

Deliberative Democracy in English-Language Education

Cultural and Linguistic Inclusion in the School Community

Tonda Liggett

Abstract

One of the most notable aspects of democracy in schooling lies in the challenge of schools to prepare individuals with the skills to participate and deliberate with others who have varying beliefs and worldviews. Deliberation and dialogue are seen as core components for academic achievement and cross-cultural connections between English language learners (ELLs) and native English speakers. I analyze the notion of deliberative democracy in English language education as a way to promote a certain type of education that would foster ELL inclusion as well as expand the perspectives of native English speakers. I argue that this type of education would not only foster inclusion in the classroom but also prepare ELLs for meaningful democratic participation. By examining the role of deliberation in creating democratic classrooms, alternative ways of knowing become more evident as teachers raise their awareness about the ways that culture and language play out in everyday life and academic work.

Submit a response to this article

Submit online at democracyeducationjournal.org/home

Read responses to this article online

<http://democracyeducationjournal.org/home/vol22/iss2/4>

SCHOOLS ARE CHARGED with preparing students to enter into a democratic society where they will be participating members of an electorate to choose leaders with differing opinions and beliefs about how best to govern. An important aspect of this process lies in the ability of people to publicly debate issues in ways that are likely to increase their understanding of them (Gutmann, 1999). One of the most notable aspects of democracy in schooling lies in the challenge for schools to prepare individuals with the skills to participate and deliberate with others who have varying beliefs and worldviews. The focus on dialogue has been taken up in the field of English language learning (ELL) for the past decade as a way to foster academic achievement and social integration (e.g., Ada & Campoy, 2004; Diaz-Rico & Weed, 2009; Peregoy, Boyle, & Cadiero-Kaplan, 2013). Methods such as cooperative learning, small-group discussion, and literature circles are aimed at promoting practice in academic English and other subjects in addition to promoting engagement with peers. In this sense, the field of English language learning has embraced dialogue as a core component of English language education.

Within this interface, I examine the role of deliberative democracy in promoting the inclusion of English language learners in a classroom of native English speakers. I ask: What role can deliberative democracy play in the cultural and linguistic inclusion

of ELLs in the school community? In this paper I analyze the notion of deliberative democracy in relation to English language education as a way to promote an education that fosters ELL inclusion as well as expands the perspectives of native English speakers. I argue that this type of education not only fosters an inclusive classroom community but also prepares ELLs for meaningful democratic participation. This article is aimed at ELL teacher-educators to help their students participate more fully in their respective school communities as well as at mainstream teacher-educators as a reminder of how they might be more engaging of ELLs in their classrooms and schools. By examining the role of deliberation in creating a democratic classroom, alternative ways of knowing become more understandable as students raise their awareness

TONDA LIGGETT is associate faculty and ESOL program coordinator at Marylhurst University. Her research focuses on the intersections of English-language education and critical multicultural education. Within this nexus, she examines issues of race, culture, and language in relation to teacher identity and teaching. Most recently she has been researching and traveling to Southeast Asia to better understand the role of globalization on language learning and cultural context.

about the ways that culture and language play out in everyday life and academic work.

Throughout this paper, I use ELLs and culturally and linguistically diverse students (CLDSes) synonymously. I refer to this group as students at various levels of language acquisition who are learning English in school (Peregoy, Boyle, & Cadiero-Kaplan, 2013). I realize that the term ELL connotes the obligation of schools to provide language services, generally, and that there are distinct concentrations of research and study regarding immigrants/immigration as well as newcomers, refugees/asylees, and so on. My intention is to address the needs of limited-English speakers in K–12 public school classrooms who have immigrated to the U.S. as children or young adults (generation 1.5). I use the common term English as a second language (ESL) to connote schools that provide instruction to ELLs, even though the students enrolled in these programs may speak two or more languages before adding in English.

