A Cross-Cultural Study on Student Engagement and Resistance to Critical Literacy in a TESOL MA Classroom

Rod Pederson
(Associate Professor in English Education, Incheon National University)

▌ ABSTRACT ▌

This paper reports on a qualitative examining the cross-cultural reasons for student engagement and resistance to critical literacy in a three week summer TESOL MA course that was part of a Korean/American university faculty exchange program. Of particular interest was the unique diversity of the class which consisted of 13 subjects from 9 different nations. Using student and instructor reflective journals, field notes on classroom observations, and the course terminal paper on student's philosophies of education as research corpora, results of the study revealed that students resisted instruction in critical literacy for ideological and epistemological reasons. Nonetheless, the data also showed that while all students resisted some theories in critical literacy, all students nonetheless engaged the course content in meaningful ways.

Key Words
Critical Literacy, TESOL, Cross-Cultural Studies, Qualitative Research, Cultural Studies

INTRODUCTION

As a critical pedagogue who has taught courses in critical literacy to graduate students in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) and English education Master's programs in Korea and the United States for the past 15 years, I have been fascinated with the issue of why some students eagerly engage the core concepts of critical literacy while others steadfastly resist these ideas. Given that the professional literature in TESOL over the past 15 years has seen a marked increase in articles dealing with issues that are derived from theories of critical literacy, such as studies on second language identity (McNamara, 1997; Norton, 2006; Pederson, 2010), voice (Norton, 1997; Pennycook, 1999), race (Kubota & Lin, 2006; Motha, 2006) and linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992; Canagarajah, 1999), one might assume that these theories have become more acceptable to graduate students regardless of their nationalities and ethnicities. While this 'sociocultural turn' in applied linguistics (Johnson, 2006) is fairly recent, these theories have been widely known and used in the fields of English education, cultural studies, and media literacy for the past 20-30 years. Many critical educators (Case, & Hemmings, 2005; Langan & Davidson, 2005; Seas, 2006) in recent years have investigated the question of why students resist these ideas and if there are specific social factors, such as gender, ethnicity, social class, and political affiliation that that underlie higher levels of student resistance to critical literacy. As such, these inquiries are multicultural not only in that the student classroom compositions are multicultural, but that the theories and practice of critical literacy are multicultural in nature as well (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; Macedo, 2003; Giroux, 2005).

Although the question of student resistance to critical literacy is interesting in itself, it obfuscates the equally impelling question of why some students actively engage in the study of critical literacy and if these students have any defining characteristics in common. It is notable that this question

is not addressed in the professional literature in terms of published research and is only addressed indirectly in terms of theory, i.e., situated forms of inquiry in English education, cultural studies, feminist, and post-colonial approaches to English education that assume a more natural acceptance to critical literacy in marginalized populations. Of course, these assumptions overlook the dynamics of why students from dominant social groups are also attracted to critical literacy, even though it may be that the percentages of students from such groups who show interest are significantly smaller, as theories such as white privilege (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; Lynn, 1999) would predict. Adding to the difficulties of investigating such questions is the issue of student diversity in graduate classrooms. Although graduate classrooms around the world may have become more diverse over recent years, the majority of such classrooms are still affected by the localities of their residence, and as such, tend to have larger numbers of students from local populations. The majority of studies investigating some of these issues reflect this classroom dynamic as they tend to focus on one aspect, such as male resistance to feminist theory (Orr, 1993 Case & Hemmings, 2005), in classrooms that have a clearly dominant group of students. Therefore, in order to gain a better understanding of why students engage or resist theories of critical literacy, and if such resistance is affected by socio-cultural affiliations, studies need to be done in more diverse classroom settings. These issues are important to cross-cultural studies as the theoretical and pedagogical base of critical literacy is heavily invested in promoting issues of social justice, empathy, and social transformation through education across cultures, ethnicities, genders, and sexual preferences. In addition, critical literacy embodies the recent call for a 'cultural studies' approach to English education that better prepares students to understand and participate in increasingly diverse local and global societies (Peim, 2003; Kincheloe, & Steinberg, 2007).

The purpose of this study is to investigate whether, and to what extent, socio-cultural factors such as ethnicity, nationality, and epistemological

orientation affect student engagement and resistance to critical literacy. This study is part of an ongoing longitudinal study investigating the nature of cross-cultural graduate student understandings of critical and post-structural/post-modern literature in applied linguistics through the qualitative analysis of student literacy autobiographies and philosophies of education (Pederson, 2010). The data gathered for this study was collected from a three week intensive summer course (Critical Literacy in TESL) the author taught as part of an ongoing faculty exchange program between the Woosong University (WSU) TESOL-MALL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages-Multi-Media Assisted Language Learning) MA Program, South Korea, and the TESL (Teaching English as a Second Language) MA Program at St. Cloud State University (SCSU), in St. Cloud, Minnesota. Of particular interest and relevance to the research questions asked in this study is the diverse student makeup of the class that consisted of 13 subjects from 9 different nations. The diversity of participants in this study should produce more comprehensive data on how critical literacy is received by disparate socio-cultural groups and thereby provide deeper insights into the how and why of student engagement and resistance to critical literacy.

LITERATURE REVIEW

CRITICAL LITERACY

Defining the meaning of critical literacy is an exercise beyond the scope of this paper as the scholarly works that define themselves as being within critical literacy are too numerous and too broad in scope to be able to summarize in anything less than a full length journal article, or monograph. In addition, the fields of critical literacy, critical pedagogy, critical media literacy, and critical theory (sociology) are often conflated to the effect

that the amorphous boundaries between these fields of study have very little actual meaning. To add to the confusion, cultural studies, feminist theory, and queer theory are often included in a mix of what might best be called 'critical' approaches to education, or simply 'criticality' (Sung & Pederson, 2102). Generally, these diverse critical approaches to education share basic understandings of theoretical concepts such as situated learning, dialogism, intertextuality, representation, social constructivism, inquiry, historiography, and post-structural notions of discourse that are grounded in viewing education as a transformative social practice for the purposes of enhancing social justice, social agency, and democracy (Giroux, 2005; Sung & Pederson, 2012). Ira Shor (1999) gives a reasonably succinct and general definition to critical literacy as:

> …language use that questions the social construction of the self. When we are critically literate, we examine our ongoing development, to reveal the subjective positions from which we make sense of the world and act in it. All of us grow up and live in local cultures set in global contexts where multiple discourses shape us (p.7).

