

# Power in Cultural Modeling: Building on the Bilingual Language Practices of Immigrant Youth in Germany and the United States

**Marjorie Faulstich Orellana**

*University of California at Los Angeles*

**H. Julia Eksner**

*Northwestern University*

In this manuscript we examine a set of language practices engaged in by immigrant youths in two contexts: the children of immigrants from Mexico to Chicago, United States, and Turkish immigrant youth in Berlin, Germany. We theorize the practices that we call *mediation* and *contestation* as contrasting yet comparable processes that arise from the social positions these youth hold vis a vis the dominant groups of each society. We situate our work within the “cultural modeling” framework (Lee, 1995) and use our understanding of these language practices to consider how they may be leveraged for the development of academic literacies. At the same time, we contemplate power-inflected constraints on such bridges to practice.

## CULTURAL MODELING

The cultural modeling framework for curriculum design builds explicitly on the resources of students from non-dominant groups by drawing analogues between disciplinary constructs and modes of reasoning, on the one hand, and students’ cultural funds of knowledge (Gonzales, Moll, & Amanti, 2005; Moll, 1993), on the other. In order to build these connections and scaffold academic learning, there are two crucial tasks for teachers and curriculum designers (Lee, 2004). The first is to develop a deep understanding of the routine practices students engage in outside of school. The second is to probe how these skills map onto disciplinary skills, topics, modes of reasoning, and procedures.

The first task is generally tackled through ethnographic and sociolinguistic research in homes and community contexts. It involves close observation and listening to identify and then analyze youth practices, ways of using language, and other resources for learning. After understanding what youth do with language and literacy in their everyday lives, we can then begin to probe similarities between these practices and those used in the academic disciplines. We can also contemplate potential points of confusion, i.e., misconceptions or naïve understandings.

The second task (Lee, 2004) requires cultivating a deep understanding of the targeted academic discipline to determine the most generative issues to be tackled in the classroom. We need to know how disciplinary topics, concepts, and procedures relate to one another and what students’ understandings of these interrelationships are. Based on this understanding, we can make decisions about points of connections to students’ social, conceptual, and linguistic lives outside of school.

To date, most of the work in cultural modeling has involved the study of literature. Carol Lee’s foundational work in this area has been focused on African-American students, particularly those who speak African-American English Vernacular (AAEV) (Lee, 1995, 2000). In this work, Lee has identified routine problems that readers face in tackling canonical works of literature: understanding

symbolism, irony, satire, and the use of unreliable narration. She has then shown how speakers of African-American English routinely produce and interpret such tropes and patterns in everyday life, particularly as they participate in the language practice of signifying, a language game of ritual insult that is played within the African-American community. Lee's cultural modeling work has involved helping students to make their predominantly tacit knowledge of signifying practices more explicit, and then to apply it to the interpretation of literary texts. More recently, Lee has extended her work to show how youth who routinely listen to rap music also interpret symbolic tropes (Lee, 1997).

In cultural modeling, everyday texts such as signifying dialogues or rap lyrics are used as cultural data sets in instruction. By working with such cultural data sets, the strategies and habits of mind that students already use in other contexts are made explicit. Students are supported in making connections between how they reason in the context of these familiar texts and how they do so with texts from the academic domain. They identify strategies for meaning-making as they move from analyzing personally meaningful texts to canonical works of literature. Lee found that students with histories of low achievement in reading became intensely engaged in literary analysis. They employed strategies for literary criticism that led to often-profound interpretations of the text.

We want to underscore the fact that cultural modeling differs from "cultural match" approaches, which attempt to align the forms of discourse, norms, values, or participation structures of home and school. We do not believe such alignment is practically possible, nor do we think it is necessary in order to make good use of the skills that youth develop in everyday settings. In contrast, instruction based on cultural modeling highlights the generative role of cultural funds of knowledge, and the specific ways in which one set of skills can be transformed for use in another setting.

There is a need to extend cultural modeling research to a wider range of cultural practices, and to the practices of a wider array of social groups. Moreover, we believe there is value in identifying commonalities of practice that cut across different communities and that, therefore, may be adapted to a wider range of instructional contexts. Towards this end, in this paper we examine linguistic practices that are engaged by immigrant youth in two distinct settings. We identify commonalities in these practices as well as potential bridges from the two sets of practices to classroom work.