Deliberative Democracy

From a deliberative perspective, the single most important institution outside government is the educational system. (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004, p. 61)

Democratic education recognizes the importance of empowering citizens to make educational policy and restrains the choices that they make among policies. This obligates and authorizes teachers to use curriculum and practices that support the intellectual and emotional preconditions for democratic deliberation: students recognizing their common interests and reconsidering individual interests in relation to understanding the interests of others (Gutmann, 1999). This challenges schools to prepare students for citizenship in a deliberative democracy, to develop their capacity to understand different perspectives, to communicate their understandings, and to engage in the give-and-take of moral argument with the goal of working toward making mutually justifiable decisions (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004).

Balancing individual interests with common interests gets at two principles that are central to discourse ethics: universal respect and egalitarian reciprocity. Universal respect recognizes the right of all people capable of speech and action to be participants in the conversation, and egalitarian reciprocity requires that within discourses each participant should have the same right to speak, to initiate new topics, and to ask for justification of the presuppositions of the conversation (Benhabib, 2002). These two principles underscore the tension that exists within the development of student capacity to understand alternative perspectives while also understanding universal moral frameworks. Benhabib (2002) focuses on moral and political universalism as a way to reconcile culturally related forms of diversity, maintaining that multicultural struggles have their place in the public sphere and that political and moral learning and value transformations can occur there.

The prospect for such moral conversation is what Benhabib (2002) refers to as deliberative democracy, where the free public sphere of civil society is the principal arena for the articulation, contestation, and resolution of normative discourses. “There is no

presumption that moral and political dialogues will produce normative consensus . . . societies in which such multicultural dialogues take place in the public sphere will articulate a civic point of view and a civic perspective of enlarged mentality” (Benhabib, 2002, p. 115). In this sense, the ability to engage in dialogue that challenges or questions perspectives of oneself and one’s identity holds promise for rethinking alternative perspectives and for initiating a willingness to reason from another point of view (Benhabib, 1992). Such reasoning is important when unpacking the assemblage of positions (i.e., status/role), narratives, and discourses that are constructed by individuals from their experiences and positionality (Mouffe, 1993).

The notion of identity, however, should not be approached simply as the coexistence of a plurality of positions or as an aggregate of factors but as a contextually dependent interchange of material and symbolic positionality (Fraser, 1989). Mouffe (1993) maintains that incorporating diverse struggles is a built-in notion of postulating alternative identities into the construction of a democratic citizenship and community; thus democracy and citizenship are at the core of dialogic engagement, not as one single identity enmeshed with others, or as a sum of identities, but as an articulating principle “that affects different subject positions . . . while allowing for a plurality of specific allegiances and for the respect of individual liberty” (Mouffe, 1993, p. 84). Deliberative democracy, then, necessarily incorporates broader, universal concerns and obligations.

Key to understanding the dynamic nature of shifting positionality between subject and community is connecting individual identity construction/deconstruction to broad contextual factors that work to frame worldviews and ideas about individual possibility. One way to do this is by looking through the lens of cosmopolitanism, which as an ideology connotes the mobility of people, ideas, cultures, images, or objects (Germann Molz, 2005) across space and a relationship among the local, national, and global (Starkey, 2007). Thus, it refers to a global sense of place as well as a synergy between collective and personal cultural identities that cultivates the recognition of individual positionality and worldviews (Delanty, 2006; Massey, 1994). For example, if we examine cultural and linguistic identity through the lens of cosmopolitanism, we bring into account two underlying precepts that can be used to press students to consider and expand beyond individual beliefs. One is that we have obligations to others, obligations that stretch beyond our familial or cultural ties, or even the more formal ties of a shared citizenship; the other is that we take seriously the value not just of human life but of particular human lives and the practices and beliefs that lend them significance (Appiah, 2006).

A cosmopolitan disposition allows individuals to draw on the country of origin as a source of identity (Appiah, 2006; Guardado, 2010; Kastoryano, 2000) while at the same time promoting a personal “stance of openness towards divergent cultural experiences” (Hannerz, 1990, p. 239). In other words, it assumes a commitment to global solidarity and global cultural diversity, along with a disposition that is adaptable and that nurtures multiple belonging (Guardado, 2010; Smith, 2007).

