taylor, 1911), social efficiency education (Bobbitt, 1918/2004), and the Tyler rationale for curriculum development (Tyler, 1949).

In technical discourses, English teachers have been constructed as "managers" of learning and behaviour who structure environments, demonstrations and linear sequences of instruction to transmit "content" and reinforce the overt behaviours and terminal performances that constitute the knowledge and skills that external agencies have named learning, achievement and excellence. These conceptions of teaching and learning preclude debates over educational aims, privilege means-ends logics, and devalue aspects of education that cannot be represented in observable or measurable terms, such as ethical commitments, political engagement, and theoretical understandings of curriculum, pedagogy, inequality, and the role of schooling in society (Delandshere & Petrosky, 2004). Importantly then, many of the ethical, political, imaginative and aesthetic dimensions of English teaching do not figure prominently in a discourse that has defined teaching in terms of standards, assessment and test-based accountability (Patterson, 2000).

Neoliberal audit culture

In many ways, state and federal policies have resuscitated business-models of teaching and education reform that date back to failed reforms of the early 20th Century. At the same time, however, they have been joined with 21st century audit technologies that have worked to redefine and discipline teachers' professional knowledge and practice:

> Audit technologies standardise and regularise expert knowledges so that they can be used to classify and diagnose populations of workers and the potential risks in managing them. Discourses of efficiency and quality, for example, regularise academic practice, narrowly defining values and successes in order to render them measurable. (Davies & Bansel, 2010, p. 7)

With teaching and learning increasingly defined in technical and behavioural terms, teaching and teacher education can be more efficiently monitored and disciplined through technologies of measurement, audit and surveillance derived from the

business world. For example, the federal NCLB act leveraged high-stakes standardised testing to hold all public schools accountable to helping all students meet state-set standards for academic proficiency by 2014. Schools were audited in terms of standardised test scores and measures of "Adequate Yearly Progress" that enabled state and federal agencies to construct school report cards that compared, ranked, graded and disciplined schools largely on the basis of standardised measures. With the impending rise of value-added teacher assessments in all states that have received NCLB waivers or federal *Race to the Top* grants, individual teachers now will be subject to annual audits and performance-triggers to determine which have "added value" in relation to predicted increases in students' academic achievement as measured by tests tied to the new Common Core Standards (Amrein-Beardsley, 2014). Here, academic achievement data constitute the basis to assess teacher performance, determine merit pay, and remove teachers whose students fail to demonstrate predicted gains in academic achievement in consecutive years.

Likewise, the effectiveness of university-based teacher education programs can also be defined, measured, compared and managed on the basis of high-stakes standardising testing and standardised teacher assessments. Just as value-added assessments purport to determine the ways in which individual teachers produce gains or declines in academic achievement, the "value" of teacher education can also be determined through twice-removed measures of academic achievement. Last month, the federal Department of Education announced a plan to eliminate university-based teacher education programs on the basis of measures of their graduates' capacities to "add value" to student achieve test scores. Similarly, a new wave of standardised teacher assessments developed by entrepreneurs and education businesses, including the EdTPA, TAP rubric and Danielson rubric also provide standardised bases to observe, assess and certify teachers against behaviourist representations of teacher quality represented in rubrics.

These tools and practices structure conditions in which teachers must comport themselves to display the observable and measurable performances that correspond to standardised templates of professional conduct and content knowledge delineated by rubrics. On a broader scale, the widespread use of these rubrics has made it possible to assess, rank and discipline teacher education programs on the basis of scores on these teacher observation rubrics. The federal Department of Education announced plans to leverage classroom-based measures of teacher performance into a national rating system of university-based teacher education programs that would form another numerical basis to evaluate and manage teacher education programs. In an era of declining state revenues and attacks on the public sector, these audit technologies and their associated disciplinary practices may play a key role in naming "low performing" public schools and university-based teacher education programs on the basis of statistical comparisons—and replace them with standards-aligned education technologies and for-profit service providers of teacher education focused on test preparation (Burch, 2009; Cochran-Smith, 2009; Weiner, 2007).

