Educational Studies

A Journal of the American Educational Studies Association

Toward a Critical Deliberative Strategy for Addressing Ideology in Educational Policy Processes

MICHELE S. MOSES
Arizona State University

MARINA GAIR
Pace University

Is it possible and desirable to transcend ideological perspectives within educational policy research and decision making? If so, what would it entail and how should we proceed? At heart, the relation among research, ideology, and policy may be characterized as a complex and interconnected web. The common view of this web is that good social and educational policy decisions are generally made based on research evidence and largely independent of ideological positions. However, it is rather more likely that research and political ideology interact throughout the research process, from the choice of research question, to the organization that provides funding for the research, to the way that findings are interpreted and used. The purpose of this article is to propose a promising strategy that can be utilized by policymakers in the process of making educational policy decisions.

The purpose of this article is to propose a promising strategy that can be utilized by policymakers and other players in the educational policy process to change the way research and ideological positions influence policy decisions. Thus, we address the seemingly intractable problem of the influence of political ideology on research questions, results, and use as well as on policy agendas and decisions. We are concerned about the selective, ideologically charged use of re-search findings either to support or criticize controversial policy initiatives. The ontological and epistemological premises on which research is conducted and applied are central to understanding the limited impact of some research on educational policy, the success of particular initiatives, and the modest progress of various other political agendas. The main questions we address are as follows: ls it possible and desirable to transcend ideological perspectives within educational

policy research and decision making? If so, what would it entail and how should we proceed?

As educational researchers, we approach this issue from the perspectives of a philosopher and sociologist, both concerned with uncovering to what degree educational policy research and outcomes are the result of ideological orientations. At this point, it is important to note that we come out of a critical democratic theoretical orientation ourselves, which colors the lens through which we view this issue. Asa result, the examples we provide may tend to indict more conservative viewpoints, although we aim to show that ideology factors into positions offered all along the political spectrum. In other words, researchers of every political stripe yield to selective use of research findings when it suits their agenda. We do not pre-tend to be neutral commentators, but we are interested in contributing to a conversation on the proper place and handling of political ideology in policy processes. Through this discussion, we aim to give attention to the prominence of policy actors' (e.g., researchers, politicians, educators, reform advocates, etc.) ideological orientations in the formulation of educational policy, as well as to challenge policy researchers and practitioners to examine how their ideological assumptions may affect their policy preferences. We argue that although ideology is an undeniable factor within educational research and policy making, it can nevertheless be addressed through purposeful attention to critical and deliberative strategies for dealing with disagreement. Although other theorists have outlined the promise of democratic deliberation for resolving difficult political disagreements, none have combined aspects of deliberative democratic theory with Freirean critical theory as we do herein.

To clarify terms, we are concerned with all forms of educational policy research, especially those that may have bearing on controversial and intractable educational policy issues such as vouchers, bilingual education, affirmative action, and standardized testing. Intractable conflicts are characterized as "highly resistant to resolution by appeal to evidence, research, or reasoned argument" (Schön and Rein 1994, xi). By ideology, we mean a politically motivated view of the world: a way of thinking, on which one's view of the political, economic, and social system is based (Young 1981). As for transcending ideology, we do not mean to invoke its elimination or call for value neutrality. Rather, in calling for transcendence of ideological orientations, we strive for a way to go beyond ideological differences of opinion, that is, to surpass the limits of these differences to aim for and hopefully reach some form of understanding and compromise.

The Seemingly Intractable Trio: Educational Research, Political Ideology, and Policy

At heart, the relation among research, ideology, and policy may be characterized as a complex and interconnected web. The common view of this web, based on rational choice theory, is that good social and educational policy decisions are generally made based on research evidence and independent of ideological positions (Wildaysky 1979). Moreover, the dominant culture of United States society in general, and the educational community in particular, includes a faith in "objective" research findings, especially when presented in the form of statistical data.1 Problems are brought to light only when bad or misinterpreted statistics are called on to justify one particular side of an intractable policy issue. Such data have the potential to distort perceptions of issues, debates, and policies. Research methods stemming from the "scientific" methods of the natural sciences have tended to hold sway over policymakers and the public.2 Accordingly, there is a common and often unquestioned notion that good, objective research will be effective in helping to resolve policy controversies.[3]

However, it is rather more likely that research and political ideology interact throughout research and policy processes, from the choice of research question, to the organization that provides funding for the research, to the way findings are interpreted and used. Donald Schön and Martin Rein (1994, xvi) insightfully observed that "I "[p]olicy researchers have tended to be co-opted by one side or another in policy controversies and have done more to fuel such controversies than to re-solve them" Too often, policy research and decisions are more the result of ideological orientations than of sound data, experience, and concern for social justice. As Gene Glass (1987, 9) pointed out, the "selection of research to legitimize political views is an activity engaged in by governments at every point on the political compass" Ideology frames, distorts, and/or structures findings, the use of final re-ports, and, eventually, educational opportunities and outcomes. In short, political ideology seems to matter more in policy making than a balanced survey of educational research. Policy decisions, then, are most often based on a complicated intermingling of research findings, researchers' political ideology, and policymakers' political ideology, among other factors (Kingdon 1995). This is perhaps to be expected when dealing with controversial policy issues of social and educational significance.

Steven Miller and Marcel Fredericks (2000) maintained that ideological commitments or preferences often work as "biasing-filters," translating research findings into particular outcomes and acceptable policy decisions. Using the case of the 'Bell Curve"[4] debate as an example, they argued as follows: "If one believes, as in the *Bell Curve,* that there are empirical data which clearly support cognitive differences among racial and ethnic groups, that belief system 'intervenes' nicely between the research findings (and approach) and the policy subsequently formulated" (Miller and Fredericks 2000, online). Data are often interpreted accordingly to justify ideological stances and belief systems; the values, ideologies, and political motives of the various researchers and policy actors tend to eclipse other factors. As Glass (1987, 9) further noted, "[s]tudies may be commissioned that sup-port either side of a policy issue." Regardless of what they illustrate, facts alone

rarely function to shape policy. So-called facts may be questionably derived in any case. Policies often grow out of worldviews that may be legitimated in the manipulation, filtering, and massaging of research data. In essence, it can be argued, as Kennedy (2003, online) did, that "all political issues are driven by a combination of ideology and political calculation"

Our discussion draws on three examples of policies characterized by ongoing ideological clashes and disagreement over research findings: bilingual education, school voucher effects, and remedial education at the postsecondary level. Representing policy disagreement at both the kindergarten through twelfth-grade and higher education levels, these three cases are of interest to us as they have gene^rated considerable political upheaval and are likely to have visible personal and social consequences, as well as impact the overall educational experience and outcomes of students in the United States, particularly over the next ten years.

Using referenda campaigns in Arizona and California as illustrations, in the next section we illustrate how ideology is a key element in policy outcomes concerning bilingual education. We then proceed to a debate over school vouchers, providing another example of a controversial educational policy. The latter portion of the article offers one possibility for dealing with ideological differences within the field of educational policy making. The article concludes by illustrating how researchers and policymakers representing different ideological perspectives regarding a controversial policy issue such as remedial education at the postsecondary level might proceed to interact if they were engaged in a process guided by the critical deliberative approach set forth in this article.

Bilingual Education5

In the following discussion, we point out the different ideological positions that have informed the research-related policy debates and referenda campaigns on bilingual education in Arizona and California. In these campaigns, research findings played a considerable role within the public debate over the issue, as evidenced by frequent media references to research findings.° Yet, both defenders and opponents of bilingual education have interpreted the research in very different ways.7 In both Arizona and California, the selective use of research served to advance particular interests and belief systems—in these cases the dominant, politically conservative perspective opposing bilingual education won out. For this reason, we analyze how opponents of bilingual education successfully used research to serve their interests.

Proponents of bilingual education generally maintain that public schools have a responsibility to aid English language learners in learning English, and advance their learning in academic subject areas while sustaining their cultural identity. Proponents also maintain that by using English language learners' na

tive languages for instructional purposes, students receive a good start to their overall school career. Drawing on prevailing research, proponents contend that English-only institutional approaches actually limit the learning potential of English language learners and negatively affect their educational achievement and outcomes.[8] Shirley Brice Heath (1986), for one, pointed out that English language learners are best prepared to learn English in school when they have a solid foundation in their native language. Moreover, monolingual English instruction engenders a form of alienation among English language learners and more often serves to diminish student participation, and hence, their opportunities to learn. Although a number of research studies have documented the effectiveness of bilingual education programs, it continues to be a source of criticism and hostility.'