## IMMIGRANT YOUTHS IN GERMANY AND THE UNITED STATES

The two communities that we study here were not initially intended as comparative. Rather, our analyses emerge from conversations between the authors and reflections on similarities as well as differences in our data. One aim in bringing these projects together is to contemplate how structural relations shape the pressures and opportunities for youth to engage in particular kinds of language practices and, thus, how cultural processes are at least partly contextual ones that emerge from the social relations between groups in particular contexts. Some practices may come to be seen as "Mexican" or "Turkish" ones because of the social positions that these groups hold vis a vis the larger society, but it is the underlying structural positioning that promotes and gives form to these practices, not membership in a social category per se. We consider how similarities as well as differences in the structural and ideological positions of these groups within their respective national scenes shape the nature of everyday language practices that youth engage in (Eksner & Orellana, 2005). We begin with a brief description of the participants, their contexts, and our methods of research, following this

with an overview of the practices we identified as ones of *mediation* and *contestation*. We then turn our attention to ways in which youths' skills in these practices might be leveraged for literacy learning in school.

Both Germany and the United States experienced a massive migration of workers beginning in the late 1950s. In Germany, most of these workers are Turkish in origin, while in the United States the largest group consists of Mexican nationals. In the Berlin field-site, where the second author conducted her research in 2000 (in the urban ethnic enclave of Kreuzberg, which is also called "Little Istanbul"), about 50% of the population were Turkish citizens (Bezirksamt, 2000). (Since nationalized immigrants are not counted as minority members in the German census, this means that the numbers in the neighborhood were actually higher.) The K-8 school located in a previously Polish immigrant neighborhood on the northwest side of Chicago where the first author conducted research from 2000-2003, had a population that was 75% Hispanic (mostly Mexican in origin) at that time.

Although there has been some class mobility in both contexts (mobility that is partly obscured by the continual influx of new immigrants), Turks in Germany and Mexicans in the United States are concentrated in the poor and working class sectors of society. They have limited access to hegemonic forms of symbolic and educational capital. For example, 14% of all Germans are enrolled in university, but only 4% of all Turks are enrolled, and this includes recent migrants from upper-class Turkish families on a student stipend to Germany (Bezirksamt, 1999). Similar statistics can easily be mustered for Mexican migrants to the United States: the percentage of Latinos (25 and older) who had a high school diploma in 2005 was 58%, and 12% of all Latinos obtained a B.A. or higher. This compares to a national average of about 83.9% with a high school diploma, and 27% with at least a B.A. (United States Census Bureau, 2005). These statistics are important for documenting the comparable social class positioning of these groups. However, as we have argued elsewhere (Gutiérrez & Orellana, in press), statistical framing can reinforce categorical, reductionist notions of groups, and so we note that these figures fail to capture variations within each population and other dimensions of these immigrants' experiences and identities.

An important difference between the populations that we studied has to do with the local contexts in which we studied them, and the ways we identified participants. Orellana's study of 18 Latino child translators was centered in classrooms and homes, while Eksner observed Turkish youth in a youth center and on the neighborhood streets. The focus of the studies in Chicago was specifically on youth's translation practices (de facto a mediational process), while the study in Germany was centered on the relationship between language and identity in the out-of-school context. Thus, it is not surprising that our illustrations of contestation are taken from the youth in Germany, while the examples of mediation are drawn from the Chicago youths' experiences. Again, we do not want our readers to assume that contestation is a "Turkish thing," while Mexicans are mediators, nor to search for some explanation for these practices in national or cultural values or norms. Both groups undoubtedly engaged in both kinds of practices. Further, we argue that the two practices, while apparently different, are in fact quite similar because they are responses to the youths' comparable structural positions in each society. Acts of mediation may also involve forms of contestation, and vice versa. It is the contrast as well as the overlap in these cases that gives empirical power to our discussion of everyday immigrant language practices.

## METHOD

Methodologically, we draw from multiple sources of data across the two sites, including field notes based on participant observation in homes, classrooms, community contexts; journal entries recorded by the youth; and transcripts of focus groups, open and semi-structured interviews, and of youth engaged in a range of talk. This ethnographic work was done over the period of several years in the Chicago site, and one year in Berlin. We engaged in separate analyses of these data, probing the nature of youths' talk as well as their reflections on their own talk. Eksner's analyses focused on understanding youths' contestational forms of discourse and their metalinguistic awareness of their discursive practices. (See Eksner, in press for detail on methodological procedures for these studies). Orellana unpacked the phenomenon of language brokering, which we here classify more generally as mediational forms of discourse, through a series of domain and discourse analyses (see Orellana et al. 2003a, 2003b). For this comparative study, we joined our separate data sets and worked through a process of analytical induction (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995) to arrive at the arguments presented here.