In summary, today's educational policies posit that educators and teacher educators can best address social, political and economic problems by complying with regulatory agencies and their mandated audit practices, being subject and subjecting themselves to external controls, and seeing their students—and themselves—in terms of quantifiable data (Taubman, 2009, p. 144). In contrast to the multidisciplinary

movements with English education scholarship, state and federal policies have taken up governing practices of advanced liberalism (Rose, 1999) and the global education reform movement (Ball, 2012) to reconstruct professional knowledge and practice in education. On the one hand, teaching and teacher education can be "governed at a distance" through calculations, audits and disciplinary practices that enable politicians, philanthropists and the private sector to monitor and steer work in the public sector (Rose, 1999). This mode of governance creates incentives to reorient teaching and teacher education around practices that are likely to increase measurable performance outcomes (standards, benchmarks, test scores, teacher evaluation rubrics)—and to downplay aspects of professional work that may not have direct influence on performance analytics for individuals, institutions or organisations (Ball, 2012).

On the other hand, this governance also works upon and through teachers' and teacher educators' freedoms and capacities for self-management. With the emphasis on "performativity" within neoliberal education reforms, educators are incited to think about and act upon themselves in terms of their performance: "Performativity invites and incites us to make ourselves more effective, to work on ourselves, to improve ourselves and to feel guilty or inadequate when we do not" (Ball, 2012, p. 31). For roughly a century, the social and educational sciences provided expert knowledge that legitimated and guided the work of curriculum, teaching and teacher education. Over the last two decades, however, languages and practices that emanated from neoliberal economic policies, corporate managerial practices, neoconservative social agendas, and the learning sciences have constituted new forms of professional knowledge and subjectivity. Neoliberal education policies do not determine how teachers and teacher educators think and act. At the same time, the language and practices of neoliberalism have had material effects at all levels of English education in the United States:

> None of us who teach, regardless of the educational level, are immune to the effects of the transformation taking place. It reaches into the corners of our practices, constricts our daily life in schools, and influences how we think about what we do in classrooms. It dictates how we spend at least some of our professional time, how our work is evaluated, and how we determine the meaning of our work. (Taubman, 2009, p. 13)

ENGAGING THE PRESENT MOMENT IN ENGLISH EDUCATION

The present moment of English Education has been structured by a series of transformations inside and outside of the profession that offer important challenges to teacher educators and teachers of the English language arts. In some cases, the last few decades have led to modest yet important moves toward more expansive visions of literacy, culturally sustaining pedagogies, multidisciplinary alternatives to traditional psychologies of education, and more sociocultural and critical ways to understand and do the work of English teaching, teacher education and education research (Beach et al., 2005; Brass & Webb, 2014; Kirkland, 2010; Morrell, 2005; Paris, 2012; Rogers, 2013). Even so, many teacher educators in the United States have little sense of neoliberalism and the larger picture of global education reform movements that may be undermining public education, university-based teacher education, local control of schools and democratic governance (Furlong et al., 2009; Howe & Meens, 2012; Kumashiro, 2010; Weiner, 2007). Thus, this essay has offered

a "topological and geological survey of the battlefield" of the present moment to draw attention to salient struggles within and around English education in the United States:

> What the intellectual can do is to provide instruments of analysis, and at present this is the historian's central role. What's effectively needed is a ramified, penetrative perception of the present, one that makes it possible to locate lines of weakness, strong points, positions where the imbalances of power have secured and implanted themselves....In other words, a topological and geological survey of the battlefield— that is the intellectual's role. But as for saying, "Here is what you must do!" Certainly not. (Foucault, 1980a, p. 62)

Today's English education has been structured in part by multiple and often contradictory discourses of education reform. Over the last twenty years, in particular, a number of multidisciplinary frameworks have structured new repertoires for theorising and practising in K-12 classrooms and university methods courses. Traditional frameworks remain operative, if not prevalent, in many teacher education programs, professional standards for teachers and teacher educators, and professional organisations, such as the National Council of Teachers of English. Now, however, English teaching can be understood and practised from a range of positions and explicit theoretical frameworks structured by recent scholarship in language and literacy studies, cultural studies, critical theory, sociology, anthropology, semiotics, media and communications studies and literary theory (Brass & Webb, 2014; Luke, 2004). These ongoing shifts in academic research and theory have changed the possibilities of teaching and teacher education, but the field's changing cartography also has made it harder for teacher educators, teachers and graduate students to stay abreast of the field's proliferating theories, languages, practices and subject positions (Alsup et al., 2006; Kelly, 2004).