Critics of bilingual education contend that learning English should be students' central activity. In this view, the native language is used sparingly as a language of instruction, if at all. Such views defend English as the official language and the efforts to sustain it. Supporters of the English-only movement pursue a variety of arguments in defending English as the official language of the United States. Foremost is the notion that bilingualism is a threat to American cultural unity.[10] Those that challenge bilingual instruction maintain that official English is necessary to preserve the unity of American culture and the full participation of immigrants in mainstream society (Chavez 1991). There is a notion that immigrants' continued allegiance to their ethnic group is a threat to being an American, and thus contributes to polarizing society along language lines." Official English would then serve to limit ethnic polarization.

Furthermore, the English-only movement works under the assumption that total immersion in the language and culture of mainstream America is beneficial for language minority peoples because it will afford opportunities to pursue education, employment, and success[12] Opponents of bilingual education have consistently associated the lack of English competency with social matters, including unemployment and low academic performance.[13] From this perspective, the inability to speak English greatly reduces the ability to secure sustainable work and lessens the chances for academic success. In essence, opponents maintain that there is a strong relation between language and social "problems;" therefore, addressing the language "disability" will respond in part to social issues such as unemployment and education.[14]

Analyzed from a critical perspective, opponents of bilingual education are not solely preoccupied with the potential loss of the English language as the primary language in the United States. The less publicized issue is the fear of a conscious resistance by English language learners. Opposition to policies such as bilingual education has been focused primarily on nostalgic notions of Americanization and an ideology of nationalism and cultural maintenance—essentially what critical social theorists have referred to as an ethnocentric fantasy of a common culture15 To

add to the complexity, there are Latinos and other immigrant groups who oppose bilingual education because, they argue, it does not serve educational equality well. They believe that cultural assimilation is in the best interests of English language learners.[16] In essence, the debate over bilingual education is not simply a debate over the value of language, but rather. a debate over ideological positions. The most recent and notable cases of the functioning of ideology with selective research findings is that of the 2000 passage of Proposition 203 in Arizona and the 1998 passage of Proposition 227 in California, which virtually banned bilingual education in both states.

In June of 1998, voters in California passed Proposition 227, an initiative that in effect bans bilingual instruction in public schools. The proposition calls for English language learners to he placed in English-only immersion classes for a period of one year, after which students are transitioned to mainstream, English-only classrooms. The initiative ignores the body of research that documents the counterproductive nature of predominantly English-based types of instruction for English language learners.[17] Despite the fact that significant literature documented how English-based instruction stifles English language learners' overall learning and academic achievement. supporters of Proposition 227 did not seem to pay attention to the illustrations of the benefits of bilingual instruction. In light of the fact that California is home to 1.4 million students who enter the public school system with varying levels of literacy and English-language proficiency, Proposition 227 has a significant and adverse affect on a large number of students   many of whom are Latinos.[18] Given the statistics and counterfindings, how did this proposition get passed?

Ron Unz, the primary underwriter and sponsor of the English for the Children campaign for Proposition 227, is a millionaire businessman in California's computer industry with some political aspirations.[19] Proposition 227—called the Unz Initiative—is one way he was able to get recognition and build political clout. The Unz Initiative mandates that "all children in California's public schools shall be taught English by being taught in English" (NAMBE 1998). Whether this initiative was well intentioned is unimportant. Similarly, Proposition 203, Arizona's more restrictive version of Proposition 227, passed in November 2000 with sixty-three percent of the vote.[20] The Arizona initiative, known as English for the Children of Arizona, was funded in large part by Ron Unz. Proposition 203 limits instruction to English only, and like Proposition 227, requires English language learners to be placed in English-only immersion classes for a period of one year. In the case of Arizona, the proposition can only be reversed by the passage of another ballot initiative.[21]

Regardless of the studies of bilingual education (in Arizona and other states) which show that it is both effective and worthwhile, and the efforts of citizens to sustain it, in this case, these counterpoints seemed to be irrelevant in the policy-making process briefly described herein.[22] This is due primarily to the influential assimilationist ideology that frames having a first language other than English

as a handicap rather than a benefit. This ideology has fueled the bilingual debates and has consequently shaped the linguistic landscape in the United States.

The debate over school vouchers has also been a prominent one, and given the spirited exchanges it has fueled, provides another example of politically controversial educational policy.

School Vouchers

Jay Greene's (2001) published report, *An Evaluation of the Florida A-Plus Accountability and School Choice Program.[23]* is among a number of other illustrations of the practice of selective use of research findings to advance certain ideologically charged positions. We highlight Greene's report because it exemplifies scholarship that reinforces a policy agenda that is dominant within the current political climate. The report documents gains in achievement on the *Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test* in the areas of reading, mathematics, and writing and convincingly establishes a link between the threat of school vouchers for students in low-performing schools and achievement gains in those schools. Greene (2001, 9) argued that the threat of vouchers is responsible for the improvement of low achieving schools: "An accountability system with vouchers as the sanction for repeated failure really motivates schools to improve."

Greene's (2001) reading of the evidence has the potential to play an important role in policy making at both the federal and local levels across the country. Although the statistical model and conclusions of the report have been challenged, policymakers in support of voucher and accountability initiatives may not find the dispute with the mechanisms of the statistical analysis as compelling as the generous conclusions drawn by Greene.[24] Reports such as Greene's are sure to be used by conservative educators and policymakers as convincing arguments to defend and facilitate voucher plans. The voucher effect will no doubt be sold to the general public as an effective force in motivating failing schools to improve academic achievement. The argument can be made that the interpretation and use of Greene's research findings may be largely dependent on the particular interests of policymakers. As Miller and Fredericks (2000, online) maintained, "[f]indings are largely irrelevant to policy makers". What is relevant, but overlooked, is how those findings can serve an ideological agenda.[25] The case of research on school voucher programs illustrates how ideological commitments often work as "biasing-filters" (Miller and Fredericks 2000, online), as stated earlier—translating research findings into particular outcomes and acceptable policy decisions.

In addition to Greene's (2001) work, a number of other researchers have recently conducted studies that demonstrate the effectiveness of school vouchers in raising test scores, particularly for African American students.[26] Their findings have received wide media publicity and have also been disputed by a variety of scholars and interest groups.[27]

Henry Levin found that there is little measurable difference in the levels of achievement between students enrolled in traditional schools and voucher recipients who attended private schools. Levin pointed out that such observations have been readily neglected in the surrounding policy debates and that the evidence suggesting otherwise is vastly exaggerated. Voucher critics contend that vouchers tend to be used by students from families who have greater material resources and are more informed about educational alternatives than students from families who are not as well off. According to those who challenge the data, these particular facts and other nonmeasurable characteristics are not apparent in a number of the reports whose conclusions are being heavily circulated [28] Levin (1998, 373) concluded the fallowing: "The effect of educational vouchers has been premised on theoretical or ideological positions rather than evidence" In a recent article in *Educational Evaluation and Policy* Analysis (2002), he attempted to add balance to the issue by offering a more comprehensive and evaluative framework on which to determine the benefits of educational voucher programs and their effect on educational performance.[29]

In cases such as Greene's and others', researchers have reassessed data indicating the effectiveness of school vouchers in raising test scores and ended up with in terpretations to the contrary. The statistical methods employed by Paul Peterson (of Harvard University and the Hoover Institution), for instance, also came under heavy scrutiny, particularly when he declined to release his raw data to a group of academics that requested to check his results. Levin (1998, 373), who initiated the request. concluded that it seemed more important to "get something out at election time"[30] than to allow the work to undergo peer review; suggesting that such reports were serving political purposes more than any other. Many of these studies are criticized because they are underwritten by conservative foundations in support of voucher programs. Their statistical data have led to policy conclusions that champion voucher programs as a solution to the nation's educational challenges.

It can he argued, however, that within both conservative and liberal Left contexts, researchers chose not to discuss various aspects of the research, overemphasizing either the benefits or the shortcomings of voucher plans. In this way, each attempt to gain public support for their respective positions on the issues surrounding school choice. For provoucher stakeholders, some things may go unreported or are avoided if they do not serve particular interests. Likewise, the researchers who challenge provoucher conclusions may inaccurately characterize the findings, misinterpret and even distort claims such as those of Greene (2001) and others.[31] Several recent studies by researchers at The National Education Association (NEA),[32] Brian Gill et al. of Rand,[33] and Kim Metcalf et al.[34] (1999) questioned the effectiveness of vouchers in enhancing academic achievement and made a primarily social case against voucher plans. Despite randomized field studies which show that vouchers have boosted academic achievement among low-income African American students, researchers of the NEA study, for instance, char

acterize vouchers as an "elitist strategy" and argue that vouchers exacerbate economic, racial, ethnic, and religious stratification in society. Framing the results as fragile, exotic, and statistically insignificant, and pushing a primarily social stance that puts the community first, many critics of voucher programs conclude that they fail to deliver the educational benefits they are purported to, and thus fail democracy. Despite the well-intentioned aims of voucher opponents to advance education policies that defend social justice and serve democratic ends, it can be argued that their positions are also based largely on ideology and selective attention on the voucher study evidence available to date.