TWO SETS OF LINGUISTIC PRACTICES:  
CONTESTATION AND MEDIATION

In the following, we offer a few brief examples of linguistic mediation and contestation practices. We use these to illustrate both the practices themselves and how they evince the youths' metacognitive and metacultural awareness of what they accomplish socially in and through language.

*Practices of Contestation*

Contestation practices are at work when youths linguistically challenge the identities wrested upon them. Language is used here as a tool to contest the presupposed context of inequality when talking to members of the out-group (Germans). In the first example, Çem, a 17-year-old male and one of the leaders of a peer group of Turkish regulars in a Berlin youth center, is interviewed about uses of standard German in his life.<sup>1</sup> He initially talks about using it when going to a job interview, and acknowledges the symbolic capital that derives from speaking standard German.

JE: Are there any situations in which you like "good German" better, or where it is more important?

Çem: Yes, sure, at, if you apply some place and you go to the interview. There it is probably very important, that you can -- If I'm with my friends and stuff, then it's not so important. I think...

Çem then goes on to make the point, however, that when he speaks standard or "good German," he is at the same time answering to and reframing the identities that are being imposed on him by his interlocutors:

Çem: Yes, exactly, aah, in everyday life, when I'm outside, I also try to... let's say something comes up with somebody, especially with older people, Germans, then I try to talk as well as possible...so that then I, aah, so that they think, look it, that's a foreigner-schmoreigner -- they think like that most of the

time, yes, old people have prejudices and stuff. And when I talk well, then these are suddenly...puff...then these are suddenly gone. And that I like, that they...first thought, yeah, we can do him...stuff...do him in easily, and if I then say something, then they are quiet all of a sudden, you know. That I like. There it's useful to me.

In using German, Çem intends to show the interlocutor that “he can't be done in.” He sets up an “us/them” dichotomy between Germans and Turks in Germany that emphasizes opposition and underlying conflict, even with presumably non-threatening and relatively powerless “old people.” In detailing this, he also displays his metalinguistic awareness that command of standard language gives him some form of status and power in the interaction.

A second example of using language to contest comes from the opposite end of the youths' available spectrum of registers. While Çem described a situation in which he uses standard German to negotiate situational power, in the following example 17-year-old Murat uses a crude youth slang, which Eksner has called “Stylized Turkish German,” a term modeled on Rampton's *Stylized Asian English* (Rampton, 1995). It is a situational code that is almost exclusively reserved for interactions during conflict situations with Germans. (Germans however, perceive it to be a new kind of pidgin German and do not generally recognize its situational nature.) Representations of the language employed by Turkish youths carry a host of powerful ideological connotations in German society, which are again appropriated by the youths.

In the following excerpt, Murat expresses awareness of how code choice needs to be adjusted according to both interlocutor and intentionality. Murat nicely contrasts two ways that different codes can lead to different outcomes in conflict interactions.

JE: And before the [physical] fight really starts, is the verbal aspect also a part of this, how you talk...?

M: Yes, naturally. If you... let's say, talk really normal, you know. If I tell you [pause, quiet voice], Why do you do this? *Do you really want to fight, or stuff?* Or when I say [louder, faster, higher pitch] What's up, lan? D'you want...[slower, lower pitch] Come on, I'll beat you or stuff. Then a fight will start. But when you talk really normal, do everything really careful, then everything would be cool.

The switch from colloquial German to this reenactment of Stylized Turkish German is indicated by a shift in pitch, volume, style, and rhythm, as well as by nonstandard grammatical forms and word order. The paralinguistic dimension is of critical importance for this code: accent is increased or performed by speakers who normally speak without or with little Turkish accent. The new code is essentially defined by an ethnic overlay that signifies “toughness” and “foreignness.” As Eksner has detailed elsewhere, this perception of accents as “tough” is connected to societal discourses on “foreigners,” i.e. immigrants, as dangerous and threatening (Eksner, in press).