While Shor's definition locates the interests of critical literacy within dynamics of the social uses of language and texts, this definition would be equally applicable to the other 'critical fields' mentioned above. Sung and Pederson (2012) summarize this debate over the delineations between the various critical fields of study by concluding that:

> the meaning of "being critical" is embedded in a specific, yet very wide body of literatures and practices, and is contextual to the individual educator and the context[s] of her practice (p.158).

Therefore, for the purposes of clarity critical literacy will be used as an umbrella term that subsumes all of the critical fields of study mentioned above.

RESISTANCE

According to Giroux (1983), resistance is defined as the reasons for why students do not actively engage in learning activities in public school classrooms. Or, conversely, resistance is theorized as being a product of curricula and pedagogies that have little or nothing to do with student lives in terms of the values, beliefs, and experiences of the students. While much of this definition specifically points to socially marginalized groups who are not part of the dominant discourse of public education, it also explicates why many of the students from the dominant, white-middle class discourse of the schools are also disaffected. Giroux's theory of resistance also theorizes how to engage students in learning by valuing their culture, experiences, and bodies of knowledge, as well as including these things into the curricula through forms of inquiry education. Thus, Giroux's theory of resistance becomes an elegant tool in critical literacy as it not only defines engagement and resistance, but also provides a theoretical direction for curriculum and instruction (Freire & Macedo, 1987; Shor, 1999).

Much research in critical literacy has been devoted to investigating why students resist instruction in critical literacy. Generally, this research focuses on the reasons why specific socio-cultural groups may resist instruction in the tenets of critical literacy. While all forms of resistance may be said to be ideological in nature (Giroux, 2011), the majority of these studies focus on how issues of race, social class, gender, which also commonly serve as foci for explicating the underlying mechanisms of social inequality in theories of critical literacy (Sung & Pederson, 2012), serve as socially divisive mechanisms that lead to student resistance. Other studies also report issues of job anxiety (Shor, 1999), orientations towards positivistic epistemological views (Riley & Claris, 2009), the power relations between teacher and student (Seas, 2006), and institutional socialization (Fobes & Kaufman, 2008) as alternative causes of student resistance to critical

literacy. However, from a post-structural perspective, all of these diverse causes of resistance are similar in that they are reported to arise from socialization into specific discursive practices within given societies or cultures. In other words, subjects derive their values, beliefs, ideals, and social practices from the discourses they are raised in (Foucault, 1984; Bourdieu, 1991) and defend against, or resist, conflicting perspectives. As such, while intuition might lead one to think that resistance to critical literacy might predominantly be a manifestation of the guilt or shame subjects may have of belonging to a social group that has historically marginalized other social groups, such as males marginalizing females in the workforce, these studies report that it is the socialization into specific discursive identities that is the primary underlying cause of resistance. Nonetheless, these studies do not reject the notion of guilt or shame as a contributing factor to student resistance to critical literacy, and as such, this issue should be a matter for further research.

In terms of the common reasons for resistance to critical literacy (race, social class, gender), it is clear that group affiliation/identity is widely reported as the root cause. Recent studies investigating how issues of gender create resistance to critical literacy in university courses were done in the fields of composition (Orr, 1993), Science and engineering (Fobes & Kaufman, 2008), and education (McKinney, 2005) found that resistance was rooted in the discursive construction of male masculine identities. Orr (1993) goes on to point out that it is the challenge to a subject's masculine identity, not an issue of pedagogy or curriculum that causes resistance to the feminist strain in critical literacy.

> "…male students' resistance is not an artifact of some particular feminist pedagogic technique but is instead a function of the challenge feminism poses to men socialized into this culture's norm(s) of masculinity" (p.??).

Similarly, studies investigating issues of race as a cause of resistance

to critical literacy found that challenges to subject's racial identity to be the primary contributing factor (McKinney, 2005). Case & Hemmings (2005) found that white women pre-service teachers used the 'distancing strategies' of silence, social dissociation, and separation from responsibility to resist anti-racist forms of critical literacy in response to their perceptions that the curriculum was positioning them as being racist, implicated in institutional racism, and racial discrimination. While no studies were found that specifically investigated social class as a cause of student resistance to critical literacy, all of the literature surveyed in this study linked social class to the discursive construction of identity and, thus, social class may be theorized as being linked to subjects' perceptions of race and gender (Mclaren, 2006; Giroux, 2011). Finally, some studies found epistemological orientation to be a contributing factor to student resistance to critical literacy (Riley & Claris, 2009). Specifically, positivistic views of science, or the 'myth of objectivity', were cited as driving factors for student resistance. In other words, students socialized into positivistic forms of education actively resisted the post-structural perspectives that serve as a part of the theoretical foundations of critical literacy, such as the social construction or subjectivity of knowledge, truth being contextual, and the discursive construction of socio-cultural power relations (Foucault, 1984; Bourdieu, 1991).

ENGAGEMENT

Literature in critical literacy addressing student engagement is primarily theoretical in nature. So much so, that it is extremely difficult to find any empirical studies examining how using pedagogical techniques derived from critical literacy foster student engagement. The only studies that could be found within recent years were Shin & Crookes' (2005) *Exploring the possibilities for EFL critical pedagogy in Korea: A two-part case study* and McInerney's (2009) *Toward a critical pedagogy of engagement*

for alienated youth: insights from Freire and school–based research. Shin & Crookes (2005) found that Korean high and middle school students were not resistant to critical pedagogical techniques while McInerney (2009) found that a 'critical pedagogy of engagement' greatly reduced student resistance in Australian public schools. What is significant about this apparent paucity of research on student engagement in critical literacy is not the absence of empirical research on the subject, but the theoretical orientation which drives research in a different direction. Simply put, research in critical literacy tends to examine the causes of what (McInerney (2009) calls 'anti-resistance', instead of focusing on the how or why critical literacy engages students in learning.