In our view, it appears that the scholarship of conservatively aligned educationists tends to dominate the public debate. Calling for more balance in educational reporting and policy deliberations, we echo Berliner and Biddle (1998, online), who maintained that "it is inappropriate to expect a democratic free press to be anything but highly critical of the society in which it lives. That is one of its functions. But it is not inappropriate to ask for balance. And we do not think we have that" We recognize that although a balanced examination of statistical data before using them to deter-mine the overall impact of vouchers on student outcomes is desirable, issues of power and control are central features in how such policies are ultimately played out. In the immediate and subsequent sections, we pay more attention to symbolic politics in the process of educational policy making.

Research, Policy, and Symbolic Politics

Mary Lee Smith, Walter Heinecke, and Audrey Noble (1999, 157) argued that (in Arizona, at least) assessment policy change has less to do with research and analysis than with "political spectacle" and issues of power and control over schooling. Policy actions function as political symbolism rather than as rational decision-making endeavors based on facts, evidence, experience, or fair deliberation. They called this "a predicament in the theory of policy," arguing that the use of persuasive rhetorical devices also functions in distorting social reality and has an influence on effecting educational policy making (157). Drawing on Smith et al., educational policies cannot be examined without drawing attention to the symbols that guide them.[35]

In addition to the (ab)use of research findings, persuasive rhetorical devices are effective in encouraging policy initiatives. Policymakers have consistetly employed educational buzzwords, slogans, anecdotes, and other figurative language to advance their ideological positions. Primary sources of social science research are neither readily disseminated to nor read by the general public; the public's position on educational issues is more often influenced by metaphors or media representations than by research findings.[36] In the current wave of reform, for instance, this can be seen in the debate over school performance and declining achievement scores. The public is unlikely to sort through the educational research literature

pertaining to test scores and arrive at a balanced understanding of the issue.[37] Instead, they rely on the press to interpret and simplify the vast amount of data that educational research produces. This simplification is frequently achieved by the use of metaphors. Lakoff and Johnson ([1980] 2003) theorized that metaphors are significant sources of information because individuals and groups use metaphors to organize their thinking. They also argued that metaphors and various figurative expressions could signal and communicate both the meaning and content of an ideological choice. Lakoff (1993, 5) pointed out that much of what we read in the newspapers and hear from the political arena is "metaphorical commonsense reasoning" that everyone can understand. Thus. metaphors can have considerable influence over our understanding and function as powerful tools in organizing public perceptions about an event or a phenomenon.

The current dominance of the political Right in the United States, for instance, can in part be attributed to a number of shrewd strategies, including language politics.[38] To illustrate more specifically, we take the example of President George W. Bush's phrase "no child left behind," commonplace in recent political discourse. In President Bush's words:

> The quality of our public schools directly affects us all—as parents, as students, and as citizens. Yet too many children in America are segregated by low expectations, illiteracy. and self-doubt. In a constantly changing world that is demanding increasingly complex skills from its workforce, children arc literally being left behind... If our country fails in its responsibility to educate every child, we're likely to fail in many other areas. But if we succeed in educating our youth, many other successes will follow throughout our country and in the lives of our citizens... [No child left behind] will serve as a framework from which we can all work together ... to strengthen our elementary and secondary schools... These reforms express my deep belief in our public schools and their mission to build the mind and character of every child, from every background, in every part of America.[39]

Because the quality of public schools is conveyed as a "national crisis"[40] that directly affects us all, the widespread slogan suggests an expected commitment and responsibility toward children. "No child left behind," echoes a moral idealism.[41] Who would dispute that no child should be left behind? As Michael Apple (2001) has cogently argued, it is an organizing metaphor employed to unite Americans around a larger moral, economic, and cultural agenda. What conservatives have been able to do is successfully use the metaphor to push the educational imperatives it seems to encompass. Although there is much to contend with here, in the following section we offer one possibility for dealing with ideological differences within the field of educational policy making.

Possibilities for Transcendence

Contending with ideological differences, particularly when they are embodied effectively in metaphors and other symbols, is indeed difficult. In this section, we conceptualize a "critical deliberative strategy" for transcending---not eliminatingthe use and influence of political ideology in the context of research-informed policy dialogue. This strategy builds on the notion of critical cultural workers (as championed by Paulo Freire) and the concept of deliberative democracy (as theorized by Amy Gutmann and Dennis Thompson). Our reliance on the work of these scholars underscores our own ideological leanings. Nevertheless, our hope is that the critical deliberative strategy will be helpful for policy actors regardless of ideological orientation. Certain key concepts can be embraced by all: dialogue, communication, reflection, and understanding.

Critical Cultural Workers

The Brazilian educator and political activist, Paulo Freire, argued that although there are a number of scholars as well as a handful of organizations dedicated to conducting research that serves egalitarian ends, not enough scholars are working as critical "cultural workers" who orient themselves toward concrete struggles in the public and political domains to extend the equality, liberty, and justice they defend.[42] Shor and Freire (1987, 131) maintained that "[t]he movements outside are where more people who dream of social change are gathering," and pointed out that there exists a degree of reserve on the part of academicians in particular, to penetrate the media, participate in policy debates, or to permeate policy-making bodies. Freire went on to argue that if scholars, researchers, or educators want to transform education to serve democratic ends, they cannot simply limit their struggles to institutional spaces. They must also develop a desire to increase their political activity outside of the schools. In essence, a critical cultural worker is one who crosses borders. They move beyond their familiar institutional spaces and thus beyond ideological borders that can function to constrain them and the values of democracy. They arc volunteers, activists, and everyday people who in various ways challenge those policies and ideals that violate democratic and social justice imperatives. They do a kind of work that more often involves risks, consequences, and mindfulness. For instance, teacher and principal Deborah Meier (2002). has spent more than three decades working as an advocate of public education. Meier has been particularly instrumental in revitalizing public schools in New York City's East Harlem District 4, where standardized test scores were among the lowest in the city. A leader in the urban schools reform movement, she founded several small alternative schools—most notably Central Park Elementary Schools—that emphasized and modeled a democratic environment in which teacher autonomy, parent voice, collaboration, collegiality, alliances, mutual respect, high standards.

and a lively democratic discourse were viewed as essential elements not only lead-
ing to increased graduation rates among students but also to the practice of
thoughtful citizenship.'" Meier's (2002) overall commitment is to creating small
schools that educate people with thoughtful habits of mind so that they may fulfill
the promise of a democratic citizenship. She maintained that schools need to be
communities of a manageable size to be effective in this regard.

Following Meier's lead, education professor William Ayers has been a leading
voice in teaching for social justice and a key player in promoting the small schools
cause elsewhere.[44] Ayers and community organizer Patricia Ford brought the small
schools concept to Chicago, his hometown. Ayers (2000) believed that bringing
the "rigor of private schools" to students in underserved communities would result
in increasing their educational outcomes. As a result of his advocacy, scholarship,
and the support he garnered from like-minded colleagues, the "Chicago move-
ment" has had considerable influence on state legislation pertaining to the
Chicago public school system. Although not claiming a complete victory, Ayers's
work in the community has increased the small schools momentum. Both Meier and
Ayers serve as examples of "critical cultural workers" who believe that they have
a responsibility to furthering the aims of a democratic education.