The youths themselves are aware that there is efficacy in “talking hard” with interlocutors from the out-group. They show metapragmatic awareness of the situational power of this code, as well as of the importance of taking their audience into account. In using Stylized Turkish German, the youths claim power in situations of conflict. In the interviews, the youths stressed the efficacy of language as performative/performance at different times and showed that they understood utterances to be acts in an interactive continuum. Speech acts in Stylized Turkish German can thus be understood

as performative in the sense described by Austin (1975). Importantly, we need to recall that the underlying principle of all of these interactions is that we-they codes are reenacted.

### *Practices of Mediation*

In contrast to the Turkish youth, who described their own practices as “talking hard,” the mediational language that the first author documented among the children of immigrants from Mexico to Chicago might be considered talking “soft.” This mediational talk has variously been called language brokering (McQuillan & Tse, 1995), family interpreting (Valdes, 2002), immigrant child mediating (Chu, 1999), and natural translation (Harris & Sherwood, 1978), as well the term we coined, “para-phrasing” (Orellana, Dorner, & Pulido, 2003; Orellana, Reynolds, Dorner, & Meza, 2003). Conceptualizing translation practices as para-phrasing is particularly useful for the task of cultural modeling applications for literacy; we can look, for example, at how to leverage the kinds of skills that youth display when they translate and apply it to the literacy demands of “paraphrasing,” or putting academic texts into one’s “own words.”

This linguistic practice—like all cultural practices—arises from the needs and opportunities of particular circumstances. In this case, it emerges in contexts where children have greater knowledge of English, and at times, of U.S. institutional and cultural norms than do their parents. Thus, the youth are often called upon to help their families by deploying their language and literacy skills for English tasks. The circumstances of immigration, as well as the social relations that are constituted therein, powerfully shape the nature of the practice. Importantly, in language brokering encounters, children are expected to advocate for their families’ rights vis a vis a public that often makes racialized assumptions about their own and their families’ abilities, intelligence, social positions, and financial status.

We offer an example of a para-phrasing encounter from a journal kept by 11-year-old Miguel. This entry, the first of a series that Miguel wrote for us, illuminates Miguel’s metalinguistic awareness of how he meets the challenges of translating (as we asked students to reflect on in these journals), but it also offers a hint of the ways in which immigrants’ structural positioning, as working-class ethnic minorities, can play out in mediational encounters:

Today me and my dad went to buy a bunk bed. We got the bunk bed but it was missing a part, we went back (to) the place again and they told my dad that it was ready, it isn’t fixed (broken). My dad got angry at him because he told us to wake up a little. I traduced all of the things to my dad. I split the word guardrail in half I translated guard I thought about lifeguard I know what lifeguard is so I went on to the 2nd word.

Student-authored journals offer insights into youths’ self-report about experiences of social relations and their reflections on their language choices, but they are, of course, limited. What we know from the journal is that Miguel’s father got angry at the store clerk because of something the clerk said that seemed to include an insult to his father’s intelligence. In this case, Miguel did not reflect on how he felt about this transaction or its social demands; he did not show us how he responded to the store clerk, though he did offer a metalinguistic reflection regarding a specific strategy that he used to figure the meaning of the word “guard rail.” Most of the youth in the first author’s original study were 10-12 years old, and at this age the youth did not focus on the power dimensions that shaped their practice in our conversations with them. But the journals that they wrote offered insights into the

kinds of situations they encountered, experiences connected to their unequal social positioning, and thus were sometimes more useful than direct questioning about power relations.

In follow-up interviews with 13 young people<sup>2</sup> when they were in high school, there was more evidence that these older youth more explicitly recognized the racist and xenophobic attitudes that framed some of the mediational encounters. Fifteen-year-old Josh, for example, told of going with his family to purchase a car, only to overhear a salesperson say “how us Mexicans can’t buy a car.” Josh reported on how angry he felt and how he “wanted to break a window, dent a car...I was pretty mad.” In this case, Josh did not engage in these physical forms of contestation, nor did he attempt to mediate the situation; his family instead asked to work with a Spanish-speaking salesperson. But in other encounters, when Spanish-speaking personnel were not available, and when families needed the goods or services, youth had to soften their talk in order to help their families. They might have needed to mediate between their parents (often the direct or indirect recipients of racist and xenophobic attitudes) and the figures that had the power to withhold goods and services. This “soft talk” involved a careful balancing of seemingly contradictory goals, as indeed it included subtle forms of contestation embedded into a mediational stance that avoided the direct confrontation that practices of contestation directly invited.