Because there are so many human possibilities worth exploring, we neither expect nor desire that every person or every society should converge on a single mode of life. Whatever our obligations are to others (or theirs to us) they often have the right to go their own way . . . There will be times when these two ideals—universal concern and respect for legitimate difference—clash. There’s a sense in which cosmopolitanism is the name not of the solution but of the challenge.
(Appiah, 2006, p. xv)

Looking at cosmopolitanism as a way to highlight the dynamic and shifting intersections between individual beliefs and universal obligations can assist students in understanding the layered and complex factors that inform their individual ways of knowing, behaving, and interacting in the school community. Roudometof (2005) offers a brief sketch for operationalizing a cosmopolitan-local continuum that considers the degree of attachment to a locality (e.g., neighborhood, city, state, country), along with the degree of economic, cultural, and institutional protectionism. Each dimension presses for further definition of cosmopolitan orientations and global sensibilities as a way to bring in broad contextual factors that influence and frame individual perspective. In this sense, exploring cosmopolitanism within a classroom of native English speakers and limited proficient students gets at the principles of universal respect and egalitarian reciprocity that Benhabib (1992) puts forth as a way to reconcile multicultural struggles in a democratic classroom.

English Language Education

HISTORY

In order to prepare English language learners to participate in democratic classrooms, there has been a shift over the past three decades toward communicative competence and the ability to communicate beyond merely knowledge of grammatical forms. This has led to teaching practices that are more student centered and involve students in problem solving, exploring personal areas of interest, and designing projects (Diaz-Rico & Weed, 2009). Such practices incorporate scaffolding content instruction through paraphrasing, use of visuals, multimedia, and student-centered instruction, along with organizational formats that allow for alternative and varied forms of assessment such as portfolios, group learning assignments, and pair work. These methods are meant to provide ELLs with comprehensible instruction and academic language development by varying the means of presenting material to make it more accessible and understandable without overly simplifying the content (Diaz-Rico & Weed, 2009).

The focus on communicative competence followed an era of constructivism during the 1980s to 2000s that emphasized the sociocultural dimensions of language learning: social interaction, interactive discourse, cooperative learning, construction of meaning, and interlanguage/sociocultural variability (Brown, 2007). Theorists such as Bahktin, Vygotsky, and Piaget advocated for analyses that extended Chomsky’s principles of generative linguistics to learners’ social, cultural, and political aspects. Bahktin (1986) maintained that the central function of language was to serve as a medium of communication within a social and cultural context. Cummins’s

(1979) theories of bilingualism and cognition posited that two different yet related language skills, basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP), differentiated the language-learning process according to cognitive load required for social and academic communication. These theorists exemplify the shift toward communication in context to underscore the importance of linguistic competence in combination with sociocultural understanding.

Preceding constructivism, a decade of generative linguistics and cognitive psychology in the 1960s maintained that human language could not be analyzed solely in terms of observable stimuli and responses with volumes of data, as put forth by behaviorists (1940s–1950s) but needed to encompass an explanatory level of language study, a “principled basis, independent of any particular language, for the selection of the descriptively adequate grammar of each language” (Chomsky, 1962, p. 63). Chomsky’s notion of universal grammar entailed systematic analyses of the deep structure of language as a way to understand innate, psychological, social, or environmental factors that cause particular human behavior. Chomsky, along with de Saussure, Ausubel, and others, pressed linguists to make connections between contextual factors and language-acquisition processes that they maintained were innately human.

The era of generative linguistics was a complete shift from the 1940s and 1950s when the effectiveness of language learning and teaching was determined solely through scientific methodology—that is, quantifiable data and empirical research focused on observation and observable outcomes. Structural linguistics and behavioral psychologists advocated direct instruction, grammar translation, observable performance, and audiolingual techniques as the most valid way to teach a new language. Skinner, Bloomfield, Sapir, and others set out to describe human languages by their structural characteristics in ways that were quantifiable, placing the utmost importance on data and objectivity (Brown, 2007). Within this school of thought, sociocultural factors were seen as irrelevant to the language-learning process.