Derived from Giroux's (1983) seminal work *Theory and Resistance in Education: Towards a Pedagogy for the Opposition*, the notion of anti-engagement focuses on the various reasons why students resist the traditional curricula and pedagogies that exist in K-12 education including, culturally specific (biased) curricula that alienates and/or marginalizes other cultural groups or discourses, the 'hidden curriculum' of economic logic that focuses curriculum on employment niches, and curricula that has little relation to student lives. This theoretical orientation is not surprising to those versed in critical literacy as it is well known that the major impetus in critical literacy is a drive for social justice and social agency in society through education by demystifying the ideologies that produce social inequalities in terms of race, class, and gender (Shor, 1999; McLaren, 2006). As such, both the theoretical literature and empirical studies that touch on the subject of student engagement look instead to how issues of race, class, and gender in curriculum and pedagogy alienate and disempower students, as opposed to if, or how, it engages them. However, this orientation towards understanding student engagement in terms of resistance to education, does not mean that the concept of engagement does not exist within critical literacy theory. Focusing on the causes of student resistance to curriculum and pedagogy as a means to foster student

engagement is a common approach in critical literacy as it is assumed that the reasons for such resistance are what prevents active student engagement in the classroom (Freire & Macedo, 1987; Shor, 1999). Giroux (2003) emphasizes the rationale underlying this approach to student engagement by stating that:

> Students marginalized by class, race, and gender were seldom invited to participate in the educational discourses, pedagogical practices, and institutional relations that shaped their everyday lives. Even worse, they were often marginalized and oppressed within such discourses and social formations. (p.12)

Given the understanding that many students are regularly subjected to such conditions in K-12 education, it is a matter of common sense to assume that curriculum and instruction that address these failings would increase student engagement.

Derived from Freire's (1987) conception of literacy as 'reading the word and the world', theories in critical literacy look as much to active student engagement as to enhancing social justice and social agency through the basic pedagogical principles of situated learning, dialogism, critical reflection, democratic practices, and student activism (Shor, 1999). Although Freire (1987) does not specifically evoke situated learning, as his work was prior to Lave & Wenger's (1991) seminal work on the subject, he nonetheless evokes the theory in his conception of literacy through the reading of the 'world', which equates to students investigating their own social context in relation to the larger society. Thus, students not only gain a greater understanding of the socio-political machinations of their social positioning, but also become more engaged in learning as they are intimately connected to the content of instruction. In addition, this aspect of situated learning is also connected to the concept of critical reflection, or inquiry, through a specific orientation towards knowledge as it instantiates the belief that students' knowledge and experiences are

valuable aspects of the curriculum and overall learning experience (Barton & Hamilton, 2000; Pederson). In recent literature, this concept is often referred to as 'voice', or the right to signify, and is linked to enhanced student engagement (Norton, 1997; Pennycook, 1999). Similarly, dialogism, or the sharing of student insights, experiences, and results of inquiry through discussion, may be seen as an exercise in voice and inquiry, both of which may be said to enhance student engagement as students are invested in their inquiry as it a situated practice. Democratic practices refer to students having input into the curriculum, evaluation, and daily practices of the classroom, which also increases student voice and investment in learning as they are more directly involved in classroom practices (Norton, 1997; Pennycook, 1999). Finally, the concept of student activism, which Freire (1987) calls 'publishing', gives further impetus to student voice, agency, and engagement through the final step in a pedagogical process of situated student inquiry by necessitating some form of student action (letter, blog, web page, project, etc.,) demonstrating what they have learned through an informed political position on the topic under question. Thus, it becomes clear that these basic pedagogical concepts of critical literacy are seamlessly connected in ways that foster student voice, agency, and engagement in learning. McInerney (2009) aptly summates how theories of resistance in critical literacy translate into pedagogical strategies for student engagement by raising the following questions:

> If we deny subjectivity, silence student voices, show scant respect for children and their culture, suppress the creative capacities of individuals and close down spaces for inquiry, we are likely to reinforce existing patterns of alienation and disaffection amongst young people. Why would students want to learn in such an environment? Why would they not withdraw their assent? (p.31)

RESEARCH DESIGN

This study is an ancillary report on a longitudinal, ongoing, study utilizing TESOL MA students' literacy autobiographies as data to investigate how students used the reflective practice of writing a literacy autobiography to understand the origins of their systems of knowledge, values, and beliefs for the purposes of better understanding the nature, purposes, and outcomes of teaching and learning, and, to gain insight into how students are responding to their exposure to critical and post-structural/post-modern literature in applied linguistics (Pederson, 2012). The impetus for this ancillary study developed prior to the commencement of an annual summer TESOL MA course the researcher teaches at an American university entitled *Critical Literacy in TESL*. As the course was uniquely diverse in terms of student's socio-cultural backgrounds, the researcher decided that the course was a unique opportunity gather data on how critical and post-structural/ postmodern approaches to applied linguistics are received and understood by students from different socio-cultural backgrounds, as well as gathering data relevant to the ongoing study regarding how such literature affects student's world views and identities.

The setting for this study was a summer TESOL MA course (*Critical Literacy in TESL*) that was part of a faculty and student exchange program between Woosong University TESOL-MALL MA Program in Daejeon (WSU), South Korea and St. Cloud State University TESL Program in St. Cloud, Minnesota (SCSU), with the course being held at St. Cloud State University. The course was held five days a week for three weeks for a period of three and one half hours from July 8 through July 26, 2013. The researcher had taught the course for the previous 4 summers and the course always had high enrollments as the SCSU TESOL MA curriculum did not include critical education courses. The course utilized a seminar format where course readings served as material for open class discussion. While class discussions were driven by student interests in

the literature and the connections they made between the literature and their own experiences, the discussions were nonetheless semi-structured in nature as the instructor often guided the discussions to address specific theoretical points in the literature, such as the functions of complicity within hegemonic systems and the differences between individual and systematic perceptions of race and gender bias. The assigned literature for the course reflected the wide base of literature in critical literacy which also included readings from the fields of critical pedagogy (Freire, & Macedo, 1987; Kincheloe, & Steinberg, 1997), cultural studies (Hall, 1997; Giroux, 2011), sociology (Foucault, 1984; Bourdieu, 1991), and applied linguistics (Canagarajah, 1999; Pennycook, 1999). In addition, the assigned readings for the course were not pre-selected, but assigned daily in order to follow student interests. As such, the course was designed to provide a wide base of foundational theoretical concepts that might interest students, broaden their theoretical horizons, allow them to begin to usefully critique their field of study and their own teaching practices, and serve as an impetus for further study.