Interviews with older Latino youth also offered evidence that these youth, like the Turkish youth, were sometimes quite conscious of their linguistic choices. Nineteen-year-old Luz described, for example, how she softened her words and exaggerated politeness norms in commercial transactions as well as in encounters with social service agencies. As she put it, “I became a huge kind of ‘Can I help you’ person.” She told of tempering her father’s derogatory comments to social service agents, and of carefully wording her mother’s critique of the service they had received, in such a way that would get the point across but that would not seem inappropriate coming from the mouth of a child, or make her mother seem rude.

### UNPACKING THE SKILLS INVOLVED IN CONTESTATION AND MEDIATION

On the surface, these practices of mediation and contestation may appear diametrically opposed. But Josh’s report helps us to see that these divergent practices arise from similar relationships between participants and structures of power; they simply represent different ways of engaging with those forces. This is to say that in both cases youth are responding to identities that are thrust upon them and their families; contestation and mediation are responses to assumptions that are made about them by interlocutors. Where they most differ is in the social and practical goals of the speakers.

Moreover, both kinds of responses involve keen readings of social and linguistic cues and responses to those cues that involve deliberate choices in style and manner. Often these are consciously directed toward a specific rhetorical effect for the targeted audience. As such, they can be considered literacy skills -- in fact, the sort of complex, multi-literacy skills that are highly valued in school (Gee, 1996). These skills should be acknowledged and built upon by educators. But just how to do so is the second challenge of cultural modeling. This is a challenge that we will only begin to take up here, but that we are continuing to tackle in ongoing research.

When we use the cultural modeling framework to examine what is involved in practices of mediation and contestation, we see a few core linguistic skills that can be leveraged in the service of

academic literacy development. First, there are the keen readings of social, cognitive, and linguistic cues that we have detailed. These reading abilities reflect an underlying sense of audience awareness, and at least some of the youth were able to articulate their understanding of their audiences explicitly. But importantly, these youth are not merely conscious of who their audiences are in some categorical way; they are aware of how their audience may view them, and thus how their social positioning constrains their own language choices. They are conscious of the choices that they make and perhaps even more conscious of the very real limitations of their choices, and the repercussions their choices may have (Bourdieu, 1977).

Then, in response to their readings of these cues, immigrant youths have multiple language codes available to them, and they code-switch<sup>3</sup> appropriately, based on their purposes for particular contexts and with particular interlocutors. In this, our work underscores what many other researchers working with non-dominant youth have found: that youth use language as a tool to construct particular identities for themselves as well as to resist the identities that are sometimes thrust upon them (Alim, 2004; McKay, 2000; Zentella, 1997).

These are powerful skills that can be built on through cultural modeling work in ways that facilitate metalinguistic, metacognitive, and metacultural awareness. We believe there are many possible points of leverage for these skills, including applying youths' keen reading of social skills to reading comprehension tasks and literary analysis, and their translating activities to the practices of paraphrasing written texts. In ongoing work with teachers in Los Angeles, Orellana is working with a research team to apply mediation and contestation skills to writing. In particular this research group is focusing on using youths' mediational and contestational skills for the academic skill of writing persuasive essays that are directed to particular (real) audiences (Pacheco, Martínez, & Orellana, 2006). The cultural modeling work involves cooperating with students to analyze the ways in which they speak to different audiences, along the dimensions of tone, register, vocabulary, grammar, and form. This is accomplished by having students re-enact encounters involving mediation (especially translation activities) and contestation (times in which they faced racism or other injustices). Through role-play and discussion, the youth examine how they speak in different contexts, to different audiences. We focus especially how they vary their tone, vocabulary, grammar and the degree of formality of their speech.

Students are then guided in applying these same skills to writing tasks. To parallel translation activities that involve saying "the same thing" in different ways to different audiences (speakers of different languages), we give students the challenge of writing on the same topic to two distinct audiences, and we guide them in thinking about appropriate forms for each as well as in considering how their words will be received.

The writing tasks that we are focusing on, commonly known as "persuasive writing," might be considered an academic version of the marriage of contestational and mediational practices. That is, students are taking positions on things that matter to them and arguing their positions in their writing. This kind of persuasive writing also involves a presentation of self, and so we are guiding students in reflecting on how they present themselves in and through their linguistic choices.

