

продолжительный период времени, пытаются писать о нашей непостижимой стране в позитивном ключе, разбавляя поток уничтожительных публикаций. В их статьях акцент ставится на увеличившемся благосостоянии населения страны и на изменениях мнения россиян о том, каким должно быть цивилизованное общество. Ср.: *Russia is swimming in money; its economy has grown fivefold under Putin, from \$200 billion to \$920 billion, and the once-destitute government has paid off its international debt in full and early.* (Россия буквально купается в деньгах, за годы правления Путина ее экономика выросла впятеро – с 200 миллиардов долларов до 920 миллиардов, а правительство, еще не сколько лет назад нищее, уже полностью, причем досрочно, погасило весь свой внешний долг.) [Baker]; *My 4 years here have seen an ugly surge of authoritarianism in Russia but also vast economic freedoms; the broad repression of dissent, but also a hardened popular understanding of how a proper, civilised society should be...* (За те четыре года, что я провел в России, я увидел жуткий всплеск авторитаризма, но при этом огромное расширение экономической свободы; увидел репрессии в отношении инакомыслящих, но при этом укрепление в массовом сознании определенных принципов того, каким должно быть нормальное цивилизованное общество...) [Walsh]; *Ostensibly these reforms are aimed at strengthening Russia's hand in fighting terrorism...* (Очевидно эти реформы направлены на [укрепление силы руки] России в борьбе с терроризмом.) [Sevunts].

В цитируемых высказываниях латентное психологическое воздействие на читателя оказывается посредством метафорических моделей РОССИЯ – БОГАТАЯ СТРАНА, РОССИЯ – СИЛЬНАЯ СТРАНА. Если учесть, что как в американском, так и британском национальном сознании существует отношение к богатству как к результату колоссального труда, то концептуальные векторы метафор «купания в деньгах» и «укрепления силы» направлены на привлечение внимания к преобразившейся, помолодевшей и набирающей силы стране. Это формирует уважение к долгожданной эволюции в российском обществе, лишенном возможности движения вперед в прошлом веке.

Таким образом, в ярком сиянии метафор, представляющих путинскую Россию в политическом дискурсе США и Великобритании «заложниками русского медведя», оказываются не только иностранные государства, зависящие от энергоресурсов России, но и сама Россия, угодившая в ловушки, расставленные историей государства с сильной властью, сосредоточенной в руках самодержца, и демократией в зародыше. По представлению западных СМИ, страна находится в пленах своих традиций, к сожалению, далеко не радужных. Другими словами, исследование метафорического представления современной России показало, что на зарубежном политическом дискурсе складывается удручающий и наводящий страх имидж России. О том, что это за явление, черный пиар или реальное состояние дел в стране, большинство иностранных граждан, получающих сведения о России из рассмотренных СМИ, не задумыва-

ются. Может быть, есть смысл самой России задуматься над улучшением своего имиджа на международной арене?

СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

- Arnaud de Borchgrave. Using cues of the past // The Washington Times, May 10, 2005.
 Baker P. Which Way Did It Go? // The Washington Post, Dec. 25, 2006 // <http://www.washingtonpost.com>.
 Clark N. In bed with Russophobes // The Guardian, Dec. 4, 2006 // <http://www.guardian.co.uk>.
 Hastings M. Corruption, violence and vice have triumphed in Putin's Russia // The Guardian, Nov. 27, 2006 // <http://www.guardian.co.uk>.
 Madigan C. M. Finding another Russia // Chicago Tribune, December 27, 2006 // <http://www.chicagotribune.com>.
 Medish M. Again, Russia is waiting for Godunov // Financial Times FT.com, Dec. 7, 2006 // <http://www.ft.com>.
 Playing a dangerous game // The Economist, May 11, 2006 // <http://www.economist.com>.
 Rachman G. Neither friend nor foe, Russia tests the limits of realism // The Financial Times, Dec. 5, 2006 // <http://www.ft.com>.
 Rahn R. W. Russian bear sets a trap // The Washington Times, Dec. 1, 2006.
 Schmemann S. A guide to what's happening in Russia // The International Herald Tribune, Dec. 19, 2006 // <http://www.iht.com>.
 Sevunts L. Vladimir the Great roiling Russia // The Washington Times, Nov. 14, 2004.
 Skidelsky R. Could the poisoner be from Prince Putin's court // The Times, Nov. 20, 2006 // <http://www.timesonline.co.uk>.
 The Kremlin is killing Russia's rule of law // The Financial Times, Dec. 4 2006 // <http://www.ft.com>.
 Walsh N. P. How I learned to love Vlad // The Guardian, July 31, 2006 // <http://www.guardian.co.uk>.

© Красильникова Н.А., 2007

Santa Ana Otto Los Angeles, the USA WHAT YOU SAY IS WHAT YOU GET: METAPHOR ANALYSIS OF U.S. PUBLIC DISCOURSE ABOUT EDUCATION

Аннотация

В данной статье на основе изучения целого спектра газетных статей представлен анализ современного дискурса американской прессы, посвященного проблемам образования США. Выборка была обработана с учетом положений когнитивной теории метафоры, которая объясняет особенности человеческого мировосприятия. Наше исследование – это попытка показать, как американское общество и политики изображают сферу государственного образования при помощи концептуальных метафор. Были выделены 3 модели: школа как завод, учебная программа как путь, социализация как река. Следуя когнитивной теории метафоры, эти модели определяют изменения в системе образования. Помимо этих устоявшихся метафор, автор предлагает альтернативные «партизанские метафоры», как один из способов изменить взгляд Америки на систему образования США.

U.S. newspapers regularly claim there is a crisis in American public education. The votes of the American electorate and its representatives also seem to bear out this all-too permanent institutional predicament. Voters and their representative at all levels (in local board elections, at board meetings, on state referenda, and at the federal level) have each sought to improve the public educational institution. Yet in spite of these actions, the votes, the new programs, and billions of dollars invested, American public schools have experienced minimal change. Many economic, sociological and pedagogic explanations have been given for the country's inability to make much headway, as well as

critiques of the avowed crisis. (See Berliner & Bidble (1995) or Varenne & McDermott (1998) for critiques of the manufactured public's sense of a crisis. Dennis & LaMay (1993) and Maeroff (1998) focus, in particular, on the mass media's role in this crisis.)

In this article I offer an empirical study of how the U.S. public thinks about American public education. I look at the language used in the print media discussions of the public education that were generated during the political campaigns that passed the California 1998 anti-bilingual education referendum, Proposition 227.

To gauge public discourse, I sample print media in two ways. My research team comprehensively sampled the *Los Angeles Times* for a two-year period leading up to the vote on the referendum to obtain a deep assessment of the local and regional public discourse. Additionally, for a broad sample of U.S. public discourse on public education, we sampled a score of other major English-language newspapers over the same period. This data was interpreted in terms of cognitive science principles regarding the power of everyday metaphor to constitute the electorate's understanding of social issues. This study departs in significant ways from many other educational studies of discourse, to which we turn.

SITUATING THIS STUDY AMONG DISCOURSE STUDIES OF EDUCATION. In line with the late 20th century "linguistic turn" in social theory (Chilton 1996, pp. 37-40; Fairclough 1989, p. 13), educational scholars have responded with focused attention on the discourse of their profession. Two of the toolsets that scholars have used in this task are critical discourse analysis and the cognitive metaphor theory. Regarding the first, Luke provides a pithy description of the goal of critical discourse analysts, to "denaturalize everyday language." We attempt to make "sensible and available for analysis everyday patterns of talk, writing, and symbolic exchange that are often invisible to participants." We also argue that text representations are not forthright and natural depictions, but "discursive artifacts" that "disguise their own status and authority through linguistic techniques" (Luke 1995-1996: 12, 19).

Regarding the second toolset, the fundamental claim of metaphor theory can be stated as succinctly. People do not make sense of their surroundings in terms of logic and reason. Instead, images make up a central part of human thought. Humans build their concepts of the world in terms of images. In text and speech, this image formation function is expressed by means of metaphor. George Lakoff has developed a full account of this epistemology over the last fifteen years that he calls Embodied Realism (Lakoff, 1993 and 1999; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

Metaphor analysis of public education has taken several forms. From a literary point of view, Danahy (1986) offered an early study of the education profession's use of metaphor to characterize second language students. More recently, Guerra

(1998) employed cognitive science's tools on the metaphors educators use to conceptualize LITERACY. Wolfe (1999) compared two generally used metaphors, LEARNING AS ACQUISITION and LEARNING AS PRACTICE, teachers use to describe the learning of students of English as a second language. [[Please note the typographical convention to distinguish the metaphor (which is not a word but a correspondence relationship between two semantic domains), from text instances of a metaphor. The metaphor will be indicated in SMALL CAPS, as in LEARNING AS ACQUISITION.]] Most recently, Cook-Sather (2003) provided a statement on social scientists' root metaphors for education *per se*, EDUCATION AS PRODUCTION and AS CURE. These researchers cite many other studies of metaphor in professional discourse. For a study of the educational metaphors used within a classroom, see Cameron (2002). For a different kind of analysis of curricular discourse, see Pinar (1988 and 1995).

With the first set of tools, Kumaravadivelu (1999) analyzed classroom discourse critically, while Fenimore (2000) builds on Postman & Weingartner's (1969) institutional "semantic environment" concept. Fenimore presents a treatment on the totality of language used by teachers in schools as creating a "language environment" which has significant impact on student outcomes, which compound the difficulty of non-mainstream students. As in metaphor studies, these latter scholars have focused on the discourses of educational professionals-not everyday people.

In contrast to the foregoing studies, I offer a study of the American public's conversation about education. Many scholars have previously studied the public discourse of education in various ways, although they have not used cognitive metaphor theory linked to critical discourse analysis. Noguera (1995) compares the public testimony regarding school desegregation in two cities in which the public education discourse has shifted from explicit discussions centered on race to the implicit terms of school safety and academic standards. Noguera bases his analysis on race and racialization concepts of Omi & Winant (1987), among other non-linguistic frameworks. From yet another angle, some anthropological linguists have recently focused their attention on speaker linguistic awareness and on both referential and non-referential language functions. Silverstein defines language awareness as "sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use" (quoted in Kroskry 2000, p. 5).

In the present article, I study the semantic expression in language using prose metaphor as the unit of measure. I claim that key conceptual metaphors articulate an underlying of American ideology of public education. In contrast, language ideology studies by linguistic anthropologists focus on the characterization of language, such as American English, as a key symbol of language ideology. Four aspects define their work. First, "language ideologies represent the perception of language

and discourse that is constructed in the interest of specific social and cultural group" (Kroskrity, 2000, p. 8); Second, "language ideologies are profitably conceived as multiple...within sociocultural groups that have potential to produce divergent perspectives expressed as indices of group membership" (*ibid.*, p. 12). Third, "members [of sociocultural groups] may display varying degrees of awareness of local language ideologies" (*ibid.*, p. 18). Lastly, "members' language ideologies mediate between social structures and forms of talk" (*ibid.*, p. 21).

While I focus in this article on the metaphorization of public education, I share with language ideology scholars their first and last assertions. I took special interest in their second assertion and looked specifically for ideological diversity in U.S. public education discourses at the level of prose metaphor. As I will indicate below, I found almost no diversity. Nor did I find significant awareness among the public or professionals that metaphor generates ideology. Although I will use public discourse that was generated during the political campaigns for and against bilingual education, this article does not focus on the public's stated views on language, *per se*. (For such a study, please refer to Santa Ana, 2002, chapter 6).