This challenge has been complicated further by a series of dividing practices within English education. With "social" and "critical" theories often critiquing traditional psychologies of English education, the field now may be divided by competing notions of "reading" and "literacy" (Lankshear & Knobel, 2006), autonomous versus ideological models of literacy (Street, 1984), and mainstream versus "critical" discourses of multiculturalism and teacher education (McCarthy, 1994; Phelan & Sumsion, 2008). Many of these oppositions have repositioned several "progressive" frameworks of the 1970s to 1990s as dated, if not ideologically suspect stances toward English teaching, that may obscure the social, cultural, and political dimensions of educational practice, assume and extend deficit discourses of cultural and linguistic difference, and ignore relations of privilege and structural inequalities inside and outside of schools. Thus, while critical approaches are far from dominant in U.S. English education, the growing visibility of critical approaches and stances has been conceptually generative, pedagogically useful, and politically important. At the same time, the proliferation of critical approaches can also work to fragment educators and researchers into specialised niches and to intensify long-standing divisions between classroom teachers and university faculty (Dimitriadis, 2012).

This new kind of intensification points to one of the effects of neoliberal education policies and the onset of the "new teacher education" in the early 21st Century (Cochran-Smith, 2009). The last two decades, in particular, have given rise to a series of neoliberal policies that have established the languages and practices of standards and accountability, best practices, choice, evidence-based education, alternative routes

to teacher certification, value-added teacher assessment, and related policies that extoll human capital theories, free market capitalism, and high-stakes standardised testing (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2001; Delandshere & Petrosky, 2004; Doecke et al., 2012; Doeke et al., 2003; Hursh, 2007; Mayer et al., 2008; Taubman, 2009). These policies take up psychologies that overlap in largely unrecognised ways with progressive/traditional discourses of teacher education (see Friedrich, 2014) and the learning sciences (see Taubman, 2009, especially chapter 7). At the same time, these policies have discredited and contradicted the multidisciplinary trends and more expansive views of literacy education outlined in the beginning of this essay. In particular, neoliberal policies have privileged instrumentalist notions of teaching and teacher education that represent a clear "disavowal of critical pedagogy, the civic meaning of schooling, and the role that teachers might play in connecting learning to matters of politics, power, and democracy" (Giroux, 2010, pp. 371-372). The neoliberal era in teacher education has structured key barriers and seldom more than "small openings" to engage in critical work with preservice and inservice teachers (Groenke & Hatch, 2009).

With the rise of neoliberalism in education, the governance of curriculum, teaching, and teacher education has shifted away from the education professions (teachers, administrators, teacher educators, educational researchers, professional organisations) and from democratically elected bodies (local school boards, state and federal legislatures) (Howe & Meens, 2012). Increasingly, educational policy is now being developed and implemented by networks of policy entrepreneurs, state governors, philanthropists, foundations, for-profit and non-profit vendors, and edu-businesses that operate independently of states and on behalf of states (Ball, 2012; Burch, 2009; Picciano & Spring, 2013).

The deceptively named "Common Core State Standards" (CCSS) exemplify these networks and changing governing patterns in US education. In contrast to 1990s standards movements—which involved educators, professional organisations, unions, and public oversight—the Common Core standards were called for and developed by overlapping networks of policy entrepreneurs (e.g., Student Achievement Partners), venture philanthropy (e.g., Gates Foundation, Pearson Foundation, GE Foundation), neoconservative think tanks (Fordham Foundation), corporate executives (e.g., Business Roundtable), and non-governmental trade organisations (Achieve, Inc., National Governors Association) in "partnership" or "consortia" with education publishers (e.g., Pearson Corporation, McGraw-Hill) and standardised testing companies (Education Testing Service, ACT, College Board).

The Standards are the first stage of a three-stage reform movement predicated on increasing "college and career readiness" through high-stakes testing and increased private sector involvement in education (Glastris, 2012; Rothman, 2011). The next stage is the roll out of new on-line standardised tests aligned with the common core, the PARCC and Smarter Balanced assessments, which pilot test results indicate will dramatically decrease the number of U.S. students named "proficient" against grade-level college and career readiness standards. The third stage will roll out "smart" education technologies aligned with the common core, often in the form of competency-based digital games, that employ real-time assessment and reporting of standards-based measures as students play games and work through computerised modules (Glastris, 2012). These "stealth assessments" employ a process of continuous

assessment built around hundreds of data points built into technologies that would enable computers to monitor, assess and respond to progress as students "meet standards" through computer-based lessons and simulations, digital instruments, and especially games (Tucker, 2012).