In these activities, students' everyday practices of contestation and mediation become the source "texts" for analysis. Our goal is for students to see the power in their own voices, and the ways in which that power can be used for their own benefit in school. At the same time, we are encouraging

the youth to assert their powerful voices on matters they care deeply about, and in ways that can be heard by real audiences.

## POWER

Even as we build on the power of students' everyday voices, we want to acknowledge the complexities of power as it operates in schools and society. The practices we examine arise from structural positions of power and we cannot ignore those structures of power when we create models for new school practice. Our work contributes to a growing body of literature that explores the metalinguistic and metacognitive skills of bilingual youth, as well as procedural knowledge involved in the work that child translators do. However, bilingualism, code-switching, and the everyday translating done by immigrant youth in Germany and the U.S. are not seen as linguistically rich practices by most people. This is so because of naïve beliefs about language; for example, code-switching and other forms of language-mixing collide with beliefs that there are strict boundaries between languages, that languages can and should be kept pure; and translation is assumed to be easy or natural for bilinguals. But perhaps more insidiously, this is also so because the speakers themselves are devalued (Bourdieu, 1977). The notion of deficit is strongly connected to speaking a non-dominant language in both the U.S. and Germany. Further, contestation is experienced by most authority figures as threatening, and this threat may keep the recipients from appreciating the linguistic dexterity that is involved.

These contradictions are not new. Similar issues presented themselves when the cultural modeling framework was originally developed; the sociolinguistic literature of the 1970s was deeply engaged in the creative features of African-American English and suggested there should be implications for advanced literacy instruction. At the same time, African-American English Vernacular held very little linguistic prestige in U.S. society (as continues to be the case), and attempts to define pedagogical practice that builds on AAEV met with great public resistance. Lee designed her curriculum intervention in spite of this ideological context. How did outside power relations encroach on the implementation of this work? We would guess that in those classrooms where cultural modeling was less successful, part of the underlying cause was rooted in issues of ideologies about AAEV and its social function and efficacy both on the side of teachers and students.

The teachers who participate in Orellana's current project are oriented to a "funds of knowledge" (Moll, 1993) perspective, and predisposed to value the everyday practices of immigrant youth. Even so, in practice they find it difficult to make spaces that truly validate such skills in schools. This is in part because district- and state-mandated curriculum do not value these kinds of skills, but instead enforce scripted instruction in discrete, reductive, and traditional literacy skills. Cultural modeling work thus faces both institutional and ideological obstacles to its full implementation. This is another reminder that language struggles cannot be resolved in neutral space and that language pedagogy must take power relations at multiple levels into account.

## CONCLUSION

We conclude with a call to the literacy field to further disseminate research findings that contradict myths about language and bilingual practices to the general public. In order to create more

ideological space for Cultural Modeling projects to thrive, myths about language and speakers of non-dominant languages must be dismantled. This means promoting broad concepts of language and literacy in which flexibility, dexterity, and metalinguistic virtuosity are valued, rather than emphasizing narrow forms of excellence. We need to help the field of education to see that the ability to code-switch is a foundational language and literacy skill. Moreover, it is one that will have increasing importance in the future, given rapidly changing communication technologies and global interchanges of people, ideas, and cultural practices.

Secondly, literacy researchers need to keep challenging deficit framings of immigrants and speakers of non-dominant languages. Such framings are pervasive and insidious, and they are inscribed in multiple ways in educational research. Although these populations face significant challenges in our educational system, they also bring rich sets of resources, skills, and experiences that all students can learn from, and we need to highlight those skills at least as often as we address the challenges they face.

Contesting beliefs about language and about immigrants must go hand in hand, of course, because the bilingual and code-switching skills that non-dominant youth develop through everyday language experiences are again the very sort that should have tremendous value for an increasingly intercultural future. Perhaps educational researchers can learn from youths' mediational and contestational skills as we work both to mediate and to contest the field's understanding of these issues.