Cognitive metaphor theory and critical discourse analysis have previously been combined to study the public's conversation about education. Luke (1995–1996) used critical discourse analysis to reveal the subject positioning and reading positioning in several distinct teaching settings, including a Sunday school teacher's interaction with primary school-aged children, teacher talk in a fourth grade of Aboriginal and Anglo-Australian students, and one possible reading by a teacher of an official school guidebook. Gee (1999) playfully teaches the pervasiveness of discourse as a buttress of social structure, and the wide range of social science disciplines that have responded to the "linguistic turn," by offering illuminating illustrations of both classroom and non-classroom discourse in his masterful text on discourse analysis. Finally, Miller & Fredericks (1990) employed metaphor theory to establish the implicit ideological stance of the authors of the highly influential 1983 report, *A Nation at Risk*, which has been credited with initiating the American crisis mode for public education.

In the present study, I integrate within critical discourse analytic framework (as does Luke and Gee) the insights of metaphor theory (as does Cook-Sather, and Miller & Fredericks). Like the aforementioned scholars, I claim that the very language used to talk about public education constrains the discourse user's understanding of the institution of public education. However, I privilege metaphor as the unit of inquiry. For that reason, I interpret my findings regarding how the public understands the institution of public education in terms of the cognitive science metaphor theory.

THE SETTING AND ANALYSIS OF A POLITICALLY-CHARGED DISCOURSE. During the 1990s in California, newscasts regularly reported on a mounting public education crisis, and that La-

tinos and other language minority students in particular were suffering as a result. Most research of the time indicated that diminishing state investment in public education precipitated the crisis. Many figures could be cited, such as that state education officials had annually certified that California school districts with English-only programs performed no better than their bilingual counterparts. Few credible scholars focused on the language of instruction of language minority students as cause of their plight (Carroll *et al.*, 2005). Nevertheless, teaching methods were put forward as the culprit. Ron Unz, a millionaire businessman with no educational credentials, drew an irrelevant conclusion. He ignored vast evidence of statewide under-funding of public education coupled with structural inequities across districts that closely corresponded with poor school performance of Latinos. Instead, Unz incorrectly deduced that bilingual education kept these English language learners from learning English. Latinos made up eighty percent of those bilingual classrooms. Hence rather than a structural reason, Unz asserted that classroom instruction in Spanish led to their academic failings. He offered California voters a statewide referendum, Proposition 227, to eliminate bilingual education in public school classrooms. Unz' intuitions were sharp. He had located not the cause of this educational predicament, but the presumption among lay people about these students' problem. Proposition 227 had instantly appeal and led in opinion polls from its first day in the public eye. It ultimately was approved in June 1998. During the two years prior to its vote, the public focused its attention on Latino public education, producing a great deal of news reports which I have gathered to analyze in this paper.

Because I am a Chicano social scientist, the findings of my research on politicized topics such as Proposition 227 are frequently read with more than average professional skepticism. Critical discourse analysis expressly purports to be both a scientific and normative enterprise (van Dijk 1993, p. 253). Further, all analysis of political issues is normative (Himmelfarb, 1996). Consequently, when I investigate politicized topics I should proactively address the two judicious doubts that skeptics will have about such research. One, the skeptic will dismiss analyses that appear to have a selectional bias. By this, doubts arise if it seems that the investigator has "cherry-picked" data, choosing only the material that suits his/her political stance. Two, the skeptic will reject any analysis that seems to interpret the data with a bias. In short, the reader must be reassured that the researcher's political bias does not predetermine the findings of the study. I will describe the research protocol I used to fore-stall these biases.

First I prevented selectional bias with a series of steps. Having established Proposition 227 as the topic of investigation, I decided to use newspaper texts as my source of public discourse on this topic. I chose to use making the massive commercially produced electronic database, LexisNexis®, because it independently indexes the newspaper arti-

cles it archives. I wanted to gather articles both intensively (many articles from one newspaper) and extensively (articles from across the country). To do this, I designed two kinds of searches, with prior decisions on both the range of dates, and the streams of public discourse on which to draw. By using a Boolean formula that included the previously determined time frame and print sources, with one keystroke I could electronically download a complete set of independently indexed newspaper articles. This large set of news articles became the sample of public discourse that my team analyzed in this article. Because I did not create the index of articles, and because every news article in this sample was analyzed, the data was not cherry-picked. That is, this analysis is based on a comprehensive examination of the data sample.

To preclude the second criticism of biased interpretation, I personally did not read or analyze major portions of the news texts. Instead, I established a research protocol so that different groups of readers would do the reading and interpreting for me. I trained UCLA undergraduate students in the basics of critical discourse analysis and metaphor theory, using articles from the sports and business sections of newspapers. By introducing them to theory and method using unrelated news articles, I avoid inadvertently shaping their judgments regarding the metaphors that appeared in the Proposition 227 news articles.

Each reader was trained to identify conceptual metaphors—the object of this investigation—and to code the source and target domains of each text instance of a metaphor. To use the terminology of Lakoff and Johnson (1980), a metaphor is a conceptual mapping from a semantic source domain to a different semantic target domain. Here from the *Los Angeles Times* is an illustration: "It's such a demanding profession," Miyagawa said. "And yet, kids are great. They surprise you. And when they blossom! Wow. It's awesome, it really is." (*Los Angeles Times*, 18 Sep 95, page A-1). In this verbatim excerpt, a teacher uses the word **blossom** to describe his students. In this case, the source semantic domain of the metaphor is FLOWER, and the target semantic domain is STUDENT. [[In this article, each news text instance of a metaphor will be shown in **boldface**, as in **blossom**. When the groups of readers determined that words such as *blossom*, *tend*, *sow*, *cultivate* expressed the same conceptual mapping, these words were classified as distinct instances of one metaphor. In contrast, the metaphor itself is presented in SMALL CAPS, as in the metaphor, STUDENT AS CULTIVATED PLANT.]] Once the student readers became proficient at these tasks, different readers were assigned overlapping subsets of the total news article sample. In this way, different individuals independently read and coded the same article. I did not pre-establish any set of terms for coding the metaphor sources and targets. Each reader independently coded the metaphors that appeared in newspaper article, even determining their own labels for the source semantic domain and target semantic domain of each

metaphor. Once each reader had completed her/his initial reading of the articles, they came together in groups to compare their individual interpretations. They were asked to present their coded interpretations to one another to see if they could arrive at a consensus on each instance of a metaphor in each article. I instructed them to try to reach a consensus for each particular instance of a metaphor. If they could reach a consensus, it would be added to the metaphor database. If no consensus could be achieved among separate groups of readers for a particular text instance of a metaphor, then it would be eliminated from further consideration. My goal was to obtain a high level of intersubjective reliability of interpretation. By this we mean different readers are very likely to arrive at the same interpretation of a given piece of text, at the level of the particular instance.

For the intensive assessment of a single source of public discourse, different teams of readers completely coded the full sample totaling 113 articles indexed "Proposition 227" that appeared in the *Los Angeles Times* over a two-year period leading up to the referendum vote, between June 1996 and July 1998. The *Times* was selected because it is the newspaper with the greatest distribution in California. For the second wide-ranging sample of U.S. public discourse on public education, I sampled twenty-three major newspapers over the same period.

The *Los Angeles Times* was selected for intensive analysis because it is one of a handful of U.S. newspapers of record and is widely distributed across a large daily readership. I have argued that an empirically rigorous metaphor-based critical discourse analysis of a single U.S. mass media source, such as the *Times*, on any political topic (in this case, U.S. public education) is likely to reveal the same constituent metaphors employed by other U.S. mass media sources (Santa Ana, 2002). The nation's most politically conservative and progressive mass media use the same conceptual metaphors to constitute discourses on major political topics. Others have previously made this claim from different disciplinary stances, such as Hall, et al. (1978); Foucault (1979); and McGee (1980). This has been documented in the public discourse of another colonizing nation, for example see Danso & McDonald (2000). For the U.S. case, refer to Ono & Sloop (2002).

In 2003 LexisNexis® catalogued over forty news sources it called "major newspapers." My team downloaded articles appearing from May 1996 to June 1998 from the following papers: *Chicago Sun-Times*, *Daily News* (New York), *Omaha World-Herald*, *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, *Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, *The Boston Globe*, *Boston Herald*, *Denver Post*, *Denver Rocky Mountain News*, *Houston Chronicle*, *New York Times*, *Plain Dealer*, *San Francisco Chronicle*, *Seattle Times*, *Washington Post*, and *USA TODAY*.

Each newspaper article instance of a metaphor was thus intersubjectively analyzed, which means that more than one person made free judgments

about the source and target domains. The readers initially had a great deal of variation in the terms used to code the target and source semantic domain of each instance of a metaphor, since the authors provided minimum guidance for the labeling. However, readers of the same articles easily recognized the same instances of metaphors in the article, and negotiated an appropriate label for sources and targets. In the end, consensus was achieved for well over 90% of instances of metaphors initially located in the Proposition 227 news article sample. Once the groups of readers came to consensus on each text instance of a metaphor in the downloaded sample of news texts, my team discussed various possible classifications of similar metaphors.

Public discourse metaphors tend to be either occasional or productive. Occasional metaphors are semantically unrelated to other metaphors, appearing in one or two linguistic expressions, and carry little constitutive weight. On the other hand, productive metaphors are not limited to a finite set of linguistic phrases. They occur in a multitude of forms. When used to depict crucial political concepts, they are linked to other semantically related concepts in well-rehearsed narratives that recite commonplace aspects of our world. When they become conventionalized, these tropes constitute and legitimate particular forms of institutional structure, in this case, U.S. public education. In the final step of the research method, I took the lead to focus the teams' attention on the three highly productive metaphors located in the newspaper data, which will be discussed in the following section.

AMERICAN PUBLIC EDUCATION METAPHORS. I find that U.S. society conceptualizes public education with only three productive conceptual metaphors. The first predominant metaphor, SCHOOL AS FACTORY, provides the conceptual framework for what public schools are designed to do. The metaphor is over one hundred and fifty years old. Its semantics (content and associated relationships) continue to configure everyday understandings of what a student is, and how a child learns in the mind of the American public. An unrelated second metaphor, CURRICULUM AS PATH, informs curricular aspects of education. The third metaphor, SOCIALIZATION AS RIVER, governs our thinking about the socialization process of associated with public education. The importance of these three metaphors for policy considerations of American public education is discussed below. We begin with the school.