In the context of educational research and policy, critical cultural workers
would specifically aim to introduce multiperspectival dialogues into dominant po-
litical frames of reference, direct less recognized forms of research and findings
into policy-making bodies, develop political vocabularies of their own, mobilize
the knowledge of those pursuing similar democratic ends, and inform and em-
power underrepresented groups so that they may develop political efficacy. Freire
was insistent that critical cultural workers do more than communicate
information; they would labor to foster and maintain a democratic culture in
various cultural sites beyond schools. They would carry this work out into social
gatherings and society in general. In our view, one important consideration for
educational researchers as critical cultural workers is to consider the ways in
which the information produced by alternative research can be framed,
disseminated, and used by influential policymakers, individuals, and
organizations to make more informed and reasonable decisions regarding
education policies that serve the larger interests of the communities they will
affect. We argue that a Freirean-inspired vision is necessary to carve out spaces
to advance egalitarian and progressive educational (and other) policies that
would benefit all. Some would counter, however, that a Freirean strategy requires
more than a romantic vision. It demands a collective and concentrated effort.[45]

Although critical political leanings such as those espoused by Freire can pro-
vide political direction in the struggle for social change, they have also been chal-
lenged. Among feminist critiques, for instance, critical theory (and some of the en-
deavors it supports) has been accused of "repressive myths."[46] In this critique, a
notion such as empowerment. for instance. can he imbued with Paternalism and

perpetuate relations of domination whether it be in the classroom, in academic dis-
course, or in everyday life.[47] Giving power can also mean the ability to take
power.[48] In other words, the efforts to empower people in certain contexts can si-
multaneously strengthen privileged positions. In the same sense, a Freirean ap-
proach to permeating policy-making contexts may involve a form of imposition by
cultural workers, whereby representation, organization, and collective struggle
may not necessarily build understanding or political efficacy among groups of peo-
ple, but merely essentialize the other. Similarly, the notion of dialogue most also be
understood in terms of its potentially reproductive elements and the forms of com-
plicity it can engender. Although research as a political act can give voice, we rec-
ognize that it can also silence. Dialogue is not a neutral or apolitical process, as
power, privilege, and persuasion are always present in speech acts. Therefore, as
Henry Giroux (1992, 79) recognized, "cultural workers need to develop a non-
totalizing politics that makes them attentive to the partial, specific, contexts of
differentiated communities and forms of power... ."

Equally important, argued Giroux (1992, 79), is that cultural workers "[
acknowledge] the politics of personal location" and not assume independence
from any ideology. but pay attention to the ideological forces that mediate their
work. Thus, in promoting the notion of critical cultural worker, we must not
overlook how it too can mobilize actors to serve an ideological agenda that creates
a political separatism in which the ability to authentically inform policy is
significantly de-creased. As Freire put it, critical cultural workers must not become
their own worst enemy. Furthermore, the path toward self-definition and agency in
any social and cultural field must not be submerged with universal and generic
categories of liberal thought (Giroux 1992. 246-248). As part of their practice in
the context of research-informed policy dialogue, cultural workers must "speak
with rather than exclusively for others" (Giroux 1992, 29).

Despite its limitations, the concept of critical cultural worker extends the possi
bilities for dealing with policy conflicts and provides an essential component of
building a generation of citizens who will struggle to improve a society rife with
injustice. Deliberative democracy is another such component.

Deliberative Democracy

In examining how to reconcile difficult policy controversies and the role that re
-search findings play within them, researchers have struggled to conceptualize and
propose satisfactory strategies. One strand of thought advocates for researchers to
join with policymakers in some kind of collaborative research effort, which would
lead to reflective compromises over and solutions for policy conflicts.[49] Although
this suggestion makes sense, especially due to its emphasis on collaboration and
reflection, it neglects an element crucial to the success of any resolution endeavor:
deer). mutual understanding. This is where a deliberative democracy can contrib-

ute, for example, in clarifying, and perhaps, reconciling conflicting research findings or conflicting values.

Amy Gutmann and Dennis Thompson (1996) formulated an alternative conception of democracy—deliberative democracy. Because moral conflict and disagreement are seen as the most difficult challenge facing democracy, Gutmann and Thompson attempted to conceptualize a democracy that places moral discussion in political life at the center to cope with fundamental conflicts in values and ideology. Their conception of deliberative democracy is characterized by three conditions that regulate and structure the deliberative process of politics: (1) reciprocity, by which reason-giving and justification for mutually-binding policies are seen as a mutual endeavor; (2) publicity, which stipulates that policymakers, researchers, officials, and members of the public in general should have to justify their decisions and actions in public; and (3) accountability, which requires those who make policy decisions to answer to those who are bound by those policies. In addition to the three conditions, Gutmann and Thompson (1996) outlined three components that serve to govern the content of policy deliberations: (1) basic liberty, which controls what government and society can demand of people and what people can demand of one another; (2) basic opportunity, which concerns the distribution of goods necessary for pursuing a good life (e.g., basic income); and (3) fair opportunity, which has to do with the distribution of goods to people based on their qualifications.

Critics of the deliberative democratic approach have pointed out that its emphasis on argument excludes true communication and participation.[50] For example, Iris Marion Young (1996) suggested that to ensure the inclusion of diverse and nonntinstream viewpoints, one needs to incorporate the sociocultural practice of storytelling, which, as opposed to processes of argumentation, focuses on the lives of individuals, enables people to seek commonalities, and levels the playing field among people participating. Another prominent criticism of the deliberative democratic strategy is that it downplays the role of power and interests within the political and policy process and seems to assume that all participants have equal resources to enable their effective participation.[51] As Pierre Bourdieu (1993) theorized, we live in cultural and social fields of power where various discourses vie for dominance and where the more "competent" and "skillful" actors continuously advance particular ideological stances and belief systems that are difficult to counter, particularly if they have the economic resources and the social contacts to facilitate such efforts. These points are illustrated in Linda Miller–Kahn and Mary Lee Smith's (2001) study of parental involvement in the school choice movement in Boulder, Colorado. They described the ways in which a combination of backstage politics, privilege, and "choice" rhetoric, disguised as an inclusive ideology, more often structured (and controlled) bureaucratic processes in setting educational policy and practice. Communication skills, knowledge, and social and cultural competencies. more of which were possessed by "local elites," advantaged them in moving both comfortably and strategically about the school-community.[52] Echoing Bourdieu (1993), Miller–Kahn and Smith demonstrated how economic, social, and cultural capital coupled with persuasive rhetorical devices function to manipulate the policy-making process, resulting in unequal educational outcomes for students from diverse social class, racial, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds.

Transcending Ideology: A Critical Deliberative Strategy

An important point in crafting a solution to the (mis)use of research in ideology-based educational policy conflicts is that neither a critical cultural worker approach nor a deliberative democratic approach can work alone. Instead, combining a Freirean approach and a modified deliberative democratic strategy may address the weaknesses of each used in isolation and could help solve intractable ideological policy conflicts because there is an emphasis on dialogue and deliberation with a simultaneous recognition that dialogue and deliberation themselves are not neutral or universal, as power and privilege enter into speech acts. The key is that these strategies are aimed at reaching understanding, and not just at winning (Young 1981). This way, researchers and other policy actors can move beyond a pure ideology-driven endeavor to reach a place where discussion, communication, understanding, mutual respect, and critical action are central within controversial research and policy debates.

This is no easy philosophy to espouse, especially when winning is such a central cultural element in the United States. Those skeptical of whether all stakeholders would be willing to participate in the critical deliberative strategy at all would question its feasibility. Perhaps policy actors feel content or righteous arguing for ideologically driven policy agendas and are not interested in reaching compromise. A strong response to the skepticism is that there is ample evidence that continuing to conduct research and policy making activity without attending to issues of ideological difference will result in continued policy stalemates that do no good in furthering anyone's agenda. Consider that the debates over controversial issues like school vouchers or affirmative action have resulted in little policy coherence and a tendency to leave the ultimate decision to the United States Supreme Court.[53] The conscious application of critical deliberation within communities could foster better dialogue and understanding over such difficult issues. The key is that stakeholders would need to be willing to communicate with each other regardless of political perspectives. We acknowledge that this can be a major stumbling block to inclusive deliberation. Indeed, some scholars on the Left have called for a "fight fire with fire" strategy based on beating opponents at their own game. For example, David Stoesz (1987, 3) called for liberal policy institutes and think tanks to take up the aggressive ideological policy analysis championed by conservative think tanks, which he said "have developed projects for the purpose of making social policy more consonant with conservative philosophy." This often in-

volves the use of statistical data as if it were irrefutable evidence.[54] Liberal policy groups have been criticized for citing evidence selectively for the purpose of advocating for liberal social policy as well. One notable example is the American Association for University Women. Their 1992 Report, *How Schools Shortchange Girls*, came under fire for utilizing shoddy research and anecdotal evidence to prove that girls are losing out in school.[55]

The biggest challenge for the critical deliberative strategy, then, is in how to engender fruitful communication and dialogue. That challenge will need to be taken seriously by those involved in policy debate. Critical deliberation may not be successful, but it must be attempted. We should note that some disagreements are not based on deep or even shallow misunderstandings, and simply cannot be overcome. Consider the qualitative difference between the debate over phonics and whole language approaches to teaching language arts. and the debate over teaching creationism and evolution theory in schools. We can see more possibilities for transcending ideological commitments through critical deliberation and mutual understanding in the so-called reading wars than we can in debates over the origin of humanity. As such, we are not trying to suggest that the critical deliberative strategy to transcend ideology will work every time, in every type of conflict. We propose only that the critical deliberative strategy has the best chance to influence key actors within research and policy processes. Although, in some cases, they may never come to agree, the goals of critical dialogue and action, inclusion, communication, and mutual understanding will aid in producing a healthy democratic process in which mutual respect might be reached. Conflict is a necessary part of any such process. Our hope is that the critical deliberative strategy for dealing with difficult conflicts may be used to arrive at even better research and policy processes.