LANGUAGE POLICY

Despite the focus on communicative competence in the fields of bilingual education and English-language education over the past three decades, these programs have been targeted for financial and political reasons as being ineffectual in teaching English to immigrants. This perception has resulted in negative campaigns that have worked to ban ESL/bilingual school programs in California, Massachusetts, and Arizona. The opposition against bilingualism can be seen on a structural level in the renaming of the U.S. Department of Education Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs to the Office of English Language Acquisition (Wilson, 2011). Additionally, in 2011, 31 U.S. states attempted to copy Arizona’s immigration law, SB 1070, which introduced legislation to require immigration checks by local police, to require immigrants to carry papers, and to make it illegal for people who are undocumented to live or look for work in the state and for people to knowingly hire, harbor, or transport them (Downes, 2012).

Today, English-only initiatives and legislation exists throughout the United States, with more than half of the states continuing to increase strict immigration regulation (Diaz-Rico & Weed, 2009). Such restrictive policy limits the amount of instruction time and support for ELLs, along with teacher professional development opportunities to improve ELL instruction. In the broader social context, “history indicates that restricting language rights can be divisive and can lead to segregationist tendencies in a society. At the same time, such legislation rarely results in a unified society speaking solely the mandated language(s)” (Thomas, 1996, p. 129). There is much research that indicates that language learning in dual-language programs can improve academic language skills and sociocultural integration in the classroom and school community. They are not, however, widespread in most school districts, nor are they widely reflected in state or national language policies. This discrepancy between strict language policy and inclusive language-education practice represents the mixed sentiments that various factions in the U.S. have toward immigrants and immigration. The difficult task for teachers then becomes ameliorating policy-level inequity outside of the classroom while constructing inclusive practices inside.

PRACTICES/PROGRAMS

Dual-language programs are considered to be an effective way to build on a student’s home language, teach content area subjects in both languages, and promote cross-cultural learning. Dual-language models vary; some prescribe teaching in English one day and the first language the next day, while others alternate the language by subject matter. Such a model allows native English speakers and ELLs to simultaneously participate in the difficult task of learning a new language together. Dual-language programs were first established in the 1960s to address the needs of Spanish-speaking students in Florida and French-speaking students in Maine. By the 1980s, dual-language magnet schools were established in cities like Tucson, Arizona, to help desegregate schools by attracting White students to predominantly minority schools. Thomas and Collier’s (2002) longitudinal study over 18 years in 23 districts across 15 states compared dual-language programs with transitional bilingual programs or English-only classes. They found the dual-language model closed the achievement gap between English learners and native English speakers while also transforming the school experience to become more inclusive for all students. The study found that by nurturing multilingualism and multiculturalism in school, more friendships developed that crossed class and language barriers and parental involvement increased (Wilson, 2011).

Other models include transitional bilingual education, which provides initial instruction in both the native language and target language. As English proficiency increases, native-language instruction decreases. A self-contained ESOL model consists of classes where all ELLs are taught content area subjects together. In the beginning stages, they often join mainstream students for classes such as physical education, music, and art until their academic language proficiency increases to join content area classes. Push-in models consist of ESL tutors working alongside

mainstream teachers in the classroom to scaffold instruction for ELLs. Conversely, in pull-out models, ELLs receive instruction in vocabulary, grammar, oral language, and spelling for separate half-hour to one-hour per-day classes with a trained ESL instructor. This is the most common form of ELL instruction; it is a model that is rarely integrated with the regular classroom program, and when ELLs return to their home classroom, they are usually not instructed on curriculum they missed while they were gone (Thomas & Collier, 1997).

The possibility for developing communicative competence within these models varies greatly, depending on state- and district-level language policy and the training of administrators and teachers to assist, modify, or scaffold the language-learning process. This training and support also determines the possibility of incorporating a cosmopolitan orientation that could assist in building on notions of universal respect and egalitarian reciprocity as central elements to democratic education.