What is a School? The pivotal conceptual metaphor guiding our understanding of public education revolves around the notion of school. In the 1840s, at the height of the American industrial age, the most exciting new institution on the scene became the frame of reference for the new notion of public education. At the outset of the 21st century, this metaphor still represents schools as the manufacturing centers of an educated citizenry: SCHOOL AS FACTORY. Many of the key semantic elements that we commonly understand to constitute a facto-

ry are imposed on the constituents of the school – the students, the teaching process, the teachers, and the precepts and standards for running the school. In the metaphor database developed to study public discourse on public education, the following excerpts from the *Los Angeles Times* were located. Each of the numbered verbatim excerpts in this article, except when otherwise noted, is from the *Los Angeles Times* 1993–1998. In the following instances from news reports that exemplify the SCHOOL AS FACTORY metaphor:

1. "The first **batch** of students is tested" (28 Feb 97, page B1)

2. "drill more English into nonfluent students" (14 Apr 97, A3)

3. "I am telling [teachers], 'You know in my heart that I am your friend, but, collectively, we simply have to produce a better product,'" [said California Governor Gray Davis] (13 Mar 98, A1, A24)

4. "a two-year study to measure the effectiveness of these [educational] programs." (29 Mar 95, B3)

[[Please note in these excerpts that quoted passages retain the original quotation diacritics. To keep the excerpts brief, we added text in [brackets] to clarify the propositional content of each excerpt.]] The FACTORY metaphor is expressed in many forms, such as:

5. 'Plenty of us do not feel this [ESL program] is running smoothly' (18 Apr 98, B3)

6. training teachers to spot the initial signs of reading problems and fix them (4 Oct 98, B1)

7. The proposed **overhaul** of...bilingual education (17 May 96, B-1)

8. **revamp** the way [a school] teaches students (Oct 10, 1998, B7)

9. **dismantle** language programs (9 Mar 95, A1)

10. **teacher shortages** (25 Nov 98, B2)

11. **scrapping** bilingual instruction (9 May 97, B5)

Everyday metaphor, as casually used in commonplace public texts, is a crucial measure of the way that public discourse articulates and reproduces societal relations. Although at first, these metaphoric expressions might seem to be no more than rhetorical flourishes of minor importance, the centrality of metaphor in the construction of the social order is vigorously argued in cognitive theories. In fact the view that metaphor is merely ornamentation results from the belief that metaphoric understanding is derivative of literal expression, and that metaphor is consequently a marginal element in the material of discourse. Rejection of the ornamental evaluation of prose metaphor is keeping with the linguistic turn in the social sciences. The intellectual origin of this view that language and discourse have great import in the organization of the social world can be traced back in the German tradition to the linguistic anthropologist Alexander von Humboldt and to the philosopher Gottlob Frege, who made the first inquiries steering social theory in this direction. Frege noted the well-known logical dilemma that the evening star and the morning star cannot be logically identical, but are indeed identical. His solution, that both intentions and extensions exist, that is to say two senses can refer to a single entity, in this case the planet Venus, provoked a line of philosophic analysis that gives precedence to the concept over the object. Lafont

paraphrases this insight as follows: "linguistic expressions are held to determine, if not what there *is*, at least what there *can be* for a linguistic community—or what such a community *can say* (i.e., *believe*) that there *is*. In this sense, the key function of language is held to lie in its *world-disclosing capacity*" (1999, xii, emphasis in the original).

To estimate the social impact of a public discourse metaphor, we can look at the semantics that are imposed on the target semantic domain, SCHOOL, by the meaning structure of the semantic source domain, FACTORY. Metaphor theorists have argued that a constitutive metaphor underpins and validates worldviews that are consistent with its source semantic domain (Lakoff, 1990, 1993; Gibbs, 1994). Accordingly, we appraise the social effects that the metaphor establishes, in this case, the American public understandings of its public schools. Consider the notions of the semantic source domain FACTORY that are imposed on the notion of SCHOOL. This should be familiar since evidence of the factory is found everywhere in today's world, and people take its function and its products for granted. Factories produce all kinds of objects, from vitamin pills to automobiles. Factories of all kinds share many properties. For example, these products are standardized, so that a newly produced dry board eraser or school bus is indistinguishable from another. When the metaphor circulates in public discourse, the commonly shared semantics of FACTORY are automatically impressed on our understanding of schools.

It is understood that in factories, the production process of such commodities has been broken down into its components and systematized. Machines are linked together by conveyor belts. The cheap raw material entering the factory is carried along on conveyor belts from one machine to another. Each machine performs a sequence of tasks. Factory workers dot the assembly line. Each worker also performs a narrowly defined activity in the fabrication of the finished product. The workers execute their bit of the manufacturing process over and over in elementary routines. Repetition and boredom, rather than creativity and ingenuity, is characteristic of factory jobs.

What is a School child? What is Learning?

Following the entailments of SCHOOL AS FACTORY, today's public understanding of learning is identical to the view held by Thomas Gradgrind, a character created by Charles Dickens 150 years ago:

"Now, what I want is Facts. Teach these boys and girls nothing but Facts. Facts alone are wanted in life. ... You can only form the minds of reasoning animals upon Facts: nothing else will ever be of any service to them.' ... The speaker, and schoolmaster, and the third grown person present, all backed a little, and swept with their eyes the inclined plane of little vessels then and there arranged in order, ready to have imperial gallons of facts poured into them until they were filled to the brim" (Dickens, 1854, p. 1).

Gradgrind, patron of a self-proclaimed model urban school in 1850, expounds an obsolete view

of learning and students that Dickens satirizes at the time. Unfortunately, this metaphor continues to have a profound impact on the experiences of U.S. schoolchildren today. From the point of view of educational traditionalists, mechanistic metaphors about learning are often still apt. These include the STUDENT AS EMPTY VESSEL to be filled with knowledge, AS COMPUTER to be programmed, or AS MACHINE to be built and tuned by educators. Paulo Freire is renown for his critique of what he calls the banking model of hegemonic education. Freire depicts the banking model where teachers toil to forge knowledge in a mechanical manner to establish in the minds of children a singular view of the world (Freire, 1970, pp. 57-60). Note that the empty vessel metaphor for student learning is semantically consistent with the banking metaphor for school as an institution.

On the other side, educational constructivist theorists hold the view that each student constructs his/her own knowledge. In this model, teachers are not knowledge blacksmiths or computer programmers. The teacher is a facilitator, assisting students build their own knowledge. Knowledge is a construct created by each learner; it is not external to the child. Even ' $1 + 1 = 2$ ' must be constructed by each child in order for it to become his or her own knowledge. The child is far more dynamic, constructivists would argue, with the KNOWLEDGE AS CONSTRUCT metaphor than within the traditional viewpoint that knowledge consists of discrete external facts.

The debate between mechanists and constructivists was engaged in professional educational circles decades ago. It deserves greater media coverage, because of its important implications for American public education. If the American public were exposed to these fundamental metaphors, it would be possible for the public to reconsider how to best educate America's children from a principled basis. However, as measured by the metaphoric imagery sampled in the newspaper data sets, the public remains unaware that the debate took place long ago in the educational research arena, and that the mechanists lost. Consequently, contemporary public discourse on education is not illuminated by current conceptual paradigm, much less the latest research regarding how children learn. Instead, the public discourse on education continues to be framed in archaic terms.

Mechanistic metaphors for learning go uncontested in public discourse, guiding the operationalization of American public schooling today. The orthodoxy is taken as given in U.S. public discourse. On the other hand constructivist imagery appears only rarely, and then is presented as "theory," which is to say a junior rival and pretender to the orthodoxy. In U.S. educational discourse, as sampled in the *Los Angeles Times* corpus, most metaphors reflect views that children are passively taught by knowledge holders.

One way to gauge the power of orthodox metaphors to guide popular understanding of learning is to trace the verbs used to characterize students

and teachers. Using the corpus of articles appearing May 1996–June 1998 from many different newspapers, we tested the conceptualization of student as a passive recipient of education by comparing the use of the verbs: *teach* and *learn*. This search was narrower. We downloaded the articles retrieved in two searches for all articles from "major newspapers," as defined by LexisNexis, that have a headline including the phrase *Proposition 227*, between May 1996 and June 1998. We used the following Boolean conditions:

- All headlines containing within the same sentence the root word *learn* plus any of the root words *student* or *child* or *kid*
- All headlines containing within the same sentence the root word *teach* or *educate* or *taught* plus the root words *student* or *child* or *kid*

The first search retrieved 95 articles with the word *teach* (and its derivatives such as *taught*, *teaching*, but not *teacher*). The second obtained 51 articles with the word *learn* and its verbal derivatives). To begin, the gross measure (of 95 versus 51 articles) indicates that public discourse discussions in this wide distribution of newspapers far more often address the activity of adults, rather than child learning. When *teach* is used, moreover, the education professionals are explicitly considered active agents, while students are recipients of the actions of the educators. A few examples are provided for illustration:

12. hundreds of thousands of immigrant children who will at last be **taught English** when the school year (New York Times, 16 Jul 98, A14)

13. Teachers who heed parents' explicit requests to **teach** their children English need (New York Times, 16 Jul 98, A14);

14. theory of bilingual education is that non-English speaking **children are taught** in their native language until they are proficient enough to be **taught in English** (Rocky Mountain News, 6 Jun 98, 61A)

15. They claimed their children were being **taught no English**. (Financial Times, 6 Jun 98, 11).

In these excerpts (which centered on bilingual education and English language acquisition), the student does not learn English, he or she is taught it. The language they end up speaking is seen not to be a consequence of normal language acquisition processes, but is the product of teaching. In public discourse across the U.S. on schooling and classrooms, then, the teacher does not spend her/his days facilitating student learning, designing learning settings, and choreographing learning moments. The American public believes teachers teach. *Teach* is a transitive verb, and the object of its action is the school child. Edward Thorndike's obsolete theory of learning in which teachers must drill knowledge into the child apparently still makes common sense to the public and many educators. In Thorndike's theory, published in 1913, learning is a fixed association between a situation and a response that is achieved with rehearsal. Better learning is a demonstrably quicker response to the same situation. With enough repetition, the correct response gets "stamped" into the student's mental template, and errors are "stamped out." The teach-

er's role is to regulate the students' activities in the classroom to develop the desired repertoire of responses. This theory of learning was later replaced by B.F. Skinner's stimulus and response behaviorism, which has in its turn been replaced by progressively complex forms of constructivism. For a synopsis of learning theory, see Byrne 1996.

If alternative frameworks for speaking about the learning process were available in public discourse, such as constructivism (much less social practice!), then we would expect a greater portion of all educational professional/student relations to be expressed with such terms. In discussions of classroom activities (as well as of cognitive aspects of learning), the child would be the active agent, and the educational professional would be a learning promoter. Today's public discourse on education constitutes teachers as agents and students as recipients of their learning.

Looking more closely at the 51 articles that contained derivatives of the verb *learn*, one can further qualify these public discourse references to learning. At times they refer to decontextualized cognitive processes. News reports on studies of cognition (as for example, cognition is associated with bilingualism) were grouped in this search. Additionally, *learn* verbs were at times teamed up with *teach* verbs, such as in:

16. But what Rojas was declaring, in essence, was that he would rather go to jail than work to **teach young children to learn English** in a year. (San Francisco Chronicle, 12 June 98, A25)

17. "If the schools don't **teach them English**, how are they going to learn it?" (Plain Dealer, 1 June 98, 1A)

18. "The idea that children best **learn English by teaching them only in Spanish** doesn't have a lot of evidence to support it." (USA Today, 27 May 98, 4A)

Consequently, in this subset of the sampled American public discourse, learning generally presumes instructor agency. In the news articles that focus on classroom activities, the student is the passive recipient of a teacher's activity. To reiterate, this is not just a matter of semantics. Cognitive linguistic research demonstrates that prose metaphor reveals worldview (Lakoff, 1993). Talking, which is often dismissed as separate from the construction of social reality, encodes key components of the structures of the social world. As Foucault formulated it, discursive practice reveals the social relations that are constituted in everyday social interaction (1980, pp. 92–108).

As for the manufacturing process, the SCHOOL AS FACTORY metaphor is entirely consistent with traditional metaphors that conceptualize passive pupils who are mechanistically taught extrinsic facts, rather than learning by constructing knowledge for themselves. Moreover, one implication of the concordant blending of the FACTORY metaphor and mechanistic metaphors for learning is that no important learning occurs outside of the SCHOOL AS FACTORY walls. It is as if the child enters the school inert, mute, without thought, with no understanding of the world.