How might researchers and policymakers representing different ideological perspectives proceed to interact regarding a controversial policy issue if they were engaged in a process guided by a critical deliberative approach? Consider remedial education[56] at the college level. It is one example of an oft-debated educational policy issue that is characterized by ideological clashes and controversies over research findings. Let us provide a bit of background on this issue to illustrate how a critical deliberative strategy might work to transcend ideology within the debate over remedial education.

Two perspectives dominate the debate.[57] Opponents of remedial education generally come from a more conservative political orientation. They maintain that the students who need remedial courses should be attending community colleges in-stead of four-year institutions of higher education, and unprepared students are harmed when admitted to institutions at which they cannot compete.[58] Part of the argument is that although remedial programs may be well intentioned, ultimately they are political programs, and not educational ones.[59] Among the number of controversial points that have been raised by opponents, for instance, is that remedial education programs disproportionately benefit students of color.[60] On the other

side, more liberal scholars argue that remedial education centers on creating opportunities, increased retention, and better graduation outcomes for students underprepared for some college-level courses.[61] In the liberal view, remedial education is particularly beneficial for students of color or poor students with decreased educational opportunities or whose kindergarten through twelfth-grade education was historically lacking. For those advancing contemporary liberal ideals in the educational policy arena, remedial education fits into the aims of an education in a democratic society concerned with social justice for disadvantaged students. The abolishment of remedial programs, on the other hand, serves to blame and punish some students for circumstances over which they have no control.[62] Although the reasons for the backlash against remedial education are varied and complex, when one delves beyond the surface justifications for abolishing remedial education, race and class are exposed as key issues. In briefly examining this, we can see not only how arguments against remedial education are mostly political and economic, but also how old notions of meritocracy are veiled by the rhetoric of standards and quality.

At issue are the primary purposes of colleges and universities in the United States. The question often comes down to whether academic standards or educational opportunity should be the top priority. This largely ideological division has resulted in a national debate in the United States over whether remedial education programs have a rightful place at the four-year college level. The different policy actors, in this case college administrators. faculty members, students, educational researchers, and policymakers, have been unable to engage each other in productive dialogue to find satisfactory solutions to the conflict.

Recognizing that it may not be possible to completely transcend a dichotomous view and attend to both concerns, if the policy actors were to follow a critical deliberative strategy in deciding this controversial policy issue, a number of factors in the process would change. Although individual institutions would still make the final decisions regarding remedial programs on their campuses, rather than favoring solely the advice of likeminded faculty members and administrators, college administrators and policymakers would rely much more on the viewpoints of politically diverse researchers. Researchers would fill the role of cultural workers on this political issue. They would be drawn on as essential participants in policy debates, highlighting the points of debate that are clarified by research findings. To take one example, a prominent objection to remedial courses at the college level offered by opponents of such courses is that they are too expensive [63] They contend that remedial programs end up costing taxpayers a large amount of money. Not only are taxpayers paying for students to learn this material in high school, but they must also pay for some students to be taught the same material in public colleges and universities as well. This results in a double cost. In addition, critics argue, it is very difficult to accurately estimate the full cost of remedial education programs due to the stigma associated with them and the often-fuzzy definition of what con-

stitutes a remedial program.[64] Interestingly, educational research has shown that remedial education programs generally cost slightly less than one percent of an institution's yearly budget.[65] In raw numbers, this means that remedial programs cost approximately $1 billion dollars per year of an overall public higher education budget of $1 15 billion dollars. Thus, in relative terms, the programs may cost very little to administer and run. These findings make clear the actual financial costs of remedial programs, and as such, aid in the communications of the policy actors. To take another example, remedial programs also are often criticized because they purportedly serve to lower academic standards and achievement. Researchers Lavin , Alba, and Silberstein (1981) found that exposure to remedial courses made no significant negative or positive differences for students in terms of academic achievement, grade point averages, retention, or graduation. They also found that success in remedial courses did make a difference for students who passed their remedial courses. Such students were more likely to persist and graduate college than comparable students who did not take remedial courses. If success at remedial courses correlates with overall college success, and failure at remedial courses correlates with overall college failure, then researchers have contributed an intriguing response to some of the basic criticisms of remedial education. Conservative critics may be satisfied because there is evidence that standards are not substantially lowered by remedial courses. And liberals may be satisfied because students' equality of educational opportunity is expanded by the availability of remedial courses. Furthermore, these findings suggest that there could be a resolution for the conflicting goal priorities within institutions of higher education. Institutions can strive both to contribute to an expansive opportunity structure for all students and to foster high level academic research and scholarship.

In addition, a critical deliberative decision-making process would attend more to the view of those people who have the most to gain or lose depending on the policy decision. Students, those arguably most affected by the outcome of the remedial debate, have had to deal with tangible policy changes at institutions of higher education. Although many remedial programs remain in place, others have been reduced or abolished.[66] Certainly, the reasons for students' need for remedial education courses vary, but the acknowledgment or recognition of systemic inequalities that students have experienced would allow actors in this debate to move from monolithic perspectives and perhaps develop a more balanced understanding of the issue. Researchers employing nonmainstream and participatory methods of inquiry, for instance, can introduce a "discourse of difference"[67] into the deliberative process that challenges the mainstream assumptions about remedial education. Embracing research that documents students' lived experiences rather than privileging research that involves pure data gathering, fixed sampling strategies, and generalizable results. can provide a counterargument to the prevailing view within higher education that seems to blame personal or cultural factors such as race, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status for limited academic preparedness. Such efforts toward balanced representation in determining the existence, need, or continuation

of remedial education can move the discussion from focusing primarily on individual shortcomings to institutional ones in framing the debate. A critical deliberative approach would take up the voices and lived experiences of those least represented but with the most to gain or lose in the outcomes of the remedial debate. The deliberative process would provide conditions in which those directly affected by policy outcomes are not included simply for emotional appeal, but as essential resources and actors in policy negotiations. It would ensure that those most affected would be included in deliberations about what is educationally worthwhile. This calls for educational and other researchers whose inquiries counteract reductionist interpretations, negative stereotypes, and fictionalized representations of remediation, to engage in more of a political struggle, to practice research as a political act. Specifically, this requires that they function as cultural workers who inform and mediate policy-making contexts, as well as guide the meaning, reception, and use (as well as follow the potential misuse) of their work.[68]

In sum, policy deliberations related to remedial education programs (as well as any other education policy with personal and social implications) should include individuals with diverse viewpoints on study advisory boards, engage issues beyond student achievement to ascertain more comprehensive understandings of the issue, develop multiple kinds of research studies to review the policy from a multitude of vantage points, and commit to long-term program evaluations before championing policy conclusions.[69] These efforts may offset power differentials in the deliberation process by infusing mainstream interpretations of the remediation issue with a multiperspectival discourse and understanding.

Although there is no guarantee that political cul-de-sacs can be penetrated to include more discursive forms of representation, these examples show how research findings may play a central role in a critical deliberative decision-making process. Interactions within the process of critical deliberation would give increased attention to relevant educational research findings rather than allowing ideology alone to drive interpretations of research findings and policy initiatives.

As mentioned earlier. inequalities in power relations among those involved in the policy debate are likely to enter into any deliberation and dialogue that may take place. In the case of remedial education, it is often students of color and poor students who come to college from inferior neighborhood public schools that rely on remedial courses to level those public school inequalities. Ernest House (2001, online) pointed out that "Americans have defined their educational system in such a way as to ensure that African Americans (and often other minorities) are treated in an exclusionary way." Under critical deliberative theory, more powerful policy actors such as high level college administrators and members of boards of trustees would be obliged to be accountable to the students who need remedial courses to pursue selective higher education. Instead of focusing on political outcomes concerning issues like academic standards and achievement, the policy process would endeavor to reach mutual understandings between supporters and opponents of remedial education, by privileging reciprocity and dialogue. and building these ele-

ments into critical policy debates. Of course, it is impossible to know what the policy outcome would be if a critical deliberative strategy indeed was pursued in this example, but our hope is that a result mutually acceptable to more interested par-ties would emerge.

