Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Classrooms as the Lab of Glocal Literacies

Ching Ching Lin[1]

TESOL/Bilingual Advanced Certificate Programs
Touro College Graduate School of Education

**Abstract:** As technology continually re-defines boundaries and contributes to new communities, clusters and identities in the United States, teaching global literacies calls for moving beyond what Sonia Nieto refers to as the deficit view of transnational immigrant youth and tapping into their community cultural wealth as a source for global learning. Using Critical Discourse Analysis, this paper examines how a wide disarray of teacher webs that feature best practices theorizes *glocal* literacy – a meaningful integration of global and local forces. The result indicates that while great strides have been made in utilizing digital technology with an increasingly global focus, incorporating the vision of *glocal* literacy as a process of culture and border crossing in technology-infused teaching remains under-theorized. Inspired by sociocultural theories such as Glocalization, New Literacy Studies Theory and Critical Literacy, the author

---

[1] Ching Ching Lin, Ed. D. has taught ESL at secondary and college levels and currently teaches TESOL as an adjunct professor at Touro College. She has presented her work at the annual conferences of American Philosophical Association, NYS TESOL, IAFOR, and other national and international conferences and has published manuscripts on various topics including "Dialogic Pedagogy and its Discontent" (a book chapter from Cambridge Scholars Publishing) and "Storytelling as Academic Discourse: Bridging the Cultural-Linguistic Divide in the Era of the Common Core" in the *Journal of Basic Writing*. She is currently the co-editor of a book titled "*Inclusion, Diversity and Intercultural Dialogue in Young People's Philosophical Inquiry* (Sense Publishers). She has served as a proposal reviewer of NYS TESOL annual conferences. Her primary research interests are in the field of multicultural education and sociocultural approaches to learning and language acquisition. Her teaching interests mainly focus on tapping into funds of knowledge of culturally and linguistically diverse students as cosmopolitan intellectuals. Ching Ching Li can be rached at ching-ching.lin4@touro.edu

identifies current trends that help seize the potential of diverse, interconnected communities into teaching students as *glocal* citizens.

**Keywords:** glocal, internationalization, deficit model, diversity, multiliteracy


**INTRODUCTION**

The changes in digital technology have brought the world into a new era of globalization. These changes have revolutionized the twenty-first century cultures and cultivated new patterns of relationships among human, technology, and cultures in multiple ways. Specifically, ongoing technological changes in recent years have deepened and broadened interconnectedness and interdependence on multiple levels – as manifested in the global resonance of local issues.

Given this new human landscape, educators have the obligation to make sense the global events washed up on local shores and reconcile them in local contexts. As classrooms are gradually aligned with new technologies, there have been urgent calls to shift literacy practices to integrate global and local processes and prepare students for the complexity of contemporary societies characterized by a process of *glocalization* – a term Roland Robertson (1995) coined to capture the dynamic, mutual constitutive relations between global and local contexts.

Using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), this paper explores how global literacies have shifted since the advent of digital technologies and analyzes how different notions of global literacy practices meaningfully integrate global and local forces. My findings show that the current paradigm of global learning, though broader and multidimensional in perspectives than its earlier eras, inherits the legacy of the decontextualized notion of literacy and consequently a deficit model that prevents it from drawing strengths from literacy practices developing in today's culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms. Given the role of immigration in fueling population growth and shaping contemporary societies, this paper calls for a *glocal* literacy practice that recognizes and incorporates immigrant youth's global perspectives and transnational experiences as a wealth of classroom resources that benefit all learners as we prepare their entries into the globalized world. Challenges and opportunities for transforming linguistic and cultural diversities into a powerful pedagogical tool for *glocal* learning will be discussed.

**SHIFTING CONCEPTIONS OF GLOBAL LITERACY: FLOWS AND DISRUPTIONS**

As an attempt to develop a critical perspective of the current trends in global literacy practices, this study forages into a wide disarray of 'documents' from teachers' webs such as articles, blogs, videos, newsletters, webinars, PowerPoint, government position papers, curriculum, school mission statements, etc. Using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a research tool that guides me through the procedure of data collection and data analysis, this paper seeks to go beyond the mere description of texts and expose the discourse of global literacy as a social practice connected with broader world views or ideological assumptions that are considered common sense and yet camouflage the shifting power relations between global issues and local concerns (Fairclough, Pardoe and Szerszynski, 2003).

Over the past few decades, global literacy has been used as an umbrella term to denote a form of constructive teaching and learning and employed interchangeably with terms such as "21$^{st}$ century literacy", "global education", "international education" etc. and have been taken to encompass a plethora of literacy skills such as digital literacy, global awareness, cross cultural competence, and media literacy, to name a few. Using various cognates of 'global literacy' as the primary search terms in order to outline a profile of current global literacy practices, I compiled a corpus of relevant 'texts' suggesting best classroom practices that promote global literacy knowledge and skills and generated a data set of 102 documents of global literacy.

As an analytic research method, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) combines textual analysis and social theory and provides a means to systematically tackle an intractable amount of data (Fairclough, 1995; Fairclough, Pardoe and Szerszynski, 2003). This research method allows me to systemically exploring and tracking the discursive formations emerging across the study samples, in order to analyze the cultural and ideological assumptions underlying various conceptions of global literacy. In particular, CDA enables me to draw conclusions about how current global literacy practices theorize (or under-theorize) funds of knowledge and community cultural wealth of transnational immigrant youth in America.