While the child is a passive object, the factory is

portrayed as the active agent in the educational process. In many instances, the word *drill* signals this metaphor. Consequently the educational institution and teachers are seen as furnishing, shaping or otherwise regulating children with educational skills: "*Classes will be geared toward fostering skills*" (*Los Angeles Times*, 19 Apr 97, B2). Here the school is an active agent operating on a passive pupil. In recent years certain U.S. school districts have made efforts toward recognizing evidence of individual student knowledge. Educational measures such as student portfolios are consistent with a more up-to-date notion that the student is an active learning agent. However, these innovations were not reflected at all in the American public discourse sampled:

19. "The federal government's own Goals 2000...calls for every adult American to have the math and language '**skills** necessary to compete in a global economy. It's crucial to this country's economic survival" (*Los Angeles Times*, 6 Feb 95, A3)

20. "I'm for English fluency because it is an essential **tool** to function in the marketplace." (*Los Angeles Times*, 14 Feb 97, B4)

Yet in the dominant metaphor of the discourse on education, even particular skills are imparted to passive children. In the following excerpts, note the passive verbs associated with the academic skills that children in fact achieve:

21. "[A school] system they contend fails to **give students the language skills** needed to advance in society" (*Los Angeles Times*, 6 Feb 95, A3);

22. "The program seeks to ... **provide tools** to help them integrate into society." (*Los Angeles Times*, 14 Feb 97, B4)

When we move outward from the mechanistic teaching sphere to the sphere of the site of the SCHOOL AS FACTORY, today's students are unthinkingly considered to be the raw material fed into the factory, or as educational theorist John Goodlad stated, "economic utility units" (quoted in Tell, 1999: 14-19). While all parents believe that their child is the most precious end of family life, in the factory metaphor, the child is merely grist for the mill. In this metaphor, the student's intrinsic value is less important than its product potential, since the factory creates valuable items from inexpensive raw material. Moreover, the factory is built to process raw material that is standardized. Quality control is an applied science developed to boost industrial productivity via, among other things, regularization of input. In order to optimize the manufacturing process, the factory readily rejects any non-standard material (namely its minority students) throughout the fabrication process.

Academic tracking is also conceptualized in terms of the FACTORY metaphor. Tracking, in its manufacturing context, expedites administrative scheduling problems of assigning students to classrooms and teachers. Note that the word *tracking* is semantically compatible with the semantic domain of the SCHOOL AS FACTORY metaphor in reference to assembly-line transport of factory product through a set of manufacturing steps along a conveyor belt. If the public's thinking is limited to the SCHOOL AS

FACTORY constituting metaphor, tracking makes sense. From this point of view, tracking optimizes the resources of a school that has to contend with hundreds, even thousands, of students. It is more efficient to place so-called fast children in educational fast tracks while consigning so-called slow children to slow tracks.

If the child, particularly the socially marginalized child, is granted the central frame of reference, then the dangers of tracking are easier to perceive. It has been demonstrated in a series of studies that tracking establishes a self-fulfilling prophecy which reduces the long-term educational advancement of the student, particularly the child whose familial background does not correspond to the mainstream middle-class Anglo-American upbringing (Rist 1970). Most disturbingly, the tracking decision most often takes place based on minimal interchange between a teacher and a child. Once relegated to the slow track, teachers' lower expectations lead to lower achievement levels on child's part, which confirms the original prediction and most often seals the educational fate of the child. Academic development and the highest levels of social advancement are refused to these children when they are relegated to the least valued tracks on the schoolhouse factory floor (Oakes 1985). Thus, they are unjustly denied equal educational opportunity (Anyon 1980).

What are School Teachers? Teachers on the SCHOOLHOUSE AS FACTORY FLOOR become factory workers whose training, skills, and activities are circumscribed. The profession is no longer highly esteemed. Much has been written about the effects of industrialization on people's occupation. The master craftsman of earlier times had cumulative knowledge to build a unique finished product from start to finish. With industrialization, this knowledge is broken down to its components, and meted out in pieces to the teacher who now rehearses the role of assembly line workers. In the factory workers repeatedly perform only a single step in the manufacturing of a standardized product. Thus with this metaphor, images of factory-trained instructors, who perform a limited set of tasks mechanically on thousands of students, replace the image of erudite and scholarly educator, who discharges his/her venerable profession edifying and cultivating students over a long period of time (Apple 1999). In his 1986 study, Danahy noted the use of artisan metaphors where the teacher's function as a potter, is "to mold lifeless lumps of clay into something shapely, beautiful and human." He points out these can be subsumed in the machine metaphor since "in a modern industrial economy, it comes as no surprise to discover metaphors which are related, but draw instead on mechanical production to clarify, justify or rectify what we do" (p. 229).

Teachers should not be blamed for their place in the schoolhouse factory. They have resisted their debased position in society throughout the past century. On the floor of the 1901 National Education Association convention, noted educational labor activist Margaret Haley warned against

"factoryizing" education, which made 'teachers into automatons "whose duty it is to carry out mechanically and unquestioningly the ideas and orders of those clothed with the authority of position'" (Bradley, 1999, p. 31).

Evidence abounds that teachers now comprise a blue-collar labor force, not a class of professionals. The National Education Association and American Federation of Teachers may be described as professional guilds, but they function like industrial labor unions. They organize the rank-and-file, negotiate bread-and-butter issues, conduct work stoppages, and sign collective-bargaining contracts. Although these unions promote professional development, peer-quality monitoring and other professional society interests, their most important purpose is to obtain fair compensation for labor performed, namely salaries, benefits, grievance procedures, and so forth. They do not operate like the American Medical Association or the American Bar Association. Teachers have been aptly dubbed "United Mind Workers" (Kerchner, et al., 1997).

Origin of SCHOOL AS FACTORY. It is easy to see how the SCHOOL AS FACTORY was originally embraced in 19th century U.S. At that time industrialism was the nation's most potent institutional notion (Fitzpatrick, 1995). Public education from its beginning was designed to train an industrial workforce, and to relieve nativist pressures of the period. The children of a large foreign-born populace were seen as unprepared either to play their part in U.S. industrialization, or to participate in a democracy in which franchise was being expanded beyond the traditional oligarchy. Thus newly formed public schools were designed to shape these children into an orderly corps of production workers and a pro-capitalist electorate. Nineteenth century schools were "cultural factories" where immigrants and other workers were molded with so-called American values (Oakes, 1985). Bowles and Gintis have pointed out the objective was, and continues to be, to establish industrial behaviors, habits and values among workers, particularly those from rural and immigrant backgrounds, to optimize factory work productivity, to develop worker compliance to industrial authority, as well as to dilute class consciousness as it promoted a nationalist ideology extolling capitalism and representative democratic state. (Also see Anyon, 1997).

Finally, consider the standard of success for schools, as factories. In 19th century U.S., the most salient institutional model was industrial, rather than, for example, a church model or legislative model. Efficiency is the standard to judge the quality of factories. The efficiency standard of industry is its cost-per-unit-produced. Correspondingly, the doctrines of factory-site productivity, effectiveness, and efficiency (which Dickens's industrialist and self-styled educationalist, Gradgrind, sounded off about 150 years ago) remain the doctrines of public education success that are expressed today. Consider the following excerpts:

23. "[A superintendent] said he will appoint a special task force to study the **overall effectiveness** of bilingual

education here" (*Los Angeles Times*, 28 Jun 95, B3)

24. "*Gangs not as an invading army but as our own offspring-the byproduct of a polarized economy, **ineffective schools**, [etc.]*" (*Los Angeles Times*, 19 Feb 95, 16)

25. "*Bilingual programs are only as good and **effective** as the principal, the teachers and the parents at that school.*" (*Los Angeles Times*, 17 Oct 95, B1)

It must be emphasized that effectiveness, or efficiency, namely a high ratio of output to input, is not a necessary standard for educational institutions. The words *efficiency* and *effective* are etymologically related. Respectively, their sources are Latin present and past participles of *efficiere*. The root of this word, in turn, *facere* means 'to make'. Had another metaphor been chosen, then another success standard would have applied. For example, a personal quality, such as intellectualism or doctrinarism, has been the standard for schools based on a church model. Seminaries are set up on this model. Likewise, the standard has been regimentarianism for military academies. Note once again that the efficiency standard in the public school as FACTORY is entirely compatible with the mechanistic metaphors that constitute the American public's theory of student learning. The semantic congruence of these metaphors contributes to their persistence.

Kant argued in 1795 (1983) that neither utility nor effectiveness is an appropriate standard for moral quality, since each can justify immorality. He made this argument to reject Machiavelli's claim that the ends justify the means. Kant's rebuke aptly extends from a subject's moral character to the standard of U.S. public education, the nation's major institution for human development. Efficiency as a gauge of quality does not recognize the dignity and worth of each person; it does not treat each student as an end. Instead, it relegates the child to the status of a mere object, an item for consumption made by the educational factory. The inherent logic (Lakoff, 1987, pp. 141–144) of the SCHOOL AS FACTORY metaphor, combined with mechanistic learning metaphors, conceptualizes the child as a unit of industrial production. Learning becomes an institutionally controlled process, not a matter of life-long personal growth and edification. American school children are treated as means to institutional ends.

The implications are huge. Within this model, children are not inherently valuable subjects, but passive recipients of their education. Worst, they become commodities. As they enter school, they are only as valuable as they conform to predetermined quality-control standards. Educational failure is presumed to be due to a student's inferior personal qualities, or that child's cultural background. The practices of the institution are not faulted, and its principles rarely questioned. Public education may not be based on profit, like a factory, but U.S. public school performance in the early 21st century is certainly based on Gradgrind's criteria: efficiency and industry.

Business metaphor. Another metaphor is often extolled in public discourse as a novel, even

revolutionary metaphor for thinking about public schools: EDUCATION AS BUSINESS. In our post-industrial age, this metaphor is more frequently used to evaluate the quality of education, in terms of profitability, rather than efficiency. In educational circles, certainly, this way of thinking about schooling is recognized as nothing new. Applying concepts of business ideology to American public schools such as "rational management" and "efficiency" has occurred since the 1890s. (See Callahan (1962). In Charles Dickens' *Hard Times*, the patron of the less-than-model school, Thomas Gradgrind, was a businessman as well as an industrialist. The BUSINESS metaphor shares the major weakness of the industrial model. It is not child-centered. The recent history of U.S. business indicates that it is not an appropriate model for the educational development of America's schoolchildren. With the end of Fordism, U.S. business has become leaner and meaner. What this has meant in practice is that business will jettison rather than retrain its workforce, discard rather than update its less profitable product lines, and place even greater attention on short-term profit margins rather than the long-term quality of its production units. To employ the BUSINESS metaphor to conceptualize U.S. public education will have grave consequences for its workforce of teachers, its diverse and chiefly 'non-standard' raw material (namely working-class and language minority students), and its marketplace vision of America's citizenry.

Before turning to the second major constitutive metaphor for education, an alarming feature of the recent public discourse on education must be presented.

Warehouse metaphor. The U.S. now requires an expansion of public education to a greater proportion of its population, and a far more profoundly educated citizenry to support its post-industrial, increasingly information-based economy. However, this demand for enhanced caliber and democratization of education has not been supported with commensurate funding and political backing. In fact, the financial cuts and political criticism of the system increased around the time Fordism came to an end. As a result, public school students presently endure a chronically underfunded system (Helfand, 2005).

Consequently, an identifiable hazard threatens today's American school-aged children. In particular the inner-city schoolchild is treated as if she is a second-rate commodity. For many years, the children of blue-collar, immigrant, and racialized parents have been consigned to the slowest tracks of the schoolhouse as factory. Now they are taken off that conveyor belt, and relocated off the factory floor. Heaped together, without even the guise of receiving an education, they are placed in sub-standard facilities under the surveillance of over-worked storeroom staff. Consider the following excerpts:

26. "The children in America's urban areas who are **warehoused** through broken school systems which rob them and our country of hope and promise" (Los Angeles

Times, 28 Aug 97, B7)

27. "The rampage of angry youth who spent their childhood **warehoused** in 2,000-plus student **holding tanks** will continue" (Los Angeles *Times*, 28 Apr 96, B16)

28. "Black and brown kids who have been **warehoused** by an education system." (Los Angeles *Times*, 23 Aug 95, B9)

To advance along the U.S. educational path in such circumstances requires even greater effort on the part of a poor or racialized child in these contemptible circumstances. In these cases, what are required are teachers who refurbish the storage depot to save a child or a classroom from the ravages of the failed factory system. (For a classic example, see Kohl, 1988, pp. 33–38.) This development does not portend well for a marketplace-based reorganization of public education.