This study employs a qualitative, mixed methods approach in investigating how TESOL MA students respond to critical and post-structural/postmodern educational literature and instruction. Creswell (2000, 2001) explicates mixed method research approaches as the weaving together of two or more research techniques to better document and understand the research problem under study. According to Creswell, mixed method approaches may include both quantitative and qualitative research techniques, or may employ multiple research techniques with in one paradigm, whether qualitative or quantitative. However, mixed method approaches are generally understood to employ techniques from both paradigms (Creswell, 2003, Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). This study employs a mixed methods approach that utilizes three qualitative research techniques including daily reflective journals by students as a response to daily readings and by the instructor/researcher on the nature and developments of the course, field

notes by the instructor/researcher written immediately after each class to document class discussions, and an analysis of the student's terminal course papers (philosophy of education). In addition, both participant observation and action research were also part of the research design. As the instructor was an active participant in class discussions, the negotiation of assigned readings with students, and whose observations served as data sets, participant observation was utilized as a research technique (Spradley, 1980). Although it was not the intent of this study to be viewed as, or present itself as an action research study, the dynamics of the course fit an action research paradigm as instructor reflection on student responses to the course content were part of a feedback loop that determined future course content (Stringer, 2007). It may also be stated that this form of reflective pedagogy is common to practitioners of critical literacy (Shor, 1999; Kincheloe & Steinberg (1997). As the purpose of this study was to investigate how students from a diversity of cultures and nations responded to literature and instruction in critical and post-structural/postmodern theories of education, the study focused on the extent to which on issues of race, nationality, and epistemological orientation affected student engagement and resistance.

PARTICIPANTS

The student composition of the course consisted of 4 White American students, 6 international students from 5 different nations, and three US immigrants from 3 different nations, giving a total of 13 subjects from 9 different nations. All of the students were members of the SCSU TESL MA program and had not previously been exposed to any of the wide theoretical base that encapsulates critical literacy. As some of the issues that arose during class discussions may be viewed as controversial, and in some nations potentially actionable, the student names in the following

class roster have been assigned pseudonyms to protect the anonymity of the students:

1. Azad: Male, Turkey; immigrant
2. Burhan: Male, Saudi Arabia
3. Claire: Female, Ghana
4. David: Male, United States
5. Haddad: Male, Bangladesh
6. Hua Ling: Female, Taiwan
7. Janice: Female, US
8. Mada: Female, Saudi Arabia
9. Mardea: Female, Cameroon; Immigrant
10. Sadiah: Female, Pakistan; immigrant
11. Sara: Female, United States
12. Thomas: Male, United States
13. Wei: Female, China

DATA COLLECTION

FIELD NOTES

In order to document the content and nature of classroom discussions the instructor/researcher wrote field notes during class discussions and immediately after the end of each class for a period of up to 30 minutes. The purpose of these field notes were to document the actual student and teacher interactions that occurred during the class (Creswell, 2003). In addition to recording accurate details of class discussion, the researcher also included student's apparent affective responses to the literature and discussions, such as excitement, interest, doubt, discovery, disgust, anger and other such emotional and intellectual responses. As the course content

was determined daily by the instructor to reflect student interests, the field notes also served as a tool to match burgeoning student interests to relevant literature to be assigned as course readings.

STUDENT AND INSTRUCTOR REFLECTIVE JOURNALS

Students in the course were assigned daily reflective journals for the purposes of focusing their consideration of the theories presented in course literature and class discussions, as well as providing useful data for the study. In order to gain greater insight into the students thought processes, students were informed that their journal entries could address both the literature and discussions of the course. The instructor/researcher wrote reflective journal entries each evening for the purpose of documenting the development of the course in terms of how the students were responding to the course literature, what readings should be assigned to best align student interest and the general purposes of the course, to reflect on how the instructor was responding to the student dynamics of the course, and to determine what pedagogical choices would best fit the evolution of the course. Reflective instructor journals are a widely known and used research technique in teacher education (Creswell, 2003, Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Commonly used in narrative research (Hayano, 1979; Pratt, 1994), action research (Stringer, 2007) and other diverse forms of qualitative inquiry, instructor reflective journals serve as a method of inquiry into student and teacher perceptions, beliefs, problems, attitudes, and processes of thought and development(Creswell, 2003, Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). As such, reflective instructor journals were used in this study to gain insight into both student and instructor perceptions about the course content and development.

STUDENT WRITINGS

As the purpose of the course, and the purpose of critical literacy in

general, was to have students reflect on, or attempt to situate, how the theoretical concepts of the literature presented in the course affect education, students were assigned to write a philosophy of education paper as the terminal assignment of the course. Students were given little instruction on how to write the paper other than that there was no right, or wrong, way to write the paper as it was to be a vehicle for the process of thought that leads to an informed system of educational beliefs. As such, the assignment was meant to be a personal inquiry into the purposes of education. While there are a great many treatises of what a philosophy of education is (Schönwetter, et. al., 2002; Goodyear, & Allchin, 1998), and how to write one (Chism, 1998; Kearns, & Sullivan, 2010), general agreement exists within the field of education that composing such a document is crucial to teacher development and practice. The use of student writings as data in qualitative inquiry is also common practice in educational research. Good examples of this are Lillis' (2003) use of student essays as data to understand how student's critical responses to course content denoted their development of academic literacies and Langan & Davidson's (2005) use of student writings to analyze student responses to feminist pedagogies. Similarly, this study utilized student's philosophies of education to gain insight into how students responded to the course content and how it may have changed their beliefs about education and society.

DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis procedures employed in this study are commensurate with coding procedures found in various methodologies in qualitative research. Specifically, each data set were repeatedly and systematically read to identify patterns of similarity or contradiction and then subjected to theoretical sampling in order to connect the data to working theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The data were also triangulated as multiple

data sets were subjected to analysis. Emerging patterns within the data served as codes to be connected to theory (Creswell, 2003). Similar to grounded theory, often viewed as a neutral or 'blank slate' approach to data analysis, this analytical approach is also utilized in critical forms of research when it is acknowledged to be informed by the researcher's disciplinary knowledge and epistemological orientation (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Thus, this means of data analysis not only allowed the recognition of emerging patterns, but also allowed them to be viewed through the critical, post-structural/postmodern lens that was the foundation of this study and reflected of the purpose of the course under study.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

Before entering into a discussion regarding the results and analysis of the data generated by this study, it is necessary to state that the TESOL MA course under study was, without doubt, the most extraordinary course the author has ever taught in his 15 years of being a graduate educator in the fields of TESOL and English education. This statement is not made as a self congratulatory 'pat on the back', or as a statement promoting the benefits or ultimate necessity of critical forms of education. Rather, it is a statement that both mirrors my experiences as a critical educator and represents a general truth that all critical educators know: that regardless of how good a teacher you are, a large percentage of the students in your classes will resist critical approaches to education to a greater or lesser extent. Simply stated, the class under study was remarkable in that 12 out of 13 students thoroughly and meaningfully engaged the ideas presented in the course literature and class discussions. In addition, these 12 students also demonstrated an awakening critical consciousness by coming to their own informed conclusions regarding how these ideas related to their own experiences as students, teachers, and agents in a larger social milieu.