The Common Core should be read as the centre-point of neoliberal reforms in the United States. The strongest proponents of the CCSS have been quite explicit that the ultimate aim of the standards is to discipline teachers' professional knowledge and practice, to open up public education to investors and entrepreneurs, and to position the education professions as consumers of standards-based services, products, assessments, and educational technologies (Rothman, 2011). In the words of former Microsoft CEO Bill Gates, a central leader of the Common Core movement: "Identifying common standards is not enough. We'll know we've succeeded when the curriculum and the tests are aligned to these standards" (Gates, 2009, para. 48), and

> When the tests are aligned with the common standards, the curriculum will line up as well, and it will unleash a powerful market of people providing services for better teaching. For the first time, there will be a large uniform base of customers looking at using products that can help every kid learn and every teacher get better. (Gates, 2009, para. 50)

The CCSS marked an explicit departure from traditional state and local control of public education and from educators taking central roles in their profession. Rather, the CCSS have created a single "market" where the private sector can reform public education across the fifty states with tests, services and products aligned with the standards. In this "state-led" reform, the free market has been positioned to reshape curriculum, teaching and assessment at the state and local levels through the provision of CCSS-based tests (PARCC and Smarter Balanced), pre-packaged materials developed by educational publishers, and educational technologies and games. Conversely, states, school districts, and teachers have been positioned here as "customers" of these tests, technologies and services.

This growing role of the private sector and non-governmental actors in educational policy-making and governance points to the declining status of teachers, unions, professional organisations, and university teacher educators. At the very least, the education policy landscape in the United States poses significant threats to teachers and teacher educators, including the dismantling of public education, the de-professionalisation of teachers and teaching, the prevalence of deficit discourses of cultural and linguistic difference, scripted and pre-packaged materials tied to high-stakes assessments, and the scripting of teaching and the diminishing of the role of colleges and universities in teacher education (Lytle, 2013, p. xv). Ultimately, these policies may be predicated on dismantling public education and university-based teacher education as part of a wider assault on the public good, the public sector, and social welfare state (Giroux, 2010). For decades an insider within the "education reform" movement, Diane Ravitch now argues that the reform movement she helped lead now marks a concerted effort by major foundations, billionaires, and hedge fund managers to destroy public education for idealistic reasons, for ideological reasons, and for financial reasons (Ravitch, 2013). Similarly, critical educators not only see recent state and federal policies as reactions against critical pedagogy and multicultural education, but very real threats to privatise public education and

eliminate university-based teacher education (Giroux, 2010; Kumashiro, 2010; Weiner, 2007).

In conclusion, the present trajectory of educational policies in the United States represents very real threats to public education, English teaching, and university-based teacher education. For the most part, however, teacher educators and professional organisations in the United States have simply capitulated to top-down reforms, adopting the languages and practices of standards and accountability and assuming positions as "technicians" and "customers" of standards, services and products developed outside of the profession (Taubman, 2009). In contrast, this essay has offered a partial mapping of recent transformations inside and outside of the academy in the hopes that it might help English educators to understand this contested moment, to negotiate multiple and often competing discourses of education reform, to reassess traditional divisions among the English education professions, and to (re)claim an active role in changing the ways in which English teaching might be understood and practiced in the early 21st century.

REFERENCES

Alsup, J., Emig, J., Pradl, G., Tremmel, R., & Yagelski, R. P. (2006). The state of English education and a vision for its future: A call to arms. *English Education, 38*(4), 278-294.

Amrein-Beardsley, A. (2014). *Rethinking value-added models in education: critical perspectives on tests and assessment-based accountability*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Appleman, D. (2000). *Critical encounters in high school English: Teaching literary theory to adolescents*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Ball, S. J. (2012). *Global education Inc.: Neoliberal policy networks and the neo-liberal imaginary*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Beach, R. (2007). *Teachingmedialiteracy.com: A Web-link guide to resources and activities*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Beach, R., Green, J., Kamil, M., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2005). *Multidisciplinary perspectives on literacy research*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Bobbitt, F. (1918/2004). Scientific method in curriculum-making. In D. Flinders & S. Thornton (Eds.), *The curriculum studies reader (2nd Ed.)* (pp. 9-16). New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.