Conclusion

Ellen Condliffe Lagemann's (2000) historical analysis centers on what she called the "troubling history" of educational research—an unwillingness to transcend ideological frameworks. Note that we call for transcendence of ideological perspectives, not dismissal or avoidance of such perspectives. It is not objectivity or neutrality for which we advocate, but a more reasonable, honest approach to educational research and policy. Differences in opinion, ideology, and interpretations of research are legitimate and will continue. Moreover, the contemporary political environment in the United Sates has been described as a "political spectacle"[70] in which contending with ideological differences, particularly when they are embodied in "plain folk Americanisms"[71] and other influential symbols, presents a complex situation, especially for those pursuing democratic educational outcomes. Recognizing that there is a spectrum of actors, a range of competing discourses, and ongoing processes of change, our central concern in this article has been to conceptualize one way, within a democratic society, to best address intractable conflicts within educational research and policy and transcend the use and influence of political ideology in the context of research-informed policy dialogue. We have argued for a critical deliberative strategy, based on a combination of critical cultural worker orientations and deliberative democratic approaches. Through a critical deliberative approach, some headway may be made in ensuring that multiple perspectives on controversial issues are taken into account by policy actors with diverse and often divergent interests. By engaging in such practice, we can avoid educational policies based on one-sided research and rhetoric, as well as mitigate educational inequalities, and in so doing, build a fuller and richer democracy.

Acknowledgment

Notes 1.

See Joel Best (2001).

3. For example, see M. F. D. Young (1981).
4. Sec Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray (1994).
5. The discussion of bilingual education borrows from Michele S. Moses (2002), chapter 3.
6. See Linda Chavez (2000); James Crawford (1999); Rebecca Gordon (1999); Carlos Illescas (1999); Robert D. King (1997); Mike McCloy (1999); Ron K. Unz (2001).
7. Jim Cummins (1999).
8. Stephen B. Heath (1986); María de la Luz Reyes (1992); Lily Wong-Fillmore (1991).
9. See, for example, Jim Cummins (1981); Kenji Hakuta (1986); Stephen D. Krashen (1996); Ofelia B. Miramontes, Adel Nadeau, and Nancy L. Cummins (1997); Lily Wong-Fillmore. (1991).
10. See Linda Chavez (1991).
11. See Linda Chavez (1991).
12. Ibid.
13. See Ofelia Garcia (1995); Raquel Ruiz (1984); Harold Schiffman (1996); Ronald Schmidt (1997).
14. Ibid.
15. See Henri Giroux (1997).
16. See Linda Chavez (1991).
17. Theodore Andersson and Mildred Boyer (1976); Jim Cummins (1981); Kenji Hakuta (1986); Stephen Heath (1986); Stephen Krashen (1996); Lily Wong-Fillmore. 1991.
18. Ibid.
19. In 1994, Ron Unz attempted a bid for the republican nomination for governor, but lost to Pete Wilson.
20. James Crawford (2000).
21. Barbara Miner (1999).
22. Stephen Krashen, Grace Park, and Dan Seldin (2000); Jay Greene (2001).
23. Jay Greene (2001).
24. For a discussion on the possible methodological flaws of the report, see Gregory Camilli and Katrina Bulkley (2001), and Haggai Kupermintz (2001).
25. Michael Apple (2001, see pp. 38-41) illuminates the ideological rationale behind voucher initiatives: "Public institutions such as schools are "black holes" into which money is poured—and then seemingly disappears—but which do not provide anywhere near adequate results... As "black holes," schools ... waste economic resources that should go into private enterprise... By turning [schools] over to the market through voucher and choice plans, education will be largely self-regulating ... Behind [voucher and choice programs] is a plan to subject schools to the discipline of market competition...There are now increasingly convincing arguments that while the supposed overt goal of voucher and choice plans is to give poor people the right to exit public schools, among the ultimate long-term effects may be the increase of 'white flight' from public schools into private and religious schools and the creation of the conditions where affluent white parents may refuse to pay taxes to support public schools..."
26. See William G. Howell, Patrick J. Wolf, Paul E. Peterson, and David E. Campbell (2000).
27. A number of these reports can be found at <http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/pepg/papers.htm>
28. See the work of Martin Conroy on this point as well as the work of Alex Molnar, Walter C. Farrell, David Berliner, Luis Huerta, and Roslyn Michelson, who have individually and collaboratively analyzed the politics behind market-based school reform and argue that vouchers reinforce segregation and inequality between poor students and their better-off counterparts.
29 Henry M. Levin (2002).
30. The results were released as the national republican convention was getting under way in Sari Diego, California.
31. Sec <http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/pepg/pdf/resp.pdf>

33. Sec Brian P. Gill, Michael Timpane. Karen E. Ross, and Dominic J. Brewer (2001).

34. See Kim K. Metcalf and Polly A. Tait (1999); Boone, Frances Stage, Todd Chilton, Patricia Muller, and Polly A. Tait (1997); and Kim K. Metcalf, Patricia Muller, William Boone, Polly Tait, Frances Stage, and Nicole Stacey (1998).

35. Mary Lee Smith, Linda Miller-Kahn. Patricia Fey, Walter Heinecke, and Audrey J. Noble (n. d.).

36. Ibid.

37. lbid; David C. Berliner and Bruce J. Biddle (1995).

38. George Lakoff (1993) analyzes some of the reasons for conservative political victories in the United States. He argues that the metaphors prominent in conservative agendas are successful because they are simple, focused, and comprehensive, and as a result, have been able to garner widespread support compared to the "issue by issue" political activity of liberals. The strategic use of metaphor has proven to be an effective practice in policy formation. In addition to commonsense strategies, the language politics employed by conservative politicians are tactically designed to be indisputable. David Gillborn (as cited in Michael Apple, 2001, 69) maintains that "[t]his is a powerful technique. First, it assumes there are no *genuine* arguments against the chosen position; any opposing views are thereby positioned as false, insincere, and self-serving. Second, this technique presents the speaker as someone... honest... Hence, the moral high ground is assumed and opponents are further denigrated" See also Noam Chomsky's (1988) argument on linguistic competence.

39. President George W. Bush, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/reports/no-child-left-behind.html>

40. For example, in the 1980s, a number of reports were prominent in criticizing the condition of public education in the United States, arguing that educational institutions were failures as a result of a "rising tide of mediocrity" (National Commission on Excellence in Education 1983, 5). A drop in academic achievement was attributed to the cultural and political movements of the I 960s believed to have engendered misguided egalitarian reforms. In this view, interdisciplinary and broadly defined programs of study "watered down" the curriculum and in doing so weakened the skills and cognitive capacities believed necessary to maintain the United States's competitive edge within a global economy (Joel Spring 1991). These reports were embraced by right-wing politicians and generated considerable support during the 1980s. Linking economic productivity to educational performance, conservative politicians structured their argument as a "crisis" in education that required widespread reform efforts. By overstating the severity of the economic and educational crises, these highly critical reports caught the public's attention. The "crisis" in education, albeit somewhat manufactured, was perpetuated by influential citizens. legislators, journalists, intelligentsia, and financial sponsors of conservative platforms in a manner that created a significant amount of public frustration (David Berliner and Bruce Biddle 1998).

41. See Michael Apple (2001).

42. See Paolo Freire (1998). This idea also draws on the work of Henri Giroux (1992). According to Giroux. the concept of cultural worker traditionally referred to artists and writers but extends to those in law, medicine, social work, theology, and education. Furthermore, Giroux extended the concept of cultural worker to include the need for multiple solidarities and political vocabularies in extending democratic principles and effecting social change.

43. Deborah Meier (2002). Over ninety percent of Central Park East's students have graduated and moved on to college.

44. William Ayers, Gabrielle H. Lyon, and Michael Klonsky (2000).

45. A useful source of insights is the Freirean-inspired analysis undertaken by Jean Stefancic and Richard Delgado (1996) of the strategics conservatives have deployed in influencing social policy formulation over the last two decades in the United States. Their analysis of how conservatives have gained control over official English campaigns. IQ and race, Proposition 187, affirmative action, welfare reform, and the culture wars on campuses can inform those with Left political ideologies how to penetrate the policy-making process

46. Elizabeth Ellsworth. (1992, 91).

47. Ibid.

48. Donaldo Macedo, personal communication, 1999.

49. Sec Donald Schön and Martin Rein (1999).

50. See Mary Lee Smith, Walter Heinecke, and Audrey Noble (1999, 120—135).

51. Amy Gutmann and Dennis Thompson, in fact, acknowledge that it may he problematic for their theory to rely on people's ability, and, perhaps more importantly. their willingness to reflect and reason beyond their own self-interest and to step into the shoes of another.

52. Amy S. Wells and Irene Serna (1996, 93—118).

53. *Zelman v. Simmons-Harris* U.S. 2002; *Gratz v. Bollinger* U.S. 2003.