I began this analysis of current American public discourse on education at the schoolhouse level, with the entailments of the FACTORY metaphor. A crucial liability of this metaphor is its implicit reinforcement of outdated mechanistic models of learning. Moreover, educational programs are conceived, implemented, and evaluated based on the efficiency metric, rather than on the basis of student academic potential. The student is viewed as "a unit of economic utility." Consequently, the student is not the ultimate measure of organizational success. It is as if toasters are being manufactured. This metaphor is not useful in so far as people are not merchandise.

The metaphoric basis of public education discourse in America is not limited to the concept of institutional relations. Apart from the FACTORY model, two other highly productive conceptual metaphors further reveal how the public conceives education.

What is Curriculum? In the public understanding of education, the child proceeds step-by-step in a sequence of classes and grades toward the end of becoming an educated person. The major metaphor that is revealed by a systematic review of over one hundred articles is the CURRICULUM AS PATH metaphor. The path is a common metaphor that is used in many aspects of human life. *The course of human life* is just one example. In education, the *curriculum* (< Latin *currere* 'to run') is the established set of courses that a student has to take to become educated in a specific topic.

The elements of the semantic source domain, PATH, that are most often associated with the target domain, CURRICULUM, include the unidirectional "movement" of an individual "toward" a progression of goals. Another element of the metaphor is its association with individual volition, namely that the person moves along the path by his or her own actions. Note that none of these conventional associations are obligatory aspects of education. Recall that although this is presently taken to be self-evident, as a metaphoric basis for student education, the PATH is not naturally the single way to conceive of curriculum. Two alternatives will be taken up at the end of the article.

In the CURRICULUM AS PATH metaphor, there are

many expressions of directional movement of a person's education, as exemplified in the following:

29. "Opponents contend the [bilingual education] program ... will almost certainly hurt the **academic progress** of limited-English students" (Los Angeles Times, 9 Feb 96, A3)

30. "For many of these impressionable foreign-born teens, the **passage** through the bilingual program is about far more than just learning English" (Los Angeles Times, 29 Oct 95, B1)

31. "Last year, 1150 schools around the state with non-English-speaking students failed to **advance** a single student into English fluency. A third of schools failing to **advance** any students to English fluency were teaching only in English." (Los Angeles Times, 19 May 98, R-1)

Also note other instances of the ubiquitous CURRICULUM AS PATH metaphor elsewhere in this article, such as *compete* and *advance*. These terms all imply significant voluntary effort on the part of the individual student.

Apart from the student's progression in stages toward some goal, another central feature is a prescribed series of impediments along the educational path. These impediments are an expected part of the process toward the goal of becoming an educated person:

32. "If we set the bar of standards so high that a student must **pole-vault** over it", [a teachers union official] said, 'we must also give the student a **pole**" (Los Angeles Times, 21 Nov 96, A3)

33. "Students like Guillen must pass a final **battery of exams** before graduating" (Los Angeles Times, 25 Oct 95, B1)

34. "Some 'latchkey kids' come home and dutifully **plow through** their **homework**." homework (Los Angeles Times, 14 May 95, B1)

A further feature of the CURRICULUM AS PATH metaphor is that the progress toward that goal of being educated takes place at a certain pace, and that *progress* is an attribute of the child's success, as illustrated in the following excerpts:

35. "Many language experts...believe that children **fall behind** when they are taught academic subjects in a language they are still learning" (Los Angeles Times, 10 Mar 95, A3)

36. "Right now what we need to do is **get** our young people **back on track**" (Los Angeles Times, 12 Mar 95, 12)

37. "Her four children...would have been **set back** if they had been thrust into English-based classes in the primary grades" (Los Angeles Times, 13 Apr 97, A1)

38. "Extensive research by Oakes into the **progress** of Latino students in public schools has shown that they are consistently **routed into** the least academic **courses** of study, beginning in elementary school. That so-called '**tracking**' is worse for bilingual-program students." (Los Angeles Times, 1 Jun 95, A1)

As the second of the three dominant metaphors in contemporary public discourse on education, it is appropriate to review the PATH semantic domain. The semantic domain of the PATH includes an embodied experience of walking along a trail or track to some destination. The everyday frame of understanding of this semantic domain entails a starting point, an endpoint, a route to be traversed possibly with some impediments, and a sense of directedness on the part of the walker to follow the path

toward the endpoint. The mapping of the semantic domain of PATH onto the domain of CURRICULUM imposes a well-developed framework of everyday embodied knowledge of walking path onto a crucial aspect of a central institution of human life. The mapping includes the following correspondences: Education corresponds to a walking pathway. It has a beginning corresponding to a state of being uneducated, a route to traverse corresponding to an established set of courses (= routes) and a succession of grades (= slopes or gradients of increasing difficulty). There are expected impediments to overcome that correspond to formal batteries of evaluation that require demonstrated mastery of the curriculum of each grade. Lastly there is a destination corresponding to the completion of the curriculum of a school system, leading to the graduation of the student, certifying achievement of the status of an educated person.

When PATH is used to conceptualize curriculum, each person (metaphorically) undertakes a journey from the position of an uneducated person toward the place of an educated person. All these topological elements are employed in the CURRICULUM AS PATH metaphor in the public discourse on education.

Misleading Entailment: Personal Volition. This metaphor contains three associated elements of inherent logic. First, education within this metaphoric configuration is attained one step at a time. Second, a succession of grades must be passed along the way. Three and most importantly, an education is attained by one's own motivation. These built-in logical assertions of the CURRICULUM AS PATH metaphor play a central role in its constitutive function. They foreground the volition of the individual path taker, and background all structural factors that make up the social environment of the American public school. As a result, the metaphor projects a distorted image of actual process of U.S. public school students.

This entailment draws off all the differences that make each person's schooling experience unique. This has tragic political consequences in an American institution that copes with massive structural inequity. First, when the path metaphor is used, the U.S. public tends to overlook the myriad structural differences across different school settings. These include crucial school site disparities such as teacher preparation and experience, school facility size and condition, student cultures and demographics, per student budget allotment, and professional personnel ratios-all of which disadvantage poor and linguistic minority children in urban schools. The metaphor establishes semantic relations that direct our attention away from structural disparities. CURRICULUM AS PATH foregrounds individual volition as it backgrounds the conditions along the path. Hence, the metaphor makes each educational path-taker responsible for his/her educational journey. For adults this is a reasonable expectation. However, the U.S. public school system is specifically designed to serve children who are not responsible for structural liabilities of the

school system they attend. Still, the American public tends to presume that when a school child fails to succeed in public school, that the problem is a lack of personal initiative, or the family is blameworthy. By way of this metaphor, Americans can more easily pass over the failure of their educational institution.

Note that an element of the commonplace understanding of a FACTORY, namely manufacturing standardization, reinforces the false entailment that the curricular path of every public school child is indistinguishable for all practical purposes. Of course, this is not the case. Still, this personal volition entailment strips classroom content and process, as well as institutional context, of all educational relevance. It is as if every elementary student walks along identical educational paths. It makes the middle school child responsible for the institutional failings that our society imposes on her. The entailment readily dissociates the institutional strictures and social obstacles that a disadvantaged school student has to overcome. It also detaches the privileged student from all the material advantages that his or her wealth accrues. The personal volition entailment is grossly untrue, and yet is reinforced each time the PATH metaphor is invoked. With this metaphor, the implication is only two things determine each educational success or failure: talent and sweat.

Consider the conceptual source of a very common term in public education. The commonly used term *drop out*, as a noun or verb, appeared 135 times in the 113 *Los Angeles Times* articles that were indexed for Proposition 227. *Dropout* is an Americanism that came into general use in the 1920s (Chapman, 1995) when industrialism was in its heyday. Although it might not have been obvious just a moment ago, once attention is focused on the PATH metaphor, the term readily communicates an image of a runner giving up the educational foot race. Again, nothing in *dropping out* refers to the structural factors that push a student out of school. The alternative term, *push out*, assigns agency of schoolchild attrition squarely to the responsible adults in the public schools. This term is only used by a small set of progressive educational scholars.

In short, all structural difficulties that impair the education of language-minority and working-class children tend to be overlooked in the story that CURRICULUM AS PATH narrates. Instead, internal fortitude alone brings triumph or failure. Although this deceptive entailment of the dominant metaphor has been definitely repudiated in scientific studies and eloquently disputed in American social commentary, such as the searing study of two immigrant students (Valdés, 1998) or Laura Angélica Simón's 1995 film documentary, *Fear and Learning at Hoover Elementary*, it will resist rejection so long as its source metaphor, CURRICULUM AS PATH, goes uncontested in the public discourse on education.

Everyone in U.S. society tacitly accepts the narrative related by the curricular path metaphor—in so far as the metaphor is used to discuss formal education. In it, academic achievement is based on

personal initiative. Individualism is a key principle of this metaphor. The personal volition entailment reinforces the American myth that purely by the dint of native abilities and personal efforts, each person makes their way along the path. When linked to another American narrative, the educational path becomes a racetrack. The myth of the U.S. educational meritocracy, in which every child vies equally for the educational laurels, is also conceptually buttressed by this metaphor (Berliner & Biddle, 1995). CURRICULUM AS PATH draws attention away from the background unequal educational opportunities, dissimilar socioeconomic factors, and institutional racism, where these factors can be overlooked. Although U.S. public discourse does not take into account U.S. public school structural inequity, which dashes the human potential of millions of children each day, at their most vulnerable stage in their lives.

To reiterate, CURRICULUM AS PATH is not a natural or necessary metaphor. It is merely a conventional way of talking that is the basis of our conceptualization of educational content. It is quite healthy to suspend for the moment the pairing of the FACTORY and PATH metaphors, which together mask and legitimize a number of unjust institutional aspects of public schooling. The so-called good reasons and appeals to human nature that have been marshaled over the years to justify the efficiency standard may then begin to sound like brittle rationalizations.

We now turn to the final major constitutive metaphor for public education that was located in U.S. public discourse.

What is the Mainstream?

The *mainstream* is one of the most frequent metaphors in educational discourse. This term appeared scores of times during the Proposition 227 debate on bilingual education. Here we offer just two examples:

39. "Immigrant students ... try to learn enough English to join the **mainstream**" (*Los Angeles Times*, 1 Jun 95, A1)

40. "More than 24,000 students were transferred out of bilingual program classes and into **mainstream classes** in 1994–95." (*Los Angeles Times*, 17 Oct 95, B1)

It turns out that this metaphor guides our thinking about how a child becomes a typical American adolescent. As the final metaphor that structures public discourse on public education in the U.S. today, it is important to explicitly present its semantic structure. During the 1997-98-campaign period of Proposition 227, the principal uses of the term *mainstream* was in contrast to programs of bilingual education. Its source semantic domain is RIVER. Since a river is directed toward a goal, several conceptual relationships of the RIVER metaphor are similar to the source domain of the PATH metaphor. The everyday frame of understanding of river also involves a flowing stream with a beginning that traverses some distance, with turns and obstructions that may snag the traveler riding the current. However, important contrasts should be noted. Un-

like the PATH metaphor, to float on the metaphorical river does not invoke a sense of personal propulsion. The river conveys all voyagers along in its current. This distinguishes the RIVER metaphor and the narrative it establishes.