Drawing broadly on critical discourse analysts like Fairclough (1995), van Dijk (1995), Willig (2008), Wodak & Meyer (2000), and others, I employed an analytic procedure involving analytic concepts such as discursive formation, discursive strategy and discursive effect.

As a way of representing broader world views, a discourse or *discursive formation* can be indicated by "the regularity among seemingly unconnected

groups of statements and the rules that govern this regularity' (Smythe, 2006, p. 26). To identify discursive formations within the text of global literacy, I looked for trends and patterns within and across the study samples. Such analyzing procedure involves a reflective process that sensitized me to the complexity and contradictions of different discourses within the text of global literacy, and special attention given to *discursive strategies* deployed in normalizing or excluding certain populations (Fairclough, Pardoe and Szerszynski, 2003; Smythe, 2006). *Discursive effects* are concerned with who gains or who is denied of power through discourses and the implications of this for the reproduction of imbalanced power relations.

My findings revealed that different accounts of global literacy often have different political ends-in-view and different ontological and epistemological commitments, but share common characteristics that have profound discursive effects on the dynamic relationships between global and local forces. For example, the realization that U.S. is falling behind in global education race in the post Cold War era has propelled many to call for a paradigm shift in literacy practice that provides the next generation of students with experiences and opportunities through which they may acquire global competencies (Alger & Harf, 1985; Andringa, 2001; Case, 1993; Psacharopoulos, 1994). Only by taking into consideration of the shifting of the broader social and political contexts can we adequately understand the evolving discourse and praxis of global literacy over the past decades and its effects on the power relations between global and local forces.

Turning my lens of inquiry to the discursive formations within the text of global literacy contributes to a more nuanced theoretical understanding within the extant literature and how it theorizes immigrant youth within a transnational, globalized context. Employing CDA helps me outline a profile of literacy practices in the shifting contexts of the sociocultural development in the U.S. society, and reveals themes emerging from the data and analyzes ideological tensions underlining different instructional methods. Analysis reveals that the incorporation of digital technology in the classroom has profoundly transformed classroom practices, allowing for a more complex, multidimensional and realistic learning experience (Chan, Roschelle, Hsi, Kinshuk, Sharples, Brown & Soloway, 2006; Hanna, 1998; Selwyn, 2012). In particular, the use of digital technology enables us to seek actively to cross cultural and national borders and use the virtual world as a resource for learning. Yet, my analysis also exposes a lack of a deeper understanding of the dynamic interplay between local and global process across the study sample, and hence a failure to institute a reciprocal learning relationship between local communities and the surrounding schools. To highlight

the shift in the global literacy practices, I sort the data into two time frames with the advent of digital and media technology marked as a turning point.

**The first wave of the global literacy movement (1940s-1980s)**

In the 1940s, fueled by the desire to restore the post War world order and inspired by the theory that education and economic/political stability correlate with each other, the U.S. invested significantly in "exporting" its literacy program to some remote parts of the world, mostly in the third world countries (Griffin and Khan, 1992). As a founder and a key player in the worldwide literacy programs (entitled "Fundamental Education") founded by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the U.S. participation in the international coalition of global literacy projects is linked to its geopolitical interests during the Cold war (Dorn & Ghodsee, 2012; Iltus, 2007; Watras, 2010).

Global literacy programs created in this era were mostly "export oriented". The U.S. participation in the global literacy campaign was not motivated by its desire to learn from other cultures for the benefit of educating their own citizens, but as part of its global agenda in securing its geopolitical interests by promoting world peace and economic stability throughout the world (Griffin and Khan, 1992). The focus of the "fundamental education" campaign was primarily on imparting the basic literacy skills of reading and writing, which remained the status quo throughout this period, despite that efforts were made in the 1960s and 1970s to broaden the concept of literacy to encompass not merely the ability to read, write and basic arithmetic skills, but also include Functional Literacy such as job training and other development-oriented literacy skills and knowledge (Kirkendall, 2010).

As the result of the process of globalization and the unfolding in the anthropological and ethnographical understanding of other cultures, UNESCO's literacy global campaign has attracted various criticisms:

1) The programmes imposed a modern scientific culture on indigenous societies and have used language learning to mask political agendas and the cultural traits that the programmes implied (Watras, J., 2010).

2) Embedded in the early global literacy programs is a normalizing notion of literacy that contributes to a deficit view of literacy that positions those that are different or deviate from its values and implied standards—on both domestic and international fronts—in lower social status (Kelder, 1996). Early global literacy programs labeled individuals and societies as inadequate or developmental often on the basis that they fell short of the ascribed norms or standards. This thinking was evident in the remedial reading and writing programs at all educational levels in the United States

in this era. Students from diverse cultural and hence different literacy backgrounds often found themselves placed in those programs sometimes simply because administers or teachers failed to appreciate the literacy background that they brought to the classrooms (Street, 2006).