54. Although Stoesz's suggestion to increase the presence of political ideology in the policy-making process may be wrongheaded, the choice of research method should be taken into consideration by educational researchers interested in having their research make an impact on policy. The critical deliberative strategy, which we advocate, would support efforts to combine research methods such as quantitative, qualitative, and narrative findings. both to challenge the hegemony of quantitative methods that may be misinterpreted or manipulated, and to provide a more complete portrait from which to analyze issues and make policy decisions (see Joel Best. 2001).

55. American Association of University Women (1992), as critiqued by Christina H. Sommers (2000).

56. Remedial courses are defined loosely as courses dealing with precollege material, which are centered on addressing academic weaknesses (see Hunter R. Boylan and William G. White, (1987, 1—4; Patricia Cross, 1976: John E. Roueche and Suanne D. Roueche, 1999). Although there has been some contention about how to describe the courses that fall under the "remedial" or "developmental" label. most public commentaries outside of Academe refer to remedial education, especially when discussing the various criticisms and debates surrounding it. For that reason, remedial education is referred to herein.

57. The discussion of remedial education borrows from Michele S. Moses (2002).

58. Bruno V. Manno (1995, 47–49): Laurence Steinberg (1998, 37—41).

59. Lois Cronholm (1999a, 1999b).

60. Lisa Guernsey (1996). In addition, those opposed to remedial education at four-year colleges question the impact of remedial courses on academic standards, whether or not remedial education policy condones poor academic achievement by students and public schools, and the cost of remedial programs (see Lois Cronholm, 1999a, 1999h; Bruno V. Manno, 1995, 47-49; Laurence Steinberg, 1998).

61. Clifford Adelman (1998); David H. Ponitz (1998); John E. Roueche and Suanne D. Roueche (1999).

62. Critics argue that students in remedial courses arc each individually responsible for their underpreparedness. These critics maintain that some students have simply chosen not to take the demanding high school courses that would have better prepared them for the levels of writing, reading, and mathematics expected of college students at four-year institutions. As such, they were unable to score high enough on entrance and placement examinations. The general sentiment is that they are either unintelligent or irresponsible persons who squandered their kindergarten through twelfth-grade educational opportunities. Hence, they do not deserve so-called second chances at the postsecondary level.

63. See Bruno V. Manno (1995); Ronald Phipps (1998).

64. Sec Ronald Phipps (1998).

65. See David W. Breneman (1998).

66. See Kit Lively (1995); Peter Schmidt (1998).

67. Espousing the educational philosophy of Freire, Giroux formulates a politics of voice and argues that a "discourse of difference" is necessary to permeate monolithic perspectives and relations of power and privilege (see Henry Giroux 1992).

68. Giroux (1992) makes this argument in *Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Poll-*

69. Jack Jennings (2000).

70. Murray Edelman (1988) argued that the contemporary political milieu in the United States resembles theater, comprised of a range of actors and intricate plots. The curtain conceals the backstage action where irrational and manipulative politics by skilled but immoral actors is really played out.

71. See Michael Apple (2001).

References

Adelman, Clifford. 1998. "The Kiss of Death? An Alternative View of College Remediation." *Cross Talk* 6:11.

American Association of University Women. 1972. *How Schools Shortchange Girls.* Final Report. Washington, DC: Author.

Andersson, Theodore, and Mildred Boyer. 1976. *Bilingual Schooling in the United States: History, Rationale, Implications, and Planning.* Austin, Tex.: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Apple, Michael. 2001. *Educating the "Right" Way: Markets, Standards, God, and Inequality.* New York: Routledge/Falmer.

Ayers, William, Gabrielle H. Lyon, and Michael Klonsky. 2000. *A Simple Justice: The Challenge for Small Schools.* New York: Teacher's College Press.

Berliner. David C., and Bruce J. Biddle. 1995. *The Manufactured Crisis: Myths, Fraud, and the Attack of America's Public Schools.* White Plains, N.Y.: Longman.

Berliner, David C. and Bruce J. Biddle. 1998. "*The Lamentable Alliance Between the Media and School Critics.*" *The School Administrator* <*http://www.aasa.org/publicati* ons/sa/l1998_09/Berliner.htm>

Best, Joel. 2001. *Damned Lies and Statistics: Untangling Numbers from the Media, Politicians, and Activists.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1993. *The Field of Cultural Production.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Boylan, Hunter R., and William G. White. 1987. "Educating the Nation's People: The Historical Roots of Developmental Education, Part 1." *Review of Research on Developmental Education* 4:1-4.

Breneman, David W. 1998. "The Extent and Cost of Remediation in Higher Education" in *Brookings Papers on Education Policy.* Edited by Diane Ravitch. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute.

Camilli, Gregory, and Katrina Bulkley. 2001. Critique of "An Evaluation of the Florida A-Plus Accountability and School Choice Program" *Education Policy Analysis Archives.* <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/>

Chavez, Linda. 1991. *Out of the Barrio: Toward a New Politics of Hispanic Assimilation.* New York: Basic Books.

Chavez, Linda. 2000. "Nation's New Dual-immersion Plan Revives Languishing Bilingual Ed" *Tucson Citizen,* 22 March, 1998.

Chomsky, Noam. 1998. *Language and Politics.* Montreal, Canada: Black Rose Books.
Crawford, James. 1991. *Bilingual Education: History, Politics, Theory, and Practice.* Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services, Inc.

Crawford, James. 1999. "What Now for Bilingual Education'?" *Rethinking Schools* 13: 1-5.

Crawford, James. 2000. "Bilingual Education: Strike Two" *Rethinking Schools* 15:3, 8.

Cronholm, Lois. 1999a. "The Assault on Remediation: The Triumph of Logic Over Emotion." <http://www.baruch.cuny.edu/president/remediation.html>

Cronholm, Lois. 1999b. "Why One College Jettisoned All Its Remedial Courses." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 46:B6–B7.

Cross, K. Patricia. 1976. *Accent on Learning.* San Francisco: Jossey–Bass.

Cummins, Jim. 1981. *The Role of Primary Language Development in Promoting Educational Success* for *Language Minority Students. Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework.* Los Angeles: California State University. Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.

Cummins, Jim. 1999. *"Research, Ethics and Public- Discourse: The Debate on Bilingual Education."* Paper presented at the National Conference of the American Association of Higher Education. Washington, D.C. (March).

Edelman, Murray. 1988. *Constructing the Political Spectacle.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ellsworth. Elizabeth. 1992. "Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering? Working Through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy" in *Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy.* Edited by Carmen Luke and Jennifer Gore. New York: Routledge.

Feuer, Michael J., Lisa Towne, and Richard J. Shavelson. 2002. "Scientific Culture and Educational Research" *Educational Researcher 31 (8):* 4–14. U. S. Department of Education. Strategic Plan 2002–2007: "Educational Research in the No Child Left Behind Act." <http://www.nctm.org/highered/nclb.pdf>

Freire, Paulo. 1998. *Teachers as Cultural Workers.* Boulder, Colo.: Westview.

García, Ofelia. 1995. "Spanish Language Loss as a Determinant of Income Among Latinos in the United States: Implications for Language Policy in Schools" Pp. 142–160 in *Power and Inequality in Language Education.* Edited by James Tollefson. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gill. Brian P., P. Michael Timpane, Karen E. Ross, and Dominic J. Brewer. 2001. *Rhetoric Versrus Reality: What We Know and What We Need to Know About Vouchers and Charter Schools.* <http://www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR III8/>

Giroux, Henry. 1992. *Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education.* New York: Routledge.

Giroux, Henry. 1997. *Pedagogy and the Politics of Hope: Theory, Culture, and ,Schooling.* Boulder, Colo.: Westview.

Glass, Gene V. 1987. "What Works: Politics and Research." *Educational Researcher* 15 (X) :9.
Gordon, Rebecca. 1999. "Language Hysteria: The Aftermath of California's Bilingual Ban." *Colorlines* 2 (Spring): 19–20.

Gratz v. Bollinger (02–516) U.S. 2003.

Greene. Jay. 2001. *An Evaluation of the Florida A-Plus Accountability mid School Choice Program.* New York: The Manhattan Institute.

Guernsey, Lisa. 1996. "Study Finds That Twenty-Nine Percent of Freshmen Take Remedial Instruction." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (November 1) A23.

Gutmann, Amy, and Dennis Thompson. 1996. *Democracy and Disagreement: Why Moral Conflict Cannot he Avoided in Politics. and What Should be Done About It.* Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press.

Hakuta. Kenji. 1986. *Minor of Language: The Debate on Bilingualism.* New York: Basic Books.

Heath, Shirley. B. 1986. "Sociocultural Contexts of Language Development." Pp. 143–186 *in Beyond Language: Social and Cultural Factors in Schooling Language Minority Students.* Edited by Carlos Corté's. Los Angeles: California State University. Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.