Deliberative Democracy and ELL Education

One aspect of a deliberative democracy framework that poses problems for English-language education concerns the *style* of argument or reason giving. In this sense, such a framework favors those who are privy to this particular knowledge and discourse style. However, a rhetorical style that forefronts emotion can often be more effective than rational syllogism. For example, critical race theory (CRT) employs storytelling as a way to “analyze the myths, presuppositions, and received wisdoms that make up the common culture about race and that invariably render blacks and other minorities one-down” (Delgado, 1995, p. xiv). As Ladson-Billings (2009) notes, the primary reason that stories or narratives are deemed important is that they add necessary contextual contours to the seeming objectivity of positivist perspectives. Groups that seek to press the boundaries of the status quo tend to mobilize support through passionate, heated appeals to gain public attention rather than the measured reasoning of deliberative democracy.

Storytelling has been an important part of English-language teaching for several years. It is used to introduce classmates to each other, to learn more students’ cultures and traditions, to find commonalities for students to connect to each other, and so on. In this sense, storytelling is a key component of community building. Storytelling allows ELLs to place themselves in the story line, to have the opportunity to not only voice their perspectives but also convey alternative understandings through their own narrative (Ada & Campoy, 2004; Diaz-Rico & Weed, 2009; Liggett, 2014). Broadening the dialogue style of deliberative democracy can then work to open up discourse in ways that contextualize individual experience to make curricula more relevant, engaging, and accessible to ELLs.

Another issue to consider in the mapping of a deliberative democracy framework onto ELL education is the role that silence has in language learning for immigrant students. Feminist poststructuralist theories have addressed this issue, calling into question the privilege given to talk versus silence and to the public use of language versus private reflection (Kramsch & von Hoene,

2001). Attempts to empower students to find and articulate their voices can be interpreted as a controlling process that demands verbal collaboration (Ortner, 1996). In multimodal pedagogies, silence can be seen as a mode of communication, as a pedagogical form that is participatory, affirmative, and productive—an inclusive silence—rather than oppositional or resistant (Stein, 2004).

This silence acknowledges learners as subjects of integrity who may want teachers to “hear” that there are things which are unspeakable, which cannot be said. . . . The kind of silence . . . [advocated] here respects human beings’ rights to silence in the context of the power exercised by teachers in placing learners under obligation to speak . . . learners can be offered a choice of silence in the same vein as a choice to speak. (Stein, 2004, p. 109)

Students whose participation is not being acknowledged in the classroom may lose their desire to learn the language or may even engage in passive resistance to classroom practices and curriculum demands. In addition, those learners whose participation patterns align more closely with dominant culture methods of learning may receive higher evaluations. Recognizing that ELLs have multiple ways of knowing that may not include oral communication is important to creating a sense of cultural and linguistic inclusion in a democratic classroom.

Discussion

In attempting to expand teachers’ notions of cultural and linguistic identities, teachers will have to discuss interpretations of the social aspects that inform their beliefs and be open to discovering that their interpretations might be questionable. As Benhabib (2002) notes, such discussion does not ensure collective agreement or understanding. Students can misinterpret cultural differences hierarchically, rendering them illegitimate based on their own cultural beliefs about family, career, marriage, and others. Yet in the process of dialogic engagement, students are pressed to come closer to a sense of moral understanding by making apparent the social facts of positionality and status, highlighting how experiences in daily life empower us differently. With this disclosure of differences across English language learners and native English speakers, immigrants and natives, men and women, we can begin to recognize the epistemic privilege that specific groups might have, owing to their particular experiences. From this recognition, the importance of epistemic cooperation across the differences identified in such dialogue may, in fact, help us come to see the importance of building shared social knowledge to better describe and thus empower our collective world.