## REFERENCES

- Alim, H. S. (2004). Hearing what's not said, and missing what is: Black language in white public space. In S. F. Kiesling & C. Bratt Paulston (Eds.), *Intercultural discourse and communication: The essential readings*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bezirksamt. (1999). *Jugend plan: Sozialstatistische daten für die AG 99 - nach Sozialräumen I - IV und mit summen* (No. 4959). Berlin: Bezirksamt Kreuzberg von Berlin.
- Bezirksamt. (2000). *Daten und fakten zur situation von Kreuzbergern und Friedrichshainern nichtdeutscher Herkunft*. Berlin: Bezirksamt Kreuzberg von Berlin - Ausländerbeauftragte.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Chu, C. (1999). Immigrant children mediators (ICM): Bridging the literacy gap in immigrant communities. *The New Review of Children's Literature and Librarianship* (5), 85-94.
- Eksner, H. J. (in press). *Ghetto ideologies, youth identity and stylized Turkish German. German Turks in Berlin-Kreuzberg. Spektrum. Berliner Reihe zu Gesellschaft, Wirtschaft und Politik in Entwicklungslaendern* (Vol. 91). Hamburg: LIT Publishing House.
- Eksner, H. J., & Orellana, M. F. (2005). Liminality as linguistic process. Immigrant youths and experiences of language in Germany and the United States. In J. Knoerre (Ed.), *Childhood and Migration* (pp. 175-206). Bielefeld: Transcript.
- Emerson, R. J., Fretz, R. I., and Shaw, L.L. (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideologies in discourse*. Bristol, PA: Taylor & Francis.
- Gonzales, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (Eds.). (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gutiérrez, K. and Orellana, M.F. (in press). The "problem" of English learners: Construction genres of difference. *Research in the Teaching of English*.
- Harris, B., & Sherwood, B. (1978). Translating as an innate skill. In D. Gerver & H. W. Sinaiko (Eds.), *Language Interpretation and Communication* (pp. 155-170). New York: Plenum Press.
- Lee, C. D. (1995). A culturally based cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching African-American high school students' skills in literary interpretation. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30, 608-631.

- Lee, C. D. (1997). Bridging home and school literacies: A model of culturally responsive teaching. In J. Flood, S.B. Heath, D. Lapp (Eds.). *A handbook for literacy educators: Research on teaching the communicative and visual arts* (pp. 330-341). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Lee, C. D. (2000). Signifying in the zone of proximal development. In C. D. Lee & P. Smagorinsky (Eds.), *Vygotskian perspectives on literacy research. Constructing meaning through collaborative inquiry* (pp. 191-225). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, C. D. (2004). Literacy in the academic disciplines and the needs of adolescent struggling readers. *VUE' - Annenberg Institute for School Reform* (Winter/Spring), 14-25.
- McKay, S. L., & S.C. Wong (Ed.). (2000). *New immigrants in the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McQuillan, J., & Tse, L. (1995). Child language brokering in linguistic minority communities: Effects on culture, cognition, and literacy. *Language and Education*, 195-215.
- Moll, L. C., J. Tapia, & K.F. Whitmore. (1993). Living knowledge: The social distribution of cultural sources for thinking. In G. Salomon (Ed.), *Distributed cognitions* (pp. 139-163). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Orellana, M. F., Dorner, L., & Pulido, L. (2003). Accessing assets: Immigrant youth's work as family translators or "para-phrasers." *Social Problems*, 50, 505-524.
- Orellana, M. F., Reynolds, J., Dorner, L., & Meza, M. (2003). In other words: Translating or "para-phrasing" as a family literacy practice in immigrant households. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 38, 12-34.
- Pacheco, M., Martínez, R., & Orellana, M. F. *Translating contexts: Leveraging bilingual youths' translation experiences for school literacy tasks*. Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA, April 2006.
- Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.
- United States Census Bureau. (2005). Facts for Features: Hispanic Heritage Month 2005.
- Valdes, G. (in press). *Expanding definitions of giftedness. The case of young interpreters from immigrant countries*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual: Puerto Rican children in New York*. New York: City University of New York.

#### AUTHOR'S NOTE

This research was supported by grants from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (1 RO3 HD39510-01), the Spencer Foundation, and the International Reading Association (Elva Knight Award).

#### FOOTNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> The interviews in Berlin were conducted in German, and translated into English by the second author.
- <sup>2</sup> These youth were originally identified as language brokers based on their responses to a survey when they were in fifth or sixth grade, and then were observed in translation situations as well as in their classrooms during a period of two years (Orellana, Reynolds, et al., 2003).
- <sup>3</sup> Code-switching refers to the alternation between two or more codes, or registers in the course of discourse between people who have more than one language in common. Sometimes the switch lasts only for a few sentences, or even for a single phrase. The switch is commonly made according to the subject of discourse, or it may serve to index a speaker or an event.