3) The literacy practices in this era followed and reinforced a dichotomy of "literate versus illiterate, print versus oral, quantity versus quality, cognitive versus non- cognitive impacts" (Graff, 2003, p. 17). In so doing, opportunities were missed not only to address the interweaving of social and cultural contexts of literacy practices in an increasingly complex globalized reality but also to build on the diversities of post-war contemporary societies as a wealth of resources for the benefit of educating the general (Street, 2006).

**The second wave of the global literacy movement (1980s-present)**

Since 1980s, the burgeoning Internet and digital technologies have ushered American society into a new era of globalization. People become able to address local and global socio-cultural and political issues through various global digital engagements. The information revolution contributes to the erase of national borders, dismantling major barriers to intercultural communication (though, in doing so, it also created new barriers through resistance) in various fields of science, culture and economy.

Within the second wave, the motives to promote global literacy have varied widely and are "drawn from overlapping, but distinct spheres of influence" (Farah, 2014). Despite there is considerable continuity and continuum between this era and the previous generation, the second wave of global literacy movement is different from the previous one in the following important aspects:

*1) A pluralist view of literacy*: The new literacy practices during the digital era compel a pluralist concept of literacy in response to changes in patterns of communication and the multiple demands of globalized societies. In its Greater Expectations report, The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) articulated their vision of global literacies: "students should have sustained opportunities to learn about the human imagination, expression, and the products of many cultures; the interrelations within and among global and cross- cultural communities; means of modeling the natural, social, and technical worlds; and the values and histories underlying US democracy" (AACU 2002, xii). Thus, there is no single notion of literacy as a set of skills that students should possess, but multiple literacies (Leu, 2000; Mills, 2010).

*2) Fostering cross-cultural competence*: this new pluralist paradigm of literacy views literacy practices as apprenticing students into the discourses and social

practices of cross-cultural communication. There has been the awareness that both the transmission approach of filling students with information and facts (as proposed by Hirsch, 1987, for example), and a training model of instructing them in isolated decoding skills, are no longer tenable. As a result, new ways of meaning-making emerge across all boundaries emerge, such as:

- Develop proficiency with the tools of technology;
- Build relationships with others to solve problems collaboratively and cross-culturally;
- Craft and share information for global communities in virtual environments to meet a variety of purposes;
- Manage, analyze and synthesize multiple streams of simultaneous information across multi-media;
- Attend to the ethical and social responsibilities required by these complex environments (Alvermann, Moon & Hagood, 2000; Muspratt, Luke & Freebody, 1997)

*3) Promoting Active Learning*: The new literacy paradigm also pushes for more active learning. In order to facilitate autonomous learning, many global literacy programs recommend the flipped classroom to promote learning in multimodality and multiliteracy. By having students view lectures, videos and text assignments before they come to class, flipped classrooms integrates multiple components of literacy, and promote active learning and peer-to-peer collaborative inquiry with faculty supervision, mediation and challenges that are constructed to simulate the autonomous learning required of students in a more complex setting in the digital era (Berrett, 2012; Pierce and Fox, 2012).

*4) Developing Global awareness*: As literacy is aligning with the new digital reality, urgent calls have been made to include cultivating the global awareness of the interconnectedness and the inter-dependence of the world in school curriculums. Programs "designed to inform critical thinking by engaging the components of information literacy as a vehicle to encourage problem solving and conflict resolution in a global environment" (Farah, 2014, p.879) have been blossoming throughout all levels of education. Compared to the "export oriented" approach of the first, the second wave of global literacy efforts have centrally focused on fostering the awareness of the interconnectedness of the world and cultures, and expressed a more avid desire to learn from others. This focus is evident in the "internationalization" of the U.S. education system. A glimpse of the global studies programs found examples such as:

- Using ePals, students write to adult pen pals about books they are reading, thereby offering an interactive audience for their literary reaction (Global Nomads Group).

- Students design and direct live video-conferences with students in other locations, sometimes remote and war-torn. Important topics with global implications are addressed such as present-day conditions in Darfur, the war in Iraq, and environmental issues, as well as students' day-to-day lives.
- Through the Sister School project, preschool through 5th grade classroom can partner with classes in different countries. Partner schools determine how often to exchange information.
- **S**tudents read about concerns of people worldwide via *www.newspapermap.com*, by which a student can go to any country in the world, open up a local newspaper, and have the option of translating it into more than 30 languages.
- Students connect with other students around the world in real time via Skype (Crawford and Kirby, 2008; Merryfield, 2000).

While this growing interest in internationalizing U.S. education has helped broaden the perspective of global literacy, it woefully reinforces a dichotomic view of the global and local, by framing global literacy in the context of "connecting with the world from within the subjective world we have within us to learning and discoursing in worlds unfamiliar to us" (Farah, 2014, p. 882). The dichotomization of the global and the local encouraged an "outward" look that resulted in the mushrooming of study abroad programs at all educational levels. According to Furman, Goldberg, and Lusin (2006), the number of students studying abroad, for instance, has more than doubled over the past ten years, and enrollment in foreign language courses grew 13 percent between 2002 and 2006 (Furman, Goldberg, & Lusin 2006).