It is important to note, however, that for English language learners the notion of egalitarian reciprocity may be difficult to achieve, as the classroom context is doubly marked by unequal relations of power—that is, the power differential inherent to any teacher-student relationship, which is accentuated by the additional distance created by membership in variously subordinate groups. One area that could expand and inform our thinking about unequal relations of power is positioning theory. The concept of positioning refers to the manner in which different categories of

people (e.g., grouped by language, race, gender, etc.) enter into interactions. In classroom communication, the positionality of students with limited English proficiency is determined by their ability to use syntax, semantics, and phonetics, which influences the power relations between teacher and student, and student to student in a classroom. In positioning theory, however, conventions of speech and action are shifting, contestable, and ephemeral, in ways that are similar to identity construction.

Identity is seen as fluid, with various points within discourse locations to enable a fashioning or constructing of factors that culminate in a unique complex of subjectivities within life stories. Humans are not seen as being acted upon but rather as agents moved by intentionality and in relation to others as a way to better understand one’s self (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999; Katz & DaSilva Iddings, 2009). One’s positionality reveals feelings of agency and suggests that the social and discursive context in which human beings operate has powerful implications for how students experience a sense of self. In addition, individual identity plays out as an assemblage of positions (i.e., status/role) where narratives and discourse are constructed by the subject from relations (and therefore experiences) of one’s positionality (Mouffe, 1993).

At the same time, we may need to consider whether certain rights claims can span across cultures and societies and, if so, how we, as teacher-educators, might deal in our practice with the challenge of balancing respect for cultural differences while not abandoning our views based on support of universal human rights, at least in the public sphere. We cannot hope to reach a final consensus on how to rank and order such rights, but we can turn to conversation between people from different ways of life in order to cross boundaries and learn from each other. “There are some values that are, and should be, universal, just as there are lots of values that are, and must be, local” (Appiah, 2006, p. xxi). Critical feminist approaches could be helpful here to challenge our own assumptions, to problematize our everyday practices, and to engage students in examining their—and our—own linguistic options, choices, and behaviors, developing, in the process, a sense of critical agency (Kramsch & von Hoene, 2001; Pavlenko, 2004).

Moving Toward Deliberative Democracy for Cultural and Linguistic Inclusion

For English language learners whose life experience can vary so greatly according to country of origin, native language, reason for immigration, and amount of time in the U.S., among other variables, the need for teachers to recognize the relationship among such varied experience and the complex factors that inform student learning is fundamental to scaffolding academic achievement. With an increased awareness of culturally nuanced behaviors and points of view, teachers learn to modify/adapt classroom curricula to meet the needs of their students. Additionally, they learn that knowledge and understandings of education can vary and play out in classroom behavior, participation, or academic work in ways that may differ from their own norms.

In thinking about methods that are conducive to academic and social inclusion, to deliberative democracy, for ELLs, there are several classroom practices. By incorporating these methods,

teachers play a vital role in creating a context that makes students feel compelled to participate. For example, teachers can encourage students not to be judgmental of each other, request that they suspend their disbelief of a peer's experience with discrimination, point out parallels with oppression that they may already recognize, question assumptions, model risk taking by articulating unasked questions and apparent contradictions, teach vocabulary about oppression and discrimination, and depersonalize debates by focusing on institutional oppression before examining individual roles (Bolgatz, 2004).

In addition, teachers can play an important role in mediating the social dynamics of the classroom as a way to foster universal respect and egalitarian reciprocity. For example, they can organize peer-led groupings to interrupt patterns of authority and shift social dynamics, make different levels of discourse visible, vary the size of discussion groups, and slow the conversation down when students imply or state assumptions quickly (Bolgatz, 2004, p. 86; Liggett, 2009). In addition, teachers can expand discussion to broader international contexts by introducing notions of cosmopolitanism, global solidarity, universal morals and values, obligations to others beyond family ties, mobility of people, ideas, cultures, images, and objects through explorations of popular culture, immigration patterns and trends, and inquiry into what it means to be a global citizen. The idea of cosmopolitanism can be viewed as synthesizing cultural and linguistic diversity in the context of academic learning.