However, it must also be stated that while 12 of the students did ultimately engage the ideas presented in the course, all of the students in the course exhibited some form of resistance to the course content to some extent, and did so in ways that were unique to their own experiences and beliefs. Analysis of the data revealed that within the major codes of engagement and resistance to critical approaches to education, the sub-codes of ideology and epistemology (resistance) and history, experience, and progressivity (engagement) best explained how students in the course responded to the course content.

RESISTANCE

Much of the data that revealed why some students were resistant to the ideas presented in the class came under the code heading of ideology. This code designation is problematic as the term 'ideology' may subsume a wide range of social phenomena including social class, race, religion, and political affiliation, to name a few (Gerring, 1997). Moreover, it may be shown how these seemingly disparate classifications may intersect in a variety of ways, such as how ethnicity plays a significant part in the economics of social class designations. Therefore, for the purposes of clarity and brevity, ideology will be defined as "…a set of idea elements that are bound together, that belong together in a non-random fashion" (p. 980). Thus, as a code, ideology may be seen as both an individual and/or group affiliated system of beliefs that interact in specific ways with the course content.

Of all of the students, Sara exhibited the most determined and continuing resistance to the course content, particularly as it related to issues of race and social class. As literature in critical literacy is crucially concerned with how ethnic bias is both represented, and reproduced, in the curriculum and instruction of educational systems (Kincheloe, & Steinberg, 1997;

Giroux, 2011), it is not surprising that it served as a point of resistance for some students. Specifically, the interrelated theories of white privilege (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997), double consciousness (Dubios, 1994), and hegemony (Gramsci, 1971) proved to be both enlightening and disturbing to the students. These theories may be said to be related in that they all posit a duality of power relations and consciousness in terms of the inequality of social relations between specific groups within a society, whether national or global. The theory of white privilege posits that white people in western societies are unable to see the numerous privileges granted them by the systematic power of their ethnicity and that such privileges are denied to other ethnicities, or people of color (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997). Similarly, the theory of double consciousness posits that while this blindness to the privilege of power is systematically inherent to those that possess it (they do not need to recognize it as their lives are not so negatively constrained), marginalized ethnic groups, of necessity, understand the social workings of power for both groups, hence having a double consciousness (Dubois, 1994). Gramsci's (1971) theory of hegemony ties these theories together by positing that complicity for the systematic social domination of one group over another is held by both groups. That is, a social group may not be dominated unless it gives some measure of tacit support to its own domination. In addition, by defining social domination as a systematic phenomenon, these theories deny individualistic definitions of social bias that claim innocence if an individual has not committed an overt singular act of discrimination. In other words, being a member of a society that systematically discriminates against certain social groups makes one complicit in their domination (Kincheloe & Syeinberg, 2007; Giroux, 2011). The following two excerpts from Sara's journal responding to the reading of Kincheloe & Steinberg exemplify her resistance to these ideas:

I guess I just don't understand why the "racist/victim/oppressor" cards

> are still getting played, positioning white privilege as the culprit for oppression of others, instead of combating what is wrong in a community, and working to make things better, instead of pointing fingers at others. (July 12, 2013)

> It is maddening as hell to be positioned as part of a problem you did not create, and cannot change, especially when you are being made to feel bad about yourself for trying to do the best you can with your own life. (July 12, 2013)

Here, Sara's responses clearly illustrate that she feels uncomfortable with and rejects the idea that she is in any way responsible for the ethnic bias that she admits continues in America. As such, she firmly adheres to an individualistic view of racism. In doing so, she not only denies her complicity in the domination of others, but intimates a commonly held belief in 'reverse racism' that victimizes those innocent of ethnic bias (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2007). As these theories of social domination and complicity are foundational ideas that run through theories of critical literacy, Sara's individualistic views on the nature of social power define much of the impetus for her resistance to the course content.

Three other students also evinced some aspect of resistance similar to Sara's. Interestingly, the data shows that while the three other American students were clearly made uncomfortable when addressing the same issues in the literature and class discussions, their responses were more general in that they did not specifically target ethnicity as the reason for their discomfort and/or skepticism. David best exemplifies this data as he responds to both class discussions that included the issues of ethnic bias and the course reading of *Representation, globalization, and the native speaker: dialectics of language, ideology, and power* (Pederson, 2012), which included arguments on linguistic imperialism, the western domination of academia, and its ties to globalization. David relates his dilemmas through the following series of questions aimed at both himself and the instructor:

> Do other majors obsess over their own inner-evil? Do they have the same inner-evil? I sure hope/expect business majors do. If this profession is so bad, why do I (a generally not-so-bad person) want to continue with it? Am I, in fact, a not-so-good person? Or, have I just been raised in a society whereby my raging ego and ethnocentrism blinds me to that which I don't know and makes that which I know so easy for me to mindlessly follow a path and an ideology that is, essentially, detrimental on the global scale? Am I the problem? (July 16, 2013)

Here, David shows that although the theories that attempt to explicate the social workings of power through language teaching, and education in general, make him uncomfortable in terms of his contemplation of personal guilt and complicity, he nonetheless is clearly considering the validity of these issues in terms of his own personal experiences and beliefs. In this way, he demonstrates that resistance is not a monolithic phenomenon: that it is common to all forms of education, but may be overcome if the teacher and students create a pedagogical space that encourages inquiry and free thought (Giroux, 2011). In addition, instructor journals noted that the question 'Do I have to feel bad or guilty about being an English teacher?' is a common question that is to be expected when teaching critical literacy as the issue of complicity, or symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 1991), is a foundational aspect of theories in critical literacy (Sung & Pederson, 2012). As such, some resistance to these ideas is to be expected as students work out their own answers among and between themselves. Instructor field notes and journals also noted that student's facial expressions (frowns) and body language (fidgeting) were accurate indicators of the intellectual struggles the students were undergoing prior to their expression in journals. Finally, as the data shows that only the white American students demonstrated this type of resistance, the findings support the general premise of critical literacy that curriculum and instruction that address such issues are more engaging to a diversity of students, and also supports the literature on resistance to critical literacy that names ideology as a primary cause

of resistance (Yagelski, 1999).