Amid the increased interest in study abroad opportunities and international research, one can't help feeling something amiss in this picture of global literacy practices. Indeed, those who have been working closely with immigrant populations in the U.S. may wonder: how does the transnationalism and multilingualism of linguistically and culturally diverse communities fit into this enterprise of global literacy? While we applaud this increased interest in intercultural communication and transnational issues, we are also cognizant that we are surrounded and living among resourceful citizens—this phenomenon itself a manifestation of globalization—and hence of the conspicuous under-representation of this population in this new enterprise of global literacy.

The problem with many of the "international" approaches is that they continue to view literacy—global or otherwise—as sets of decontextualized skills or disembodied knowledge to be learned and taught. Bok (2006) argues that while there is much that students can learn about global trends and issues

through supervised research projects that examine both domestic and international issues and global simulations, there is a limit to what these pedagogies can teach. Though studying abroad can remedy the lack of experiential component in international research projects by offering students direct experience with cultures outside their own, these opportunities in any form remain inaccessible to the vast majority of students. In addition, while the best of these programs foster critical reflections on global interconnectedness, many programs offer only superficial engagement with global learning. "Study abroad can often simply move 'the bubble' of a campus to foreign soil" (Battistoni, Longo, & Jayanandhan, 2009, p. 93).

For educators to respond to the call for globally oriented education, there is a need for a deeper understanding and critique of the notion of global literacy and in particular, address the interweaving relationship between the local and global in the new reality. Given that as a society, the U.S. is characteristic of the ongoing influx of cross border movement of people and ideas, it would be foolish of us not to tap into this wealth of national resources for learning global literacies.

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR GLOCAL LITERACY

In their study of Latino youth, McCarthey and Moje (2002) suggest that immigrant youth develop complex literacy practices that reflects the transnational experience and as a result of their negotiation between their youth cultures and school norms. Incorporating transnational literacy practices of the U.S. immigrant population involves adopting a different way of understanding and interpreting literacy practices that Geertz calls a "thick description" of what individuals are doing while engaged in literacy practices (Kelder, 1996).

In the following, I review major work in sociocultural theories in an attempt to point to the broader implications for global literacies studies of new immigrants and how we can learn from them and tap into the resources that they bring to the classroom.

### Glocal Literacies

The concept *glocal*, which has been used by scholars to describe a global phenomena that are simultaneously universal and particular, helps frame the local and global connections that people make as they learn to adapt and adopt new literacies in new cultural settings (Meyrowitz, 2005). Since Roland Robertson coined the term in 1995, glocal has been used to signal a revision of the concept of "global" and as a more apt term for what is transpiring in the world today. The concept *glocal* offers a view of everyday life that does not dichotomize

local and global particularities. Glocalization describes how people relate linguistically, culturally, cognitively and socially to one another and to the social milieu they inhabit in times of change (Sarroub, 2008). This view of globalization refuses to treat global culture as monolithically "unified" or as a "socializing institution" into which local cultures converge, but as a multi-dimensional and at times contradictory phenomenon, which entails a dialectic relationship between the global and the local. Hence the very concept of glocal assumes a dynamic negotiation between the global and the local with the local appropriating elements of the global which it finds useful, while at the same time employing strategies to retain its identity (Koutsogiannis and Mitsikopoulou, 2004).

Glocal is hence useful to understand emerging literacy practices in the new era, linking literacy practices to navigating different social contexts such as public schools, homes, work places, and communities and negotiating between global and local contexts. Literacy in the globalized era can no longer be defined in traditional terms as stemming from cognitive and psychological underpinnings. Those dichotomous relationships must be relinquished for a broader understanding signaling individuals' abilities to actively appropriate multiple literacy ideas and approaches as resources in navigating different contexts, cultures and places.

## New Literacy Studies

As the U.S. becomes increasingly diverse both culturally and linguistically, literacy scholars such as Street (2006) and Gee (2010) call for making explicit a sociocultural paradigm of literacy study. The New Literacy Studies (NLS) saw literacy as a social practice reflecting "ways of participating in the distinctive social and cultural practices of different social and cultural groups" (Gee, 2010, p.4). Paul Gee argues that a fuller understanding of literacy can only take place in its full range of contexts "not just cognitive, but social, cultural, historical, and institutional, as well" (Gee, 2010, p.2). From a socially situated perspective, the act of reading and writing is integrated with "different ways of acting and interacting; different ways of knowing, valuing, and believing; and, too, often different ways of using various sorts of tools and technologies". (Gee, 2010, p.2)

The work of Street (1995) and others contribute to an understanding of the nature of "situated literacies" that exist in the intersection of the contexts of technology, language, culture, society, ideology contexts and developing ways to incorporate them in curriculum and instruction. According to Street (2006), literacy practices are embedded in cultural and social contexts – simultaneously reflecting the negotiation of power interplay between broader social perspectives and local interests. Street (1995) argues that this ideological perspective is

critical in challenging the deficit view of minority language and cultures that prevents us from recognizing the value and potential of minority literacy practices. For Street, to identify and recognize multiple literacies in the educational system would contribute to intercultural understanding and communications and eventually to greater equity and opportunity.

The sociocultural perspective of New Literacy Studies allows us to more accurately capture multiple forms of literacy practices across contexts and languages in which many immigrant youth engage in daily life where literacy practices are partly a matter of survival (Cummins, 2006; Haneda, 2006). It honors the linguistic and cultural capital that immigrant youth have brought to the classroom. Ultimately, the incorporation of cultural and linguistic diversity in the school curriculum and classroom practices might lead to the creation of a teaching/learning model of global literacy practices built on the practices of multiple and social literacies that are grossly overlooked and marginalized in the current literature (Gee, 2005; Street, 2006).