Brass, J. (2009). Historicizing the role of education research in reconstructing English for the 21st Century. *Changing English, 16*(3), 275-286.

Brass, J., & Burns, L. D. (2011). Research in secondary English, 1912-2011: Historical continuities and discontinuities in the NCTE imprint. *Research in the Teaching of English, 46,* 2, 171-186.

Brass, J., & Webb, A. (Eds.). (2014). *Reclaiming English language arts methods courses: Critical issues and challenges for teacher educators in top-down times*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Buckingham, D., & Sefton-Green, J. (1994). *Cultural studies goes to school: Reading and teaching popular media*. London, England: Taylor & Francis.

Burch, P. (2009). *Hidden markets:The new education privatization*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Carey-Webb, A. (2001). *Literature & lives: A response-based, cultural studies approach to teaching English*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2009). The new teacher education in the United States: Directions forward. In J. Furlong, M. Cochran-Smith & M. Brennan (Eds.), *Policy and politics in teacher education* (pp. 9-20). New York, NY: Routledge.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, M. K. (2001). Sticks, stones, and ideology: The discourse of reform in teacher education. *Educational Researcher, 30*(8), 3-15.

Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (Eds.). (2000). *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Davies, B., & Bansel, P. (2010). Governmentality and academic work shaping the hearts and minds of academic workers. *Journal of Curriculum Theorising, 26*(3), 5-20.

Delandshere, G., & Petrosky, A. (2004). Political rationales and ideological standards of the standards-based reform of teacher education in the US. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 20*(1), 1-15.

Dimitriadis, G. (2012). *Critical dispositions: Evidence and expertise in education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Doecke, B., Wyse, D., & Zacher Pandya, J. (2012). Themed issue: English teachers' work. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique, 11*(3), 1-97.

Doeke, B., Homer, D., & Nixon, H. (Eds.). (2003). *English teachers at work: Narratives, counter narratives, and arguments*. Kent Town, SA: Wakefield Press/Australian Association for the Teaching of English.

Dressman, M. (2007). Theoretically framed: Argument and desire in the production of general knowledge about literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly, 42*(3), 332-363.

Duncan-Andrade, J., & Morrell, E. (2010). *The art of critical pedagogy: possibilities for moving from theory to practice in urban schools*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Dutro, E., & Collins, K. (2011). A journey through nine decades of NCTE-published research in elementary literacy. *Research in the Teaching of English, 46*(2), 141-161.

Foucault, M. (1980). Body/power. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977* (pp. 55-62). New York, NY: Pantheon.

Freebody, P., Luke, A., & Gilbert, P. (1991). Reading positions and practices in the classroom. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *21*(4), 435-457.

Friedrich, D. (2014). "We brought it upon ourselves": university-based teacher education and the emergence of boot-camp-style toutes to teacher certification. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives, 22*(2), 1-18.

Furlong, J., Cochran-Smith, M., & Brennan, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Policy and politics in teacher education" international perspectives*. London, England: Routledge.

Galda, L., & Beach, R. (2001). Theory and research into practice: Response to literature. *Reading Research Quarterly, 36*, 64-73.

Gates, B. (Producer). (2009, October, 2013). *Bill Gates—National Conference of State Legislatures*. Retrieved from http://www.gatesfoundation.org/media-center/speeches/2009/07/bill-gates-national-conference-of-state-legislatures-ncsl

Gee, J. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies* (2nd ed.). London, England: Falmer Press.

Gee, J. (2009). A situated sociocultural approach to literacy and technology Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://jamespaulgee.com/node/6

Giroux, H. (2010). Dumbing down teachers: Rethinking the crisis of public education and the demise of the social state. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and cultural Studies, 32*, 339-381.

Glastris, P. (2012, May/June). Introduction: The next wave of school reform. *Washington Monthly*.

Gonzalez, N., Moll, L., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorising practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associaties.

Green, B. (2006). English, literacy, rhetoric: changing the project? *English in Australia, 40*(1), 7-19.

Green, B., & Reid, J.-A. (2008). Method(s) in our madness?: Poststructuralism, pedagogy, and teacher education. In A. Phelan & J. Sumison (Eds.), *Critical readings in teacher education: Provoking absences*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.