Herrnstein, Richard, and Charles Murray. 1994. *The Bell Curie.* New York: Free Press.
House, Ernest R. 1999. "Race and Policy." *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 7.16. <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v7n16.html>

Howell, William G., Patrick J. Wolf, Paul E. Peterson, and David E. Campbell. 2000. *New Study Shores That Vouchers Boost the Achievement of Low-Income African—American Students.* <http://www.brook.eduldybdocroot/views/papcrs/Wolf/20000828.htm>

Illescas. Carlos. 1999. "DPS Bilingual Plan a Cause for Concern." *The Denver Post* 1 B, 4B. (February 28).

Jennings, Jack. 2000. *"School Voucher Debate Gets an Incomplete."* <http://www. ctredpof. org/vouchers/voucherpressreleasejune2000.pdf>

Kennedy, Sheila Suess. 2003. "Privatizing Education: The Politics of Vouchers" *Phi Delta Kappan* (April 2). <http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/kken0102.htm>

King. Robert D. 1997. "Should English Be the Law?" *The Atlantic Monthly* (April) 55–64. Kingdon, John W. 1995. *Agendas. Alternatives, and Public Policies.* New York: HarperCollins.

Krashen, Stephen D. 1996. *Under Attack: The Case Against Bilingual Education. Cul*ver City, Calif.: Language Education Associates.

Krashen, Stephen D., Grace Park, and Dan Seldin. 2000. "Bilingual Education in Arizona." *NABE News* (September/October):12–14.

Kupermintz, Haggai. 2001. "The Effects of Vouchers on School Improvement: Another Look at the Florida *Data."* *Education Policy Analysis Archives* (March 19). <http://epaa. asu.edu/epaa/v9n8/>

Lagemann, Ellen Condliffe. 2000. *An Elusive Science: The Troubling History of Education Research.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George. 1993. *Moral Politics: What Conservatives Know that Liberals Don't.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. [19801 2003. *Metaphors We Live By.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lavin, David E., Richard D. Alba, and Richard A. Silberstein. 1981. *Right Versus Privilege: The Open-Admissions Experiment at the City University of New York.* New York: Free Press.

Levin, Henry M. 1998. "Educational Vouchers: Effectiveness, Choice, and Costs" *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 17 (Summer): 373.

Levin, Henry M. 2002. "A Comprehensive Framework for Evaluating Educational Vouchers" *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 24 (Fall): 159–174.

Lively, Kit. 1995. "Cal State U. Revises Plan for Ending Remedial Education." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* A27 (December 15).

Manno, Bruno V. 1995. "Remedial Education: Replacing the Double Standard with Real Standards" *Change* 27:47–49.

McCloy, Mike. 1999. "Showdown Over Language." *The Arizona Republic* (January 7). <http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/JWCRAWFORD/AR4.htm>

Meier, Deborah. 2002. *The Power of Their Ideas. Lessons to America from a Small School in Harlem.* Boston: Beacon.

Metcalf, Kim K., Patricia Muller, William Boone, Polly A. Tait, Frances Stage, and Nicole Stacey. 1998. *Evaluation of the Cleveland Scholarship Program: Second-Year Report.* Bloomington: Indiana University, Indiana Center for Evaluation.

Metcalf, Kim K., and Polly A. Tait. 1999. *"Free Market Policies and Public Education: What is the Cost of Choice?"* <http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/ kmet9909.htm#1 I>

Metcalf, Kim K., William Boone, Frances Stage. Todd Chilton, Patricia Muller, and Polly A. Tait. 1997. *An Evaluation of the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Grant Program: First-Year Report.* Bloomington: Indiana University, Indiana Center for Evaluation.

Miller, Steven I., and Marcel Fredericks. 2000. "Social Science Research Findings and Educational Policy Dilemmas: Some Additional Distinctions." *Education Policy Analysis Archives* (January 5). <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaalv8n3/>

Miller-Kahn, Linda, and M. L. Smith, "School Choice Policies in the Political Spectacle," Education Policy Analysis Archives, 30 November 2001. <http://epaa.asu.edulepaa/ v9n50.html>

Miner, Barbara. 1999. "Bilingual Education: New Visions for a New Era" *Rethinking Schools* 13:18–20.

Miramontes, Ofelia B., Adel Nadeau, and Nancy L. Commins. 1997. *Restructuring Schools for*

Moses, Michele S. 2002. *Embracing Race: Why We Need Race-Conscious Education Pol*icy. New York: Teachers College Press.

NABE. 1998. "English Language Education for Children in Public Schools." *NABE News* 12–14 (February 1).

National Commission on Excellence in Education. 1983. *A Nation at Risk: The imperative for Educational Reform.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Phipps, Ronald. *1998. College Remediation: What It Is, What It Costs, What's at Stake.* Washington, D.C.: The institute for Higher Education Policy.

Ponitz, David H. 1998. "Commentary." Pp. 35–37 in *Remediation in Higher Education: A Symposium.* Edited by Chester E. Finn, Jr. Dayton, Ohio: Fordham Foundation.

Reyes, Maria de la Luz. 1992. "Challenging Venerable Assumptions: Literacy Instruction for Linguistically Different Students." *Harvard Educational Review* 62:427-446. Rodriguez, Richard. 1982. *Hunger of Memory: The Education of Richard Rodriguez.* New York: Bantam.

Roueche. John E., and Suanne D. Roueche. 1999. *High Stakes, High Performance: Making Remedial Education Wr°rk.* Washington, D.C.: Community College Press.

Ruiz, Raquel. 1984. "Orientations in Language Planning." *National Association for Bilingual Education Journal* 8:15–34.

Schmidt, Ronald. 1997. "Latinos and Language Policy: The Politics of Culture." Pp. 343–367 in *Pursuing Power: Latinos and the Political System.* Edited by F. Chris Garcia. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Schmidt, Ronald. 1998. "A Clash of Values at CUNY Over Remedial Education." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* A33–A34 (March 2W.

Schön, Donald A., and Martin Rein. 1994. *Frame Reflection: Toward the Resolution of Intractable Policy Controversies.* New York: Basic Books.

Shor, Ira, and Paulo Freire. 1987. *A Pedagogy for Liberation: Dialogues on Transforming Education.* South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin and Garvey.

Smith, Mary Lee, Linda Miller–Kahn, Patricia Fey, Walter Heinecke, and Audrey .1. Noble. n. d. *Political Spectacle and the Fate of American Schools.* New York: Routledge/Falmer Press.

Smith, Mary Lee, Walter Heinecke, and Audrey J. Noble. 1999. "Assessment Policy and Political Spectacle." *Teachers College Record 101.*:157.

Sommers, Christina H. 2000. *The War Against Boys: How Misguided Feminism is Harming Our Young Men.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Spring, Joel. 1991. *American Education: An Int'oduction to Social and Political Aspects.* New York: Longman.

Stefancic, Jean, and Richard Delgado. 1996. *No Mercy. How Conservative Think Tanks and Foundations Changed America's Social Agenda.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Steinberg, Laurence. 1998. "Commentary." Pp. 37–41 in *Remediation in Higher Education: A Symposium.* Edited by Chester E. Finn. Dayton, Ohio: Fordham Foundation.

Stoesz, David. 1987. "Policy Gambit: Conservative Think 'Links Take on the Welfare State." *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare* 14:3.

The National Education Association. 1999–2001. *Vouchers: What the Research* Says. <http://www.safeschoolsnow.org/issucs/vouchers/research-vouchers.html>

Unz. Ron K. 2001. "Bilingual Education Lives On." *The New York Times A 23* (March 2).

Wells, Amy S,. and Irene Serna. 1996. "The Politics of Culture: Understanding Local Political Resistance to Detracking in Racially Mixed Schools." *Harvard Educational Review* 66: 93–118.

Wildaysky, Aaron. 1979. *Speaking Truth to Power: The Art and Craft of Policy Analysis.* Boston: Little, Brown.

Wong—Fillmore, Lily. 1991. "When Learning a Second Language Means Losing the First." *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 6:324–346.

Young. Iᵳis Marion. 1996. "Communication and the Other: Beyond Deliberative Democ-
racy" Pp.] 20—135 in *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Po-
litical.* Edited by Seyla Benhabib. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
Young, Michael F. D. 1981. "Ideology and Educational Research," Pp. 34—43 in *Poverty,
Power; and Authority in Education: Cross-Cultural Perspectives.* Edited by Edgar B.
Gumbert. Atlanta: Georgia State University.
Zehman v. Simmons—Harris (00—175 I) 436 U.S. 2002.

Correspondence should he addressed to Michele Moses, Box 872411, Arizona State

University, Tempe, AZ 85287. E-mail michele.moses@asu.edu