**Critical Literacy**

As we move into the 21st century, the threats posed and opportunities created by way of political, economic, and cultural globalization present a world context of intensive ideological conflicts. It is also a contextual domain in which the future of schools, work, and public life intersect in light of new digital capacities (e.g., multimedia, and hypermedia) and global information systems (i.e., the Internet) that challenge our perceptions of reality, locality, and community (Alvermann and Hagood, 2000; Morgan and Ramanathan, 2005). The London Group (1996) added a critical component to 'multiliteracy": literacy becomes a full literacy development only when it is considered as social practice. Critical multiliteracy involves seeing literacy as "designs of meaning" and interpreting their social and cultural contexts in order to foster in students an ability to develop a critical perspective on the context. By underscoring the power-related aspects of literacy, students will engage in meaning making within wider contextual domains: the ideological implications of the existing order and transformations in informational technologies that have facilitated histories and social change (Alvermann and Hagood, 2000; Gee, 2005; Kellner and Share, 2005).

**THE CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY DIVERSE CLASSROOM AS GLOCAL CONTEXT**

The interweaving of the three theoretical perspectives (Glocality, New Literacy Studies and Critical Literacy) provides us an apt framework to understand the

multiple layers of literacy practices and socialization in globalized contexts. This is particularly salient in the U.S. immigrant population, where home is both in American and other countries. A number of empirical studies have helped us understand how the role of transnational experience shapes immigrant youth's literacy practice and vice versa. These studies illuminate how immigrant students mobilized multilingual repertoire in negotiating between different social groups and localities. The stories of the life and experience of immigrant adolescents provide us a window and perspective of global learning.

In an ethnographical study, Lam (2012) documents the influences of intercultural connections on emergent literacy practices. She writes about how Kaiyee (pseudonym), a 16-year-old who had lived in the U.S. used instant messaging and blogs to communicate with different social networks, including 1) a local network of peers from school and youth groups in the Chinese community that used a combination of Mandarin and Cantonese, along with English, to interact and share information, 2) an online network of Asian-American youth who communicated by using both standard and hip-hop English and 3) a transnational network of her childhood peers, relatives, and online friends in China (Lam, 2012). Her study describes how immigrant youth use their multilingual literacy resources within the context of transnational flow and movement.

In a similar study based on interview narratives of a multilingual Latino indigenous community in North Carolina, Machado-Casas (2009) shows that the use of multilingualism and multiliteracies practices is critical in immigrant youth's achieving cultural mobility and social survival, allowing them to carrying out diverse activities that transcend national borders such as "sending money home, managing business transactions, assisting people in their hometown, and keeping up with current events in both places" (Machado-Casas, 2009, p. 89).

In her research on the literacy practices of Yemeni immigrants in Michigan, Sarroub (2008) discusses how literacy practices serve to facilitate mobility in transnational social fields, relationships, and connections. Drawing on data from ethnographic interviews, Sarroub documents how three Yemeni American girls serves as the 'literate brokers' between their home cultures and the American mainstream cultures, assisting their family's negotiation of health, school, and economic matters (Sarroub, 2008). Her analysis demonstrates that their transnationalism and multiligual literacy practices help them forge fluid, creative, and yet often contested identities and movement in both local and transnational contexts.

In a participatory research project, Sanchez (2008) describes how three transnational Mexican youth use different languages and literacy practices to help them navigate different cultural contexts. Their moving back and forth

across the borders to visit their transnational communities on both sides of the U.S. and Mexico borders made it necessary for them to use multilingualism and different narrative practices such as telling and retelling stories to express themselves "in a way that reflected their values, beliefs and purposeful intentions" (Sanchez, 2008, p. 277). Despite that the mainstream society may not appreciate the value of their life experience for academic readiness, their multiple literacy practices aligns with "alternative conceptions of literacy that emphasize economic, historical, transnational, technical, and other expanded notions of literacy" that meet the demands of an increasingly globalized and yet diverse world (Jime´nez, 2003, quoted in Sanchez, 2008, p. 277). Sanchez's study demonstrates immigrate youth's ability to integrate family and community narratives into a broader narrative of their border crossing experience and, in doing so, helps highlight the complex relationship between multilingualism and border mobility.

These multiliteracies practices of immigrant youth invite continued study because culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms have become a microcosm of transnational phenomenon, reflecting what spans across continents and cultures, between the global and the local. It is especially critical, given that, by 2020, one in every five students in the United States will be an immigrant or the child of immigrants (Suarez-Orozco, 2001). As the U.S. continues to receive diversified immigrant populations, glocalized literacy practice will be at the forefront of intellectual and policy debates as schools struggle to accommodate student populations of culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.

Unfortunately, a deficit view of immigrant youth that prevails in America educational cultures prevents us from duly appreciating the wealth of resources that new immigrants can bring to the classroom (Nieto, 2015). While the overwhelming majority of teachers have their multilingual students' best interests in mind, a deficit view is ingrained in the educational culture, as evident in the use of phrases that have been applied to *English Language Learners* (ELLs), such as "limited proficiency," "no skills," or "no prior knowledge" "low literacy rate" "the lowest attainment and achievement rates of all ethnic and racial groups in the United States" (NCES, 2003) in government papers, research papers, or in school cultures etc.