Groenke, S., & Hatch, A. (Eds.). (2009). *Critical pedagogy and teacher education in the neoliberal era: Small openings*. New York, NY: Springer.

Howe, K., & Meens, D. (2012). *How recent education reforms undermine local school governance and democratic education*. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center.

Hull, G., & Schultz, K. (2001). Literacy and learning out of school: A review of theory and research. *Review of Educational Research, 71*(4), 575-611.

Hursh, D. (2007). Assessing No Child Left Behind and the rise of neoliberal education policies. *American Educational Research Journal, 44*(3), 493-518.

Janks, H. (2009). *Literacy and power*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Juzwik, M., Curcic, S., Wolbers, K., Moxley, K., Dimling, L., & Shankland, R. (2006). Writing into the 21st century: An overview of research on writing, 1999-2004. *Written Communication, 23*(4), 451-476.

Karp, S. (2012). Challenging corporate ed reform and 10 hopeful signs of resistance. *Rethinking Schools, 26*(3). Retrieved from http://www.rethinkingschools.org //cmshandler.asp?archive/26_03/26_03_karp.shtml

Kelly, U. (2004). Passionate contracts: discursive contradiction and struggle in secondary english teacher education programs. In B. Barrell, R. Hammett, J. Mayher & G. Pradl (Eds.), *Teaching english today: advocating change in the secondary curriculum* (pp. 57-67). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Kirkland, D. (2010). Englishes in urban contexts: Politics, pluralism, and possibilities. *English Education, 42*(3), 293-306.

Kosnick, C., Rowsell, J., Williamson, P., Simon, R., & Beck, C. (Eds.). (2013). *Literacy teacher educators*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Kumashiro, K. (2010). Seeing the bigger picture: Troubling movements to end teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1-2), 56-65.

Labaree, D. (2004). *The trouble with ed schools*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2006). *New literacies: Changing knowledge in the classroom*. London, England: Open University.

Larson, J., & Marsh, J. (2005). *Making literacy real: Theories and practices for learning and teaching*. London, England: SAGE.

Luke, A. (2004). AT LAST: The trouble with English. *Research in the teaching of English, 39*(1), 85-96.

Luke, A. (2012). Critical literacy: Foundational notes. *Theory into Practice, 51*(1), 4-11.

Lytle, S. L. (2013). The critical literacies of teaching. In C. Kosnick, J. Rowsell, P. Williamson, R. Simon & C. Beck (Eds.), *Literacy teacher educators: preparing teachers for a changing world* (pp. xv-xix). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.

Mayer, D., Luke, C., & Luke, A. (2008). Teachers, national regulation, and cosmopolitanism. In A. Phelan & J. Sumison (Eds.), *Critical readings in teacher education: Provoking absences* (pp. 79-98). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.

Mayher, J. (1999). Reflections on standards and standard setting: An insider/outsider perspective on the NCTE/IRA standards. *English Education, 31*(2), 106-121.

Mayher, J. (2012). English teacher education as literacy teacher education. *English Education, 44*(2), 180-187.

McCarthy, C. (1994). Multicultural discourses and curriculum reform: A critical persective. *Educational Theory, 44*(1), 81-98.

McComiskey, B. (Ed.). (2006). *English studies: An introduction to the discipline(s)*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

McCormick, K. (1994). *The culture of reading and the teaching of English*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Mellor, B., & Patterson, A. (2004). Poststructuralism in English classrooms: Critical literacy and after. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 17*(1), 85-102.

Moore, M. (2008). Where we are now. *English Education, 40*(4), 271-276.

Morrell, E. (2002). Toward a critical pedagogy of popular culture: Literacy development among urban youth. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 46*(1), 72-77.

Morrell, E. (2005). AT LAST: Critical English education. *English Education, 37*(4), 312-321.

Morrell, E. (2008). *Critical literacy and urban youth: Pedagogies of access, dissent, and liberation*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Morrell, E., Duenas, R., Garcia, V., & Lopez, J. (2013). *Critical media pedagogy: Teaching for achievement in city schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Muspratt, S., Luke, A., & Freebody, P. (Eds.). (1997). *Constructing critical literacies: teaching and learning textual practice*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Pahl, K., & Rowsell, J. (2005). *Literacy and education: Understanding the new literacy studies in classrooms*. London, England: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher, 41*(3), 93-97.