The second major impetus for student resistance revealed by the data was one of epistemological socialization. Specifically, six students evinced a strong skepticism to the post-structural/postmodern epistemological claims of the subjectivity of knowledge and truth embedded in the course literature. Such adherence to positivistic forms of knowledge and education are not surprising as it is widely known that positivism remains the dominant epistemology in secondary and tertiary education (Kuhn, 1970; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2007). The data shows that these students had trouble accepting, or seeing the relevance of, discursive views of knowledge and truth. Surprisingly, these students did not object to the notion that truth was subjective, and that hence no ultimate truth exists, but rather to the oft made claim that post-structural/postmodern views were impracticable and ultimately lead to chaos (Dawkins, 2010). Mada's journal response to this issue reflects the thoughts of the other students by stating:

> With 1000 versions of the truth there can't be any tests. Without any belief in "right" or "wrong" in education, and the associated anarchy that comes with it, what can be accomplished within a school? Without possible tests, what is expected of a graduate? What can a future employer expect? What can a future employer know of their potential new worker? (July 10, 2013)

Mada's response illustrates her socialization into positivistic views of education as she specifically responds to the issue of accountability, while not denying that different bodies of knowledge or versions of the truth exist. Data from class discussions and student journals show that six other students (David, Denise, Hua Ling, Mada, Thomas, and Wei) held this belief. Hua-ling summates this belief in her journal by stating that: "Although I can see the merit in these ideas, perhaps operating from a positivist POV is not such a bad idea" (July 23, 2013). That this educational belief proved to be an impetus for resistance to the course content is not surprising

as the socialization into specific forms of curriculum and pedagogy are well known phenomena (Bourdieu, 1991; Giroux, 2011) and are supported as a cause for resistance to critical literacy in other studies (Riley & Claris, 2009).

ENGAGEMENT

The data regarding how and why students engaged the major theories of critical literacy presented in the course primarily fell into to codes: culture and progressiveness. Analysis of the data showed that issues of national, international, and ethnic history were recurrent themes in the data that were all connected to the individual native cultures of the students. As 9 of the 13 students were from nations with a colonial past, it is not surprising that these theories of critical literacy resonated with so many students. Certainly, theories of critical literacy predict increased levels of engagement by students who come from marginalized backgrounds, whether it is an issue of historical and continuing ethnic bias or a history of colonial and neo-colonial/neo-imperial domination (Giroux, 1983; Freire & Macedo, 1987).

All 9 of the non-American students positively responded in some way to the course content that addressed the historical positioning of their native country within the international community. Specifically, theories of linguistic imperialism, post-colonialism, and hegemony greatly attracted their attentions. In terms of linguistic imperialism, the data focused on the justifications for why their countries instituted language policies mandating universal English education and who benefited from these policies. The data revealed that all of the 9 non-American students not only questioned their native language and educational policies, but also determined that universal English education was a bad policy that favored specific social groups who already held positions of power. Sadiah's Journal response to the readings regarding linguistic Imperialism (Phillipson, 1992;

Canagarajah, 1999) and post-colonial theory (Bhabha, 1994; Spivak, 1995) resonated with the responses of other students by stating that:

> It has always seemed to me that most people almost never use their English after they are out of school. Then why is it so important for everyone to learn English? We can say that some people need to learn English for science and trade, but how many really do that after graduating? No, most people are just ordinary people with ordinary jobs and English does not much for them. But some people make much money from the English business, and not only Pakistani's, and the rich all speak good English and just get richer. It does not really help the regular people, I think. (July 19, 2013)

In this excerpt Sadiah not only questions the purposes for learning English, but also connects her own experiences with English education and the larger issue of who really benefits from her nation's language policies. As such, she also invokes the theory of hegemony as she intimates that these policies mainly benefit specific groups of people, who are thereby complicitous in the domination of their own people, as well as suggesting that this domination also comes from the outside. Sadiah's passion and concern illustrate that she is deeply engaged in thinking about the ideas she is being exposed to and how they apply to her own context.

Burhan extends this argument during a class discussion by taking a post-colonial stance that argues that it is not only the language, but the culture that comes with English education that dominates the people.

> English came with the colonial system. That, and its institutions. Some of that is good, some not so good. Now, I am concerned with the globalization and pop-culture that comes with language. Sure, many are concerned about this, that people will become like little American's, but what they do not say is how our economic system becomes like them. The gap between the rich and the poor gets bigger all the time, just like all western countries. (July 22, 2013)

Burhan demonstrates his engagement in the course literature by invoking post-colonial theory in the classroom discussions by pointing out that it is not enough to recognize the historical and current machinations of foreign domination, that one must also understand how foreign culture becomes embedded in the institutions and social practices of a nation. Moreover, his statement follows post-colonial theory in that he does not say that all aspects of foreign culture are negative, but that the workings of culture need to be examined in terms of how they actually function within a society (Bhabha, 1994; Spivak, 1995). The data not only showed that Burhan's feelings about the post-colonial influences of foreign culture were shared by the other non-American students, but also that all of these students were engaging in the course content and class discussions as predicted by theories in critical Literacy (Giroux, 1983). In addition, although the data showed that the non-American students were more passionate in their responses to these codes, the American students also actively participated in the classroom discussions that followed these issues.

With the upsurge of critical approaches to TESOL recently published in the professional literature, such as literature dealing with the issues of linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992; Canagarajah, 1999) identity (McNamara, 1997; Norton, 2006; Pederson, 2010), gender (Orr, 1993; McKinney, 2005), and race (Kubota & Lin, 2006; Motha, 2006), it is not surprising that all of the students, to a greater or lesser extent, engaged the course content as a progressive perspective on the field of study. The two recent special issues in the *TESOL Quarterly* (1999, 33:3; 2006, 40:3), which focused on critical approaches in TESOL, are a good example of this increasing status within the field. Thus, the increasing status of critical approaches in the field of TESOL led to student interest and engagement in these issues. As such, much of the data that demonstrated high levels of student engagement came under the code heading of progressiveness.