Hence there is a need for a more positive and broadened understanding of how immigrant youth may tap into diverse linguistic and cultural communities across national borders for learning. Understanding how immigrant youth access resources for their learning could lead us to deepen our understanding of ways of communication that are prevalent in the twenty-first century global landscape and help students develop skills to navigate cross cultural domains.

**TOWARD GLOCALIZED LITERACY**

Drawing from the interweaving perspectives of glocal literacies, multiliteracies and critical literacy, Campano suggests that we view immigrant students as cosmopolitan intellectuals who have the capacities to draw from a range of cultural resources and legacies in the literacy curriculum in order to critically engage the world. "[I]t is not just that schools ought to make students global citizens, but rather they may acknowledge how many students in our 21st century communities already are cosmopolitan intellectuals by virtue of their diasporic identities, firsthand experiences negotiating the underside of neoliberalism, and exposure to diverse literary and activist legacies" (Campano, 2013, p. 82). From this perspective, a glocal classroom entails a learning environment where both students and teachers work together to create opportunities to bridge local and global academic experiences into glocal literacy practices, thus intertwining cultural, social, and academic knowledge realms.

Through my research, I identify three current trends that have potentials to promote glocal literacies that utilize the cultural wealth of immigrant youth as cosmopolitan intellectuals.

**Bi-directional Learning**

In an ethnographic study, Parmegiani (2014) reports on his participation of a learning community cluster created by the Bronx Community, New York, comprised an advanced ESL class that he taught as a literacy teacher, a Spanish class for native Speakers taught by a Spanish instructor, where he participated as a Spanish language learner and ethnographic observer, and a First-Year Seminar, an extended college orientation course for freshmen students including both native and non-native students, taught by him as a General Education instructor. The bi-directionality of the learning process that resulted from his positioning himself as a language learner offered him the invaluable insight into the learning process of his non-native students and therefore allow him design pedagogical strategies which capitalized on students' cultural and linguistic resources (Parmegiani and Utakis, 2014).

While not all the school programs have resources to implement a bi-directional learning community cluster as described in this story, the idea of bi-directionality or teacher reversing his position as a learner can be implemented in various classroom settings. By positioning ourselves as a learner of minority students' cultural heritages, we invite minority students to participate in academic discourse community and share their trans-cultural experiences with us. Far from being an impediment to literacy development, cultural and linguistic diversity

within a classroom makes literacy teaching and learning all the more compelling, as students who grew up in different continents, speaking different languages, practicing different cultures, find commonalities in their individual struggle to mediate conflicting structures of discourse while wresting a place for themselves in the school community.

## Dual Language Programs

Across the U.S., dual-language programs have become an increasingly popular educational model. In 2000, there were about 260 dual language programs operating in U.S. schools. However, over the past decade, dual language programs have grown tenfold, with an estimated 2,000 now operating (Wilson, 2011). In dual language immersion programs, language learning is considered as an enrichment, or an addictive model building on a student's cultural and linguistic capital with content being taught in both languages. Accordingly, cultural and linguistic diversities are incorporated as a source for learning and embedded in content learning.

Research shows that dual language programs when appropriately implemented can help students—speakers of both groups—develop the types of competencies required by the globalized world such as Bilingual proficiency; achievement in content areas, and multicultural competencies (Lindholm-Leary, 2000). Estrada, Gómez, and Ruiz-Escalante (2009) reported on a dual language education model that Leo Gómez and Richard Gómez developed in the 1990s: while ELLs "who were once silent, shy, and confused are transformed into active, vocal learners who assist English-dominant peers through teacher-directed bilingual pairing and cooperative-learning activities", native English speakers benefit equally from this dual language program. "As they become linguistically and academically strong in English, they transfer those skills to conversational and academic Spanish" (Estrada, Gómez, and Ruiz-Escalante, 2009, p. 57).

Unlike traditional language learning programs, language minority students in Dual Language programs are integrated with native English speakers in an environment that explicitly values the language and culture of the language minority student and that treats all students, regardless of language or ethnic background in an equitable fashion. Both groups of speakers are highly valued, not only the native English speakers, as is the norm in most classrooms.

## Glocalized Service Learning

The interest in service learning has been revived recently as an attempt to bridge the gap between civic engagement and internationalization in American

education. It is recognized that while some of the most powerful global learning takes place when students are engaged in service internationally, an exclusively international focus on what learners experience abroad is not only costly but also can be too limited in scope. García and Longo (2013) suggest that service learning linked to local communities acquires a *glocal* focus if students can gain a deeper understanding of global and intercultural issues through community engagement at local levels. Hence they call for glocalizing service learning— "moving from location to ways of thinking, from nation-states to networks of relationships, and from divisions (international versus local) to interconnections" (García and Longo, 2013, p.114).