Patterson, A. (2000). English in Australia: Its emergence and transformations. In R. Peel, A. Patterson & J. Gerlach (Eds.), *Questions of English: Ethics, aesthetics, rhetorics, and the formation of the subject in England, Australia, and the United States* (pp. 235-253). London, England: Routledge.

Petrone, R. (2013). Linking contemporary research on youth, literacy, and popular culture with literacy teacher education. *Journal of Literacy Research, 45*(3), 240-266.

Petrone, R., & Lewis, M. (2012). Deficits, therapists, and a desire to distance: Secondary English preservice teachers' reasoning about their future students. *English Education, 44*(3), 254-287.

Phelan, A., & Sumsion, J. (2008). *Critical readings in teacher education: Provoking absences*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.

Picciano, A., & Spring, J. (2013). *The great American education-industrial complex: Ideology, technology, and profit*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Pirie, B. (1997). *Reshaping high school English*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Popkewitz, T. (1991). *A political sociology of educational reform: Power/knowledge in teaching, teacher education, and research*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Popkewitz, T. (2008). *Cosmopolitanism and the age of school reform: Science, education, and making society by making the child*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Prakash, M. S., & Waks, L. J. (1985). Four conceptions of excellence. *Teachers College Record, 87*(1), 79-101.

Rabinowitz, P., & Smith, M. W. (1998). *Authorizing readers: Resistance and respect in the teaching of literature*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Ravitch, D. (2013). *Reign of error: The hoax of the privatization movement and the danger to america's public schools*. New York, NY: Knopf.

Rogers, R. (2013). Cultivating diversity through critical literacy in teacher education. In C. Kosnick, J. Rowsell, P. Williamson, R. Simon & C. Beck (Eds.), *Literacy teacher educators: Preparing teachers for a changing world* (pp. 7-19). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.

Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Rothman, R. (2011). *Something in common: The common core standards and the next chapter in American education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Rowsell, J., Kosnik, C., & Beck, C. (2008). Fostering multiliteracies pedagogy through preservice teacher education. *Teaching Education, 19*(2), 109-122.

Sarigianides, S. (2012). Tensions in teaching adolescents/ce: Analyzing resistances in a young adult literature course. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 56*, 222-230.

Schade-Eckert, L. (2006). *How does it mean?: Engaging reluctant readers through literary theory*. Portsmouth, NH: Heineman.

Schiro. (2013). *Curriculum theory: Conflicting visions and enduring concerns*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Scholes, R. (1985). *Textual power: Literary theory and the teaching of English*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Slevin, J. F., & Young, A. (Eds.). (1996). *Critical theory and the teaching of literature: Politics, curriculum, pedagogy*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Smagorinsky, P. (1999). Time to teach. *English Education, 32*(1), 50-73.

Smagorinsky, P. (2002). Growth through English revisited. *English Journal*(July), 23-29.

Smagorinsky, P., & Whiting, M. E. (1995). *How English teachers get taught*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Souto-Manning, M. (2010). Freire, teaching, and learning: Culture circles across contexts. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Storey, J. (1996/2003/2010). *Cultural studies and the study of popular culture*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.

Street, B. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Street, B. (1995). *Social literacies: Critical approaches to literacy development, Ethnography, and education*. London, England: Longman.

Street, B. (2005). Recent applications of New Literacy Studies in educational contexts. *Research in the Teaching of English, 39*(4), 417-423.

Taubman, P. (2009). *Teaching by numbers: Deconstructing the discourse of standards and accountability in education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Taylor, F. W. (1911). *Principles of scientific management*. New York, NY: Harper.

Tucker, B. (2012, May/June). Grand test auto. *Washington Monthly*. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/

Tyler, R. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

van Enk, A., Dagenais, D., & Toohey, K. (2005). A socio-cultural perspective on school-based literacy research: Some emerging considerations. *Language and Education, 19*(6), 496-512.

Weiner, L. (2007). A lethal threat to U.S. teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*(4), 274-286.

Yagelski, R. P. (2006). English education. In B. McComiskey (Ed.), *English Studies: An introduction to the discipline(s)* (pp. 275-319). Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Yagelski, R. P. (2012). Writing as praxis. *English Education, 44*(2), 188-202.