Unlike the CURRICULUM AS PATH metaphor, for which the primary image is a walking path of a single trekker, the RIVER metaphor invokes a stream whose current transports its bobbing voyagers/students. However, the river carries them along in different ways. On the one hand, the mainstream conjures a swift and deep channel where the current is strong, and the direction narrowly defined. Anyone who is carried along in the river's mainstream will be carried further and more quickly along. In contrast, the same river runs slowly on its shallow periphery. Its shores are fraught with sandbars and stagnant pools. The child's progress drifting along in these shallows is slower and less secure. As articulated in the *Los Angeles Times*, deadwood and other debris can snag the students floating slowly along the margins of the river:

41. "We'll continue to be in the **backwaters** of public education, and, in an information-driven society, we simply can't afford to let that happen." (*Los Angeles Times*, 15 Oct 95, B1)

Contrary to the PATH metaphor, individual volition is not part of the semantic domain of the RIVER metaphor. Everyone is carried along in the current. The educational *mainstream* thus does not invoke notions of perseverance, talent, or ambition, as does the CURRICULUM AS PATH metaphor. Instead, individuals arrive at different destinations depending on their position in the river's flow. Narrow and deep channels carry children faster and further along than children caught on the slow-moving shallows of the river.

The semantics of RIVER has a second important element. A single river empties a whole region. Whether comprising a local region the size of a school district, or a whole nation, each river blends the waters of smaller distinct streams into a single common waterway. Rivers like the Mississippi, which drain a whole continent, combine the waters of many tributaries, uniting their disparate elements into a single flow. The different currents of the tributaries commingle in the mainstream until their diverse sources can no longer be distinguished.

Assimilating to the Mainstream. The river metaphor informs non-curricular educational process, namely student socialization. It also expresses the means by which a school inculcates hegemonic views. In the semantics of RIVER, students are simply carried along. If the river is swift and narrow, children move quickly and eventually blend completely with the mainstream. If slow, their absorption is incomplete. This is their assimilation into U.S. society, by which the so-called common values of society are conveyed. As they grow out of childhood in public school, students absorb general Anglo-American culture and come to accept more or less its worldview as they tacitly absorb its (often unread) canon, its hallowed national myths, and its conventional history (Apple, 1999). The RIVER met-

aphor expresses this socialization process that transforms so-called foreign children into American teenagers who partake of prevailing U.S. practices, values and conventional views on community, nation and world.

The public school creates members of U.S. society who are also likely to accept their lot in life. The RIVER metaphor also conveys students, by their placement in school, to their designated place in U.S. society, for better or worse. The overwhelming majority of racialized and language minority students are relegated to the backwaters of public schools, and hence of U.S. society. These students learn that the social practices available to them are limited to the social orders that are expressed in school. The practices of all public schools embody the naturalized ideological assumptions about student/societal members. As they mature, they tend to tacitly accept the ideology of the standing social order, including relations that enact the social inequities associated with minority status that were the institutional practice of public schools. Or they reject them and they drop out of school, and often confront worse relations than their peers who graduated. These processes are aptly expressed in the EDUCATION AS RIVER metaphor:

42. Those changes were a response, [the principal] said, to parent concerns...to speed the transfer of bilingual program students into the educational **mainstream**. (*Los Angeles Times*, 16 Jan 96, B1)

In the public discourse surrounding Proposition 227 in California in the late 1990s, educators with contrasting political views used the term *mainstream* in somewhat different ways. Conservatives held that mainstream socialization could not be achieved via bilingual education. It can only be accomplished through English-only instruction, and ultimately requires English-dependency on the part of immigrant students:

43. two school districts are considering resolutions that condemn a state-mandated language program designed to **mainstream** non-English-speaking students (*Los Angeles Times*, 9 Mar 95)

44. "Fluency in English is a 'civil rights matter,' said ...a language expert. 'We do not have any evidence that primary language instruction is leading to learning English so these children can join the **mainstream**!'" (*Los Angeles Times*, 29 Mar 95, B3)

By guaranteeing the English-language dependence of these students, their so-called foreign nature will assuredly be lost as they are channeled into the common American culture, and toward consensus with hegemonic viewpoints. For educators who espoused a pro-bilingual education position, mainstreaming referred less obviously to assimilation. In the *Los Angeles Times* database, bilingual education advocates emphasized a wider range of academic objectives and more access to college preparation courses. These resources for social advancement, as always, are available only in mainstream classes.

In the final analysis, however, no American public school educator will deny that *mainstreaming*, the social indoctrination of immigrant, linguistic minority and other marginalized children, is part of

the mission of the public schools. It is less likely that the use of the term *mainstream*, much less the RIVER metaphor, is part of educators' conscious awareness. Nevertheless, RIVER and the other two major constitutive metaphors sustain the status quo conceptualization of public schools.

SHAPING ELECTORAL AND POLICY DECISIONS.

How do these metaphors work to effect educational policy? Consider the 1998 vote of the California electorate that eliminated bilingual education for over 1,300,000 children who were legally eligible for bilingual education, of which 80 percent were Latinos. Children who should be taught in their home language constitute one-fourth of California's public school children. The California public had over the last 20 years become aware that these and all other Latinos, as well as other students of color, were receiving an increasingly inadequate education. Businessman Ron Unz blamed the bilingual programs—not underfunding and structural inequity—for the poor showing of immigrant students. He designed a referendum that appealed to the layperson's common sense understandings of schooling. Since his referendum, Proposition 227 (the shrewdly-named "English for the children Initiative") underscored the conventional view of public education, its fallacious conclusion made perfect sense to the average voter. Moreover, the defenders of bilingual education and Unz' opponents were unable to contest Unz, because they could not project a viable alternative vision of public education to the voting public. The commonplace view of American public education (with its underlying conceptual metaphors) was not contested, so by default, it was reaffirmed. Hence this pedagogically inferior directive now guides all public school instruction in California, since upon its enactment, Proposition 227 became part of the state constitution.

Within the perceptual frame of reference established by the three major conceptual metaphors that guide U.S. public education, it goes without saying that bilingual education in any form is inappropriate. This is because bilingual education fails to conform to many aspects of the SCHOOL AS FACTORY framework. For one, bilingual education rebuts its efficiency standard.

Pedagogies that are not framed in terms of the STUDENT AS MACHINE and SCHOOL AS FACTORY metaphors will be devalued when appraised in terms of efficiency. For example, Guerrero (2002) explains how framing the bilingual education policy debate in terms of efficacy terms serves the interest of bilingual education opponents, notwithstanding his finding (and that of many others) that most well designed studies confirm the superiority of bilingual pedagogy for immigrant and Chicano students. Guerrero conducted a meta-analysis of post-1990 multiple data sets that were designed to appraise the efficacy of bilingual instruction.

Likewise, contrary to the FACTORY's associated mechanistic views of learning, bilingual education upsets the assumption that no important learning occurs outside of the SCHOOL AS FACTORY walls. In particular, bilingual education affirms the home lan-

guage and life experiences that Latinos and other non-English speaking children bring to the school-house door. Bilingual education also fails to conform to the efficiency metric of SCHOOL AS FACTORY, by maintaining dual tracks (languages) with equal capacity to convey educational content. Likewise, dual PATHS are maintained when both bilingual and English-only curricula are permitted. How can we tell who really wins the educational footrace when more than one path can be taken? And contrary to the logic of the RIVER metaphor, bilingual education instructs these children in so-called non-mainstream languages and encourages non-mainstream worldviews. By the logic of this trio of conventional metaphors, bilingual education necessarily is marginal. It is not central to public education, and so is easy target for an overwhelmingly monolingual English-speaking electorate to eliminate in order to restore the coherence and consistency of the American public school status quo. Instead of bilingual education, these three dominant metaphors demanded, in the wording of Proposition 227, "that all children in California public schools shall be taught English as rapidly and effectively as possible."

This repressive constellation of metaphors for public education—FACTORY, PATH, and RIVER—is overdue for public reconsideration and replacement. However, two factors make them particularly resistant to change. One is social inertia. They also echo other U.S. master narratives such as the ethic of the rugged individual, the chimeral meritocracy of education, and the probity of so-called free competition. These frames of reference inform public schooling. As Schön (1979) noted and Wetherell & Potter (1992) documented, changing these governing metaphors will require significant social energy and creative implementation. To this end and to her credit, Cook-Sather (2003) offers practitioners new sets of education metaphors to bring about greater awareness within the profession of the power of discourse. Consult Toolan (2002), Jørgensen & Phillips (2002), O'Halloran (2003), and Rogers (2004) for other recent discussions of critical discourse analysis study in education and other arenas. The social implications of cognitive based metaphor research have been fruitfully considered in Radman (1995), Lakoff (1999), Lakoff & Núñez (2000), and Colm Hogan (2003).

In the next section, we also recommend a pair of "guerrilla metaphors" to compete in public discourse with the metaphors in current use. By guerrilla metaphors, I mean those that are likely to be broadly acceptable to the American public, but still can open up an up-to-date, even radical, view of American public education. The task is daunting, since the status quo rejects all views of education that are inconsistent with these conventional metaphors. However, the status quo is failing the majority of the nation's children. For this reason, I offer two guerrilla metaphors with the hope of advancing a new view of public education in the minds of the voting public.

GUERRILLA METAPHORS. Toward the end of

fine analysis of the origins, circumstances, and state of Chicano public education, Valencia states, "Although the plight of Chicano students continues to exist there must be optimism... It is important to continue with a 'language of critique', but also to make room for a 'language of possibility'" (Valencia, 2002, p. 368). In this spirit, I put forward two guerrilla metaphors for public education: EDIFY and CULTIVATE. Each foregrounds important elements of education that have been underemphasized with the current conventional metaphors, in particular with regard to language minority students. Neither imposes the conventional entailments that implement racial and linguistic hierarchies. These insubordinate metaphors have the potential to remake the public's understanding of the nation's major institution for human development, including its concepts of educators and schools.

Learning as Building. The first guerrilla metaphor, KNOWLEDGE AS CONSTRUCT, has been elaborated among American educational theorists, professionals and researchers since at least Thomas Dewey (1897). It is also substantially consonant semantically with the latest learning metaphor, LEARNING AS PRACTICE, which Wolfe (1999) notes has become the chief metaphor of theorists since the 1980s. With LEARNING AS BUILDING, knowledge is a construct and the student is an active builder of his or her own intellectual edifice. This metaphor is particularly well suited to capture current scientific models of language development which emphasize the individual's own unique creation of a grammar via specific developmental stages and social interaction. The child, as well as the adult, assembles the framework of understanding of language and other types of knowledge in which she will cognitively and socially deploy. In this metaphor, then, the teacher relinquishes the job of mind worker and takes on a much more creative and collaborative role of consultant and master builder. Thus the teacher imparts and shares these skills to the student as she progresses, from apprentice to expert builder herself, within what might be called the KNOWLEDGE AS ABODE metaphor. This metaphor reflects the actions that the best teachers have always offered their students across human cultures.

Within the edification metaphor, the school is no longer a factory, but rather becomes an active, building construction site. The student is no longer a chip of raw material to be drilled, threaded and stamped into shape along the educational assembly line, to be judged as a standard issue production unit, to be marked down as defective if not standard issue, or to be warehoused when overstocked. The teacher no longer is an intellectual drone or industrial worker. Instead, they are both active builders of knowledge.