Much of the data that fell under the code heading of progressiveness came from the philosophies of education that students wrote as the terminal

project of the course. Although some students expressed in class discussions that much of their interest in critical literacy came from its perception of being the 'cutting edge' of theory within the field of study, they most clearly articulated their perspectives in their terminal papers. The majority of students in the class (3 Americans and 5 non-Americans) exhibited some measure of this code in their papers. Janice's and Claire's papers most clearly exemplified student writings regarding this issue in the following manner:

> Janice: I believe that critical approaches to TESOL need to gain wider credence and use in the field. Although I have yet to be convinced that all of these theories have merit, or are truly practicable in the classroom, I believe that their focus on what the students need as individuals, and what their societies need, are issues that need to be addressed. It is also obvious that these critical ideas are an increasing trend in the field such that any professional in the field needs to be conversant with them. (p.3)

> Claire: It is about time educators finally begin thinking about what students and their society really might need. So little of what is taught in school or university has anything to do with the people. It makes me feel good that such ideas are gaining prominence in the field and are now necessary to learn. (p.4)

Both Janice and Claire clearly recognized that critical literacy has become an integral part of TESOL and that such knowledge is firmly a part of what it means to be a professional in the field. Claire's excerpt also implies that the negative aspects of English education in her nation (Ghana) have not been addressed and could possibly be ameliorated by approaches from critical literacy. While all students questioned the validity and/or practical usability of some of the specific theories presented in the course, as Janice excerpt relates, all of the students in the course appeared to embrace most

of the theories to a greater or lesser extent. The data also showed that Janice's concern regarding the application of ideas from critical literacy to the classroom was shared by many students. However, as the application of critical literacy to any classroom is, by definition, anti-method (Giroux, 2011) or post-method (Kumaravadivelu, 2001), or more specifically the creative application of theory to practice (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2007), students seemed to understand that it was up to them to decide how these ideas might be applied. Such feelings regarding the difficulty in applying ideas from critical literacy to the classroom are well known and are understood as part of the process of developing a critical teaching practice through reflective teaching (Sung & Pederson, 2012).

Finally, in order to get a better understanding of the nature of the course under study, it is necessary to relate three incidents that fell outside of the analytical codes and occurred both in and outside of the classroom. Data from instructor field notes and journals related that class discussions grew more lively and interactive as the course progressed. As many of the theories presented in the course literature are difficult and have great depth in terms of potential meanings and applications, it is common for students to have some sense of confusion until they begin to connect the ideas to their own experiences. This period of confusion, or intellectual overload, was clearly demonstrated by the students in this course. Two students (Thomas and Haddad) related that their heads felt like they were about to 'explode' with all of the ideas floating around in them. Yet, most students did ultimately make these connections. Haddad typified this aspect of student response when he approached me outside of the building during the break and said:

> I was very confused for the first few classes. I must admit that I did not know what to make of these things and did not know why you were talking about them. I have never heard of such things before. But, finally I began to understand. You have opened my eyes, and

> I can't wait to go home and tell others about them. I think they are greatly needed. (July 16, 2013)

Naturally, I refused credit for this endorsement and told him that these ideas came from a great many scholars. Nonetheless, this conversation did show that students were genuinely engaging the ideas and thinking about how they applied to their own contexts. The second incident again occurred during a break where I noticed a group of four students (Azad, Burhan, Janice, and Wei) engaged in conversation in the hallway. I approached them and discovered that they were engaged in a discussion about the post-colonial nature of hegemony and complicity within their own nations. This incident is notable as it is unusual to see students so avidly continue their discussion during a break. The third incident occurred during a class discussion where Sara was voicing her resistance to theories of white privilege and systematic racism. What was significant about this incident was that I, as the instructor, did not have to interject on why her perspective was limited and what that limitation meant. Instead, Claire and Sadiah responded to Sara in supportive tones why her perspective didn't work and why she didn't recognize her own white privilege. This incident best exemplifies the nature of the class in terms of how the students engaged the content of the course and how it gave them confidence in themselves and encouraged a sense of voice. All three of these incidents seem to confirm theories of engagement and resistance in critical literacy as these theories predict that pedagogies that are derived from these ideas not only resonate more with students, as they better connect with student lives and experiences, but also empower students with an increased sense of voice and social agency as well (Freire & Macedo, 1987; Kincheloe, & Steinberg 2000; Giroux, 2011).

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study indicate that although TESOL MA students show resistance to some aspects of critical literacy, they tend to engage the ideas in the literature and class discussions, to a greater or lesser extent, according to the discursive construction of their identities and social positioning (who they are). While all students displayed resistance to some theories in critical literacy, only one student exhibited firm resistance to one aspect of critical literacy theory (ethnic bias) that could not be overcome. The data illustrated that although all students showed some resistance to individually specific theories, they nonetheless were actively considering their merit and possible pedagogical applications. The results of this study also appear to validate other research findings on engagement and resistance to critical literacy in terms of resistance to ideological and ethnic theories that conflict with the discursive construction of their identities and engage students from historically and/or ethnically marginalized social groups (Giroux, 1983; Freire & Macedo, 1987). In addition, the findings of this study found that many students engaged theories of critical literacy for the purpose of keeping up with the 'cutting edge' ideas emerging in the field of TESOL and equating the increasing status of critical literacy in TESOL literature to the notion of professionalism. Finally, although all students engaged the majority of theories presented in the course, the data supports the theoretical predictions and research on engagement and resistance in critical literacy in that the non-American students, or students from nations that historically fell under colonial rule and were, thus, marginalized, engaged at higher levels than the non-American students. In other words, as one of the primary purposes of critical literacy is to address issues of social inequality embedded in education (Shor, 1999; Giroux 2011), it is not surprising that the non-American students engaged the course content at higher levels.

Lastly, it needs to be stated that the findings of this study are not easily

generalizable to other similar courses. The levels of student engagement demonstrated through the intellectual acuteness of student writings and the thoughtful and lively nature of class discussions are unique within my 15 years of teaching critical literacy to graduate students in TESOL and English education. I do not attribute the unique nature of this class to my own expertise in critical literacy or my teaching approach, but rather to the unique student composition of the class as I have never had a student group that was so diverse in terms of ethnicity and nationality. Nonetheless, the results of this study do show that TESOL MA students are generally open to theories of critical literacy regardless of their ethnicity or nationality and that they find these ideas to be of value to their field of study and themselves as teachers, individuals, and members of a larger society.

❖ REFERENCES

Barton, D., Hamilton, M., & Ivanic, R. (Eds.) (2000). *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context.* New York: Routledge.

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture.* New York: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press.

Canagarajah, S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. London: Oxford University Press.

Case, K. & Hemmings, A. (2005). Distancing strategies: White women preservice teachers and antiracist curriculum. *Urban Education 40(6),* 606-626.

Chism, N. (1998). Developing a philosophy of teaching statement. In K. Gillespie (Ed.) *Essays on Teaching Excellence: Toward the Best in the Academy*. POD Network: A Publication of the Professional and Organizational Development Network.

Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design: quaolitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Dawkins, R. (2010). *The greatest show on earth: The evidence for evolution.* New York: Free Press.

Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (2011). Introduction to the design and practice of qualitative research. In, N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln, (Eds.) *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE. pp.1-20.

Du Bois, W. (1994). *The Souls of Black Folk*. New York: Gramercy Books.

Fobes, C. & Kaufman, P. (2008). Critical pedagogy in the sociology classroom: Challenges and concerns. *Teaching Sociology, 36,* 26-33.

Foucault, M. (1984). *The Foucault reader*. New York: Random House.

Freire, P. & Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy, reading the word and the world.* New York: Praeger.

Gerring, J. (1997). Ideology: A definitional analysis. *Political Research Quarterly, 50(4),* 957-995.

Giroux, H. (1983). *Theory and resistance in education: a pedagogy for the opposition*. New York: Bergin and Garvey.

_____. (2003). Public pedagogy and the politics of resistance: Notes on a critical theory of educational struggle. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 35(1),* 5-16.

_____. (2005). *Border crossings: cultural workers and the politics of education.* New York: Routledge.

_____. (2011). *On critical pedagogy.* New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Goodyear, G. & Allchin, D. (1998). Statements of teaching philosophy. *To Improve*

the Academy: Resources for Faculty, Instructional, and Organizational Development, vol. 17. (M. Kaplan, ed.) Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press. 103-21.

Gramsci, Antonio (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. New York: International Publishers.

Hall, S. (1997). *Representation: cultural representations and signifying practices*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hayano, D. (1979). Auto-ethnography: Paradigms, problems, and prospects. *Human Organization*, 38, 113-120.

Johnson, K. (2006). The sociocultural turn and its challenges for second language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 235-257.

Kearns, K., & Sullivan, C.S. (2010). Resources and practices to help graduate students and postdoctoral fellows write statements of teaching philosophy. *Advances in Physiology Education, 35*, 136-145.

Kincheloe, J., & Steinberg, S, (1997). *Changing multiculturalism: new times, new curriculum.* London: Open University Press.

_____. (1997). Addressing the crisis of whiteness: reconguring white identity in a pedagogy of whiteness, In: J. Kincheloe, et. al., (Eds.) *White Reign*. (New York, St Martin's Griffin, pp. 3 – 29.

Kubota, R. & Lin, A. (2006). Race and TESOL: Introduction to concepts and theories. *TESOL Quarterly, 40(3),* 471-494.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). Toward a postmethod pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly, 35(4),* 537-560.

Kuhn, T. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Langan, D. & Davidson, D. (2005). Critical pedagogy and personal struggles: Feminist scholarship outside women's studies. *Feminist Teacher* 15(2), 132-158.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation.* Boston: Cambridge University Press.

Lillis, T. (2003). Student writing as 'academic literacies' drawing on Bahktin to move from critiques to design. *Langauge and Education. 17(3),* 192-207.

Lynn, M. (1999). Toward a critical race pedagogy: a research note, *Urban Education*, *33(5),* 606-626.

Macedo, D., et. al. (2003). *The hegemony of English.* Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

McInerney, P. (2009). Toward a critical pedagogy of engagement for alienated youth: Insights from Freire and school-based research. *Critical Studies in Education, 50(1),* 23-35.

McKinney, C. (2005). A balancing act: Ethical dilemmas of democratic teaching within critical pedagogy. *Educational Action Research, 13(3),*375-392.

McLaren, P. (2006). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education.* New York: Pearson.

McNamara, T. (1997). Theorizing social identity: What do we mean by social identity? Competing frameworks. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(3), 561-567.

Motha, S. (2006). ESOL teacher identities in U.S. K-12 public schools. *TESOL Quarterly, 40(3).* 495-518.

Norton, B. (1997). Language, identity, and the ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(3), 409 – 429.

_____. (2006). Identity as a sociocultural construct in second language education. In K. Cadman & K. O'Regan (Eds.) *Tales out of school: Special issue of TESOL in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Orr, D. (1993). Toward a critical rethinking of feminist pedagogical praxis and resistant male students. *Canadian Journal of Education, 18(3),* 239-254.

Pederson, R. (2012). Situated Learning: Rethinking a Ubiquitous Theory. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*. 9(2), 123-148.

_____. (2010). Conscientization and the discursive construction of identity across cultures: Using literacy autobiography as a reflective and analytical tool. *Cross-Cultural Studies, 20 (1)*, 149-182.

Peim, N. (2003). *Changing English? Rethinking the politics of English teaching.* New York: NATE.

Pennycook, A. (1999). Introduction: Critical approaches to TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 33(3),* 329-348.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pratt, M. (1994). Transculturation and autoethnography: Peru 1615/1980. In F. Barker, P. Holme, & M. Iverson (Eds.), *Colonial discourse/postcolonial theory* (pp. 24-46). Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Riley, D. & Claris, L. (2009). From persistence to resistance: Pedagogies of liberation for inclusive science and engineering. *International Journal of Gender, Science and Technology, 1(1),* 36-60.

Schönwetter, D., et. al. (2002). Teaching philosophies reconsidered: A conceptual model for the development and evaluation of teaching philosophy statements. *International Journal of Academic Development, 7,* 83-97.

Seas, K. (2006). Enthymematic rhetoric and student Resistance to critical pedagogies. *Rhetoric Review, 25(4),* 427-443.

Shin, H. & Crookes, G. (2005). Exploring the possibilities for EFL critical pedagogy in Korea-a two-part case study. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 2(2),* 113-138.

Shor, I. (1999). What is critical literacy. *Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 1(4),* 1-27.

Spivak, G. (1995). *The Spivak reader: selected works of Gayati Chakravorty Spivak*. New York: Routledge.

Spradly, J. (1980). *Participant observation.* New York: Rinehart and Winston.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J., (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and technique.* Newbury Park, London: Sage.

Stringer, E. (2007). *Action research in education.* New York: Pearson.

Sung, K. & Pederson, R. (2012). Critical practices in ELT as a project of possibilities or a banal discourse. In, K. Sung & R. Pederson, (Eds.). Critical ELT practices in Asia. Boston: Sense. Pp. 153-169.

Yagelski, R. (1999). The ambivalence of reflection: Critical pedagogies, identity, and the writing teacher. *National Council of Teachers of English CCC, 51(1),* 32-50.