Tensions and conflicts, however, are a normal part of the process of dialogue where communication is the goal, so underscoring guidelines for students to follow will facilitate the process. For example, respecting what each other is saying: Even if students eventually agree to disagree, with diverse groups, students need more time, opportunities, and support for building close relationships with members of racial-ethnic groups that are new to them (Dance, 2008). Mutual respect lies at the core of moral deliberation in a democracy, which requires a favorable attitude toward, and constructive interaction with, the persons with whom one disagrees (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004). In building a classroom community, in order for individuals to feel that they are an integral part of the group, being able to agree to disagree is essential to building trust and maintaining coherence.

Conclusion

An essential goal and focus throughout such cultural inquiry is to recognize that issues of culture are multiple in focus, scope, and conceptual orientation, and that one perspective is not inherently superior or liberating in comparison to another. To understand the relative status of ELLs in different cultural and social settings, a deeper understanding is needed of how diverse cultures and societies condition (and are conditioned by) constructions of knowledge.

With an analysis of the theoretical influences of identity in combination with deliberative practices of democracy, broader conceptualizations are possible so that teachers can enter their teaching situations with better understandings of the factors that influence and inform cultural and linguistically diverse student identities. In the education of teachers, a knowledge base is

required that addresses identity in ways that capture the complexity of identity construction and explicate how aspects of culture factor into maintaining a sense of balance and place in the native culture while attempting to do the same in the new one. Dialogic engagement in teacher education has the potential to move us closer to assisting ELLs in navigating this new and complex terrain, though we need to be mindful of multimodal pedagogies that enable alternative knowledge frameworks to be represented, as in the role of silence and storytelling. These pedagogical methods can accompany a deliberative approach and enhance it. Additionally, we need to recognize that the style of discourse that deliberative democracy favors may limit participation for students whose style and way of knowing may differ.

As teachers and teacher-educators, we can grow from the perspectives and lived realities that our students present to us as we revisit and revise our own understandings of individual knowledge frameworks. For teacher-educators, this means providing opportunities for teacher candidates to examine how the learning context (e.g., teaching practices, curricula, assignments, activities) facilitates participation by and contributes to a school context that fosters inclusion for ELLs/CLDSes. Incorporating a deliberative process in teaching presses students to challenge each other to better understand alternative perspectives and to draw out oppositional experience-based views of their peers (Macdonald, 2002), thus evaluating truth content in relation to group knowledge. By setting up a deliberative framework for teacher candidates to question their individual beliefs and values in relation to social, political, and cultural influences, teacher-educators facilitate a model of inquiry that fosters an inclusive classroom community while also preparing ELLs for meaningful participation in a democratic society.

References

- Ada, A. F., & Campoy, F. I. (2004). *Authors in the classroom: A transformative education process*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Appiah, A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Bahktin, M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays* (V. W. McGee, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Benhabib, S. (1992). *Situating the self*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Benhabib, S. (2002). *The claims of culture: Equality and diversity in the global era*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bolgatz, J. (2004). *Talking race in the classroom*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Longman.
- Chomsky, N. (1962). *Syntactic structures*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Cummins, J. (1979). *Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children*. Los Angeles, CA: National Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University.
- Dance, L. J. (2008). Helping students see each other's humanity. In M. Pollack (Ed.) *Everyday anti-racism: Getting real about race in school* (pp. 57–60). New York, NY: The New Press.
- Delanty, G. (2006). The cosmopolitan imagination: Critical cosmopolitanism and social theory. *British Journal of Sociology*, 57(1), 25–47.