In addition, from the frame of reference of the edification metaphor, the student does not arrive at school bereft of knowledge. She arrives at school already dwelling in her home abode of knowledge. Among the kinds of knowledge she walks into the schoolhouse with, her language is most conspicuous. Thus, the student comes to school to further

build on her knowledge foundation, to become a better builder of her own knowledge residence. Further, the home communities, cultures, and languages of the students are the communal or multi-family houses of knowledge. In the process of building greater knowledge, master builders will not tear down a child's home knowledge, or force a child to evacuate the only home she has ever known. Rather, master builders will guide the student to build upon her home knowledge.

In lieu of using efficiency as the gauge of industrial success for evaluating schools, as is the case of the SCHOOL AS FACTORY metaphor, standards of construction and architecture will predominate such as order, arrangement, symmetry, beauty, and convenience (Ching, 1995). The distinctiveness of each student will be reflected in the edification, much like freestanding single-family homes across America range widely in style.

With this guerrilla metaphor, the institution of public education become more clearly responsible for the kinds and quality of building materials that are provided to students to build their homes of knowledge. Some school districts already offer their children the highest quality materials and engage highly skilled educational architects and master builders to guide their students' own construction of mansions. These children build veritable palaces of knowledge in which they will prosper all their lives. Other school districts can provide the children of many working class, non-white, and language-minority communities next to nothing in terms of educational materials, and employ only inexperienced and under-trained teachers. At such sites, these students will build as children always do, but can only construct hovels with the means provided. It is perhaps for these reasons that many children reject impoverished school sites, for often more destructive places for knowledge construction in the streets beyond the schoolhouse walls.

The HOUSE AS ABODE metaphor provides ample semantic structure for instructional content in terms of foundations, rooms, windows, floors, keystones, and other architectural design elements. The construction site orientation also de-emphasizes the head-to-head competition incumbent in the American EDUCATION AS FOOTTRACE, while it retains the possibility of expression of different individual development. Finally, the STUDENT AS KNOWLEDGE BUILDER, LEARNING AS CONSTRUCT, KNOWLEDGE AS HOUSE, and SCHOOL AS CONSTRUCTION SITE constellation for public education in the U.S. is consonant with the NATION AS HOUSE metaphor (Santa Ana, 2002). In our post-industrial, increasingly knowledge-based global economy, with the guerrilla EDIFICATION metaphor, the continued strength and security of the U.S. people can readily be linked to the quality of U.S. public education as national house.

Education as Cultivation. The second guerrilla metaphor is agricultural. The object of education in this metaphor includes the cultivation of language arts, scientific methods, rational inquiry, and creative thinking. Presently the term *cultivation* is

most often used to refer to elitist education, not the education of the masses, which are typically provided only the basics. Nonetheless, modern educational research reveals that all skills, from the rudiments to the most elaborate, are developed by way of the same processes, and the most coveted require years to cultivate. If we consider that the child's mind contains the seeds of learning, like acorns, the child's mind must be cultivated over its lifetime to bear its full potential harvest. From within this metaphor, the teacher becomes a sower and tiller. The teacher's role is critical, but just as important, the school's soil must be fertile, and school's climate temperate for learning, for the seeds of learning embedded in the mind and hands of each child to sprout and yield their bounty. The best seed falling on barren soil will perish. Hence, school ecology is foregrounded with this metaphor.

Within this view, the classroom and school site become an orchard or vineyard to nurture, with a farmer's dedication supported by all the science of a modern horticulturist. STUDENT AS TREE, CLASSROOM AS ORCHARD, EDUCATION AS CULTIVATION – this constellation eliminates the tendency to view learning as a set of mechanical skills to be drilled or facts to be committed to memory. Life-skill cultivation and lifelong creativity are its hallmarks.

Learning as cultivating can summon the pre-supposition of an orchard of erudition. In each human child are planted the many seeds that grow in us to make us social creatures (namely different languages and types of learning). A child's mind, then, is not a vacant vessel, or a nickel's worth of raw material to be hammered into an industrial product. It is an orchard in which sown seeds of knowledge can germinate and flourish richly over time.

In the relatively bankrupt semantics of the current CURRICULUM AS PATH metaphor, only one entailment is foregrounded, namely personal volition. As shown, this entailment is grossly unfair to children. On the other hand, the cultivation metaphor foregrounds a child's developmental processes. It evokes the personal potential of the student. In a productive vineyard, different vines will produce distinct varieties. In the educational context, each child will be able to express his or her unique learning potential, and to produce abundantly with careful tending. In the place of the mechanical efficiency standard of the factory, the axiom of this agricultural metaphor is inspired stewardship to nurture the inborn potential of the human seed. In place of the footrace, which produces many losers for every winner, the guiding principle of the tiller is to realize the productivity of the whole orchard. The successful cultivator patiently tends vines so they can bring forth their yearly yield of fruit. This metaphor does not discount individual volition, nor is it incompatible with the goal of a greater meritocracy.

Dahany (1986) divided metaphors drawn from educational literature on teacher/student relations into mutually human ones and human to nonhuman ones. Dahany deemed the former were bad, and view the latter critically. Among the latter was a

gardening metaphor, which Dahany correctly noted entails student passivity. This entailment must be kept in mind when using this guerrilla metaphor.

It emphasizes elevating human sensibilities and creativity far better than conventional mechanistic metaphors for education.

SHARED ADVANTAGES. In high contrast, to its favor, EDIFICATION is semantically congruent with the HOUSE metaphor. Likewise CULTIVATION is consonant with NATION AS BODY. Since the U.S. public already conceptualizes the nation either in terms of a house or the human body, associating public education to elements of this national HOUSE or this national BODY will be readily acceptable to the layperson. These two guerrilla metaphors will then have the added advantage of associating the fate of the nation with the quality of public education.

Neither the EDIFY or CULTIVATE metaphors employ the conventional RIVER metaphor. Wiley has noted that using the term *mainstream* in educational contexts reinforces and obscures potent power relations (Wiley, 1996, 1998). To become part of the educational mainstream is to become part of the dominant Anglo-American cultural matrix. On the other hand, to remain on the margins of that mainstream is to remain subordinate to more powerful groups. In contrast, with the guerrilla metaphors, children are either privileged to attend schools rich enough to edify their home knowledge and cultivate their talents, or they are relegated to schools that neither edify nor cultivate. Such a failed public school builds (in edification terms) or grows (in cultivation terms) powerless and disadvantaged children, through no fault of the child.

The current constellation of PATH and RIVER metaphors is particularly injurious to non-English speaking students and non-standard English speaking students. Language use that is not standard is deemed to be a *barrier* along the curricular path of students. The singular path is associated with a single dialect and monolingualism. Consequently, bilingualism is also a barrier. In the logic of current metaphors, if this obstacle is not *bridged* or otherwise overcome, then bilingualism becomes a *prison* for students. This metaphor-generated viewpoint culminates with the claim that if these children are not mainstreamed, in other words, if they do not become monolingual, they will become educationally *handicapped*. None of these inaccurate associations automatically follow when using the edification or cultivation metaphors for education. See Santa Ana (2002, chapter 6) for a full analysis of guiding metaphors for languages other than English, the English language, and their relationship to the nation in the public discourse on U.S. public education that are mentioned in this section of the article.

In bold relief, the edification metaphor for education resonates with the commonly used term, *home language*. The metaphor can be used in a manner that is consistent with the latest research on linguistic acquisition and cognitive development, to state in effect that eliminating a home language demolishes the linguistic home of a child's

knowledge. The private residence of erudition of the unmistakably educated person, over the objection of monolingual nativists, is not English-dependence, but multilingualism. Further, authentic bilingual education provides the materials and master builders' guidance for children to develop multiple linguistic competencies to construct new homes of knowledge.

To use the frame of reference of the other guerilla metaphor, CULTIVATION, to eliminate a child's home language is to rip out the six or seven year old sapling in order to plant a stringy seedling. Current psycholinguistic research indicates that each child has abundant linguistic resources for a whole orchard of languages. Why do Americans settle for one variety (Standard English), when their children can become accomplished speakers of many languages and varieties of English? From within this metaphor, the rampant growth of language during the child's whole public school period can be articulated with the vocabulary of richness and life-long yield, rather than the conventional view of OBSTACLE, PRISON and HANDICAP.

SUMMARY. Three conceptual metaphors currently constitute America's understanding of public education. SCHOOL AS FACTORY is archaic. Yet this one hundred and fifty year old metaphor remains fully productive in U.S. public discourse, and has not been seriously contested in public discourse by more adequate metaphors. America's children thus are seen, so to speak, as raw material that is fashioned into products that are filled with knowledge content. They have learning forged into them through repetitive, numbing rehearsal. Moreover, the supposed new metaphor for education, SCHOOL AS BUSINESS, retains the antiquated elements of the factory metaphor and reinforces the unfairness of the current system that rewards and punishes accidents of birth that fit current hierarchical relations of power. It promotes conformity since children who fit the mold are promoted for the accident of their white middle-class upbringing. On the other hand, the native capacities and acquired cultural and linguistic richness of racialized minority and working-class children will continue to be demoted. These children's potential can be casually disregarded when the factory efficiency metric is used, or if the business bottom-line is the measure for educational excellence.

The second constitutive metaphor, CURRICULUM AS PATH, is congruent with the SCHOOL AS FACTORY metaphor. The PATH invokes personal responsibility on the part of children for their schooling, and falsely holds that the conditions of the academic footrace are the same for each child. This false entailment backgrounds unequal social and structural factors that favor some groups at the expense of other groups. Socioeconomic disparities and continuing institutional racism are passed over in these mythical allegories. The American ethic of fair head-to-head competition, which most citizens avow, is mocked by the entailment.

The third constitutive metaphor, again found with abundance in public discourse, characterizes

the other process of public schools. The socialization process as RIVER is part of growing up in a school setting; it is automatic as aging a year in 365 days. It is not a matter of will or personal initiative. Mainstreamed children naturally mature to become members of the majority society. On the other hand, Latino students (as well as other immigrant, working class and racialized children) are accorded their well-established roles on the margins of U.S. society.

With these three conceptual metaphors, the contemporary discourse on U.S. education cannot construct U.S. values of the inherent worth of every child. Via this uncontested discourse, we *drum* and *drill* values into children rather than cultivate those values. We fabricate citizens and manufacture their opinions, rather than edify students so they can critically choose their own values. Children are mere things to be processed by educational workers in factory that are subject to the efficiency metric. America fails to treat its posterity as its most important social end. This archaic discourse stultifies the public's appreciation of the nation's most important natural resource, and its foremost human development institution. Voting decisions that retard and restrict public education will continue to sustain the lamentable status quo – until educators forcefully articulate, and the public finally adopts new ways of visualizing learning, schools, and curriculum. The two entirely insubordinate guerilla metaphors can broaden the electorate's expectations of how to edify and cultivate the children who are our nation's future.

REFERENCES

- Anon J. Social class and the hidden curriculum of work // Journal of education. 1980. Vol. 162. P. 66-92.
- Anon J. Ghetto schooling: A political economy of urban educational reform. New York: Teachers College Press, 1997.
- Apple M.W. Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Berliner D.C., Biddle B.J. The manufactured crisis: Myths, fraud, and the attack on America's public schools. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books, 1995.
- Bowles S., Gintis H. Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life. London: Routledge and K. Paul, 1976.
- Bowles S., Gintis H. Schooling in capitalist America revisited // Sociology of education. 2002. Vol. 75(1). P. 1–18.
- Byrne J.P. Theories of cognitive development and learning. Chapter 2 of Cognitive development & learning in instructional contexts. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1996.
- Bradley A. The not-quite profession: The course of teaching. Lessons of a century. Education week. 1999. Vol. 19(2). P. 31–32.
- Callahan R.E. Education and the cult of efficiency: A study of social forces that have shaped the administration of the public schools. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.
- Cameron L. Metaphor in educational discourse. New York and London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2002.
- Carroll S.J., Krop C., Arkes J., Morrison P.A., Flanagan A. California's K–12 Public Schools: How Are They Doing? Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2005.
- Chapman R.L. Dictionary of American slang. New York: HarperCollins, 1995.
- Chilton P.A. Security metaphors: Cold war discourse from containment to common house. New York: Peter Lang, 1996.
- Ching F.D.K. A visual dictionary of architecture. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1995.
- Colm Hogan P. Cognitive science, literature, and the arts: A guide for humanists. New York: Routledge, 2003.