By framing service-learning efforts *glocally*—that is, as opportunities to learn about the interconnectedness of the world—local, community-based service-learning provides an ideal opportunity for cosmopolitan education, global learning can take place in multiple, connected settings. For example, García and Longo (2013) write that at Jane Addams School, students worked with Hmong refugees on a series of community-identified projects ranging from preparation for the U.S. citizenship exam to school reform (García and Longo, 2013). Reciprocity in these community based projects draws attention to migration patterns, to cultural dissemination and in doing so allows students to gain a deep level of understanding of the unique history and culture of the immigrant populations. Moreover, the opportunities and challenges facing the immigrant communities in the United States—things like their struggles with learning a new language, separation from family, and the discrimination they face in their daily lives—are in fact global problems and can only be addressed at a global level.

Glocalized service learning thus recognizes the experiences of immigrant students in helping other students connecting the curriculum with the community, giving students who have had experience in community-based settings the chance to orient and frame their global learning experiences. Framing local engagement practices globally create opportunities in which non immigrant students learn from immigrant population's cross-cultural and transnational experiences—considering these are the type of skills that students will need in a changing, global society—while ELLs are invited to act as community assistants, and acting as liaisons between community partners.

**CONCLUSION**

The current trends of internationalization in the U.S. educational system while being a welcome initiative to develop global literacy, its tacit attitude about the role of the culturally and linguistically diverse classroom in promoting global literacy, however, exposes the deficit view prevalent in American society about

the immigrant population. The transnational experiences of immigrant students and their multiliteracies practices, developed as part of their skills in negotiating the global and the local, signal a wealth of learning resources that we can turn to when globalizing our classrooms. By developing a primary focus on the adaptive characteristics of immigrants' hybrid cultures—real people with stories and feelings, we provide an environment that will allow all students to deepen their understanding of the global issues of migration and transnational identity through the first hand experience of new immigrants and through relationships formed in community-based literacy projects. A focus on immigrant students' transnational and cross cultural experiences in navigating their ways through different societal structures and norms allows other students to make commitments to understanding and addressing the complex problems in communities in a globalized and multilingual world.

**REFRENCES**

Alger, C. F., & Harf, J. E. (1985). Global education: Why? For whom? About what? Retrieved April 4, 2016, from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED265107.pdf.

Alvermann, D. E., & Hagood, M. C. (2000). Critical media literacy: Research, theory, and practice in "New Times". *The Journal of educational research*, *93*(3), 193-205.

Andringa, R. C. (2001). The internationalization of higher education: Can the American experience advance peace and learning in the World. *Retrieved June 11*, 2016, from http://www.cccu.org/filefolder/internationalization_of_Higher_Education_Can_the_American_Experience_Advance_Peace_and_Learning_in_the_World.pdf

Battistoni, R. M., Longo, N. V., & Jayanandhan, S. R. (2009). Acting locally in a flat world: Global citizenship and the democratic practice of service-learning. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *13*(2), 89-108.

Berrett, D (2012, February 19). How 'flipping' the classroom can improve the traditional lecture. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Feb. 19, 2012.

Bok, D. (2006). *Our underachieving colleges: A candid look at how much students learn and why they should be learning more.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Campano, G. (2013). Literacies In/For Action: Prefigurative Pedagogies and Collective Knowledge Projects. *Literacy in Composition Studies*, *1*(2), 78-85.

Case, R. (1993). Key Elements of a Global Perspective. *Social Education*, *57*(6), 318-25.

Chan, T. W., Roschelle, J., Hsi, S., Kinshuk, Sharples, M., Brown, & Soloway, E. (2006). One-to-one technology-enhanced learning: An opportunity for global research collaboration. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, *1*(01), 3-29.

Crawford, E. O., & Kirby, M. M. (2008). Fostering students' global awareness: Technology applications in social studies teaching and learning. *Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, *2*(1), 56-73.

Cummins, J. (2006). Multiliteracies and Equity: How Do Canadian Schools Measure up?. *Education Canada*, *46*(2), 4-7.

Dorn, C., & Ghodsee, K. (2012). The Cold War Politicization of Literacy: Communism, UNESCO, and the World Bank. *Diplomatic History*, *36*(2), 373-398.) (UNESCO 2005:153-55

Estrada, V. L., Gómez, L., & Ruiz-Escalante, J. A. (2009). Let's make dual language the norm. *Educational Leadership*, *66*(7), 54-58.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*: New York: Longmans.

Fairclough, N., Simon Pardoe & Bron Szerszynski (2003). Critical discourse analysis and citizenship. In A. B. H. Hausendorf (Ed.), *Constructing Citizenship*: John Benjamins.

Farah, B. D. (2014). Implementing Critical Thinking in Cross Disciplinary Programs: a Framework for Global Literacy Instruction. *Qualitative & Quantitative Methods in Libraries*, (4).)

García, N. A., & Longo, N. V. (2013). Going Global: Re-Framing Service-Learning in an Interconnected World. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *17*(2), 111-135.

Gee, J. P. (2005). The new literacy studies: from 'socially situated' to the work. *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context*, *2*, 177-194.

Gee, J. P. (2010). A situated-sociocultural approach to literacy and technology. *The new literacies: Multiple perspectives on research and practice*, 165-193. Retrieved July 17, 2016, from http://jamespaulgee.com/geeimg/pdfs/Literacy%20and%20Technology.pdf

Graff, Harvey J. (2003). "Introduction to Historical Studies of Literacy", in Interchange, Vol. 34 2/3, pages 123-131.