- Delgado, R. (Ed.). (1995). *Critical race theory: The cutting edge*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Diaz-Rico, L. T., & Weed, K. Z. (2009). *The crosscultural, language, and academic development handbook: A complete K–12 reference guide* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Downes, L. (March 10, 2012). When states put out the unwelcome mat. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from: <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/11/opinion/sunday/when-states-put-out-the-unwelcome-mat.html>
- Fraser, N. (1989). *Unruly practices: Power, discourse, and gender in contemporary social theory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Germann Molz, J. (2005). Getting a “flexible eye”: Round-the-world travel and scales of cosmopolitan citizenship. *Citizenship Studies*, 9(5), 517–531.
- Guardado, M. (2010). Heritage language development: Preserving a mythic past or envisioning the future of Canadian identity? *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 9(5), 329–346.
- Gutmann, A. (1999). *Democratic Education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gutmann, A., & Thompson, D. (2004). *Why deliberative democracy?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hannerz, U. (1990). Cosmopolitans and locals in world culture. In M. Featherstone (Ed.), *Global culture: Nationalism, globalization, and modernity* (pp. 237–252). London, U.K.: Sage Publications.
- Harré, R., & van Langenhove, L. (Eds.). (1999). *Positioning theory: Moral contexts of intentional action*. Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Kastoryano, R. (2000). Global trends and issues: Settlement, transnational communities and citizenship. *International Social Science Journal*, 52(165), 307–312.
- Katz, L. & DaSilva Iddings, A. C. (2009). Classroom positionings and children’s construction of linguistic and racial identities in English-dominant classrooms. In R. Kubota & A. Lin (Eds.), *Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice* (pp. 138–157). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kramsch, C., & von Hoene, L. (2001). Cross-cultural excursions: Foreign language study and feminist discourses of travel. In A. Pavlenko, A. Blackledge, I. Piller, & M. Teutsch-Dwyer (Eds.), *Multilingualism, second language learning, and gender* (pp. 283–306). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). Just what is critical race theory and what’s it doing in a nice field like education? In E. Taylor, D. Gillorn, & G. Ladson-Billings (Eds.), *Foundations of critical race theory in education* (pp. 17–36). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Liggett, T. (2009). Unpacking white racial identity in English language teacher education. In *Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice*. Kubota, R. & Lin, A., (Eds.) New York, NY: Routledge Press. pp. 27–43.
- Liggett, T. (2014). The mapping of a framework: Critical race theory and TESOL. *The Urban Review*. 46(1). pp. 112–124.
- DOI, 10.1007/s11256-013-0254-5. June, 2013.
- Macdonald, A. A. (2002). Feminist pedagogy and the appeal to epistemic privilege. In A. A. Macdonald & S. Sanchez-Casal (Eds.), *Twenty-first century feminist classrooms: Pedagogies of identity and difference* (pp. 111–133). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Massey, D. (1994). *Space, place, and gender*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mouffe, C. (1993). *The return of the political*. London, U.K.: Verso.
- Ortner, S. (1996). *Making gender: The politics and erotics of culture*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Pavlenko, A. (2004). Gender and sexuality in foreign and second language education: Critical and feminist approaches. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical Pedagogies and Language Learning* (pp. 53–71). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Peregoy, S. F., Boyle, O. F., & Cadiero-Kaplan, K. (2013). *Reading, writing, and learning in ESL: A resource book for teaching K–12 English learners* (6th ed.) Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Roudometof, V. (2005). Transnationalism, cosmopolitanism and glocalization. *Current Sociology*, 53(1). Retrieved from <http://csi.sagepub.com/content/63/1/113>
- Smith, W. (2007). Cosmopolitan citizenship: Virtue, irony and worldliness. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 10(1), 37–52.
- Starkey, H. (2007). Language education, identities and citizenship: Developing cosmopolitan perspectives. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 7(1), 56–71.
- Stein, P. (2004). Representation, rights, and resources: Multimodal pedagogies in the language and literacy classroom. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 95–115). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, L. (1996). Language as power: A linguistic critique of U.S. English. *Modern Language Journal*, 80, 129–140.
- Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students*. Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELA) Resource Collection Series, No. 9.
- Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (2002). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students’ long-term academic achievement*. Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence, University of California-Santa Cruz.
- Wilson, D. M. (2011, March/April). Dual language programs on the rise: “Enrichment” model puts content learning front and center for ELL students. *Harvard Education Publishing Group*, (27)2. Boston, MA: Harvard Education Press.