- Cook-Sather A. Movement of mind: The Matrix, metaphors, and re-imagining education // Teachers college record. 2003. Vol. 105(6). P. 946–977.
- Danahy M. On the metaphorical language of L2 research // The modern language journal. 1986. Vol. 70(3). P. 228–235.
- Danso R.K., McDonald K. Writing xenophobia: Immigration and the press in post-apartheid South Africa. Cape Town, South Africa: Idasa, 2000.
- Dennis E.E., LaMay C.L. (Eds.). American's schools and the mass media. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, 1993.
- Dewey J. My pedagogic creed // Dewey on education / M.S. Dworkin (ed.). New York: Teachers College Press, 1959. (Original work published in 1897.)
- Dickens C. Hard times. London: Penguin, 1995. (Original work published in 1854.)
- Fairclough N. Language and power. New York: Longman, 1989.
- "Fear and Learning at Hoover Elementary". Film documentary directed and narrated by Laura Angélica Simón. (Hohokus, NJ: Josephine Producciones, Transit Media, 1997).
- Fennimore B.S. Talk matters: Refocusing the language of public schooling. New York: Teachers College Press, 2000.
- Fitzpatrick E. Industrialism // A companion to American thought / Ed. by R.W. Fox, J.T. Kloppenburg. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1995.
- Foucault M. Discipline and punishment. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.
- Foucault M. Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972–1977. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.
- Freire P. Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Seabury Press, 1970.
- Gee J.P. An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method. London and New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Guerra J.C. Close to home: Oral and literate practices in a transitional Mexicano community. New York and London: Teachers College Press, 1998.
- Guerrero M.D. Research in bilingual education: Moving beyond the effectiveness debate // Chicano school failure and success: Past, present and future / Ed. by R. Valencia, 2nd edition. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Hall S., Critcher C., Jefferson T., Clarke J., Roberts B. Policing the crisis: Mugging, the state, and law and order. London: Macmillan, 1978.
- Helfand D. Study offers grim look at schools. The State trails national averages in almost every objective category, the Rand Corp. report says. Its lead author urges systemic solutions // Los Angeles Times, 4 January, 2005, p. B1.
- Himmelfarb G. Strictly family: Book review of George Lakoff's 'Moral politics: What conservatives know that liberals don't.' // TLS: Times literary supplement. 1996. № 4870. P. 12.
- Jørgensen M., Phillips L. Discourse analysis as theory and method. London; Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications 2002.
- Kant I. Perpetual peace, and other essays on politics, history, and morals. Translated and with introduction by Ted Humphrey. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co. 1983. (Original work published in 1795).
- Kerchner C.T., Koppich J.E., Weeres J.G. United Mind Workers: Unions and teaching in the knowledge society. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass 1997.
- Kohl H. 36 Children. New York: Plume, 1988.
- Kroskrity P.V. Regimenting languages: Language ideological perspectives // Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics and identities // Ed. by P.V. Kroskrity. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press, 2000.
- Kumaravadivelu B. Critical classroom discourse analysis // TESOL quarterly. 1999. Vol. 33(3). P. 453–484.
- Lafont C. The linguistic turn in hermeneutic philosophy. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999.
- Lakoff G. Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Lakoff G. The contemporary theory of metaphor // Metaphor and thought / Ed. by A. Ortony, 2nd edition. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Lakoff G. Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to Western thought. New York: Basic Books, 1999.
- Lakoff G. Don't think of an elephant: Know your values and frame the debate: The essential guide for progressives. White River, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing Company, 2004.
- Lakoff G., Núñez R.E. Where mathematics comes from: How the embodied mind brings mathematics into being. New York: Basic Books, 2000.
- Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors we live by. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1980.
- Luke A. Text and discourse in education: An introduction to critical discourse analysis // Review of research in education / Ed. by M.W. Apple. 1995–1996. Vol. 21. P. 3–48.
- Maieroff G.I. (Ed.). Imaging education: The media and schools in America. New York; London: Teachers College Press, 1998.
- McGee M.C. The ideograph: A link between rhetoric and ideology // Quarterly journal of speech. 1980. Vol. 66. P. 1–16.
- Miller S.I., Fredericks M. Perceptions of the crisis in American public education: The relationship of metaphors to ideology // Metaphor and symbolic activity. 1990. Vol. 5(2). 67–81.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Report to the nation and the Secretary of Education, United States Department of Education. Washington, D.C., 1983.
- Noguera P.A. A tale of two cities: School desegregation and racialized discourse in Berkeley and Kansas City // International journal of comparative race and ethnic studies. 1995. Vol. 2(2). P. 48–62.
- Oakes J. Keeping track: How schools structure inequality. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985.
- O'Halloran K. Critical discourse analysis and language cognition. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2003.
- Omi M., Winant H. Racial formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1980s. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987.
- Ono K., Sloop J. Shifting borders: Rhetoric and Proposition 187. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2002.
- Pinar W.F. (Ed.). Contemporary curriculum discourses. Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick, 1988.
- Pinar W.F. et al. (Eds.). Understanding curriculum: An introduction to the study of historical and contemporary curriculum discourses. New York: P. Lang, 1995.
- Postman N., Weingartner C. Teaching as a subversive activity. New York: Delacorte Press, 1969.
- Price S. Critical discourse analysis: Discourse acquisition and discourse practices // TESOL Quarterly. 1999. Vol. 33(3). P. 581–595.
- Radman Z. (Ed.). From a metaphorical point of view: A multidisciplinary approach to the cognitive content of metaphor. Berlin; New York: W. de Gruyter, 1995.
- Rist R.C. Student social class and teacher expectations: The self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education // Harvard educational review. 1970. Vol. 40. P. 411–51.
- Rogers R. (Ed.). An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates, 2004.
- Santa Ana O. Brown tide rising: Metaphors of Latinos in contemporary U.S. public discourse. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2002.
- Santa Ana O. Book review of Shifting borders: Rhetoric, immigration, and California's Proposition 187, K. Ono and J. Sloop. (2002). Philadelphia: Temple University Press // Aztlán: A Journal of Chicano Studies. 2003. Vol. 28(2). P. 249–258.
- Schön D.A. Generative metaphor: A perspective on problem-setting in social policy // Metaphor and thought / Ed. by A. Ortony. 1st edition. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Tell C. Renewing the profession of teaching: A conversation with John Goodlad // Educational leadership. 1999. Vol. 56(8). P. 14–19.
- Toolan M. (Ed.). Critical discourse analysis: Critical concepts in linguistics. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Valdés G. The world outside and inside schools: Language and immigrant children. Educational researcher. 1998. Vol. 27(6). P. 4–18.

Valencia R.R. Towards Chicano school success // Chicano school failure and success: Past, present and future / Ed. by R.R. Valencia, 2nd edition. London and Philadelphia: Falmer Press, 2002.

van Dijk T.A. Principles of critical discourse analysis // Discourse and society. 1993. Vol. 4(2). P. 249–283.

Varenne H., McDermott R., Goldman S., Naddeo M., Rizzo-Tolk R. Successful failure: The school America builds. Boulder, CO and Oxford: Westview Press, 1998.

Wetherell M., Potter J. Mapping the language of racism: Discourse and the legitimization of exploitation. New York: Columbia University Press, 1992.

Wiley T. English-only and standard English ideologies in the U.S. // TESOL quarterly. 1996. Vol. 30. P. 511–535.

Wiley T. The imposition of World War I era English-only policies and the fate of German in North America // Language and politics in the United States and Canada: Myths and realities / Ed. by T. Ricento, B. Burnaby. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1998.

Wolfe P.M. Changing metaphors for secondary ESL and bilingual education // So much to say: Adolescents, bilingualism, and ESL in the secondary schools / Ed. by C.J. Faltis, P.M. Wolfe. New York; London: Teachers College Press, 1999.

© Otto Santa Ana, 2007

экономии и французском утопическом социализме. Как показано в монографии Э.В. Будаева и А.П. Чудинова [2006], современная политическая лингвистика в значительной степени восходит к американским исследованиям первой половины XX века (У. Липптманн, П. Лазерсфельд, Г. Ласвелл, Н. Лейтес, С. Якобсон) и европейской антитоталитарной публицистике и документалистике (В. Клемперер, Дж. Оруэлл) тридцатых-сороковых годов прошлого столетия. К сожалению, многие из этих публикаций мало известны в России, что связано не только с идеологической цензурой, но и с тем, что они давно уже стали библиографической редкостью.

Значимость этих публикаций для отечественных читателей определяется еще и тем, что существенная часть из них в той или иной мере посвящена советскому политическому дискурсу. Соответствующие фрагменты есть и в книге В. Клемперера, еще больше их в публикациях Дж. Оруэлла, а некоторые американские публикации полностью посвящены советскому (возможно, в данном случае лучше сказать «коммунистическому») способу коммуникации.

В настоящем издании представлены впервые переведенные на русский язык главы знаменитой монографии «Язык политики: исследования по квантитативной семантике» под редакцией Гарольда Д. Ласвелла и Натаана Лейтеса (Lasswell H.D., Leites N. et al. 1949). Первая глава этой монографии «Язык власти» была опубликована в предыдущем выпуске политической лингвистики» [Lasswell 2006]. В настоящем выпуске представлены еще две главы. Первая из них «Первомайские лозунги в советской России (1918–1943)» написана Г. Ласвеллом совместно с С. Якобсоном. Авторы с использованием методики контент-анализа детально рассматривают то, как отражаются изменения в политической ситуации на содержании первомайских лозунгов.

Впервые эти лозунги были опубликованы в апреле 1918 года за подписью Я.М. Свердлова и адресованы всем местным комитетам партии и коммунистическим партийным ячейкам в Советах. Большинство лозунгов имело обобщенный характер и было заимствовано со временем, предшествовавших победе. Главные идеи этих лозунгов – необходимость защиты советской власти от врагов в России и за рубежом. Как поясняют авторы исследования – их цель «состоит в том, чтобы отметить относительные тенденции в повторении и изменении первоначального списка лозунгов». В годы Гражданской войны огромное значение придавалось «революционным» символам, но впоследствии они стали менее актуальными. Вначале лозунги были «универсальными», но в более поздние годы все большее внимание уделялось внутренним проблемам Советского Союза.

Еще одна глава из указанной монографии, представленная в настоящем выпуске, называется «Третий интернационал об изменениях политического курса». Данное исследование

РАЗДЕЛ 3. КЛАССИКА ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОЙ ЛИНГВИСТИКИ Косарев М.И., Овсянникова И.А., Соловьева О.А.

Екатеринбург, Россия
У ИСТОКОВ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОЙ ЛИНГВИСТИКИ

Abstract

The aim of the article is to show the significance of American research conducted in the first half of the XX century (W. Lipptmann, P. Lazarsfeld, H. Lasswell, N. Leites, S. Yakobson) and how these ideas influenced modern Russian political linguistics. It is of importance that a great many classical works dealt with political discourse of Soviet Russia.

В знаменитой статье В.И. Ленина «Три источника и три составные части марксизма» было ярко показано, что эта теория базируется на немецкой философии, английской политической