Griffin, K., & Khan, A. R. (1992). Globalization and the developing world: an essay on the international dimensions of development in the post-cold war era. *UNDP Human Development Report Office Paper*, (2).

Hanna, D. E. (1998). Higher education in an era of digital competition: Emerging organizational models. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *2*(1),66-95.

Haneda, M. (2006). Becoming literate in a second language: Connecting home, community, and school literacy practices. *Theory Into Practice*, *45*(4), 337-345.

Iltus, S. (2007). UNESCO-United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. *Background paper prepared for the Education for All Global Monitoring Report*.

Kellner, D., & Share, J. (2005). Toward critical media literacy: Core concepts, debates, organizations, and policy. *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education*, *26*(3), 369-386.

Kelder, R. (1996, March). Rethinking Literacy Studies: From the Past to the Present. Retrieved July 11, 2016, from http://www.literacy.org/sites/literacy.org/files/publications/kelder_review_of_lit_studies_96.pdf

Kirkendall, A. J. (2010). *Paulo Freire and the cold war politics of literacy*. Univ of North Carolina Press. Lam, W. S. E. (2012). What immigrant students can teach us about new media literacy. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *94*(4), 62-65.)

Koutsogiannis, D., & Mitsikopoulou, B. (2004). The Internet as a glocal discourse environment. *Language Learning & Technology*, *8*(3), 83-89.

Lam, W. S. E. (2012). What immigrant students can teach us about new media literacy. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *94*(4), 62-65.

Leu, D. J. Jr. (2000) 'Our children's future: Changing the focus of literacy and literacy instruction', *The Reading Teacher,* Vol. 53, pp. 424–429.

Lindholm-Leary, K. (2000). Biliteracy for a Global Society: An Idea Book on Dual Language Education.

Machado-Casas, M. (2009). The politics of organic phylogeny: The art of parenting and
surviving as transnational multilingual Latino indigenous immigrants in the U.S. High School Journal, 92(4), 82–99.

McCarthey, S. J., & Moje, E. B. (2002). Identity matters. *Reading research quarterly*, *37*(2), 228-238.

Meyrowitz, J. (2005). The rise of glocality. *New senses of place and identity in the global village in K. Nyiri (Ed.) A sense of place: The global and the local in mobile communication. Vienna: Passagen*, 21-30.

Merryfield, M. M. (2000). Using electronic technologies to promote equity and cultural diversity in social studies and global education. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *28*(4), 502-526.

Mills, K. A. (2010). A review of the "digital turn" in the new literacy studies. *Review of Educational Research*, *80*(2), 246-271.

Morgan, B., & Ramanathan, V. (2005). Critical literacies and language education: Global and local perspectives. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, *25*, 151-169.

Muspratt, A., Luke, A. & Freebody, P. (eds.) (1997) *Constructing critical literacies:Teaching and learning textual practice,* Hampton Press Inc. Cresskill, New Jersey.

New London Group, The (2000) 'A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures, in B. Cope & M. Kalantzis (Eds.), *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures*, pp. 9–38, Routledge, London.

Nieto, S. (2015). *The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities*. Teachers College Press.

Parmegiani, A., & Utakis, S. (2014). Non-convergent literacy practices and Dominican students in the US. *Rhetoric, Professional Communication, and Globalization*, *6*(1), 22-37.

Pierce, R., & Fox, J. (2012). Vodcasts and active-learning exercises in a "flipped classroom" model of a renal pharmacotherapy module. *American journal of pharmaceutical education*, *76*(10).

Psacharopoulos, G. (1994). Returns to investment in education: A global update. *World development*, *22*(9), 1325-1343.

Robertson, R. (1995). Glocalization. Time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity. In M.

Featherstone, S. Lash, & R. Robertson (Eds.), *Global modernities* (pp. 25-44). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sánchez, P. (2008). Cultural authenticity and transnational Latina youth: Constructing a meta-narrative across borders. *Linguistics and Education*, *18*(3), 258-282.

Sarroub, L. K. (2008). Living "glocally" with literacy success in the Midwest. *Theory Into Practice*, *47*(1), 59-66.

Selwyn, N. (2012). *Education in a digital world: Global perspectives on technology and education*. Routledge.

Smythe, S. (2006). *The Good Mother: A critical discourse analysis of literacy advice to mothers in the 20th century. Unpublished doctoral dissertation.* University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C.

Street, B. (1995). Social Literacies. London: Longman

Street, B. (2006). Understanding and defining literacy. *Background Paper for EFA Global Monitoring Report*.

Suarez-Orozco, M. (2001). Globalization, immigration, and education: The research agenda. *Harvard Educational Review*, *71*(3), 345-366.

Van Dijk, T. (1995). Discourse semantics and ideology. *Discourse & Society, 6*, 243-289.

Watras, J. (2010). UNESCO's programme of fundamental education, 1946–1959. *History of Education*, *39*(2), 219-237.

Willig, C. (2008). *Introducing qualitative research in psychology*. Berkshire, England: Open University Press.

Wilson, D. M. (2011). Dual language programs on the rise. *Harvard Education Letter*, *27*(2).

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2000). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*: Newbury Park, CA: Sage.